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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Among the 350,000 immigrants who have come to Australia since the end of the war are included some 171,000 "Displaced Persons", war-time and post-war emigrés resettled in this country by arrangement with the International Refugee Organisation. These immigrants are now scattered in cities and country areas throughout Australia. The process of their incorporation into the Australian social structure is a matter of considerable practical importance, because their incorporation is still very far from complete, and because this experience should presumably provide a useful guide for official policy and the behaviour of individuals and private groups towards the new arrivals who continue to settle in this country under a variety of schemes. But this unprecedented influx of Europeans also allows the sociologist to pursue further the theoretical problem of the process of assimilation.

The present study was designed as a contribution to the understanding of this problem. Because little sociological material was available, either on the general position of immigrants in this country, or on the Displaced
Persons in particular, no attempt was made in advance to formulate rigid hypotheses. The study was, rather, an exploratory one, designed to analyse the relation between the immigrant's social background, his social relations in this country both with other immigrants and with Australians (social assimilation), his acquisition of new cultural patterns (cultural assimilation), his attitudes and beliefs about his country of origin and about the new society (identifications with and orientations towards groups), and his own perception of his present position, particularly in terms of worthiness and success (adjustment). It was expected that it would be possible to identify recurring combinations of these several aspects of the assimilation process, that is, general patterns or modes of organisation of the individual's behaviour, attitudes and values (types of adaptation). The concepts used in the analysis will be discussed in some detail in the relevant chapters. The concluding chapter briefly relates the findings of this study to the general body of knowledge on assimilation.

Goulburn was chosen as the site for the field study for two reasons. Being one of the largest cities in Australia outside the metropolitan areas, its social structure is diverse and complex enough to include many of the groups and institutions typical of the larger concentrations of populations in
this country, the number of immigrants in the city was not large. It was also felt that it would be more useful to study the assimilation process in a community where the absolute number of Displaced Persons, and their proportion to the local population, was small, rather than concentrating on the more dramatic but more often surveyed situation (found for example in Cooma or Wollongong) where a community suddenly expands and changes rapidly as the result of a large migrant influx.

It is our objective here to analyse the inter-relation of elements in a social process; we make no claim to be describing "the assimilation of the Displaced Persons in Australia". There is, of course, no typical Displaced Person; neither is any one of the diverse milieux in which the immigrant finds himself typical of Australia as a whole. Some factors which have affected the experience of the Displaced Persons in Goulburn are peculiar to those particular persons in this particular environment; in other respects, the Goulburn Displaced Persons are similar to certain other Displaced Persons and the city has characteristics in common with other communities in this country; finally, the Goulburn Displaced Persons resemble virtually all other Displaced Persons in certain respects and are subject to forces similar to those operating on Displaced Persons throughout the country.

The field work on which this study is based was carried out from February to August 1953, when I lived in a Migrant Hostel in Goulburn. Frequent brief visits have been made to the city since this period of continuous field work was completed.
CHAPTER 2.

RESEARCH TECHNIQUES AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Most of the material for this study was obtained directly from the Goulburn Displaced Persons in the course of personal contacts, which took the form not only of pre-arranged interviews, but also of casual meetings and participation by myself in the social life of the immigrants. Personal contact with Australians was also an important source of information. Documentary material was used to supplement and check data obtained through personal contact.

In the following pages I shall list the research techniques used, and discuss some problems of obtaining and analysing material. The first section of the chapter concerns sampling; the second and third sections discuss the acquisition of data through personal contact with Displaced Persons and the local people, respectively, the fourth refers to documentary material and the fifth contains a discussion of some problems of analysis.
1. The Sample of Displaced Person Subjects.

The Displaced Persons who are the subjects of this study fall into three categories according to the information which has been obtained about them. In the first category are those from whom detailed life-histories were secured during a series of interviews. The second category consists of those from whom incomplete life-history material was obtained through interviews. All available official records on subjects in both these categories were consulted, and information was also obtained from immigrants and Australians who had been associated with them as friends, neighbours, fellow-workers, employers etc. In the third category are those immigrants for whom we have only documentary material; the research worker met some of these subjects but did not interview them; others had left the district by the time the study was being carried out; the official documentary sources have not been tapped so thoroughly for these subjects as for those in the first two categories.

The following table compares the subjects from whom life-history material was obtained with the total adult Displaced Person population of Goulburn.
### Sample of Subjects in Relation to Total Adult Displaced Persons Population of Goulburn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Detailed Life-Histories</th>
<th>Incomplete Life-Histories</th>
<th>Total Adult Population (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumanian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) These figures are taken from the Population Survey, September 1953; they include all persons whose nationality was given as one of the countries listed, excluding the Census categories of "Children Not at School", "Full-Time Students" and inmates of the Kenmore Mental Hospital and the Training Centre (Gaol).

Subjects who were not interviewed were traced through the records of the local Employment Office and through
three industries which have employed Displaced Persons in large numbers. The material collected about these immigrants is sex, date of birth and nationality; some information on employment history since immigration has also been obtained for all of them, and data on education, pre-migration occupation and date of arrival in Australia for some of them. All the available information on the characteristics of these immigrants is summarised in Chapters 4 and 5. Information was collected on the total population of Displaced Persons for whom records were held in the Employment Office and in the three industries; sampling was not necessary.

As the preceding table shows, the subjects for whom life-history material was obtained represent a fair cross-section of the Displaced Person population in Goulburn, in relation to nationality and sex. But no attempt was made to select a random sample (1). Such an attempt would have been inappropriate in the present study. One of the central problems of the research was to delineate the pattern of social relations within the Displaced Person group, to determine which immigrants associated together in what activities. The thorough analysis of this problem involved interviewing and observing people who stood in certain

relationships to one another, such as two friends or the members of a family or clique; this aspect of the study thus precluded sampling of individuals. It might have been theoretically feasible to sample the groups studied, but by the time one had defined the boundaries of the groups from which the sample was to be drawn, a comprehensive survey of social relations within the total population would already have been completed.

Apart from this consideration, it would in any case have been impossible to take a random sample of subjects for the present study. Close rapport was necessary to obtain some of the personal and emotionally-laden material required; I found that a few of the immigrants were so personally uncongenial that this rapport could not be established, or, if established, could not be maintained; apart from these few, variations in my relationships with subjects meant inevitable variations in my knowledge and understanding of the individual.

Rigid sampling was also rendered impossible by the fact that the co-operation of the subjects was voluntary. Only one person who was approached refused outright to have anything to do with the project, but a number of others were too indifferent or too suspicious to give their whole-hearted co-operation. Some of these provided information which was clearly so unreliable, superficial or stereotyped that they were excluded from the sample; others are included in the
category "Incomplete Life-Histories". Failure to secure the full co-operation of all the immigrants who were approached resulted from a number of factors: some individuals were unwilling to spare time for a purpose which they did not understand and from which they could see no benefit to themselves; in other cases, technical factors prevented a first contact from being followed up immediately, and the immigrant lost interest; but by far the most serious factor was suspicion. From their wartime and post-war experiences many of the Displaced Persons have come to feel that questioning, especially by strangers, usually means trouble. The past lives of some immigrants contained much that they felt was best kept hidden, especially from an Australian; a few were reluctant to reveal that they had worked actively for the German cause during the war; some had marital ties in Europe which they wanted forgotten; some had forged documents to gain admission to Australia; others may have emigrated originally to escape the penalties for some breach of the law. A few immigrants feared any probing into their affairs since coming to Australia: one family's obvious avoidance of myself, for instance, was doubtless due to the fact that they owed the Department of Immigration a considerable sum of money for hostel expenses and had, presumably for this reason, failed to notify the Department of their address, as required by law. Other immigrants, particularly Russians, Balts and Poles, recalled the Soviet agents operating in
Western Europe at the end of the war in an attempt to force repatriation on the Displaced Persons; they wondered if the research worker might be concealing some similar sinister intent. (1) Immigrants from these countries were also especially suspicious of questions relating to their families at home, fearing that information could be used by the Soviet authorities to bring harm to themselves or their relatives. Immigrants may also resist talking about their personal lives, not only because of these explicit and conscious fears, but also because they have been through extremely painful experiences whose memory they have suppressed as far as possible. (2) It seems to the present writer that, unless a research worker is skilled in

(1) Evidence by Vladimir Petrov given before the Royal Commission on Espionage shows that, until February 1953, Russia maintained in Australia G.R.U. (Military Intelligence) officers, whose "special task was the repatriation of Displaced Persons who came to Australia from Germany after the war and wished to return to the Soviet". Sydney Morning Herald, 3/7/54. Before this information was revealed at the Royal Commission, I had known that in Goulburn the activities of the Soviet agents had been recalled when I began my research. It now seems possible that this suspicion might have been accentuated by the fact that the Displaced Persons knew of, or had heard rumours of, the activities of the G.R.U. officers here in Australia. In an article on the resettlement of the Displaced Persons in Britain, Stadulis, 1952, p.229, mentions "suspicion that there are Communist agents in their midst" as a generally recognised cause of mental breakdowns among Displaced Persons.

(2) In her study of "Emotional Problems of Displaced Children", Editha Sterba points out that the background material obtainable from the Displaced Person children studied was "always meagre and superficial"; some were very reluctant to yield material from their past because they wanted to forget. Sterba 1949, p.177.
therapeutic interviewing, he should beware of probing these areas of experience too deeply.

Vague and concrete suspicions and fears and the necessity to keep some memories suppressed may thus render certain areas of experience, ideas and feelings in some subjects inaccessible to the research worker, and may make other immigrants quite useless as informants. It is, of course, part of the sociologist's job to dispel the distrust which prevents him from obtaining the material he requires. The research worker cannot, however, hope to overcome this resistance to the point where he has full control over the selection of subjects from whom he obtains detailed, personal material.

The immigrants' reactions to the research project and to myself as an individual were themselves, of course, a valuable source of material and have been drawn upon throughout the analysis which follows. Especially revealing was the way in which the subjects perceived the research worker - as a Government official, a Communist agent, someone to be taken advantage of and exploited, an advisor, spokesman or intermediary, a friend, or a potential wife.

Another consideration also made it impossible to attempt random sampling in this project. This was the language difficulty. Goulburn Displaced Persons spoke some eleven different languages as their native tongues. There
was no lingua franca common to them all, though a majority knew some German and a large minority knew Russian. Many of the German-speaking Displaced Persons had picked this language up only during or after the war; and some had less facility in it than they had in English. My command of German was by no means good enough to enable me to interview in that language, and I knew none of the other languages spoken by the Displaced Persons. Interviewing had therefore to be conducted through an interpreter or in English. Very often in the course of the study, the husband, wife or friend of an interviewee would act as an informal interpreter when the need arose. No attempt was, however, made to use interpreters as a regular practice, because I felt that this would inhibit the development of rapport and distort the material obtained, especially since the subjects were all familiar with the use of interpreters in Europe, and tended to distrust them; another reason for avoiding the use of interpreters was that the only persons who would have been available already stood in some relationship to many of the subjects, and had previously been used as interpreters by government officials or the police. All interviewing was, then, conducted in English, but care was taken to ensure that the sample included Displaced Persons whose English was very poor, extra precautions being observed in cross-checking information from these subjects. In all, only 8 Displaced Persons whom I met knew so little English that even a limited
interview was impossible. The language problem would, then, have made random sampling of the total Displaced Person population impossible in this study; variations in the immigrants' facility in English also meant inevitable variations in the quantity and significance of the life-history material obtained, and these variations would not have been removed by the use of a random sample.

While the subjects do not constitute a random sample of the Displaced Person population in Goulburn they are as representative as it was possible to make them within the limitations that have been outlined above. The table on page 6 shows the representativeness of the subjects in terms of sex and nationality. The sample was also made as diverse as possible in terms of age, migrant type, duration of residence in Australia, education and socio-economic background.

We can now summarize what are likely to be sources of bias in the sample of whom life-history material was obtained. The most detailed material was obtained from persons with some competence in English, of comparatively high educational standard and social background, from lonely or severely maladjusted immigrants, from Displaced Persons who hoped for some specific or ill-defined gain to themselves, and from immigrants with whom I could spontaneously establish a genuine friendship. Because of the small size of the sample, these sources of bias are likely to have affected the results, but, since the factors influencing the extent of co-operation were so varied, the bias due to any
one factor is reduced: in other words, if co-operation was not secured for one reason, it was often forthcoming for another. Apart from these variations in the intensity of material from different subjects, the sample is biased in that it does not include any non-English speaking immigrants, and it contains a much smaller proportion of single men than the Displaced Person population as a whole.

2. Material From Personal Contact With Displaced Persons.

At the beginning of the study it seemed that it would be difficult to find in Goulburn the kind of living quarters which could be used also as an office and to which subjects could be invited for interviews. The problem was quickly resolved, however, when I was granted permission to take up residence in the Migrant Hostel, which had been opened at the beginning of 1951 and which housed almost exclusively British immigrants. Except for the Manager and his assistant, the secretary, and one or two British women who were employed as cleaners from time to time, the staff of the Hostel - chefs, dining room attendants, kitchen men, yardmen, etc - were all Displaced Persons or the German wives of Displaced Persons. The number of Europeans employed fluctuated around 13; about half of them lived in the Hostel, the remainder having obtained homes of their own in the town. At first I was an object of extreme suspicion to the Hostel staff, the fact that I had been granted the unprecedented privilege of taking up residence only serving to
increase their distrust. Very slowly at first and then more quickly, they came to accept me and I maintained continuous contact with most of them for the six months of my stay. Since I took my mid-day and evening meals in the Hostel dining-room with the staff, I saw some of them every day. There was very little informal social life among the Hostel employees, and virtually no organised social activities, but I eventually became accepted into one clique of four and spent some time in informal visiting and conversation with them every day or so. The cleavage between the European staff and the British residents was noticeable when I first arrived in February 1953, but became even more marked as the Australia-wide dispute between British Hostel residents and the Commonwealth Hostels Ltd. ran its course; the sympathy of the Europeans was entirely with Commonwealth Hostels. Because the British immigrants were not to be included in the study and because this cleavage would have made it very difficult for me to come and go between the residents and staff, I made no attempt to associate with the British immigrants, who, from the beginning, almost certainly identified me with the management and staff. Throughout the period I did of course have casual contact with a number of the British residents.

Soon after arriving in Goulburn, I arranged with the editor of the local daily newspaper to publish a news item about the research project. This publicity proved to
be helpful in my later contacts with both immigrants and Australians; it lent a certain legitimacy to my position in the community and an authenticity to my credentials. The first contacts with Displaced Person subjects were made at the Hostel, and through the Kenmore Mental Hospital and the Chief Clothing Factory, where I knew immigrants to be employed; an assistant interviewer later made contact with Railway employees. Relationships among the Displaced Persons were such that, once the initial contacts had been established, I automatically met more immigrants as I joined in the informal social life of the group and could readily arrange for introductions to particular people whom I had heard of.

A large living-room in a hut somewhat isolated from the rest of the Hostel provided ideal conditions for interviewing and for entertaining informally. Because the Hostel was on the outskirts of the town, two miles out from the centre, and for various other reasons, the subjects sometimes preferred that I should interview them at their place of residence.

Life-history material was obtained largely through an interview technique which allowed subjects to talk freely and spontaneously on the wide variety of topics.
in which I was interested (1).

Very little direct questioning was needed to elicit the material required; or, to phrase it more accurately, information which was not given spontaneously could rarely be obtained through the use of direct questions. This statement needs to be modified with regard to the well-educated subjects who had an intellectual interest in the project; direct questions could be used more readily to stimulate their interest initially and to fill in gaps after detailed material had been obtained; but they too gave the most valuable personal material when allowed to talk freely. Direct questions on any emotionally significant topic tended to put the informants on their guard. In general, the most telling revelations were those whose significance for the research was not apparent to the subjects.

From all of the Displaced Persons included in the sample I obtained not only life-history material, but also information and attitudes on other individuals and general observations on some or other of the problems with which the research was concerned. Because of differences in experience,

(1) The interviewing technique was of the "nonstructured" type, as described by Jahoda et al., 1951, Vol.1, pp. 175-179. These writers distinguish the nonstructured focused and clinical interviews from the nonstructured nondirective interview, the difference between the two types lying in the extent to which the direction of the interview rests with the interviewer or the subject. My own approach fluctuated between the focused and the nondirective.
intelligence, observational powers and capacity for generalisation, some subjects were more useful as "informal collaborators" (1) than others, but none was used only for this purpose and all performed this function at least to some minor extent.

There was little attempt to organise formal group interviews, but, through being accepted as a full or peripheral member of several cliques, I often had the opportunity to discuss problems in a group situation and on one occasion had a fruitful discussion by going through a prepared list of questions with four friends to whom I was well known. It was found that these informal group discussions provided a useful check on material obtained from participants in individual interviews; the stimulus of the group could elicit new material and fine shades of meaning which had not appeared in the individual interview; this additional material often came into the open as the result of information known to other members of the group, but not to myself (1).

The choice of a country town as the locale for the research was determined partly by the knowledge that I


(2) A useful discussion of the advantages and limitations of the group interview is to be found in Thompson and Demerath, 1952.
must become a participant-observer if I was to obtain the kind of material I wanted. Apart from the fact that observation produced additional insights and provided a check on the interviews, it was quite inevitable that I should enter into the social life of the Displaced Persons, partly because, as a stranger to the town, I had at first few contacts elsewhere, and partly because, the circumstances of the Displaced Persons themselves being what they are, no-one could take a personal and continuing interest in them without becoming to some extent incorporated into their everyday lives. The question of the extent to which a research worker should participate in the life of a group whom he is studying has often been raised (1). This did not present a serious problem in the Goulburn study, but two points are worth commenting on. At various stages during the research it was difficult to prevent a certain individual or clique from taking possession of me; this had to be avoided partly because of the harmful effects of becoming too closely identified with certain immigrants, but also because it could become too time-consuming and too restrictive on my freedom of movement; the marked tendency of many Displaced Persons to adopt this possessive attitude towards me was of course related to their personal insecurity.

and their feeling of not being accepted by Australians. Secondly, from the outset I had to make it clear that there were some activities that I was not interested in; going to the cinema, the only form of organised recreation in which most of the Displaced Persons took part, was one of these activities and attending public dances was another. It seemed better to avoid these pastimes altogether rather than risk the difficulties that would arise through accepting the invitations or company of some individuals and not of others. Before long, all the immigrants with whom I had close contact completely accepted it as a personal idiosyncrasy that I "didn't like the pictures", and ceased to suggest that I should go with them. In two or three cases, I could not, or did not try to, overcome the immigrant's feeling of rejection resulting from my refusal of an invitation, and contact between us faded out.

My relationship with the subjects of the study varied greatly. With a few I established a friendship which still continues. Some offered me a friendship which I could not reciprocate with equal sincerity. With others I maintained an even, fairly impersonal but easy acquaintance. Only two points concerning the relationship of the research worker to the informant require further comment here. The first is the question of the impartiality of the research worker. Discussions of interviewing techniques frequently
exhort the research worker to refrain from passing judgments or taking sides on any issue that arises (1). My own experience suggests that, where the research worker is a participant-observer, the studied and continued avoidance of all value judgments has its disadvantages. In the long run, it arouses distrust in informants as it would in any other relationship: one who never expresses his views on crucial issues is likely to be suspected either of "sitting on the fence" or hiding some sinister intent. And continued refusal of one party to commit himself inevitably introduces an element of artificiality into any close relationship; when the lack of reciprocity becomes evident, it creates tension. These observations are not to be interpreted as a plea for the research worker to disregard the importance of impartiality. I simply wish to point out that complete impartiality is inconsistent with the full acceptance of the research worker as a person by his informants, and is likely to defeat the purpose of establishing close rapport. Amongst the immigrants whom I came to know well, I found that it was constantly necessary to indicate my own judgment on important issues, and indeed the relationship would have become impossibly artificial from my own point of view had I not done so.

(1) E.g., Whyte, op.cit., p. 498, states, "it was extremely important that I accepted with interest everything they did and whatever they said. I scrupulously avoided passing moral judgments upon anybody".
Closely related is the difficult question of how the informants perceive the research worker. Particularly among the less educated immigrants there was a tendency for the subjects to interpret my interest as a sign of personal attraction or compatibility, a tendency to read into my behaviour an offer of friendship. This difficulty was usually resolved as a genuine friendship developed, or the immigrants redefined their attitude to me and accepted a fairly impersonal, but easy relationship (1).

The problem of recording material presented difficulties. The production of a notebook and pencil in the initial interview nearly always made the immigrants withdraw and was usually interpreted, as far as I could gather, as indicating the official nature of my enquiries. After about four attempts of this kind, I never recorded material in the presence of the subjects unless I had already established good rapport with them in the course of a number of contacts. Basic factual material was recorded on a prepared Schedule (see Appendix 1); in the case of about 8 subjects, with whom close contact had already been established

(1) The reason why a comparatively small proportion of single men is included in the sample is partly that some of them tended initially to regard me as a possible girl-friend or wife, or to assume that I was looking for a husband, and, when my behaviour was not as they expected, from this point of view, it was sometimes impossible to establish any other kind of relationship with them. The awareness of this attitude made me in turn more diffident about approaching the single men than the rest of the Displaced Persons.
before life-history material was obtained, I filled in the
schedule in their presence, but as a rule I did not produce
it during the interview. Material was, of course, recorded
as soon as possible after it was obtained, but I found that
the facility of recall was determined more by whether I was
fatigued at the time of the interview, or at the time of
recording, and by what had intervened between the event and
the recording, than by the actual duration of time that
elapsed before the material was written up.

There is no need to comment on those problems
of the validity of material which are common to any research
project of this kind: the face-saving and the prestige-
giving distortions, the suppression and repression of experi-
ences, and the research worker's techniques for limiting
biasses resulting from these factors by intensive interview-
ing, and by cross-checking with the same informant and between
informants, and by checking statements with behaviour. Only
three points are of special importance in this study. The
first is that there is virtually no opportunity for checking
on the early history of the Displaced Persons; not only is
it impossible to consult records to corroborate what they say,
but the Displaced Persons themselves come from such a diversity
of localities in their country of origin and have been so
dispersed in Australia, that there is little chance of finding,
amongst the small number of Displaced Persons in a place like
Goulburn, many people who knew each other at home. And too,
the research worker studying people from unfamiliar and
diverse cultures, and outside their own cultural setting,
ievitably lacks understanding of those subtle clues of
speech and behaviour which enable one to gauge the accuracy
of statements and the typicality of behaviour among people
with whom one is familiar. The second comment on the
validity of the material has been mentioned in the preceding
section and need only be touched on here: because the
Displaced Persons are more than usually insecure, and often
do have a very realistic reason for concealing some of their
past experiences, they are especially prone to distort and,
above all, to omit material. Expecting the research worker
to have the same attitude of superiority towards them which
they often anticipate from Australians, they may strive to
establish their own equality by "building themselves up", or
they may try to ingratiate themselves by giving always the
right answer, the technique which some of them use in their
everyday relations with Australians. The more thorough the
research worker's knowledge of the historical background of
the groups from which the Displaced Persons come, the less
likely is he to allow distortions and omissions to pass
unnoticed. A third difficulty arises when interviews are
conducted in broken English; only careful rechecking provides
a safeguard against the distortions resulting from this factor,
and often enough only a rough approximation to the subject's
more subtle attitudes and values can be obtained.

To conclude this discussion of the material obtained through personal contact with immigrants, it should be pointed out that, through some familiarity with the situation of Displaced Persons elsewhere in Australia, particularly in Sydney and Canberra, the writer has been able to see the Goulburn material in perspective, to fill out the picture of certain phases of Displaced Person experience, and check the veracity of particular happenings for which no documentation is available and which could not be adequately verified within the limits of the Goulburn study itself.

3. Material From Personal Contact With Local People

Material of various kinds was obtained from the local people. In private homes and at numerous meetings of associations, I took the opportunity to discuss the general question of immigration with the Goulburn residents, some of whom had had much contact with Displaced Persons while others had had almost none. The key informants, both for material on particular immigrants and for general information on the place of the Displaced Persons in the community were, however, the Employment Officers, City Council officials, officials of the principal migrant-employing industries, such as the Railways and the Mental Hospital, employers, the clergy, members of the important
community associations, and in particular the executive of such associations, individuals who had at any time been associated with the New Settlers League, and the Manager of the Hostel. The few pre-war Central European immigrants in the city were also interviewed.

4. Documentary Material

Documentary material on individual Displaced Persons was used both to check and supplement data obtained from interviews, and to secure information on Displaced Persons who had passed through Goulburn before the study was carried out. The most useful official source of information on individuals is contained in the Aliens Register, kept by the Commonwealth Department of Immigration (1).

A copy of the card used in this register is given below. Changes of address and of employment are

(1) The Department of Immigration also retains copies of the I.R.O. Resettlement Registration Form (see Appendix 2) for all Displaced Persons. A great deal more detail is provided for in these forms than in any other records kept in Australia, and the forms appear usually to have been filled in carefully by the I.R.O. officers. Unfortunately this material could not be drawn upon for the present research, as it is still stored in the original crates in which it was received from the I.R.O., for the most part classified according to the ship on which the Displaced Person travelled to Australia. When sorted and classified these documents will provide the best documentary material available on the background of individual Displaced Person immigrants to Australia.
Aliens are required by law to inform the Department of Immigration of changes of address and employment, but they often fail to do so, with the result that the cards do not always contain a complete record of the immigrant's residential and employment history. If, in addition to place of employment, occupation is also listed, it is usually in such general terms that it is not useful for detailed classification; e.g., men in all kinds of occupations are listed as
"labourers". Information on pre-migration occupation is of little value, because no consistent occupational classification is used, because it is often doubtful whether the immigrant has been fully or only partly trained in the occupation which he claims, and because, where immigrants are old enough to have been in employment before leaving their own countries, it is not usually indicated whether the occupation listed was the one which they followed at home, or in some other country during or after the war.

The Departmental files were also consulted on all individual immigrants for whom detailed case history material was obtained. The files were used especially to find out whether the subjects had put in their Declaration of Intention for naturalisation.

The Department of Labour and National Service acted as the agent for the Commonwealth Government in the administration of the contract. The employment records are kept in the Employment Office in Goulburn, and in May 1954, information was obtained from all cards on Displaced Persons employed at any time in and around the city. Unfortunately, in September 1953, all cards on which action had not been taken for three years had been destroyed. Had I known in advance that this action was to be taken, I should have requested that the cards be kept until I had been through them, but their destruction did not become known to me until
early in 1954. Most cards refer to Displaced Persons who served their contract, or part of their contract, in the Goulburn district, but some refer to Displaced Persons who, having moved into the district after completing their contract elsewhere, applied to the Employment Office for jobs. The practice was for cards to be forwarded from the district where the Displaced Person had been previously employed when he moved into Goulburn. A sample of the card most commonly used is attached (see Appendix 2). Details of the earlier occupational history are seldom filled in, and information on education is sometimes missing. The record of jobs held during the contract period is usually complete, but there is no obligation on either the Employment Officer or the Displaced Person to keep the record up to date after the expiry of the contract; hence many cards contain no information on the employment of Displaced Persons once the contract has been fulfilled, while others contain incomplete information. If an individual has been in receipt of unemployment benefit, that is entered on the back of the card.

Apart from the omissions referred to above, the information given in the Aliens Register and on the Labour and National Service cards can contain other sources of error. In Europe, Russian Displaced Persons commonly claimed Ukrainian or Polish nationality in order to avoid the risk of compulsory repatriation to the USSR. Later, many of these,
believing that the danger had passed, again claimed Russian nationality, and entered Australia as Russians. Others, however, continued to claim Polish or Ukrainian nationality, and are still incorrectly recorded in the Alien Register. A second source of error is that some Displaced Persons, with a husband or wife in Europe, or having previously been married, claim to be single.

A further check on the enrolment history of individual Displaced Persons was obtained by going through the records of the three industries which have employed the largest number of immigrants in Sydney, namely the Department of Railways, the Kurno Hospital and the Pacific Chenille-Croft Factory. These records also provided data on labour turnover and the general occupational history of the Displaced Persons. From the Valuation Books of the City Council, it was possible to obtain information on the value and location of property owned by Displaced Persons.

It is too soon to hope to have access to year diaries or letters of individual immigrants, but one Polish informant with a wide knowledge of Displaced Persons in Australia was available to be some detailed commentary on the general problem of assimilation (1), including the summary

(1) Where this material is quoted in the text, it is referred to simply as "comments by P.S."
of an article which he had sent to a newspaper in Germany.

I also had access to all minutes of all meetings
of the New Settlers League and to such correspondence as had
been retained. The papers of the League had not been care-
fully looked after, and some had certainly been misplaced;
attendance at several meetings showed that the minutes gave
only the most sketchy and inadequate outline of the actual
discussion.

The files of the Goulburn Evening Post, pub-
lished daily Monday to Friday, not only provided useful informa-
tion on the history of the Displaced Persons in Goulburn and
the public attitude towards them, but also gave a general
background to the life of the community. Book files from
1917 up to 1954 were used.

Hansie Wyatt's The History of Goulburn gives
a factual outline of the development of the city up to 1941.
Evelyn's Lilac City : The Story of Goulburn 1837-1947, published
this year, gives a popular and superficial account of the
city, being designed to provide, as the Mayor indicates in
his Foreword, an "advertising" for the district. The
Statistical Register of 1957, the Censuses and the unpublished
Population Survey of September 1953 provided statistical data
on the city and its population.

The bibliography to each Charter shows the
documentary material used on the different aspects of the
study.
5. Analysis of the Material

Life-history data were recorded originally under the following broad headings: basic data, migration history, family background, education, occupation, accommodation, social and cultural participation in Australia, cultural and national identification, politics, religion, aspirations and adjustment. The familiarity with life-histories of Displaced Persons obtained in Sydney before the beginning of the Coulburn study made it possible to construct a rough theoretical framework (see Appendix) as a guide to the detailed material required. Then it was to the final analysis of the material, the framework was not used in its original form, partly because it was found to be too detailed, partly because deeper insight made different classifications of the material more useful.

It is also perhaps as well to re-emphasise here a point that was made in the discussion of sampling, namely that material on certain problems was secured from only a proportion of the total sample of subjects from whom some life-history information was obtained, and this proportion differed for different problems, with of course some overlap.
Throughout the text it would have been too cumbersome to indicate the exact overlap of each sample. Wherever possible, the material has been quantified and subject to the usual tests of significance for small groups. Rigorous quantification of much of the data has been difficult, if not impossible, both because of the exploratory nature of the study and because much of the material is of the kind which does not readily lend itself to measurement. Throughout the study, it was deemed more useful to describe variations in attitudes, beliefs, values and aspirations than to attempt the ranking or measurement of such material in terms of intensity, strength or importance. The approach is thus typological (1). Little attempt has been made to give precise statements on the distribution of attitudes and values throughout the sample; because of the small size of the sample, it was felt to be inadvisable to classify the material in terms of subtle variations in each characteristic, for the number of cases representing each variation would often have been too small to be statistically significant.

The interpretation of any particular problem rests upon our knowledge and understanding of the situation of the Disabled Persons, not only in Coulburn, but also elsewhere. Statistical techniques, among other techniques, have been
used to check hypotheses rather than to suggest them (1).

(1) Despite the great elaboration and refinement of the use of statistical techniques in social research during the past twenty years, Tannenbaum's accounts on the limited place of statistics in social research remain relevant. See The Method of Sociology, 1934, pp. 217-235.
CHAPTER 3

THE EUROPEAN BACKGROUND OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS
AND HOW THEY CAME TO AUSTRALIA

1. Introduction

At the beginning of 1945, the Allied armies found some twelve million displaced persons (1) in Europe. A vast repatriation movement began even before the end of hostilities, and by July 1947 all but one million of the displaced persons had returned home independently, or with the assistance of the Allied armies and their home governments, or had been repatriated by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (U.N.R.R.A.). Although in the following years the numbers of non-repatriable displaced persons were augmented by new emigrants from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland, the total was vastly reduced through settlement in European and overseas countries. The 400,000 refugees remaining at the end

(1) The technical term "Displaced Person" refers to the body of emigrants who came under international care at the end of the war. In the following pages, the phrase is used without capitals to refer to all refugees and emigrants in Western Europe, irrespective of their legal and international status. The figure of 12 million displaced persons, taken from Kulischer, March 1949, includes persons displaced within the area occupied and controlled by the Soviet; these were rapidly resettled by the Soviet authorities.
of 1951 consisted of persons who did not wish to leave Germany, Austria or Italy, and of others who did not have the opportunity to emigrate because of age or illness, or because they were not politically acceptable to any receiving country (1).

Several international organisations have had some part in the care of displaced persons. The Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, established in 1938, continued to function as protectors of refugees until the former went into liquidation in December 1946, and the latter in June 1947; these organisations did not play a large part in relation to displaced persons, and their functions were eventually taken over by the International Refugee Organization (I.R.O.).

U.N.R.R.A. was established in November 1943 to care for displaced persons and to organise their repatriation. Because it was already clear by the end of 1945 that the displaced persons problem was not to be solved immediately by total repatriation, provision was made for international control to continue through the establishment of the I.R.O. The Preparatory Commission for the I.R.O. (P.C.I.R.O.) replaced U.N.R.R.A. in July 1947. The I.R.O. constitution having been accepted by the required number of countries, the I.R.O. proper succeeded the P.C.I.R.O. in August 1948.

(1) Vernant, 1953, Ch. 3, "International Bodies".
It was during the life of the I.R.C. that the major Displaced Person resettlement schemes were carried out; over one million Displaced Persons were resettled with the help of this organisation. The I.R.C. went out of existence in December 1951, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees having already assumed office in January 1951 to continue the international protection of refugees. The High Commissioner is still operating, but his functions are extremely limited compared to I.R.C.; in particular, it is not within his competence to organise repatriation or emigration. Another body, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, independent of the United Nations, came into operation in February 1952; one of its functions is to transfer migrants, including refugees, from Europe to absorbing countries; this organisation is primarily concerned with voluntary emigration from over-populated Western European countries (1).

The 12 million displaced persons in Western Europe at the end of the war came mostly from countries to the east of Germany, and had been dislodged from their home countries in three migration waves; the first wave consisted of 1939 escapees; the second brought prisoners and workers to Germany and occupied countries between 1939 and 1944, during

the period when the German armies were in the ascendant; the third wave consisted of people who retreated west, voluntarily or by force, as the Russian armies advanced in 1944 and 1945. In the post-war years, a new wave of refugees moved from eastern Europe to the west - Polish Jews fleeing before renewed persecution, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks, Yugoslavs and non-Jewish Poles escaping from Communist regimes. The following table summarises the composition of the displaced person population remaining for resettlement, according to nationality and migrant type.

In the remainder of this chapter, we shall briefly describe these four emigrant waves, in particular those elements which are strongly represented in Australia; a short account of the life of the displaced persons in post-war Europe will then be given; the fourth section will contain a brief description of the conditions under which Displaced Persons immigrated to Australia, and their occupational, social and migrant type composition.
### Categories of Non-Repatriable Emigrants by Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant Category</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Yugoslavia</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Czechoslovakia</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Estonia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Escapes, and Prisoners to Russia, 1939.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(not DPs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees and POWs who later joined Allied forces, and their dependants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 1939-1944 Emigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Refugees, incl. non-Germans who joined the Volksdeutsche evacuations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(very few)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POWs taken by Germany and released by Allies at end of war.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>(very few)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Labourers for the Reich, forced and voluntary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political deportees, excluding all persons deported for labour.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(very few)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Members of armed forces fighting with the Germans.</td>
<td>(very few)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 1944-45 Refugees and Evacuees.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>(very few)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Post 1945 Refugees.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>over</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>655000</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>118000</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>34000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data are too unreliable to permit percentages of emigrants in each category to be given, except that a rough estimate for the Poles is possible. The total number of Displaced Persons given at the bottom of each nationality column is composed of emigrants in the categories marked with a X. The sources used are those referred to in the text, particularly Vernant, 1953, and Kulischer, 1943. Only the principal Displaced Person Countries are included. Russians and Ukrainians are combined because it is very difficult to obtain separate figures for Ukrainians; many Ukrainians are also included with the Poles.
2. Escapees and Prisoners to Russia, 1939.

Following upon the German-Russian pact of August 1939, Germany attacked Poland, and Russia, after occupying eastern Poland, began to exert pressure on the Baltic states. These events set in motion the first migration movements of the Second World War. Several hundred thousand Polish civilians and army personnel escaped from the Germans. Most of them went to Eastern Poland, and some of these were taken in custody by the Soviet authorities. Some reached the neutral countries of Roumania and Hungary, whence a proportion were able to proceed to France, England, Switzerland and the United States, in one direction, and the Balkans and Palestine in the other; but large numbers were caught in the Nazi net as it spread throughout Europe in the following years. Another group of Poles escaped to the Baltic countries, whence many were later deported to Russia by the Soviet.

The Poles who escaped to France joined emigres resident in that country to form the First Polish Corps, which fought in France, withdrew to Britain after the collapse of France, and fought with the Allied forces until the end of the war. After demobilisation, the remainder of these forces who did not wish to be repatriated, nor to stay in western Europe, were temporarily settled in Britain.(1).

(1) Kulischer, 1943, pp. 49-50; Kulischer, 1948, p. 255; Vernant, op.cit., pp. 73-75.
When Russia entered the war on the side of the Allies, she agreed to the formation of a Polish Army from among the prisoners taken in 1939; many of the captives did not, however, survive to join the Second Polish Corps, or, as it is better known from the name of the General in command, the Anders Army. At the end of the war this Corps contained about 112,000 men, of whom approximately one sixth wished to be repatriated. The remainder were assembled in Britain, together with the First Polish Corps and civilian dependants, where they formed the Polish Resettlement Corps; they did not become Displaced Persons, but settled in Britain or emigrated to Australia and other countries under special schemes (1).

3. Prisoners and Workers to Germany, 1939-44.

After the subjugation of Poland in September 1939, Germany and Russia captured large numbers of POWs. By the end of the war, many of the prisoners taken by Germany had been allowed to return to Poland, or had become civilian workers in Germany; those still held as POWs were released by the Allies (2). Most of these civilian workers and released POWs were repatriated; the remainder stayed on in Western Europe and were eventually resettled.

(1) Kulischer, 1943, p. 58; Vernant, op.cit., pp. 73-75; Anders, 1949; Czapski, 1951. The Anders Army also included some refugees and deportees to Russia.

(2) Kulischer, 1943, pp. 135-136.
Germany released most of the prisoners taken when Yugoslavia was invaded in 1941; some of those retained in Germany refused repatriation at the end of the war (1). Estimates of the number of Soviet POW's taken by Germany are extremely varied and unreliable, but the total lay somewhere between one and a half and three million. The vast majority of these were repatriated before the end of 1945; an unknown number claimed some non-Soviet nationality, or succeeded in concealing themselves in other ways in order to avoid repatriation; many came under I.R.O. care, and were eventually resettled (2).

Of the millions of foreign workers brought into Germany and occupied countries during the war, it is not always possible to distinguish between those who were forced labourers and those who went voluntarily. For obvious reasons, many displaced persons at the end of the war claimed to have been forced labourers while in fact they were volunteers. If it is extremely difficult to assess the extent to which particular individuals were pressed into German service, it is even more risky to speculate on the depth of sympathy with the Nazi regime signified by voluntary enlistment. It can be noted, however, that there was great variation in the kind of pressures which brought millions of

(1) Kulischer, op.cit., p. 58; Vernant, op.cit., p. 88.
(2) Kulischer, op.cit., pp. 152-153; Vernant, op.cit., p. 84; Fischer, June 1949, Tolstoy, 1950; McNeill, 1950, p. 204.
foreign workers to Germany by the end of the war. To begin with, economic conditions, especially during the first half of the war, attracted many workers to Germany, where employment opportunities were much greater than in other European countries. This economically-motivated migration was to a considerable extent a continuation of pre-war movements from surrounding countries into Germany, and therefore did not necessarily signify political sympathy with the Nazi order. From the Axis and Allied countries, Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Roumania and Spain, workers were recruited under formal agreements with the Reich. Elsewhere offers of extra privileges, the withholding of unemployment relief or fear of reprisals for lack of co-operation were effective in securing recruits. Penal sanctions were enforced for failure to comply with labour direction in the occupied territories. In some countries, particularly in Poland, lightning forays on selected towns, streets or buildings were made to round up workers. Soviet citizens were deported in huge numbers from German-occupied Russia to the west. Foreign workers in Germany were classified into the following five groups, in the order in which their prestige and living and working conditions declined: Axis and allied workers; "Nordic" workers, from the Netherlands, Denmark and Norway; Western Europeans; "Ostland" workers, from the Baltic countries,
Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; Poles and Russians (1).

In the period immediately following the occupation of Poland, Germany embarked on a policy of deportations and labour recruitment in the Incorporated Provinces and the General Government. This policy not only provided Germany with a badly needed labour supply, but was also designed to remove the most active opponents of the Nazi regime and to free the Incorporated Provinces for German colonisation. While a small number of Poles did volunteer for work in Germany, hoping thus to secure better conditions than they could anticipate as forced labourers, the vast majority undoubtedly had to be coerced into the service of the Reich. The majority of these forced labourers were repatriated, but some returned to Germany, not finding conditions in Communist Poland to their liking; they joined those who had refused repatriation in the first place and became eligible for resettlement (2).

The period of most extensive recruitment of labour in the Baltic countries was 1942-43, when Germany was mobilising all her forces in an attempt to bring the war against Russia to a successful conclusion. Only a

(1) A most useful general survey of German labour mobilisation is contained in Kulischer, op.cit., pp. 122-132; see also Gross op.cit.; Hoehler, 1945; and Carey, March 1945.
very small number of these Balts were repatriated at the end of the war, although the Soviet attempted to force their return, claiming them as Soviet citizens. They remained in Germany and became eligible for resettlement (1). After 1941, Russian and Ukrainian workers were recruited in the Soviet territories occupied by Germany (2). Like the Soviet POW's, the great majority of these returned home within a few months of the end of the war, but an unknown number remained in Western Germany, and became eligible for resettlement. A small number of forced or voluntary labourers from Yugoslavia remained for resettlement at the end of the war (3). Czechoslovakia also provided an important source of labour for Germany, but nearly all Czechs were repatriated. Germany's allies, Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, contributed a comparatively small proportion to the total foreign labour pool in Germany; most workers from these countries seem to have returned home at the end of the war, if not before (5).


(2) Kulischer, op.cit., pp. 153-156; Vernant, op.cit., p. 86.


Among the peoples from occupied countries who moved into Germany, or other occupied countries, during the war were the Volksdeutsche, most of whom migrated to Germany from Soviet-occupied territories in 1939 and 1941, under agreements between Germany and Russia. The majority of these were settled in the Incorporated Polish Provinces, which were intended to become purely German areas. As ethnic Germans were specifically excluded from Displaced Person status, it would not be expected that they would come within the scope of the present discussion. There is, however, decisive evidence to show that many non-Germans joined the evacuation of ethnic German from the Baltic countries, Soviet-occupied Poland and elsewhere. The motive behind this eagerness to be accepted as ethnic Germans may have been opportunistic in many cases: the Volksdeutsche enjoyed a privileged position under Nazi Rule; they were encouraged to evacuate with bright promises of future prosperity in Germany or the newly occupied German territories; some non-Germans doubtless hoped to share this rosy future. Many other non-Germans who evacuated with the Volksdeutsche were, however, motivated by their hostility to and fear of Soviet rule. After the Allied occupation of Germany, some of these non-Germans naturally tried to dissociate themselves from the Volksdeutsche in order to obtain U.N.R.R.A. assistance; so did some genuine ethnic Germans.
Some succeeded and eventually became eligible for resettlement like other Displaced Persons (1). A few found their way to Australia.

Only a small proportion of the people who went to Germany as prisoners or workers between 1939 and 1944 were thus originally escapees from Communism; and it was only a small minority of them who refused repatriation at the end of the war. By the time emigrants in this category arrived in Australia, they had been absent from their homes a minimum of five years, and in many cases eight to ten years.

4. Refugees and Evacuees to the West, 1944-45.

As it retreated before the Russians in 1944-45, the German Army was accompanied by tens of thousands of Reich and ethnic Germans, by nationals of occupied countries being forcibly evacuated, in accordance with Germany's scorched earth policy, and by countless voluntary refugees trying to escape before the arrival of the Soviet forces. Many thousands of these refugees were overtaken by the Russians in their westward advance (2). Like the foreign labourers found in Germany at the end of the war, these 1944-45 refugees have often been condemned as German collaborators, rightly

(1) Kulischer, op.cit., Ch. 1, "Migration Movements of the German people"; Schechtman, op.cit.; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons, (1949 or 1950), p. 11; Pasilaitis (about 1947); Oras, 1948, p. 149.
(2) Vernant, op.cit., pp. 68, 70, 75, 79, 86, 88; Pasilaitis, op.cit.; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons; Carey, 1948.
afraid to stay in their own countries after their Nazi protectors had been put to flight. It is certain that this group of refugees included persons who had supported German puppet governments in occupied countries, but the Soviet occupation of the Baltic countries and Eastern Poland in 1940-41 was repressive enough to induce many Balts and Poles to attempt escape to Germany and Sweden, irrespective of their attitude to the Nazi regime, when Soviet occupation threatened once more (1). Similarly, some Russians and Ukrainians voluntarily joined the retreating German armies in order to escape from Communist rule.

A tide of refugees also poured into Austria and Italy from Yugoslavia during May and June 1945, and to a lesser extent during the ensuing months. Many of these were not political exiles, but young men wishing to avoid military service and "economic dissidents", that is, persons escaping from compulsory labour and low living standards (2).

Hungary was in a somewhat different position from these other countries. She had not experienced a period of Soviet occupation, and was not in immediate danger of Russian domination. The majority of Hungarians who left with the retreating German armies in 1944-45 were therefore

(1) Hoehler, op.cit., pp. 50-51; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons, pp. 17-18; Close, Nov. 1946.

members of the Axis government, civil servants and German collaborators; but there were also members of the upper and business classes who left because they feared the Red Army occupation. The majority of these 1944-45 refugees returned home, some of them emigrating once more after the Communists gained control of the government. Because the Hungarian displaced persons citizens, being of an Axis country, were not eligible for U.N.R.R.A. assistance, only Hungarian Jews are included in U.N.R.R.A. statistics. After 1948, the I.R.O. began to register and assist non-Jewish Hungarian displaced persons (1).

As the result of German pressure, or sympathy with the successful Nazi cause, Polish, Baltic, Yugoslav, Ukrainian, Russian and Hungarian armed forces fought in conjunction with the German Army, and some retreated with it in 1944-45. At first, the members of these armed units were excluded from U.N.R.R.A. assistance, but as time went on, the conditions under which international assistance could be obtained became less stringent, individual cases were examined, and many of these ex-soldiers came under U.N.R.R.A. and I.R.O. care (2).

(1) Vernant, op.cit., pp. 70-73; Hoehler, op.cit., p. 91.
(2) Vernant, op.cit., pp. 68, 70, 75, 81, 84-85, 86-87; Woodbridge, Vol. 2, p. 509; Spekke, 1951, pp. 405-411; Bilmanis, 1951, p. 405; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons, pp. 19-22; Le Neill, op.cit., p. 201, reports the confusion caused among relief workers in Germany in early 1946 by the absence of a definite official policy on whether Baltic members of the Wehrmacht were to be treated as Displaced Persons or not.
Soldier refugees included not only armed units which had supported Germany, but also the Chetniks of General Mihailovic, whose movement was at first supported by the Allies, but, after February 1944, repudiated. A large section of these forces retreated across the Italian frontier in April 1945. For two years after the end of the war many of them worked for the British forces in Italy; as the result of pressure from the Tito Government, they then lost their status as Allied supporters and were classed as "Surrendered Enemy Personnel"; they were moved to Germany where they were not at first eligible for I.R.C. assistance(1). They later came under I.R.C. care, however, and became eligible for resettlement.

Emigrants who left their own countries at the time of the Nazi collapse were thus motivated by the desire to escape from Communist rule, or by the fear of reprisals in their home countries because of collaboration with the Germans or with governments sympathetic to Germany. The longest period that they were likely to have been away from their home countries before arrival in Australia was seven years, and for most of them the period was closer to five years.

5. Post-War Emigrants.

From Australia's viewpoint the important national

(1) Vernant, op.cit., p. 89; Dickson, Dec. 1947.
groups in this category are Hungarians and Czechoslovaks. Communist control in Hungary became stronger after 1946, and was finally established with the elections of 1948. This changing political situation led to refugee movements which reached their peak in 1948, and diminished sharply after 1949 (1). There was very little emigration from Czechoslovakia between the end of the war and 1948, but the Communist coup of February 1948 led to large-scale emigrations, which reached their peak in 1948 and 1949. Vernant claims that only during 1948 were the Czechoslovak emigrants political refugees and, for the most part, intellectuals; after that date they were mainly "economic dissidents", or persons wishing to avoid military service or to escape from a third world war (2).

There was also a small post-war emigration from Poland and Yugoslavia during the lifetime of the I.R.C., and since 1951 there has been a continuous stream of refugees from the Iron Curtain countries. The post-war Displaced Persons who were resettled by the I.R.C. were not necessarily victims of political persecution, but often enough emigrated for economic reasons, or perhaps to escape the law. Those who were able to claim international protection found an

---

(1) Vernant, op.cit., p. 71.
(2) idem, p. 79.
organisation in smooth running order to care for them, and schemes for their resettlement planned or already in operation. Most of those who came to Australia had spent not more than three years, and many of them much less, as refugees in the west.

6. The Life of the Displaced Persons in Western Europe.

The one million wartime displaced persons who refused repatriation were deterred from returning home by economic conditions in their home countries, by the fear of reprisals for support given to the Nazi cause and by political opposition to the communist regimes in their home countries. Many emigrants who had at first refused to return for the first or second reason finally decided against repatriation for the third reason (1).

While conditions in their home countries prevented many refugees from returning there, and prompted others to join the post-war refugee movements, life in Germany, Austria and Italy held many discomforts and hardships for them. Whether the emigrants were living in U.N. camps or privately, accommodation was usually overcrowded and often of poor

---

standard; some camps were little improved since they had been used to house forced labourers or prisoners. Although the displaced persons at first received more food than the local populations, the rations were low, and in later years when monetary relief replaced food rations the money provided was inadequate to maintain the refugees above the minimum standards. The medical services were however of high quality, and achieved a great improvement in the health of displaced persons (1).

The employment situation of the refugees was unsatisfactory at most times, except during the immediate post-war period when large numbers of displaced persons were employed by the Allied armies and international authorities (2). The emigrants' failure to become absorbed into the local economy was mainly due to the economic chaos which followed the war years, but the refugees were also discriminated against by the local populations, and, on the other hand, often failed to take advantage of the opportunities for work and technical training which were available to them (3).

(1) Vernant, op.cit., Chs. 5, 6, 7; Woodbridge, Vol. 2, pp. 500-505; Kulischer, March 1949; Pasilaitis, op.cit.; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons; Close, op.cit.; McNeeil, op.cit.

(2) Woodbridge, Vol. 2, p. 519, quotes the Final Statistical Report of UNRRA's Displaced Persons Operation, June 1947, to show that in 1947, the average employment rate of all employables in Displaced Person camps in Germany was 70%.

(3) Vernant, op.cit., Chs. 5, 6, 7; U.S. Congress, op.cit., p. 13; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons, pp. 25-28; McNeeil, op.cit., Ch. 13; Tay, April, 1947.
Not only were most emigrants living in distressing material conditions, but they also occupied an unenviable position in the social structure. The peoples among whom they were located usually had an unfriendly or hostile attitude towards them, regarding them as a financial burden, as outsiders competing for scarce jobs and accommodation, as a threat to law and order, and an obstacle to their own social and economic recovery. The emigrants for their part resented the continued hostility on the part of the Germans, Austrians and Italians, and claimed that, as victims of the war, they had a right to favoured treatment. In these circumstances, there was frequent friction between the local groups and the refugees (1).

In addition, especially during the immediate post-war period, displaced persons whose countries of origin had formerly been, or had recently come to be, within the sphere of Communist domination - Poles, Balts, Ukrainians, Russians and Yugoslavs - were being threatened with compulsory repatriation, a threat which drove many into hiding, led to some suicides, and fostered feelings of insecurity, suspicion and distrust throughout the displaced persons as a whole. Forced repatriation constituted a threat to the

(1) Vernant, op.cit., Chs. 5, 6, 7; U.S. Congress, op.cit., pp. 11-12; The New International Year Book for 1947, "Refugees and Displaced Persons"; Carey, March 1945; Pasilaitis, op.cit.; McNeill, op.cit.; Hulme, 1953.
displaced persons in another sense: through claiming that non-returners must be Nazi collaborators, war criminals or unrevealed German ethnics, representatives of eastern European Communist governments greatly stimulated the existing doubts about the true loyalties and political sympathies of many displaced persons. In the present context, it is relevant to note, not the justification or otherwise of these doubts, but their deleterious effect on the security and prestige of the displaced persons (1).

The wide-spread loss of faith and disillusionment with the western Allies might also have been expected to have a demoralising effect on the displaced persons. Each nationality had its own particular reasons for believing that it had been let down during the war, at Yalta, or immediately after the war, but there were in addition certain sources of grievance deriving from the refugee situation itself. In the immediate post-war period, many displaced persons came to feel that they could not trust from Britain and the U.S.A. to protect them from forced repatriation by the Soviet authorities. There was also the fear that the Occupation authorities were in danger of developing

(1) Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons; McNeill, op.cit., Ch. 12; Tolstoy, op.cit.; Deutscher, July 1949; Fischer, Jan. 1949 and June 1949; Dickson, Nov. and Dec. 1947; Hulme, op.cit.
sympathy with the Germans, favouring them more than the displaced persons, and taking over their attitudes of hostility and superiority to the displaced persons. Nor were the refugees always convinced of the impartiality of the Allies in dealing with the several refugee nationalities under their care; some national groups were believed to be favoured more than others, and if these were also groups which did not appear to have suffered the most from Nazi persecution, cynicism flourished. Allied policy on the conditions of acquiring Displaced Person status, together with the variable execution of this policy, was also often a source of doubt and despair: at first, many displaced persons believed that the means of separating the sheep from the goats were unjust and arbitrary; as time went on, and it became easier to acquire Displaced Person status, some emigrants felt that the Allies were no longer interested in the relative claims of the victims and supporters of Nazi policy. As an undercurrent to all these sources of disillusionment was the feeling that the Allies had betrayed, and were continuing to betray the small countries of eastern Europe to protect their own interests in relation to the Soviet Union; perhaps the majority of displaced persons expected, if they did not want, a third world war, by which their countries would be liberated; they were deeply disillusioned that the western powers did not appear to perceive
the necessity and inevitability of such a war (1).

In the material and social conditions described above, the displaced persons' feeling of complete uncertainty about the future took on a special gravity. The war-time and 1944-45 emigrants suffered most deeply from this uncertainty, for, between 1945 and 1948, there was at first no assurance that international care for those who refused repatriation would continue, and there was little ground for hope of large-scale emigration. The refugees literally did not know what was to become of them, and had virtually no control over their own future. By 1948, however, three important migration schemes were in full operation: to Israel, the U.S.A. and Australia. Refugees from Communist countries arriving in western Europe after this date did not suffer any long period of uncertainty and waiting (2).

The reactions of the displaced persons to the situation described above varied considerably, not only according to nationality, location, war-time history etc., but also at different periods: it seems clear, for example, that the morale of the displaced persons was greatly improved when the migration schemes referred to above came into operation. Despite this diversity of reactions, it is

(2) Vernant, op.cit., Chs. 5,6; Berger, op.cit.
however possible to indicate some of the recurrent patterns. Some displaced persons reluctantly chose repatriation as the only solution; some are reported to have suicided (1). There was violence and lawlessness, including acts of revenge against the Germans; but violence seems to have occurred mainly in the chaos at the end of the war; apathy, lack of interest in work, living conditions or the future, were more characteristic of the following years (2). The individualism which reached its fullest expression in the black-market system was a widespread reaction. The situation of the displaced persons also stimulated expression of their national consciousness; national groups, usually located in separate camps, rivalled each other in their patriotism and anxiety to impress the Occupation authorities. National associations, representing a great variety of political, social and religious groups in their countries of origin, flourished, amalgamated, died out, and were replaced by others. The only activity which had any significance for some displaced persons was this participation in movements designed to present the refugee viewpoint and claims to the western world, or to plan for the day of liberation and reconstruction. These nationalist movements

(1) McNeill, op.cit., p. 117; Eisenhower, Crusade in Europe, p. 479; Hulme, op.cit., p. 45.
(2) Hoehler, op.cit., pp. 40-41; Fay, March 1946.
sometimes represented an attempt to create a more or less autonomous political structure, a state in miniature; some groups hoped to be able to establish compact national communities in western Europe or abroad, pending their return to their homeland (1).

Parallel to these political developments, in the domestic sphere, some displaced persons came to look upon the camps as their homes. Often to the consternation of the authorities, they dug themselves in, surrounded themselves with material possessions, and tried to create in this unpromising situation a skeleton of the kind of social structure to which they had been accustomed (2).

Whatever their reactions to these circumstances, many displaced persons had in common the conviction that their present situation was temporary, and would be solved by some far-reaching, if not miraculous, change (3). The change which eventually emptied the vast majority of non-repatriable displaced persons out of western Europe was the inauguration of migration schemes on a scale which few migrants or authorities in western countries had dared to anticipate

(1) Deutscher, op.cit.; Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons; Gross, Sept., 1950; Magorski, July 1950; Fischer, Jan. 1949.
(2) Dickson, Nov. 1947; Hulme, op.cit.
(3) Close, op.cit.
7. The Displaced Persons in Australia

The immigration of Displaced Persons to Australia was organised under an agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the P.C.I.R.C., signed in July 1947. Under this agreement, P.C.I.R.C. was to arrange for and bear the cost of transportation, the Australian Government contributing £A10 for each adult immigrant. The Government undertook to find employment for the Displaced Persons, but also required that the immigrants sign a two-year contract to work where directed. Immigrants were pre-selected by the I.R.C., the final choice being made by Australian selection boards; the order of priority in selection was: (i) single workers, (ii) childless married couples, (iii) married couples with one child, (iv) other family groups within these three categories. Vernant states that, "The extremely severe criteria for immigrants were progressively relaxed and towards the end of I.R.C. operations, Australia was admitting unaccompanied youths, from 18 to 20 years of age, widows with young children, old and invalid people, unmarried mothers, etc."(1). Selection favoured immigrants who would contribute to the unskilled labour supply, rather than highly trained tradesmen or professional persons.

(1) Vernant, op.cit., p. 706.
Although the agreement with the D.C.I.R.O. stated that there would be no discrimination in the selection of immigrants on grounds of race or religion, the proportion of Jews to total number of Displaced Persons admitted was lower than might have been expected - 4%. Vernant (1) and Murphy (2) have remarked on this low proportion, implying that the selection favoured Gentiles. Murphy points out that Australia "has taken only 7% of migrating Jewish D.P.'s as compared with an average of 20% for all other significant groups" (3). From my own contacts with the Displaced Persons, however, I would estimate that a considerable number of Jews entered Australia as adherents of some other religion, usually Roman Catholics. Most of these had probably dissociated themselves from all Jewish ties in the first instance to avoid persecution.

In addition to the Displaced Persons brought from Europe under agreement with the I.R.O., Australia also received displaced persons from Britain, mostly Poles who had fought with the Allied armies, and their dependants, and from China.

(1) idem, p. 721.
(3) idem, p. 180.
Between July 1947 and the end of 1951, when the I.R.O. ceased operations, Australia received 168,000 Displaced Persons, the peak being reached in 1950, with an intake of 70,000. Less than 3,000 have arrived since the beginning of 1952; the immigration of Displaced Persons has now virtually ceased. The Displaced Persons represent 38% of the total assisted immigrants and 72% of the total assisted non-British immigrants who arrived in Australia between the beginning of 1947 and June 1954 (1).

The following table sets out the volume of immigration between the beginning of 1947 and the end of 1953, from the "Displaced Person countries". Many of the non-Displaced Person's listed in this table are descendents of Displaced Person's; many others are Jews (2).

---

(1) Figures from the Statistical Bulletin, Department of Immigration, October 1954.

(2) Exact figures for the number of Jewish non-Displaced Persons are not available. Vernant, op.cit., p. 721 states, "permits for individual Jewish refugees sponsored by relatives or other persons already in Australia have been issued quite liberally."
### Immigration to Australia from Displaced Person Countries,
**January 1947 to December 1953.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Displaced Persons</th>
<th>Non-Displaced Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>63,394</td>
<td>7,966</td>
<td>71,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>23,543</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>25,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>19,421</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>19,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and Russian</td>
<td>17,720</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>20,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>11,919</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>13,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>9,906</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>10,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak</td>
<td>9,142</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>11,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>7,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumanian</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>4,451</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,700</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Figures for Displaced Persons supplied by the Department of Immigration. Total figures obtained from Statistical Bulletin, Department of Immigration, October 1954. Non-Displaced Person figures obtained by subtracting Displaced Persons from total. Ukrainians and Russians are combined, because prior to July 1949, Ukrainians were tabulated with Russians. The recent figures supplied by the Department of Immigration, however, tabulate Russian and Ukrainian Displaced Persons separately from 1947 onwards, and show that 14,464 Ukrainians and 3,256 Russians entered Australia as Displaced Person's between Jan. 1947 and Dec. 1953. Roles from Britain are included as "Non-Displaced Persons."
The several emigration waves described in the preceding pages are all represented among the Displaced Persons in Australia, but our immigrants do not necessarily constitute a cross-section of those from whom they were selected. We shall now indicate the relative numerical importance of these several emigration waves among Australian Displaced Persons, and give some impression of the social strata from which members of the principal Displaced Person nationalities in Australia were drawn. Table I classifies all adult male Displaced Persons who entered Australia in 1949 according to previous occupation (1).

Classifying our principal national groups of Displaced Person immigrants according to the four emigration waves already indicated, we shall refer first to those nationalities most of whose members left their countries at the outbreak of war, or between 1939 and 1944. The Poles,

(1) From I.R.O. documents in the possession of the Department of Immigration, it would be possible to obtain an exact picture of the social origins of the Australian Displaced Persons, since these documents contain information on education, previous occupation, and the date and circumstances of the immigrant's leaving his own country. The sorting, classification and analysis of this material would, however, be a major research study in itself; hence the following pages contain only the impressions on social origins obtained from information supplied by individual migrants, migrant associations, officers of the Department of Immigration and other persons familiar with our Displaced Person population. The only statistical material available is that referring to migrants who entered Australia in 1949; this material, for male Displaced Persons, is summarised in Table I, see p. 514.
of whom we now have 63,000 Displaced Persons constitute the largest Displaced Person group in Australia. The majority of Poles were drawn from the ranks of forced labourers; others are former POWs, and a very small number are political refugees and deportees. Nearly all our Polish immigrants thus left their country before 1944, and most of them much earlier. Partly because Poland was primarily a country of peasants and artisans, partly because the small bourgeoisie class and intelligentsia had mostly escaped in 1939, had been taken POWs, deported or killed, Polish Displaced Persons in Europe and Australia came largely from a background of poor education and low occupational status (1). The low standard of education was further accentuated by the fact that under German rule, Polish schools remained closed for five years. In addition to the Polish Displaced Persons, a further 1,457 Poles were assisted to come to Australia in 1947, under an agreement with Britain for the emigration of members of the Polish Resettlement Corps. Of the 12,971 Polish Displaced Person males who entered Australia in 1949, a third were craftsmen, and a quarter came from rural occupations; only 6%, the lowest rate for all 1949 male Displaced Persons, had previously been employed in professional, administrative,

commercial or clerical occupations (1).

The other national groups whose members in Australia derive mainly from the pre-1944 emigrant wave are the Ukrainians and Russians, of whom 18,000 Displaced Persons have entered Australia. They are predominantly former forced labourers and POWs whom the Germans moved west after the occupation of Soviet territory; a smaller number are refugees who fled from their countries with the retreating German armies, or were forcibly evacuated by the Germans. The 1,687 Ukrainian males arriving in 1949 contained a higher proportion of craftsmen than did any other nationality; a quarter of the total came from rural occupations. The 1,646 Russians had the highest proportion of labourers of any group (21%), and a slightly lower proportion of operatives and craftsmen. Like the Poles, the Ukrainians and Russians had a low proportion of professional and white-collar workers (6% and 7% respectively).

The wave of emigrants who left their countries at the time of the retreat of the German armies is represented in Australia principally by the three Baltic people, of whom there are 35,000 Displaced Persons. As previously mentioned, the great majority of Baltic displaced persons

---

(1) The former President of the Federal Council of Polish Associations in Australia, A. Poninski, in a private communication dated 1/3/54, estimates that there are in all 7,000 Polish "intelligentsia" in Australia.
in western Europe were 1944-45 refugees. This, plus
the fact that at first both the I.R.O. and the Australian
selection teams were not favourably disposed towards the
pre-1944 Baltic immigrants in Germany, meant that we were
bound to secure many more 1944 refugees than pre-1944
labourers. Although the social, cultural and political
elites of these countries had been suppressed during the
Russian and German occupations, the eradication of such
elements had by no means been so complete as in Poland,
with the result that a larger proportion of these groups
was represented among the displaced persons. In addition,
the white-collar class, intellectuals and bourgeoisie
escaped in greater proportion from the Baltic countries
than did the rural and farming people. These selective
processes, combined with the fact that the original popula-
tions of the Baltic countries contained a higher proportion
of professional and white-collar workers than did Poland,
meant that Baltic displaced persons in Europe had a decidedly
different occupational distribution from other eastern
nationalities (1). The available comparative material is
summarised on page 68. The 7,434 male Displaced Persons
who entered Australia from each of the three Baltic countries

(1). Baltic Refugees and Displaced Persons; Sørekk, op.cit.,
Ch. 18; Bilmanis, op.cit.; Part 5; Cras, op.cit.
in 1949 show similar occupational distributions; they have a considerably higher proportion of professional and white-collar workers (13-16%) than have the Poles, Russians and Ukrainians, and a much lower proportion of persons from rural occupations (10-15%).

Occupational Classification of Polish, Ukrainian and Baltic Displaced Persons, Males only, in British, French and U.S. Zones of Germany, January, 1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Classification</th>
<th>Polish No.</th>
<th>Polish %</th>
<th>Ukrainian No.</th>
<th>Ukrainian %</th>
<th>Baltic No.</th>
<th>Baltic %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Managerial, Clerical and Sales</td>
<td>6,561</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16,153</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>20,098</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11,263</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td>16,889</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8,429</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>10,087</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53,655</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30,220</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43,289</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data provided by P.C.I.R.O. Document PC/3OR/17; Report on Occupational Skills of Refugees in P.C.I.R.O. Assembly Centres in Europe, Jan. 1948. The Report classifies the data only for Poles, Ukrainians, Baltic peoples (not separated), Other Non-Jews, and Jews. The survey covered altogether about half of the total refugees receiving P.C.I.R.O. maintenance and care at the end of 1947. This Report has been used here in preference to later surveys of occupational skills, because it refers to the period before large-scale resettlement had affected the occupational composition of these national groups.

Of the three remaining large Displaced Person groups, the Hungarians and Czechoslovaks consist principally
of emigrants who left their countries in 1948 and after. 9,000 Czechoslovaks and 12,000 Hungarians have entered Australia as Displaced Persons. Like the Baltic peoples, the 1,909 Czechoslovak male Displaced Persons and the 2,787 Hungarians, who arrived in Australia in 1949, contained a high proportion of persons from professional, administrative, commercial and clerical occupations (19 and 15% respectively), and an even lower proportion of rural workers than the Latvians or Lithuanians (10% each); they also contained the highest proportions of persons from domestic and protective occupations (8% and 5% respectively).

It has been impossible to ascertain exactly the contribution of the several emigration waves to the displaced person Yugoslav population in Europe or in Australia (1). Three emigration waves are certainly represented in sizeable numbers in this country. Of the war-time emigrants, there are former POW's held by the Germans, and forced and

(1) Berger, March 1947, Fay, March 1946, and Kulischer, March 1949, claim that the majority of Yugoslav displaced persons at the time of writing (Kulischer uses the word "nucleus", and, although he implies "majority", may mean only the largest single group) were followers of Libailovic and King Peter; but Vernant, op.cit., pp. 88-90, declines to assess the relative proportions of the different groups among the Yugoslav displaced persons. It seems possible that Berger, Fay and Kulischer had in mind the Yugoslav displaced persons in Germany, and were not taking account of the post-war refugees in Italy and Austria. It is certain that a stream of refugees continued to flow into these two countries after the war, but it is impossible to ascertain their numbers.
The 1944-45 refugees include former followers of General Mihailovic, and supporters or sympathisers of the German puppet government. Many Yugoslavs who escaped from the Tito regime in the post-war period have also come to Australia as Displaced Persons. In all, there are 24,000 Yugoslav Displaced Persons in Australia. The 4,036 men who arrived in 1949 show a similar occupational distribution to the Ukrainians; they have the highest proportion of persons from rural occupations of any national group (28%).

In summary, the occupational distribution of Displaced Person males who entered Australia in 1949 shows two distinct patterns. All national groups have similar proportions of craftsmen (range 26-40%) and operatives (range 10-14%), and in all groups these two categories together account for 40-50% of the total. Important differences occur, however, in the proportions of rural workers, and persons from professional and white-collar occupations. Poles, Ukrainians, Russians and Yugoslavs have a low proportion of professional and white collar workers (range 6-9%), and a correspondingly high proportion of rural workers (range 20-28%). The Baltic peoples, Czechoslovaks, and Hungarians, on the other hand, have a comparatively high proportion of professional and white-collar workers (13-19%), and a low proportion of persons...
from rural occupations (10-15%).

8. Conclusion

Although it has been possible within the scope of this brief survey to indicate only the major emigration movements which brought into being the pool of displaced persons from which Australia has drawn 170,000 immigrants in the past seven years, the heterogeneity of the people to whom the single label "Displaced Person" is applied has at least been indicated. In conclusion it will be useful to give a resume of the main sources of this diversity.

There is no need to labour the diversity in nationality, and, concomitantly, in religion. The immigrants come from the most varied socio-economic backgrounds, ranging all the way from high-ranking army officers, ex-diplomats and senior professional persons to barely literate peasants. They come from both rural and urban backgrounds. They left their countries under a great variety of conditions: some were forced away under threat of violence, without the opportunity to take leave of their families or collect their possessions; at the opposite extreme were those who, with money and contacts, were able to assemble their families and possessions, and make their way in a comparatively orderly fashion to the safety of the west. The conditions in which they lived after emigration also varied enormously: some spent years in POW, concentration or labour camps,
while others lived more or less freely in private accommodation; in the post-war years, some were in one-nationality camps, which were tightly organised communities, while others lived in mixed-nationality camps, and others again privately. The interval between their first emigration and their arrival in Australia varied from twelve years, for some of the Poles, to as little as one year for some Czechs and Hungarians; many experienced the chaos of the war's ending as displaced persons, but the post-war refugees did not; they, for the most part, left their own organised communities for what were, by the time of their arrival, the organised communities of the refugees, being saved from the worst of the living conditions, the despair and the uncertainty of the people who were among the displaced in 1945-46. And finally, some were predominantly political refugees, in the sense that they became permanent expatriates because of opposition to the political regime in their home countries; while others were politically indifferent, leaving their homes or remaining away from them for reasons which had little to do with politics; their political sympathies varied all the way from full support of the Nazi cause to a complete repudiation of Nazism, expressed, for example, by the Polish underground workers; the great majority of them share an antagonism to Russia, or Communism, or both, but the basis of this antagonism is not necessarily ideological.
Whatever the conditions under which the displaced persons originally left their home countries, they all have this in common, that they did not at first intend to make new homes outside Europe, and that they therefore regard themselves as, in some measure, the victims of fate, and in a class distinct from and superior to the essentially voluntary immigrants such as the Germans, Dutch and Italians who have entered the country in recent years. In addition, they have had a certain anonymity and homogeneity imposed upon them by their common condition as, on the one hand the alien and unwanted of Western Europe, and, on the other, the subjects of more or less uniform international care and treatment. During at least the first years of their resettlement in this country, diversities in background and experience have been overshadowed by their common status as impetuous, newly-arrived aliens with a specific legal status - overshadowed in the sense that, only to the most limited extent, has their reception in this country taken account of these variations.

Small as the Displaced Person group in Goulburn is, it contains representatives of most of the numerous categories of Displaced Persons referred to above. In this, it is typical of the original grouping of Displaced Persons throughout the country, for, partly fortuitously, partly as the result of the Government's policy of
discouraging concentrations of a particular nationality, the Displaced Persons in any single community have tended to be highly diverse. When available, the results of the 1954 Census will indicate whether there has been any tendency towards concentration by nationality since this first stage of dispersal during the contract period. Because of the heterogeneity of the Goulburn Displaced Persons combined with the small total numbers, it has not been possible to trace through the significance of all the variables which are likely to be relevant to the adaptation of the immigrants in this country. Special attention has been paid to differences in socio-economic background, while other variables have been introduced only where their significance seems especially striking.
II. Displaced Persons

in GOULBURN
Chapter 4.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS IN GOULBURN

The two hundred odd Displaced Persons in Goulburn form a poorly integrated, minority group of inferior status. The characteristics and structure of the Displaced Person group will be described in this chapter, in terms of a theoretical framework for the analysis of groups and of social class to be outlined in some detail. The full evidence on which this discussion is based will be presented in the remaining chapters on the economic and social life of the Displaced Persons, their reference groups and identifications, and their patterns of adaptation.

1. A Framework for the Analysis of Groups

A group is here defined as the total aggregate of individuals who engage repeatedly in co-ordinated activity; whether or not the activity involves face-to-face contact, the boundaries of the group are determined by participation in the relevant activity. The attributes of groups can be divided into two classes: those which are also the attributes of collectivities, and those which pertain to groups as such and distinguish them from collectivities. The "collectivity attributes" of groups can again be subdivided into attributes of the group taken as an entity,
and the characteristics of the members. The attributes of groups as an entity are size, duration of the group as a group, the face-to-face-ness of relations within the group and the stability of membership.

To describe the characteristics of the members of a group is to describe its social composition. Three attributes fall into this category: the spatial location of the members, their physical, demographic, personality and cultural characteristics, and their statuses (1) in other groups. Uniform and distinctive attributes may have defined the members of the group as a class before they were a group. If this is the case, then the members of the group are likely to have passed through two stages before becoming a group. In the first stage they constituted what Sorokin calls a "nominal plural" (2), an aggregate of individuals who are not even conscious of their uniform characteristics, positions or destinies. The second stage is what Nadel calls the "quasi-group", whose

(1) Throughout this study, the term "status" is used for any position in a social system, and the term "social status" for a position considered from the viewpoint of its hierarchical relation to other positions (e.g. leader and follower), with the exception that position in a class system is designated by the term "class status". A completely self-contained group is one whose members have no statuses in any other groups. MacIver and Page, 1950, p. 9, state that the distinguishing characteristic of a community is "that one's life may be lived wholly within it."

(2) Sorokin, 1947, pp. 182 and 277.
members, though aware of their uniformity, do not co-
ordinate their activities (1).

Both the nominal group and the quasi-group
are potential groups, in the sense that groups are likely
to develop out of aggregates whose members are spatially
contiguous, or homogeneous in certain characteristics or
who occupy similar statuses in the community. The
members may, on the other hand, become more homogeneous
in these respects after the group has come into existence:
ythey may concentrate in a particular locality in order to
co-ordinate their activities more effectively; through
the development of group standards, they may become more
uniform; through participation in the group, they may
acquire uniform positions in other groups. If we look at
these three attributes of group composition from the view-
point of the individual being recruited into an existing
group, we can say that the principle of recruitment may be

(1) Nadel, 1951, pp. 185-186. Nadel has borrowed the term
"quasi-group" from Ginsberg, 1947, pp. 12-14, who tran-
lates in this way Tonnies' "Samtschaft". Nadel uses the
term "quasi-group" only for collectivities which are aware
of their uniformity, stating specifically, Footnote 2,
p. 185, that "groups which are culturally uniform only in
an 'objective' sense, having been discovered to be so by
the observer, are only so many coloured areas on a map, and
sociologically irrelevant". Not all such unacknowledged
uniformities are, however, "sociologically irrelevant":
from our knowledge of social processes, we can distinguish
those which are likely to become relevant from those which
are not. Ginsberg does not treat this problem of awareness
explicitly, but it seems that his term "quasi-group" is
intended to cover not only collectivities which are aware of
their uniformity but also all collectivities whose unacknow-
ledged uniformity is, in some way, sociologically relevant.
geographical location, or the possession of certain
characteristics or the status of the individual in some
other group, but on the other hand these attributes may
be acquired or developed only after an individual has gained
membership in the group (1).

The attributes which distinguish the group from
all other social aggregates are an elaboration of the
original definition. They are: the content and purposes
of the activities, involving the personal and social signifi-
cance of the activities (2); role differentiation; the

(1) The relevance of this third attribute can perhaps be
made clearer. A group might develop in the first place
out of the recognition for the need of co-ordinated activity
by persons who occupy similar statuses in some other group;
e.g., a Mothers' Club, a Personnel Officers Association;
once such a group is established, members are recruited only
from individuals who occupy certain positions in other groups.
On the other hand, out-group status may not be a principle of
recruitment to the in-group, but membership of the in-group
might be conducive to assuming certain positions in out-
groups, and the members of the in-group might thus become more
homogeneous in out-group statuses. For example, members of
a certain work group might be obliged, permitted or expected
to join a trade union; or, another example, by virtue of
their becoming directors of an important company, a number of
individuals might come to assume similar executive positions
in other economic or social associations.

(2) The difficulties in the application of this concept of
"significance" are very great, but this does not invalidate
it as an important attribute of groups. By "personal signi-
ificance" is meant the importance of participation in the
group in the personality structure of the members; by
"social significance" is meant the importance of the group
activities to the maintenance of the wider group or society
of which the group forms a part.
basic values and ideology underlying group activity; the reification of the group (1); the relation of the group to other groups, including its social status in a hierarchy of groups, if relevant; and finally the integration of the group. The following four factors will be taken as the criteria of integration: the identification of individual members with the group; the predictability of the behaviour of members, or the formulation and acceptance of norms governing the behaviour of members towards one another, and their behaviour, qua in-group members, towards out-groups; the precision with which the purposes and activities of the group are formulated and the effectiveness of the group in fulfilling its purposes, from the viewpoint of the members (2).

Some further comment needs to be made on the relation between predictability of behaviour, formulation of purpose, and effectiveness. To begin with, the latter two criteria are clearly inter-related in the sense that the success of a group in achieving its goals can only be

(1) While all groups are reified to some extent, reification is probably always weak unless the group is recognised by a name. The inclusion of reification as an attribute of groups was suggested by Francis, 1951.

(2) The word "purpose" is intended to convey that we are referring only to the acknowledged aims or goals of the group. Unacknowledged purposes are, by definition, not formulated. This is not, of course, to deny their importance, but it seems more appropriate to deal with them in connection with the personal and social significance of the group activities.
determined precisely when the goals are clearly formulated. For example, if an association is formed to raise a certain sum of money, success or failure can be determined exactly. But in the case of a social clique, with many purposes but none of them very explicit, and engaging in many diverse activities, there is likely to be less agreement among the members on the effectiveness of the group. The precision with which effectiveness can be determined is dependent upon the exactness with which the purposes are conceived.

The relation of predictability to the formulation of purposes also needs further clarification. Predictability depends upon the common understanding of symbols, and behaving in accordance with this common understanding. Without some degree of common understanding it would be impossible to formulate group purposes in the first place; hence the two criteria are to some extent interdependent. But predictability may derive from norms necessitated by the purposes of the group, or it may represent the importation into the group situation of norms developed and maintained in other contexts. The first case implies that the group has formulated an explicit purpose and agreed upon the regulations necessary for achieving it. But in the second case, the predictability of behaviour is not directly related to the formulation of the purpose of the group: the members of a social clique, for example, because of their common social
background and experience, may behave in a highly predictable fashion towards one another, even though the raison d'être of the clique is vague and ill-defined. Although in the analysis of groups it is necessary to show which norms are the particular responsibility of the group and which operate upon the individual by virtue of certain characteristics (e.g. age, illness), or membership in other groups, from the viewpoint of integration the important point is that the norms, wherever their source and sanction lie, should be clearly formulated and accepted, and hence that behaviour should be predictable.

According to the scheme, integration is one of the attributes of groups, and can, for the purposes of analysis, be distinguished from the other attributes listed. Any comparison of groups, or attempt to delineate types of groups, must take account, not only of integration, but of other attributes as well. Perhaps the central problem in the study of groups is, however, the question of how other attributes affect, and are affected by, integration.

Integration varies both in degree (1) and in quality. We are concerned in this study with a poorly integrated group, which, according to the definition, is one whose members are not highly identified with the group,

---

(1) Nadel, 1951, p. 165, Merton and Kitt, 1950, p. 82.
in which there is a low predictability of behaviour, the purposes and activities of the group are not clearly formulated, and the co-ordination of action is but slightly effective in achieving these purposes (1).

The situations in which this kind of group comes into existence are innumerable. A well integrated group may temporarily become poorly integrated. Poor integration may be one stage in the complete disintegration of a once highly integrated group; or on the other hand it may be one stage in the process of attaining a high degree of integration. Or, finally, the poorly integrated group may be one which never has and never will achieve a high degree of integration. The members may persist for a long time in this kind of relationship, they may disperse after this brief flutter into "groupness" or break up into a number of smaller, better integrated groups.

Using this framework for the analysis of groups, we turn now to the Goulburn Displaced Persons.

(1) Sorokin uses the terms "organised" and "unorganised", or "disorganised", groups, and describes the latter thus: "It is amorphous in all these respects: the rights, duties, possessions, functions, roles, social status, and position of its members are undetermined and undefined either in broad outline or meticulous detail; so are its categories of the lawful, recommended, and prohibited forms of conduct and relationship; so are its official law and government, structure of social differentiation and stratification, economic order, and so on. Consequently all remain uncrystallised. The whole system of social relationships and values is confused and vague." Sorokin, 1947, p.91.
2. The Displaced Persons as a Collectivity

Our study is concerned with the few residents of Goulburn who are clearly distinguished from the rest of the population, both Australian- and foreign-born, by their former legal status as Displaced Persons in Europe, and as I.R.C. immigrants to Australia. A number of characteristics sharply distinguish these Displaced Persons from the local people (1). To begin with, the Displaced Persons are not British subjects, but predominantly Polish, Yugoslav, Russian, Czechoslovak, Lithuanian and Hungarian by nationality. English is not their native tongue, and all of them can be immediately identified as "foreigners" by their speech. Some are members of the Orthodox Church, while no local Australians of non-European extraction belong to this Church.

In other respects, the characteristics of the Displaced Persons overlap with those of the local population, but the Displaced Persons as a whole show mean tendencies which deviate greatly from the means for the community as a

---

(1) The Population Survey, Sept. 1953, showed that, of the total population of 19,117 in Goulburn, only 1,299 were born overseas, and of these, 765 were born in the U.K. or Ireland. Throughout the text, the phrases "the local population" and "the Australian population" refer to the predominant Australian-born population of British descent; where necessary, finer distinctions will be made, as, e.g., in the case of the Australian-born children of Greek parents.
whole (1). The sex ratio for the Displaced Persons is two men to one woman, while it is equal for the total population. Two-thirds of the Displaced Persons are aged 20-39, while only 29% of the total population fall in this age-group. About the same proportion, two-thirds, of adult female Displaced Persons and adult females in the total population are married, but far less of the adult male Displaced Persons than of the adult males in the total population are married - 38% as compared to 67%. The average number of children per family is one. Because the Displaced Persons are recent arrivals in this country, and because the local population is fairly stable, the Displaced Persons are also distinguished by their comparatively short average duration of residence in the community. While the local population is distributed throughout the whole occupational structure, the Displaced Persons are concentrated as wage-earners in unskilled and skilled jobs. By religious affiliation, the Displaced Persons are two thirds Catholic and Roman Catholic, and the remainder mostly Orthodox, by contrast, Goulburn itself is predominantly

(1) Most of the following statistical material is taken from the Population Survey of September 1953. Details are given in Tables 13-17, pp. The average number of children per family was determined from case material on 27 families, in which husband or wife, or both, was a Displaced Person.
Protestant, having only one third Catholics and Roman Catholics; almost no Displaced Persons belong to the Protestant churches which claim the adherence of the majority of the community.

Although no comparative data for the Australian population are available, it is also worth noting that, according to the records of the Department of Labour and National Service, the great majority of Displaced Persons who have passed through Goulburn have had only a Primary school education - 63% for the men, and 65% of the women (1).

The Displaced Persons are thus characterised by a number of attributes which, in this combination, distinguish them from any other section of the community. Some of these distinctive features they have in common with other post-war immigrants: their language disability, their age and sex composition, marital status, and occupational distribution. They are, however, quite distinct from other immigrants in nationality, non-Displaced Persons being almost exclusively Dutch, Italian and German by nationality; they are also distinct in their period of residence in Australia, most of them having arrived in Australia two or three years before the non-Displaced Persons; both Displaced Persons and non-Displaced Persons have about the same

(1) See Table 17, p. 530.
proportion of Catholics (and Roman Catholics), but the remaining one third non-Displaced Persons are mostly Reformed Church rather than Orthodox. The Displaced Persons are also distinct from pre-war immigrants (1) in a number of characteristics: nationality, the pre-war immigrants in Goulburn being mainly Greek; language facility; religion, the Greek being nearly all Orthodox; and occupation, the Greeks being engaged, as owners, managers or employees, almost exclusively in small businesses of the cafe-milkbar-fruit shop variety.

The Displaced Persons are highly uniform in the statuses they hold in other groups. Apart from a very few individuals who have married into local families, or have established themselves as members of a local neighbourhood or social clique, the only important groups in which the Displaced Persons participate are work-groups, to which nearly all the adults belong. Some also attend the local churches, but none has continued to participate actively in church groups for more than a brief period. A very few men have been active in sports clubs.

The composition of the Displaced Person population has undergone considerable change since the first Displaced Persons arrived in Goulburn in 1948. Exact

(1) Pre-war immigrants are immigrants who arrived in Australia, though not necessarily in Goulburn, before the war.
figures for the number of Displaced Persons in the city are not available before 1952, but the estimates of the Employment Officers indicate that the Displaced Person population was greatest in 1951, when the numbers were somewhere around 300. During the 1952 recession, the numbers declined markedly and have dropped again in the past year. The following table sets out the three estimates that are available for the years 1952, 1953 and 1954. Inmates of the Mental Hospital and Training Centre (Gaol) have so far as possible been excluded.

**Estimates of Displaced Person Population of Goulburn,**

**1952 - 1954.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decline in the total numbers of Displaced Persons in the city has resulted from the fact that new Displaced Persons have not been taking up residence in sufficient numbers to replace those who, having lived there for two or three years, have been moving out. The Displaced Persons gained their freedom of movement only after the expiry of their contract, and the decrease in numbers since
1951 reflects the fact that, by this period, most of them had completed their contract. There is little variety of employment opportunities in the city, and their inability to find suitable employment decided many Displaced Persons to move elsewhere. Failure to find employment of any kind has not been a significant factor, for most Displaced Persons seem to have resigned from jobs on leaving the city. In order to understand more fully the processes of Displaced Person movement in and out of the community, and hence the present composition of the Displaced Person population, we shall now attempt to answer the question, how do the Displaced Persons who have left the community differ from those who have stayed?

The Displaced Persons have become in some respects more homogeneous and in others less so. There have been some slight changes in the proportions of persons in each nationality, but the diversity of national composition remains as great as when the total number of Displaced Persons in the city was much bigger than it is today (1).

The family status of the Displaced Person population has changed. From 1948 to about 1951, most of

---

(1) If national solidarity were strong, one would expect to find something resembling a "chain emigration" of certain nationalities. The fact that there is no indication of such a process, except among cliques of, at the most, 5 fellow-countrymen, supports other evidence of the poor integration of the national groups in Goulburn.
the Displaced Persons were living singly, not in family units; the majority of them had never been married; some had families in Holding Centres; some had been married but had become separated from their spouses for a variety of reasons, either in Europe or Australia. The composition of the population has now changed to the point where 44% of the adults are married, while many more are living in de facto unions. This change has come about partly through single Displaced Persons marrying, or married Displaced Persons becoming reunited with their families and settling in Goulburn. But there has also been a tendency for individuals living singly to move out of the community in greater numbers than individuals living in family units. This trend appears to have been going on for some years; it is documented in the following table for the 12-month period, early 1953 to May 1954.
EXODUS OF DISPLACED PERSONS FROM Goulburn 1952-54,  
according to family status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living in Family Units</td>
<td>Living Singly</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Living in Family Units</td>
<td>Living Singly</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Living in Family Units</td>
<td>Living Singly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Goulburn early 1953; left by May 1954.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Goulburn early 1953; still there by May 1954.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Squared = 12.61. Significant at the 1% level.
There are a number of reasons why single individuals should be more inclined to move out of Goulburn than people living in family units. Factors which keep family units in the community are not operating in the case of the single Displaced Persons: since they can follow their individual inclinations, they have greater freedom of movement; they can more easily afford to take the risk of finding employment elsewhere; they are less likely to be encumbered with material possessions, such as a house and furniture, which tend to reduce mobility. Single migrants are also often attracted to the metropolis in search of more adequate recreational facilities; the married Displaced Persons are less interested in the commercialised recreation which Sydney or Melbourne can provide. There is little to keep the single immigrant in Goulburn. The chances of making good financially, or of finding employment in a chosen occupation are no better than elsewhere, and at least appear to many migrants much less promising than in the city. Even more important, their failure to establish themselves locally is a negative, expelling factor, influencing them in two ways: because they have no stable position in the community, they are not only ready to leave it, but at the same time likely to focus their hopes of gaining acceptance and recognition elsewhere.

There is also evidence that the Displaced Person
population of Goulburn is becoming somewhat more homogeneous in pre-migration class status: migrants of former professional, white-collar or artistic occupations have left the city in greater proportion than the skilled and unskilled workers (1). The following table shows this trend for a sample of 32 men.

EXODUS OF DISPLACED PERSONS FROM GOULBURN 1953-54, ACCORDING TO PRE-MIGRATION OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Migration Occupation</th>
<th>Professional and White-collar</th>
<th>Skilled and Unskilled</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in Goulburn early</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953; left by May 1954</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Goulburn early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953; still there May 1954</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Squared = 3.46. Significant between 5 and 10% level.

(1) Of the three Displaced Persons who received some recognition because of their artistic talent, and all of whom apparently came from a comparatively high status occupational background, none now remains in the community.
The occupational distribution of the Displaced Persons is also changing. The original population consisted of Displaced Persons who were assigned under contract to employment in some essential service; most of them worked in the larulan quarries, the Railways, the District Hospital, the mental Hospital or the Migrant Hostel. As their contracts expired, they ceased to be concentrated in these few places of employment, and by the Population Survey of September 1953, Displaced Persons were to be found employed in 7 of the 10 categories of industry in the Census, and in 19 of the 40 sub-categories within these 7 industries. Occupational differentiation has not gone as far as diversification of place of employment, although it too has increased; at first, the Displaced Persons were employed almost exclusively as unskilled or semi-skilled workers; while the majority remain in this type of employment, some have acquired skills and others have found jobs where they can use training received before coming to Australia.

As the Displaced Persons have come to be less concentrated in certain occupations, so they have become residentially more dispersed throughout the community. These two changes are related, for the places of employment to which the Displaced Persons were at first directed usually provided accommodation - the Railways, the District Hospital, the mental Hospital and the Migrant Hostel; the
Metropolitan Portland Cement Co. also ran a boarding house in Goulburn for employees working at Narulan. Even when immigrants did not live in the quarters provided, they tended to concentrate in three or four residential and private hotels. Today only a few live in accommodation provided at their place of employment or in these residential; the great majority are scattered throughout the community, living under a variety of conditions - in houses which they have bought or built, temporary dwellings on land where they hope to build, in rooms in private houses, in boarding houses and private hotels. In most cases, this accommodation is poor compared to living standards of the community as a whole; many of the dwellings are very old, facilities are meagre and overcrowding is common.

The Displaced Persons are also less distinctive in certain overt cultural traits than when they first arrived in the community. Most of them have learnt at least enough English to allow them to acquire the goods and services of everyday living without drawing undue attention to themselves. Particularly on the part of the women there is a deliberate attempt to conform to the dress patterns of the local community. Most of the Displaced Persons have also learnt the minimal requirements of public behaviour and the forms of etiquette expected of them by Australians. But they appear less conspicuous than formerly not only because of
their greater conformity to the local culture, but also because the Goulburn people have become less sensitive to their distinctiveness.

We may now summarise the changes which have taken place in the composition of the Displaced Person population in Goulburn by indicating three basic trends. Firstly, the present Displaced Person population is composed largely of immigrants who were directed to employment in the Goulburn district when under contract, and who have remained to settle in the community; their numbers have hardly been augmented at all by Displaced Persons who have arrived within the past two years. The present Displaced Persons are therefore a selected class in terms of mobility; they are more "stable" than the Displaced Persons who have moved elsewhere.

Secondly, in occupation, place of residence and marital condition, in dress and certain forms of inter-personal behaviour, and even in speech, although this remains a distinguishing feature, the Displaced Persons are becoming more like the population as a whole, and particularly the lower class section of the local community. In the third place, the selective processes have made the social composition of the Displaced Persons, in terms of social background, more homogeneous; the Displaced Person population is now almost exclusively from the peasant, or skilled and unskilled
labourer class in Europe (1).

In this discussion of the Displaced Persons as a collectivity, it has been convenient to combine the several attributes, rather than discussing them individually. Keeping to the original framework, we may now, in the following chart, set out those attributes which can be readily summarised.

(1) There is also some slight indication that Displaced Persons with anti-social tendencies have not survived long in Goulburn. The evidence is difficult to obtain, since the police records alone do not adequately represent the situation, and, if it is correct that such immigrants have not found scope for their activities in Goulburn, and have moved on after a brief stay, information about them is bound to be scarce. Police charges against Displaced Persons, very few in numbers, have mostly arisen out of drunken brawls or traffic breaches. A few individuals with plans for making easy money by breaking and entering have found no encouragement among fellow-countrymen whose assistance they have sought in the city, and have moved on. In a small community like Goulburn, people who make a practice of petty dishonesty quickly become known; they soon exhaust all the available sources of financial exploitation - borrowing from fellow-immigrants, Australians or the church, or running up accounts in stores - and they move on to new fields. A city such as this does not provide much scope for the professional "crook"; the two fields of organised illicit activity which can flourish more or less openly, S.P. betting and gambling, are already monopolised by the local Australians and the well-established Greeks. There is little opening for the Displaced Person with anti-social tendencies in Goulburn, and every reason for him to be attracted to the city.
### The Displaced Persons as a Collectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the collectivity, as an entity</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>200 approx.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>Continuous existence since 1948.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>Continuous existence since 1948.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face-faceness of relations</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability of membership</strong></td>
<td>Total numbers reduced by 100 since 1951; few new arrivals; present population mostly date from 1951 or earlier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the individual units</th>
<th>Spatial location</th>
<th>Formerly segregated, now dispersed throughout the city.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic and cultural character-istics</strong></td>
<td>69% men, 31% women, 67% aged 20-39 years, 46% married. Average number of children per family, 1.65% Catholic, 6% Jewish, 86% Catholic and R.C. Majority have only primary school education, come from peasant or working class background in Europe. 70% in workforce. Engaged mostly in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations in Goulburn. Speak medium to poor English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Cannot readily be summarised).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group statuses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly all adults have low status position in an occupational group; a few belong to neighborhood groups; a very few belong to a non-displaced person social clique, association or kin group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Displaced Persons as a Group

We have now described how the Displaced Persons are distinguished from all other sections of the community by certain characteristics, and we have indicated that in other characteristics the mean or average for the Displaced Persons is different from the local population, even though there is considerable overlapping in the distribution. We shall now go on to show that the Displaced Persons constitute a group which has never been, and probably never will be, highly integrated.

Our first question is, are there any co-ordinated activities which define the Displaced Persons as a group, and, if so, are these activities distinctive from those undertaken by other sections of the population? There has never been in Goulburn any organised activity bringing together in face-to-face relations all the Displaced Persons. Neither have the members of particular nationalities acted together to preserve their distinctive activities, such as the celebration of national days.

Among themselves the Displaced Persons do, however, engage in certain poorly regulated and unorganised activities, which may be classified as mutual assistance and informal social life. The largest group of Displaced Persons who combine at the one time for some social activity is about 20, and usually the numbers would be smaller than
this. These activities are carried out through a series of unstable and interlocking cliques, diverse in nationality, which link practically all the Displaced Persons to one another, have a very few links into Dutch and German cliques, and even fewer links into the local community. The activities which one would expect to be the most psychologically meaningful, namely the primary relations among family members and close friends, are those in which the Displaced Persons join almost exclusively with other Displaced Persons.

There is nothing very distinctive about the content of social activities and mutual assistance among the Displaced Persons, but, particularly in the family and the household, patterns brought from Europe are of course retained. Only in food habits and language is there any evidence of a self-conscious effort to preserve behaviour different from that of the Australian community. Most of the Displaced Persons prefer European food to Australian; those who do their own cooking usually eat European dishes, but, for a variety of reasons the art of cooking is not highly developed among them, and the distinctiveness of their eating habits is being attenuated as they adopt more Australian foodstuffs and methods of preparation. An even stronger effect attaches to language. The immigrant's language is such an integral part of his personality that he
usually believes that he can never be completely at ease, or completely himself, while speaking a foreign tongue. Any attack on his right to speak his own language is strongly resented, and interpreted as a violation of his personal freedom. Only a very few of the better educated Displaced Persons, however, regard the preservation of their native tongue as a means of maintaining their own cultural traditions; the majority read little in any language; parents want their children to be able to speak and write their native tongue, but are doing, and plan to do, almost nothing to provide for teaching them. The lingua franca which spread in Germany and Austria during and after the war, and which was commonly known as "Displaced Person" or "Camp German", is one of the few distinctively Displaced Person cultural traits, although not shared by all Displaced Persons. Russian is also a lingua franca for many Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Poles from Eastern Poland and Russians. Little or no affect attaches to the preservation of German and Russian among the Displaced Persons as a whole; these languages persist only for the sake of convenience, and are readily replaced by English as the immigrants' command of the new language comes to equal or surpass their knowledge of German or Russian. Some immigrants, e.g., the more nationalistic Poles, repudiate the German language because they were forced to learn it by their oppressors; they are
reluctant to speak German and feel insulted when addressed in that language instead of English.

Other distinctive activities retained are those to which no strong affect attaches, which are conveniently familiar, and which can be adhered to without attracting attention, simply because the Australian community remains unaware of them. To the immigrant, these patterns are "normal", but are not morally sanctioned. While food habits do not come into this category, because of the affect which attaches to them, the times at which meals are taken often do; when possible, many immigrants will continue to eat their main meal of the day during the afternoon, but they are very little concerned if the demands of work or school necessitate some modification, bringing them closer to the customs of the local community. Countless minor items of behaviour fall into this category, and only a few more examples need be given: the method of knitting, the manner of making a béi, and even the procedure for pegging clothes on the line.

It is possible to suggest a number of reasons why the Goulburn Displaced Persons are retaining so few of the distinctive activities of their own countries and why the combined, international activities which they have developed as a group are so little distinguished in content from those common in Australia. Firstly, very many of the
Displaced persons left their homeland while still in their teens, and before they had had the opportunity to acquire the full body of cultural knowledge which would have been theirs had they grown to adulthood before emigration. The significance of this first factor is strengthened by the second, that the majority of Displaced Persons have been living apart from any family group or organised national community since they left home; they have thus been outside the influence of the kind of groups which are normally most effective in preserving a culture intact. Thirdly, the small numbers of any one nationality in Goulburn, combined with the diversity of nationalities in the total group, have made difficult either the maintenance of national traditions which require some organised effort, such as the observance of national days, or the development of any combined immigrant activities (1). And finally apart from a few photographs and personal belongings, the Displaced Persons have had nothing tangible to remind them of their former manner of living, and have lacked the material objects essential for the continuation of many customs. While in a more diverse culture such as that

(1) Where the number of persons in any single nationality is great enough, the proximity of people from a number of different countries may lead to an intensification of national feeling and efforts to preserve the national culture. Such a development often occurred in the Displaced Person camps in Europe.
of the United States, many immigrants can acquire cultural objects like those with which they were familiar at home, and possibly even imported from their own countries, they have little chance of finding these familiar articles among the much more homogeneous array of consumer goods available in Australia; only the market in foodstuffs and gramophone records has been developed to meet the special demands of the European immigrants. The Displaced Persons occasionally make things which are not usually obtainable in Australia, such as the women's embroidery. While the immigrants have access to few of the cultural objects from Europe, they are increasingly surrounded by the material paraphernalia of the Australian culture, and as a result are increasingly adopting the behaviour patterns associated with these objects: for example, clothing, radiograms, equipment for cooking and heating, bathing and washing, are already influencing their activities; refrigerators, washing machines, cars and a host of objects, as yet unknown to them, will continue to change their behaviour (1).

We have implied that little differentiation of group roles has emerged among the Displaced Persons. Minimal differentiation has been enough to permit some

(1) In the paucity of the material equipment which they brought with them, the Displaced Persons differ markedly from many of the immigrant waves to the U.S., and from the pre-war Jewish immigration and the present Dutch immigration to Australia.
ephemeral and small-scale co-ordination of activities, and no more. In a very much attenuated form, distinctive roles have been developed for the advisor-spokesman and the few individuals who often organise, provide the locale for, or otherwise play a conspicuous part in informal social activities. There is much reluctance to assume either of these roles, except spasmodically. The socially prominent individuals play an important part in keeping the group together; it may be because of personal qualities, such as sociability, the need for dominance or the fear of loneliness, or because they live where people can conveniently gather, that they have come to assume this position. The spokesmen-advisors have the attenuated role of the "leader from the periphery", which has been described by Lewin (1). It is by virtue of their knowledge of English, or experience and contacts in Australian society that they can be useful to their fellow-immigrants.

The present situation of the Displaced Persons is also having its effect upon the age and sex roles. Older people have been slow to pick up English and have not been able to take advantage of the economic situation, e.g., by working long hours overtime, to the same extent as the younger immigrants. The experience and knowledge which would have entitled these people to prestige and perhaps

---

assigned them special roles had they remained in their own
countries are no longer relevant in the new situation, and
elicit neither interest nor respect from their fellow-
immigrants. In addition, older people lack the group
status on which the respect due to age always partially
depends: they have not the family, occupational or associ-
ational positions which, both in their communities of origin
and in Australia, are normally acquired with increasing age.
The middle-aged and older immigrants' chances of achieving
more than the lowest status, either economically or socially,
are much slighter than in the case of their younger fellow-
immigrants. The younger people, with their knowledge of
English, high wages and independence of action, and their
much better chances of future success, are more likely to gain
notoriety, if not importance, and some degree of respect or
influence.

Most of the Displaced Persons have come from a
background where the activities of women were much more
directly under the control of their menfolk than is the case
in Australia. In the present situation, economic independence
and the example of Australian culture are giving many women
a new conception of their obligations and privileges, par-
ticularly within the family, while there is no longer a kin
group or organised community to reinforce and sanction the
pre-migration role. The change in sex roles means that the
behaviour expected of men and women is less distinctive than formerly; men and women now interchange many activities, particularly household tasks, which were formerly undertaken only by one sex or the other. Conflict has often resulted from the men's resistance to these changes.

There is a relationship between the paucity and irregularity of Displaced Person activities and the kind of basic values to which most of the Displaced Persons are committed. The value of co-operation or communal welfare is usually subordinated to the value of individual economic achievement. Although the group is not in any way organised to reward economic achievement, it does grant respect to its financially successful members. Such recognition is itself detrimental to co-ordinated group activity, for the successful immigrant does not generally use his achievements to help his fellow-immigrants; he is not giving anything to the co-ordinated group activities, but providing the model for successfully establishing independence from the group and perhaps for gaining acceptance in the host society.

We turn now to the ideology of the Displaced Persons and the basic values which underly their behaviour; this distinguishes them perhaps more sharply than any other attribute from other immigrants and from Australians. From the world of experience behind them, the Displaced Persons have acquired a body of knowledge and attitudes about matters
of which most Australians are dimly aware, if at all. These experiences differ from one nationality and migrant type to another, but there is considerable overlap. All the Displaced Persons, e.g., have, during the war, known German or Russian occupation, or both; all have had some experience with the British, American or Russian occupying forces after the war; most have lived in Displaced Persons camps, and most have had some post-war contacts with Germans; all have passed through a period of extreme uncertainty immediately following the war, when the fate of their countries, whether they had already emigrated or not, was still undecided. Because of both wartime and post-war events, all have thus had occasion to develop some evaluation of the action of the great powers, Germany, Russia, the U.S. and Britain, especially the actions of these powers in relation to the small nations. All of the Displaced Persons also had to face the decision of whether to emigrate and where, experienced Australian selection procedures and travelled out to Australia on a migrant ship; once here they passed through the Reception Centres, and became acquainted with the Employment Service and the machinery of the Department of Immigration. This combination of experiences sharply distinguishes the Displaced Persons from any other section of the community. As we shall see in later chapters, there is much diversity in the actual content of the knowledge and attitudes developed
out of these experiences; it is not the homogeneity of content that is significant, but the very fact that the Displaced Persons, and they alone of all sections of the community, have had occasion to develop an orientation to all these problems. When their contacts with Australians are more than superficial, they are repeatedly reminded of the gulf in understanding in these matters.

It is conceivable that out of these unique experiences the Displaced Persons could have developed an ideology distinctive to them as a group, a system of beliefs and attitudes which would in time become more homogeneous, more explicit, and more self-consciously symbolic of group integration. By a process of this kind, national ideologies often flourish among emigrant groups. No such development has, however, taken place. It is true that variations in beliefs and attitudes have been smoothed out, and some stereotyping has taken place, especially in attitudes concerning situations with which the immigrants have lost all direct contact, such as the Displaced Person camps. At the same time, the significance of these beliefs and attitudes is diminishing, partly because the Displaced Person group is not well enough integrated in other ways for it to be an effective carrier and promoter of such a system of ideas, and partly for the related reason that, as the Displaced Persons become steadily more involved in their present situation, the
emotional or personal significance of these past experiences weakens.

The question still remains as to whether the Displaced Persons have developed any distinctive system of ideas about Australia and their present position in this country. Here there is evidence of two opposite systems of ideas, each of which is made somewhat coherent, explicit and self-conscious because the immigrants discuss and interpret among themselves their continuing experience in Australian society. On the one hand, is the positive evaluation of Australia, which emphasises the freedom of movement, association and thought, the opportunities for upward social mobility and the corresponding absence of rigid class divisions, equality before the law and the democratic system of government. By contrast, the negative evaluation emphasises the ineffectiveness of discipline and authority in all spheres of life, domestic, economic, social and political, the Australians' false sense of their own importance and superiority, and the corruption, hypocrisy and self-interest behind the façade of democratic ideals. Nearly all the immigrants are agreed on the good economic position of the working man in Australia, and on the inferiority of "culture" in this country. It is also generally accepted that Australians are indifferent or hostile to all immigrants, that it is difficult for immigrants
to become socially accepted into any section of Australian society, and virtually impossible to gain acceptance in the middle or upper classes.

The Displaced Person group is very distinctly reified in the minds of its members. They use the name "Displaced Person" constantly. The boundaries of the group are quite clearly indicated by this title, except that the German wives of Displaced Persons are sometimes included, sometimes not. The fact that Government officials and other Australians rarely refer to the Displaced Persons by nationality, but use rather the composite terms "New Australian", or "immigrant" or "Displaced Persons", or in the case of non-officials, "Belta" and "refugees", intensifies the tendency of the Displaced Persons to think of themselves collectively, as well as by nationality. They themselves generally use the term "New Australian" to refer to all European immigrants, and sometimes the British too.

The attributes of the Displaced Person group which now remain to be considered are: relations with other groups, and status in the community, and integration. We shall defer the question of status and relations with other groups to a separate section, and take up the question, how well integrated is the Displaced Person group? The first criterion of integration is identification, which is taken to mean the individual's feeling of belonging in the group,
his readiness to act as a member of the group and acknowledge loyalty and responsibility to other members, and his evaluation of the group. Perhaps the most characteristic and important feature of the Displaced Person group is that the great majority of its members do not want to belong to it. They have become a group "by default", so to speak; the uniformity of their past experiences and the fact that they find themselves together in the same locality have not been in any way the result of group decisions. They were brought into association with one another because these uniform characteristics set them apart from the rest of the community and led them to be regarded and treated as a distinct out-group. They did not want this identity, but felt that it was imposed on them from outside. There is little recognition of the fact that they should be expected to make sacrifices for fellow-Displaced Persons, and they have generally a very low opinion of the group, apart from their admiration for its economic achievements. All in all, most Displaced Persons are but poorly identified with the group as a whole, and we commonly find what might be called negative identification, involving only the most reluctant acknowledgement of membership, the minimum of action as a member of, and in the interests of, the group, and contempt for other Displaced Persons.

There is an obvious similarity between the
negative identification found among the Displaced Persons and the phenomenon which is sometimes referred to as "group self-hatred". In this connection, we may refer to Lewin's very useful paper on "Self-Hatred among Jews". (1) Despite the obvious differences between the Jews and the Displaced Persons, of which the most important in this context are the traditional integration of the Jewish group, their cultural heritage and the long-standing and institutionalised discrimination to which they have been subjected, Lewin's analysis is highly relevant. Lewin argues that an underprivileged minority contains some members who "are kept inside the group not by their own needs, but by forces which are imposed upon them"; he goes on to show that this situation "has a far-reaching effect on the atmosphere, structure and organisation of every underprivileged group and on the psychology of its members." (2) For the moment it is only with what he includes in "the psychology of its members" that we are concerned. Accepting the low esteem in which his group is held by the privileged majority, the underprivileged individual may be ashamed of his own group and try to move out of it. Meeting inevitably with obstacles, he becomes frustrated and, instead of directing the

(2) Idem, p. 192.
resulting aggression against the privileged majority who are preventing him from leaving his group, he turns it against the minority itself - hence the "self-hatred".

The group identity which the Displaced Persons feel to have been imposed on them from outside is an identity as Displaced Persons, not as nationals of a particular country. National differences have been ignored both officially and unofficially, the Government even making a deliberate attempt to prevent the development of national communities by dispersing the national groups during the contract period. In other words, while the Displaced Person feels that he can hardly avoid associating and being classed with other Displaced Persons, he is not in the same sense forced into belonging to his own national group. There are few obstacles in the way of his associating with people from other countries - and he very often does - and no national group is in a similar position to the host society in that it has gained high status and is unwilling to accept fellow-Displaced Persons of other nationalities. Thus, while negative identification with fellow-countrymen is quite common, it does not have the same intensity as negative identification with the Displaced Persons as a whole.

The second criterion of integration is the predictability of the behaviour of members, or the formulation and acceptance of norms governing relations within the group
and the behaviour of individuals, qua group members, towards other groups. Displaced Persons are expected to show friendliness to other Displaced Persons; even if they are not personally acquainted - if they meet, e.g. in a train, or a hotel bar - they are expected to recognise their common status, to talk together; they should give help readily to a fellow-Displaced Person, and should not take advantage of him in any way. These norms appear to be most effective in regulating behaviour among countrymen, a little less effective among Displaced Persons as a whole, and considerably less effective in the relations of Displaced Persons with other post-war immigrants. Although some Displaced Persons accept similar norms in their relations with Australians as, e.g. neighbours and fellow-workers, there is an explicit recognition of the fact that immigrants, and particularly Displaced Persons, and the local population constitute two groups within each of which such norms apply to a much greater degree than they do in relations between them. As we shall see shortly, there is some slight tendency in the Displaced Person group to reverse these norms in their relations with Australians.

The situations in which the norms of friendliness and assistance are applicable and the forms which they should take are not at all institutionalised, and only vaguely formulated; much deviation is tolerated. The only sanctions which the group uses to enforce conformity are social
ostracism and gossip. If applied by the group as a whole, these sanctions would effectively regulate behaviour; but in practice they are not. The common philosophy is one of "live and let live", and the sanctions are brought into operation only by isolated individuals or cliques. If the group is ineffective in enforcing sanctions, it is equally deficient in the provision of rewards. The only reward which it has at its disposal is respect, or recognition. The Displaced Persons express respect through asking the advice, and taking notice of the opinions of an individual, and through performing small services which they do not expect to be reciprocated in the same terms and which in some way indicate deference towards the respected person. The individuals who elicit this respect are the spokesmen-advisors and the financially successful.

Neither Displaced Persons nor Australians have clearly formulated ideas about how they should behave towards each other; the unpredictability of these relations is, for the Displaced Persons, an important source of uncertainty and insecurity, which are detrimental to co-ordinated activity within the group. In this situation, norms of expediency become paramount. The immigrant should never contradict an Australian, nor try to teach him anything, but always appear to be the learner, to show humility. He "ought" to behave like this because it is the only way
to maintain friendly relations with Australians or to get anything out of them. And he is free to get what he can out of them because the in-group norms of assistance and refraining from exploitation do not apply in relations with Australians. As we shall see throughout the text, there are many modifications of this attitude, but it appears again and again, with varying degrees of intensity, in the thinking of the Displaced Persons.

Finally, we can suggest that, by comparison with other immigrant groups that have been studied, and even compared to the Greeks in Goulburn, the Displaced Persons have assumed responsibility for formulating or enforcing a very narrow range of norms. The activities which are regarded as the individual's concern, and outside group control, are innumerable, e.g. choice of occupation, religious and political participation, forms of etiquette, rearing of children, family life and sexual behaviour. Neither do the Displaced Persons belong to other groups which effectively regulate such behaviour. Of special significance not only to the integration of the group, but also to the status of the group in the community and the adjustment of its members, is the lack of regulation of sexual behaviour and family life, and the resulting tenuousness of these primary ties.

We may consider together the third and fourth criteria of integration, namely the formulation of the purposes of the group and the effectiveness of the group in
achieving these purposes. The fact that the Displaced Persons are a group "by default" means that they did not originally come together voluntarily to achieve some aim to which they were all committed. Mutual assistance and the organisation of social activities developed as purposes once the Displaced Persons had been thrown together in their jobs and places of residence, and recognised as a distinct group by the host society. There is, however, very little feeling that the group should stay together in order to fulfill these purposes; on the contrary, it is only because they cannot gain entree into the host society that they seek to meet these requirements in their own group. Although some immigrants have had sporadic contacts with national associations in Sydney or Melbourne, no formal association has developed in Goulburn to carry out these purposes. The tenuousness of social ties within the group and the ineffectiveness of the norms means that these purposes are not in fact being adequately fulfilled. The smallness of the group, its comparatively low economic status, its newness in the community and the personal insecurity of the members suggest that it could never be very successful in achieving these aims.

4. The Status of the Displaced Person Group in the Community

Only two attributes of the Displaced Person group now remain to be considered: their status in the community,
and their relations to other groups. Before approaching this problem, we must briefly outline the concepts of class and social status to be used here and the class structure of the local community.

"Value" is the central concept in the theory of social status and class adopted here. Every culture contains standards of judgment in terms of which the relative importance, worth, desirability or rightness of phenomena is determined, within a particular frame of reference. These standards, which may be more or less basic and inclusive, are applied to a wide range of phenomena, thus producing what we shall call hierarchies of differentially evaluated phenomena. The word "value" we shall apply to the things thus evaluated; things may be valued high or low according to their positions on these hierarchies (1). Things valued

(1) Value is commonly used in a less restricted sense than this. Thomas and Znaniecki, e.g., apply the term to any "thing" with a cultural meaning; the well-known ethnological note to Vol. 1 of The Polish Peasant in Europe and America elaborates the meaning of the concept at length, defining a "social value" as "any datum having an empirical content accessible to the members of some social group and a meaning with regard to which it is or may be an object of activity", Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918, n. 21. Radcliffe-Brown, on the other hand, uses the term in a more restricted sense, to refer to the differential meaning attached to phenomena in virtue of their effect upon the well-being of groups, "By the social value of anything I mean the way in which that thing affects or is capable of affecting the social life. Value may be either positive or negative, positive value being possessed by any thing that contributes to the well-being of the society, negative value being anything that can adversely affect that well-being", 1922, p. 264.
may consist of material or immaterial objects, physical and psychological characteristics, behaviour and thought patterns. They are evaluated in themselves, independently of the particular individuals with whom they may be associated. But through their association with (1) these phenomena, individuals are also differentiated and ranked into hierarchies, or, in other words, evaluated. Some of the basic and composite scales to be found in all complex societies are: the scales of aesthetics, of wisdom or learning, of morality, of competence in role fulfilment and of social class. The individual's class status is his position on the social scale.

Class evaluations (2) range individuals according to their access to and command over the distribution of

---

(1) The term "association with" is used to cover the possession of objects, the manifestation of psychological or physical characteristics, and behaviour.

(2) The analysis of class structure presented here has been influenced by the work of a number of writers, especially Weber, Marx, Parsons, Centers, the Warner school and Maydl. It is not relevant to discuss in detail the relation of this analysis to the theories of these writers, but some points of difference in approach and terminology should be made clear. All of these writers have explicitly distinguished between the differentiation in wealth, occupation, political power or prestige, which divides every complex society into strata, and the hierarchical grouping of the members of a society into what are usually called social classes, although the use of terms is far from uniform, (e.g., Weber uses the terms class and stratum the other way round). The decisive factor which distinguishes class grouping from any other kind of grouping has been variously conceived. To Marx and Centers, the members of an economic stratum are fully a class when they
certain goods and services, positions in groups, knowledge
and personal attributes, which are valued in that society.

Footnote (2) continued from page 119.
become conscious of their common interests and destiny. To
Parsons, a class is "an aggregate of kinship units of approxi-
mately equal status in the system of stratification", 1952,
p. 172, the system of stratification itself being "the ranking
system in terms of esteem", 1952, p. 132. Weber distinguishes
economic strata (which he calls "classes") and finds that the
members of a common stratum may develop into a social class
(which he calls "stratum" or "status group") under certain
conditions; the distinctive feature of these classes is their
ranking in terms of "social honour" and "styles of life",1948, pp. 180-195; 1947, p. 390-395. To Warner, class is
to be distinguished from other forms of stratification by the
fact that it is the one means of ranking the total membership
of a community, and this ranking is in terms of the distribu-
tion of the symbols positively evaluated by that community
1952, pp. 2-3. In all of these theories, except Warner's,
classes are envisaged as growing out of some form of stratifi-
cation. The theory adopted here takes as its starting point
the proposition that class groups can develop out of any form
of stratification based on access to and control over the
property, services, occupations, positions in association,
learning, most highly valued by that society. 1951,
p. 175, has described this as "graded access"; "(such)
cultural differences form the basis of social classes only
when the actors are conscious of them as of unequal rights
and obligations, resented and perhaps assailed by the lower
strata and jealously defended by the higher." The relation
of our primary and secondary sub-scales to Parsons' "primary"
and "secondary" criteria, 1949, pp. 166-184, needs to be made
clear. Parsons defined these terms thus, "For the primary
criteria one must look to the general common value system of
the society and its history. The secondary criteria or symbols
are often much more adventitious, the result of associations
formed in particular historical circumstances which have come
to be traditionally upheld. The primary criteria are those
things which in relation to the dominant value system are
"status-determining" attributes of the individual and which
are valued for their own sake. The secondary criteria are
those things which are regarded as normal accompaniments of
the primary criteria or as normal effects of them." 1949, p. 176.
To Parsons, the principal primary criterion in our society is
occupational achievement, and the principal secondary criteria
authority and wealth. Parsons seems to have somewhat confused
the analysis by his use of the phrases "status-determining" and
Access means that the individual, and those with whom he is identified, such as his family, are able to secure for themselves the valued things - to use the goods and services, to fill the positions. Command means that, through his control of material resources, such as the food supply, or cultural resources, such as knowledge, or through his authority or power to control people, the individual plays a decisive part in the distribution of values among his fellows. Class evaluations are distinguished in four ways from other kinds of evaluation. The first distinctive feature is that the class status of an individual always affects and is affected by the status of the kin group to which he belongs. The individual is assigned a certain status in the first instance by virtue of being born into a certain family, and if in later life he is to achieve a status different from that of his family, then, at least so far as those groups where his new status is to be recognised are concerned, he must dissociate himself from his family. The class structure ranks kin units whose members are usually

Footnote (2) continued from page 120.
"valued for their own sake"; and in his discussion of wealth as a secondary criterion, he shows that wealth in our society does not become a value in its own right and a direct determinant of status. The distinction made in the present study was suggested by Parsons' classification, but it is made in terms of the kind of stratification which is here considered most relevant to the analysis of social class, and which is somewhat different, as pointed out above, from that used by Parsons.
homogeneous; individuals belonging to kin groups in which there is some heterogeneity of status are likely themselves to be assigned an equivocal or inconsistent status (1). The second distinctive feature of class evaluations is that they always include some values for which the demand is greater than the supply, and which can be distributed by some individuals among others; wealth and material possessions are the obvious examples of values of this kind, but group roles or offices of importance can also fall into this category. If the class system of evaluations must always include some positive values of this kind, it means that class differentiation could never be based only on a combination of, e.g., beauty, intelligence, artistic ability, political beliefs and integrity.

The third distinctive feature of class evaluations is that they are common to the whole society. This does not mean there would ever be complete uniformity of opinion about the evaluations, but where a society recognises as legitimate a number of different standards of judgment concerning a

(1). Parsons, 1949, p. 172, defines a social class "as consisting of the group of persons who are members of effective kinship units which, as units, are approximately equally valued. ... The class status of an individual is that rank in the system of stratification which can be ascribed to him by virtue of those of his kinship ties which bind him to a unit in the class structure."
certain phenomenon, then that phenomenon is not a determinant of class status. In our own society, political or religious values are not directly relevant to class status for just this reason.

Fourthly, class evaluations form an interrelated system, each value reinforcing or deriving from the others, while they are not so directly related to other extraclass phenomena valued in that society. In some societies, access to and command over virtually all other values are determined by control of certain basic values; e.g., in medieval society, land was basic in this sense. In our own society, no single value determines command of all others. The phenomena which are of direct relevance to class status in most societies, and in terms of which individuals are ranked into what we might call a number of primary subhierarchies, are: property, services, occupation, positions in associations and learning. These are the values, access to which determines class status, but each of these in turn affects and is affected by the access to and command of the others.

In our own complex society, command over the distribution of values is not to any significant extent exercised directly by one individual over others. It is through the impersonal institutions of the society that individuals are sorted out into their various positions.
Control over the distribution of values no longer means the right to give food, education, office, etc., to one individual and not to another, but the right to determine policies affecting large categories of individuals, sometimes including persons beyond the boundaries of one's own society.

We can briefly illustrate the inter-relationship between access to the several values in our own society. In the following diagram, money and material possessions are the two property sub-hierarchies. The arrows indicate that position in one sub-hierarchy is derived from position in another. The diagram is intended to indicate only how access to one value is, for the individual, related to access to other values.

As we have already indicated by stating that class evaluations form an inter-related system, the fact that individuals tend to occupy similar positions on all the primary sub-hierarchies is not simply conventional or fortuitous. The consistency derives from the functional interdependence between the different values, as the diagram suggests. As long as the same people hold the same positions in all primary
sub-hierarchies, the order of phenomena in each sub-hierarchy tends to remain constant. But if, in a period of social upheaval, the members of a group, of high status on all counts, are suddenly deprived of their position in a certain sub-hierarchy, the order within the sub-hierarchy can be changed, until the new position which they occupy is once again on or near the top. Similarly, if over a long period of time, position in one sub-hierarchy ceases to be correlated with positions in the other sub-hierarchies, then a reevaluation takes place to bring the ranking of the exceptional sub-hierarchy into conformity with the others. Despite this tendency towards consistency, in any complex and changing society, there is always some discrepancy between positions in the different sub-hierarchies. And there may be a long time-lag in the re-evaluation of a sub-hierarchy; for example, although today the successful merchant may have a high position in most sub-hierarchies, the evaluation of his occupation still suffers to some extent from the stigma of his all-round low status at the end of the medieval period.

Also relevant to class status is the ranking of many behaviour patterns, tastes, attitudes and patterns of emotional expression which, through time, have come to be associated with the people occupying certain positions in the primary sub-hierarchies. These phenomena fall into the category of secondary or symbolic sub-hierarchies; their
association with the primary sub-hierarchies is a conventional, traditional or historical one. These values are secondary in the sense that they do not represent direct control over valued goods, services, privileges and roles; they are cultural indicators or short-hand symbols of certain degrees of access and control. Forms of etiquette, speech and dress, amount of leisure, tastes in literature and art, patterns of emotional expression, and, for urban dwellers, place of residence, are examples of these secondary sub-scales in our own society.

Phenomena in this second type of sub-hierarchy are also secondary in the sense that on their own, apart from the primary sub-hierarchies, they cannot influence the individual's access to and command over values. Nevertheless, it can happen that a phenomenon which was originally secondary or symbolic can become of primary significance, conferring direct access and control. Family membership commonly changes from a secondary to a primary sub-hierarchy: the status of each family is established in the first instance by its access to social values; family status is thus originally of secondary or symbolic significance. But once this status has remained constant over a long period of time, usually several generations, it comes to have primary significance, family membership alone eventually giving direct access to certain values, such as occupation, associational memberships and offices.
particularly in more stable communities - in the rural areas of our own society as compared to the metropolis, for example - clique participation and friendship also form a secondary sub-hierarchy. This means that certain families or groups of families have a clearly defined status in the class structure, and hence become in themselves, of symbolic value; other families and individuals are then ranked by association with these (1).

(1) The studies of the Warner school have documented this process in detail, particularly for the high status members of a community. Warner and his school have at times used social participation as the principal determinant of class status. Allison Davis, e.g., in Newcomb and Others, ed., 1947, p. 141, states "An individual's class status is determined by his social clique. He is no higher nor lower in the status scale than his intimate acquaintances. The basis of the social clique is equality of the members in social status and similarity of culture... Social classes are groups of people who associate, or may associate freely with one another, but who do not associate freely with those above and below them." The empirical evidence provided by this school does not, however, support these statements. As LeComis, Beagle and Longmore, 1947, point out, Warner could have treated his data to compare the observed frequency of clique relationships with what would be expected if there were no class lines. But, even on the analysis made by Warner, it is clear that, if classes consist of groups of people associating freely with each other but not with outsiders, then there are no classes in Yankee City. What the studies of the Warner school and others do suggest is that in our mobile, large-scale society, there is a great deal of participation across class lines, and groups, whose members are of the same class status and who participate exclusively with one another, are very rare, except among the smaller high status stratum.
It is also important to note that certain phenomena tend to become associated with particular social statuses, even though they do not come to be ranked in a hierarchy like those of the secondary sub-hierarchies. For example, political ideology or standards of sexual morality may be known to correlate highly with class status; yet these behaviour and thought patterns may not be ranked into a hierarchy that has any relation to class status.

An individual's class status is not in any sense a mechanical average or sum of his statuses in these several sub-hierarchies. If he holds consistent positions throughout, then his class status is clear and recognised by everyone. According to the ideal conceptions of our own society, this is how the class structure should work; there ought to be consistency on all the important scales, for the greater the consistency the more predictable is behaviour. Where there are obvious discrepancies, the individual's class status is felt to be indeterminate, his own behaviour unpredictable, and expectations about the behaviour of others towards him, ill-defined. We recognise, of course, that a class structure which allows a high degree of upward mobility inevitably involves these inconsistencies, but it is felt that they should not persist; e.g., the boy from a low status family who becomes the manager of a factory should adopt the dress, manner of living and etiquette appropriate to his position.
An important variation between communities is the amount of knowledge generally available for the ranking of individuals and families. In a small-scale rural community, for example, most people know the positions of most others in all the relevant sub-hierarchies. But in a large-scale community, a high rate of mobility and the segmentalisation of the individual's total area of participation mean that there is much contact between people who have only enough information about each other to assign positions in one or two sub-hierarchies; the individual's access to the other values is then either taken for granted, or assumed, or remains an open question for further speculation and checking.

In Goulburn there are three important primary sub-hierarchies. The first is occupation. The highest status occupation is that of the grazier who owns a large and well-established property. While the small group of people in this position still wield considerable control over economic resources and have access to the most highly valued education, material possessions, social position, etc., the high status accorded to them is an example of the kind of lag previously referred to; the historical explanation for this status must certainly take account of the social structure of the Britain from which settlers came to this country during the last century, but it is equally important that in the early history of the district, the landowners far outstripped
all other occupational strata in their access to and control over all manner of values. With the advent of business, industry, the professions and the civil service and, in a limited way, closer settlement, such control is no longer concentrated in the hands of this occupational group. The remaining occupations in the community can be ranked, very roughly, in the following order: some professions, owners and executives of large business, the highest ranking civil servants and small business owners, white collar workers, skilled workers, labourers. It will be noted that the rank order of occupations does not directly correlate with the amount of education which they demand; education itself constitutes only a minor sub-scale; the comparatively low status of teachers, who are ranked well below other professions and large business owners, both indicates and, in the eyes of the community, validates the unimportance of education.

The second important sub-hierarchy is current wealth and property ownership. The rank order of occupations does not correspond exactly to the rank order of wealth, although there is a tendency in that direction. At the top of the scale, the correspondence is very close: the large graziers are the wealthiest people in the community in terms of capital investment plus income, and they own the most highly valued form of property - land. But below this point there are some notable discrepancies: e.g., businessmen, both
large and small, are often more prosperous than professional people; skilled labourers have higher incomes than many white-collar workers.

Family membership forms a third important primary sub-hierarchy. At the top, are the "old families" who have been of high economic and occupational status in the community for two or more generations. Even though an individual member of an "old family" has not retained a high economic or occupational status, he continues to enjoy high family status. These "old families" are prominent and easily identifiable. The relative positions of the remaining kin groups are less commonly agreed upon; there are various grades of respectable law-abiding, community-minded families, and of shiftless unreliable, and socially irresponsible families. The distinguishing feature of family status is that it persists over time; it is not within the scope of the individual to change his position on the family scale to anything like the same extent as he can move up and down other scales.

The important secondary sub-hierarchies refer to material possessions, such as dress, houses, furnishings and cars, to the formalities of interpersonal behaviour, to interests, to positions in certain contacts and participation, a high degree to extra-community activity being associated with high status.
The degree of rigidity of a class structure is determined by two inter-related criteria. The first is the extent to which positions in all sub-hierarchies, primary and secondary, are concomitant; the most rigid society is one in which the same people enjoy the same amount of access to all values; it follows that in a highly rigid society, strata can be clearly distinguished because of their distinct sub-cultures. The second criterion is the extent to which individuals can move up and down the sub-scales; it is closely related to the first criterion, for class differences are most likely to be strongly institutionalised where distinct sub-cultures exist, and mobility is likely to be more difficult when a wide range of behaviour patterns, attitudes and values has to be modified before the individual can conform to the culture of a higher or lower stratum.

The concept of the rigidity of the class structure is more useful for comparison than in any absolute sense. Goulburn probably has a more rigid class structure than the metropolitan area, in terms of both criteria. The lesser mobility in Goulburn is partly due to the comparatively greater importance of the family status sub-scale, which is appropriate primarily in a community stable enough and small enough for the family antecedents of most members to be generally known. It is one of the characteristics of large cities that the individual can acquire a class status in his own right,
irrespective of the status of his kin group (with the proviso that, even in the city, he cannot acquire the status of the "old families" without the appropriate family background.) In Goulburn, the individual cannot so easily leave his family behind to move up the class scale. Mobility, both of families and individuals, does however occur, but to different degrees at different positions on the class hierarchy. Positions at the top of the class hierarchy are virtually ascribed by birth only, and cannot be achieved. Even further down the scale, spectacular upward mobility is rare. Generally speaking, the lower the individual's original status, the less barriers are there against his improving his position a little. There appears to be far less expectation of upward mobility in Goulburn than in the metropolitan area; the individual is more likely to accept his class status as fixed; if he has ambitions for his children to improve themselves, he probably sends them to Sydney to be educated and to find employment.

The class evaluations made by the members of a society about each other are expressed in interpersonal behaviour to differing degrees. Highly formalised behaviour patterns may indicate the respect of lower class people for those of higher status, or the superiority which the latter claim over the former. Only the most attenuated patterns of this kind are found among the Goulburn people, who claim that such forms are inconsistent with the democratic way of
life, and who, often enough, attempt to deny the existence of class differences by demonstrating "equality" in interpersonal relations. Attenuated patterns can nevertheless be discerned in the fact that persons of the same status (subject to age and sex qualifications) use the same forms of address, and exchange the same gifts and services, and use the same forms of etiquette in relation to each other; but persons of different status tend to behave differently towards one another, though this behaviour is, of course, mutually accepted and co-ordinated.

We have already said that there is a general feeling that there should be consistency between the positions in the several sub-hierarchies. This implies, among other things, that a position in a primary sub-hierarchy carries with it certain expectations about behaviour ranked on the secondary sub-hierarchies. In Goulburn, an infinite number of items of behaviour and characteristics are regarded, often inexplicitly, as fitting to persons of certain class status, and not to others. For example, only persons of high status are expected to assume the presidency of some groups, while no lower status persons are expected to become members of certain associations. Individuals of lower status are expected to "know their place". Persons of middle to high status are expected to be generous in their financial support of community causes; to be decorous in their public
behaviour; to be interested and active in public affairs. All manner of non-respectable behaviour is tolerated, if not looked for, in persons of very low status, on the grounds that "you can't expect anything better from them."

To conclude the analysis of the class structure of Goulburn, we must try to answer two further questions. Do the persons of similar class status form into associations or informal groups for the promotion of their common interests or the organisation of their social life? Do persons of similar class status have a sense of unity, of class solidarity? These two questions can be tentatively and briefly answered together. Several economic associations represent the interests of the people of similar class status, but all of these also rest on an occupational basis e.g. Chamber of Manufacturers, Agricultural Show Society, Chamber of Commerce, Retail Traders Association and trades unions; these associations do not embrace by any means the total population. Recruitment to some social and service associations is also either explicitly or implicitly in terms of class status, e.g. the Goulburn Club, for high status men, the Lady Belmore Club, for women from "old families", the Red Cross, the Country Women's Association and the Goodwill Club, each of them officially open to people of any status, but recruiting their members primarily from the high, middle and low status families respectively. The "old families"
at the top of the class scale are a highly integrated group, with a strong sense of their own solidarity and their distinction from other sections of the community. Participating in social activity with these "old families", but clearly distinguished from them in occupation and family status, are certain members of the professions: in the city, mainly the doctors and bankers. These are the parallel to the "lower upper" class, familiar from the studies of Warner and his school.

Since the numbers of persons in the middle statuses is much greater than in the highest status, combined social participation of the whole group is impossible; a system of interlocking cliques, each tending to contain persons of fairly similar status, has therefore developed; these interlocking cliques link the highest status to the lowest status members of the community. Some associations, such as the R.S.L., contain members of widely different class statuses. It is difficult to make any assessment of the integration into class groups of the vast majority of the community who fall below the highest status level. Apart from the "old families", probably the most integrated groups in the community are the teachers and railway employees. A strong sense of solidarity uniting individuals of different statuses is created amongst this group by the unique characteristics of their occupation; their tendency to
make a permanent career in this particular employment, their high rate of geographical mobility which means that they become acquainted with large numbers of their fellow-workers, but few other people in the many different communities to which they are posted, and the fact that they are likely to be regarded as outsiders in many communities. In the case of railway employees and teachers, the specific occupation and their status in the occupational group obscure or override or render irrelevant their positions in the class structure, so far as social participation and solidarity are concerned. As we shall see later, this gives people in these occupations something of the status of minority groups in the community.

Occupation may thus be a more decisive factor than class status in determining social participation and solidarity. Two other factors can also be decisive: whether one is a native or a newcomer, and one's religion. There is a marked Protestant-Catholic dichotomy (1). The distinction between the native and newcomer is an explicit one. The native has certain obligations and privileges which are denied to the newcomer; he has the right to speak for the city, to express his personal views on public affairs in an authoritative fashion, to present himself as a candidate.

---

(1) According to the Population Survey, Sept. 1953, there were 6,638 Catholics and Roman Catholics in the population of 19,117, i.e. 35%.
for important public offices, to take the initiative in
instituting change of any kind, in short to claim a right to
prominence and attention. Similar behaviour on the part of
a newcomer is resented, or regarded as unfitting and forward:
the newcomer should keep in the background, and show a due
humility and willingness to listen to the counsel of the old
residents. The transition from newcomer to native is a
problem which need not concern us here. Through the
religious and native-newcomer dichotomies, people of very
different (though how widely different remains unknown) class
status are united in joint activities and acquire a sense
of solidarity.

Another question would need to be answered for
the complete analysis of social class in Goulburn, but we
have not the necessary material. This is the question, do
persons of similar class status hold the same moral, religious
and political ideologies and values?

A further question which we cannot answer for
lack of data concerns the relation between political power
and class status. In our society, political status could
not be useful for differentiating the population in class
terms, because the vast majority of the people have the same
political status, that of a citizen, while only a very small
minority are members of the government. The relevant
questions are, therefore: is command over positive values
exercised through the control, direct or indirect, of a political machine, or through the control of some other institution, and, do individuals with the same class status hold similar political statuses, and exercise similar degrees of political control, direct and indirect?

In concluding this survey of the class structure of Goulburn, we can suggest that the term "stratum" adequately covers the people who occupy the same position in a hierarchy, or system of stratification; hence the word "class" can be reserved for the group which comes into existence when the units in a stratum, i.e., persons who already form a collectivity, develop a common culture and system of values, identify themselves with persons of the same stratum, and co-ordinate their activities. Classes come into existence only when the majority of the members of a stratum acquire these group characteristics; a few isolated groups in a large collectivity do not constitute a class (1). The material does not enable us to say how far classes, in this sense, exist in Goulburn, but there is certainly an upper class.

(1) The distinction between stratum and class was suggested by Centers, 1949; but Centers uses the term stratification for differences deriving from the economic system, while "Classes are psycho-social groupings, something that is essentially subjective in character, dependent upon class consciousness.... and class lines of cleavage may or may not conform to what seem to social scientists to be logical lines of cleavage in the objective or stratification sense". Centers, 1949, p. 27.
We have previously identified the Displaced Persons as a highly distinctive group in the Goulburn community. When a community contains a group as different and as outwardly, self-contained as this, the group is usually assigned a collective status, and its members are not, individually or in separate families, incorporated into the class structure. This means that, even though the members of such a group are recognized as occupying certain positions in the primary and secondary sub-hierarchies, their resulting class status is regarded as of far less significance than their status as members of this distinctive group. In the extreme case, e.g., the Negroes in the south of the United States, positions in certain sub-hierarchies are assigned by virtue of group membership, and other positions are denied on the same grounds. Even where segregation or discrimination is lacking, members of such groups do not behave, and are not expected to behave, like other people occupying similar positions: they spend their money differently, have different patterns of interpersonal behaviour, different aspirations for the future, different political or religious values, from the members of the larger society who are in similar positions. In large-scale complex societies, class status is often affected by group memberships; e.g., in a community where most lower class people are Roman Catholic, religious affiliation may take on
something of the status of a secondary sub-hierarchy.

But when this process reaches the point where the members of the group are collectively assigned a certain status, and can alter that status only by dissociating themselves from the group, then it is appropriate to adopt the special term "minority" for such a group. The disadvantage of this term is that it has been traditionally applied to groups which are discriminated against by the majority (1), and very often to distinctive racial groups. The only alternative term that suggests itself is "marginal group", but the concept of the "marginal man" was originally used by Park and Stonequist, and has continued to be so used, to imply personal and cultural conflict; the marginal man was the individual who did not belong to any integrated group (2).

(1) Wirth, for example, 1945, p. 367 defines a minority as a "group of people who, because of their physical or cultural characteristics, are circled out from the others in the society in which they live for differential and unequal treatment, and who therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination. The existence of a minority in a society implies the existence of a corresponding dominant group enjoying higher social status and greater privileges." The minority which suffers discrimination is one type of minority, using the term in the more inclusive sense as it has been defined in the text.

(2) Park introduced the concept of "the marginal man", in his article "Human Migration and the Marginal Man", 1928; Stonequist brought the term into current usage with his book, The Marginal Man, 1937. The gist of recent criticisms of the concept, by Goldberg, 1941, Green, 1947, and Golovensky, 1952, is that a group with a culture different from that of the society in which it is located does not necessarily become disintegrated, and that, whether it does or not, its members do not necessarily fall victim to personal maladjustment and disorganisation.
But the members of what we are calling a "minority group" may be adequately incorporated into certain areas of the host society, such as the economic, and the group itself may be well integrated.

Immigrants very often form minorities of this kind (1). The Greeks in Goulburn provide a good example of a well-integrated group with more or less stable minority status. They number about 130 people, of whom more than half were born in Greece, a few elsewhere in the Middle East and the remainder in Australia. Some of the older women speak almost no English; the younger generation are bilingual. They belong to the Orthodox Church. Most of them own small businesses, such as fruit shops and milk bars, or are employed in businesses owned by other Greeks. The older generation, nearly all of whom are Greek-born, worked extremely hard and saved their money carefully to give their families financial security; they used their savings to accumulate a bank balance or for re-investment, rather than following the patterns of the local community.

---

(1) See also Warner 1945, pp. 58-68, "Upon first establishing himself in Yankee City, the ethnic finds himself in the anomalous position of 'belonging' to no local social class and having the identification only of 'foreigner'... In a sense the ethnic is originally outside the Yankee City class system, but he has a minimum of status by reason of his position in both the city's residential and occupational hierarchies. Later he appears in a partially differentiated subclass within the lower class but is still not accorded complete equivalence of status with the natives of that class level."
in acquiring personal possessions and houses, and giving their children a professional education. The standards of evaluation and behaviour of the younger generation are more like those of the local population; for example, they are coming to attach a similar importance to occupation, and to accept the occupational hierarchy of the Australians, although only one young man has so far taken on a profession; they are increasingly using their money to acquire the material possessions which are valued locally, such as dress, house equipment and furnishings. Greek children repeatedly complain that their parents knew how to make money, but not how to spend it. Nearly all the Greeks belong to an association called the Greek Community, which organises social gatherings and is an instrument of social control. There is a great deal of private social activity among the several more or less endogamous sub-groups of people who have come from the same district in Greece, and who are therefore somewhat homogeneous in socio-economic background; there is less private social activity between these sub-groups from different backgrounds, and almost no such activity involving Greeks and Australians. A few Greeks, probably no more than ten in all, belong to local associations, such as the Masons, Apex, and the Country Women's Association. Most Greeks maintain close contact with relatives and Greek friends in other communities all over N.S.W. and beyond, and many attend organised Greek activities in Sydney and elsewhere. They have a stronger
sense of identification with this far-flung Greek group than with the local Australians. Because of their distinctive physical and cultural characteristics, and their group solidarity, the Greeks are a highly visible group. The Goulburn people have a number of different attitudes towards them. They respect them for their hard work and thrift, but denounce their perceived pre-occupation with accumulating money and property to the exclusion of all other values. Several individuals are respected as good, community-minded citizens. There is also some admiration for the group as a whole for the strength of their family life, and the discipline which they exercise over their members. They are believed to be "shrewd" and untrustworthy in financial dealings. But, no matter what their positions in e.g. the wealth or occupational hierarchies, the expectations which normally apply to persons in any particular position do not apply to them; they are different; they are not expected to behave or think like Australians. The local people recognise that there are differences of financial prosperity and education within the Greek community, but they expect Greeks to act together and to feel a sense of social solidarity irrespective of these differences; while, on the contrary, there is no expectation that they will participate with or feel identified with the section of the local population of the same status.
What, then is the position of the Displaced Persons in relation to the class structure which has been outlined? They too are a minority group, but lacking the integration and the defined and accepted position of the Greeks. They are a minority in that they do not fully share class evaluations of the local community; but neither have they, as a group, any formulated and commonly accepted scales of evaluation of their own. Because of the very varied national backgrounds from which they have come, one can only give examples of the kinds of discrepancy between theirs and the local evaluations; very few if any of the Displaced Persons are willing to accord the highest occupational status to the long-established graziers; the fact that these families pioneered the district and have occupied high status for several generations means nothing to the Displaced Persons; on the other hand, many of them lay much greater stress on education than do the local people. Neither are the Displaced Persons at ease with the hierarchy of families in Goulburn, nor with ranking in terms of the school at which a person was educated. The secondary sub-hierarchies enter very little into their evaluations of the local community; most of them have had too little experience of social life in Australia to be able to evaluate speech and the formalities of interpersonal behaviour, or even, except for gross differences, household furnishings.
Lacking this insight into the local social structure, and to some extent projecting their own values onto the community, the Displaced Persons tend to think of status differences largely in terms of differences in wealth; visible signs of wealth, such as cars and dress, are noted with attention. Accustomed to the more overt class differences of Europe, some Displaced Persons deny the existence of class status in Goulburn, or feel that they can make no sense of the local structure, when people who are reputed to be "very rich" and of high standing in the community behave in, to them, an inappropriate manner, coming to town in old clothes, both men and women doing hard manual work, and acting towards people of lower status in an informal and friendly manner, apparently indicating that they are altogether unconscious of class differences.

The Displaced Persons are also a minority in that they are regarded as outside the class structure by the local community. Like the Greeks, they have a special position, determined more by their immigrant status than by their positions in the class sub-hierarchies. Like the Greeks, they are believed to hold different values from the Australians; money only has any meaning for them, while occupation, community responsibility or the refinements of social living are of no consequence to them. With good reason, because of the immigrants' high rate of mobility,
the Goulburn people regard them individually as a temporary acquisition to the community, although realising that they will probably always have a small Displaced Person population. The Displaced Persons are also a distinct group in the sense that, no matter what their social background in Europe or present occupational or economic status, the local people recognise, although they seldom fulfill, particular obligations to them; broadly, these obligations are to take an interest in them, to help them because they are believed to have suffered (1) and because they are newcomers to the country, to make a special effort to provide them with a new homestead. Any attempt to fulfill these obligations, as for instance when some local association entertains immigrants on an "international night", necessarily means that the relationship with the Displaced Persons is patterned primarily in terms of their status as immigrants, rather than their class status (2). The Displaced Persons are also outside

(1) The Goulburn people are not well-informed about the war-time and post-war history of the Displaced Persons. They tend to believe that all Displaced Persons were in German concentration or forced labour camps.

(2) It would, however, be quite false to give the impression that the Australians do not try to "place" the immigrants in terms of their European class background. They distinguish roughly between the "personable" and "non-personable" immigrants, and equate these differences, often incorrectly, with their somewhat romantic and unrealistic conception of the European class structure. This does not, however, alter the fact that the obligations here being referred to are obligations to the Displaced Persons as a category, irrespective of their social class backgrounds.
the local class structure in the sense that they do not participate in the system of cliques which, as previously described, organise the local people into a rough class hierarchy.

It was noted earlier in this chapter that the class status of an individual is equivocal when he occupies different positions in each class sub-hierarchy. The minority status of the Displaced Persons is accentuated by the fact that many of them would in fact have this equivocal status. By occupation they are nearly all towards the bottom of the scale; by education and socio-economic background, many of them would have a considerably higher position; in property some are a little higher up the scale than is usual for their occupational group, and show signs of further improving their economic status considerably. They do not participate in associations, such as trade unions, appropriate to their economic and occupational status (1).

There is no legal discrimination against the

(1) Warner, 1945, Ch. 5, "The Ethnic Groups in the Class System", has indicated four processes by which the ethnic group achieves social mobility: occupational, residential, social participation, and the adoption of American culture. Warner discusses the interdependence of these four "value scales", as he calls them, and documents the important findings that, p. 98, "Among successive generations there are different rates of mobility in the three hierarchies (occupational, residential, and class) - differences which carry the ethnic group in a single direction, from a condition of great diversity among the three statuses toward an ultimate condition of identity among the statuses."
Displaced Persons, except that they suffer the disabilities of all residents who are not British subjects and who have not fulfilled the residential requirements entitling them to certain benefits and privileges. Neither is there any unofficial policy of denying them access to certain values. In practice, however, their freedom to move up the occupational scale and their access to valued offices are very much limited. Whatever their qualifications, jobs above the status of skilled worker have not been available to them in Goulburn, and there is a, usually implicit, but common tendency not to include them as full participating members in associations with prestige in the community. Although there is certainly some rational justification for these disqualifications (e.g. incompetence in the language would make it impossible for some Displaced Persons to fulfill certain jobs), they tend to be applied to Displaced Persons (and other immigrants) qua Displaced Persons, irrespective of individual differences. As we shall see below, however, this tendency is already beginning to break down.

A minority group may or may not be of inferior social status. If its members have a high degree of access to and control over certain values, then, however inconsistent their behaviour from the viewpoint of the larger community and however much their behaviour patterns may fall outside the range evaluated within the larger community, they may
still be accorded high status. The British in India were a minority group of high status; they had access to the most valued occupations and offices and were high in the wealth hierarchy; but their behaviour patterns, religious and political ideologies and values were right outside those familiar in Indian culture; they were in fact oriented to the society from which they had derived. The Anglo-Indians, on the other hand, are a minority group of low status; they despise the Indians and the values of Indian culture; the Indians for their part distrust and reject the members of this mixed blood community; but the Anglo-Indians are denied access to the values of the British group with whom they wish to be identified— their place is "that of a parasite whose hold on its host is none too secure." The Anglo-Indian lives his separate life on the border of the official community, which supplies him with sufficient employment to keep up his shabby and pathetic Britishness." (1).

The Displaced Persons in Goulburn are a low-status minority group. They are concentrated in the lowest status occupations, and live in what is locally evaluated as the poorest type of accommodation. Because they came to Australia without financial resources or property, the same

(1) Medin, 1934, p. 176.
kind of obligations are acknowledged to them as to the "underprivileged" of the local community; an obligation no longer described by the word "charity", but "service". If middle and upper class people recognise certain obligations to those of inferior status, they also have specific expectations about the appropriate responses to their help and interest: immigrants, like lower class people, should "know their place"; they should not presume on the consideration shown them, but should accept assistance without treating it in any way as a right; they should not assume that any interest shown in them entitles them to expect entrance to upper or middle class social cliques; they should, in general, accord a certain respect to the people of higher status in their interpersonal relations. Further evidence of the low status of the immigrants lies in the fact that the local people resent their displaying manifestly different behaviour, and try to make them conform to the local culture, so far as it is in their power to do so; the most common example of this attitude is the insistence that immigrants should speak English in public.

And finally, the low status of the Displaced Persons is further confirmed by virtue of the fact that they are newcomers and predominantly Catholics. An interesting manifestation of their inferiority as newcomers lies in the fact that they are not expected to initiate social activity
with Australians: "not expected" is perhaps too strong a phrase, but any overtures on the part of an immigrant, which are not in response to some action originating with an Australian, call for a comment of surprise and perhaps amusement.

The Displaced Persons are thus a minority group of inferior status. But this statement gives a somewhat misleading precision and finality to their position. While the status of the Greeks in Goulburn has become stabilised, the position of the Displaced Persons is still in process of being defined. Because their physical appearance does not usually identify them as non-Australians, because they are being distributed widely throughout the lower status occupations, because the distinctive aspects of their public behaviour and appearance are being attenuated, because of their poor group integration, and because it is only a few years since they first arrived in Goulburn, the Displaced Persons have by no means such a clearly defined position as the Greeks. The Australians are often just as unsure in their behaviour towards the Displaced Persons, as the Displaced Persons are in their relations with Australians. How friendly should they be? Is their advice and help wanted or not? Do the Displaced Persons like to join in social gatherings with Australians or do they prefer to be left alone? How is one to select the Displaced Persons with
whom one would have something in common, and avoid getting involved with the "less desirable types"? Is close contact likely to reveal personal habits and characteristics which would repel the Australian? The Australians' uncertainty about answers to questions of this kind is an indication of their vague conception about the position which the Displaced Persons occupy in the social structure. The counterpart to this vagueness on the part of the Australians is that the Displaced Persons themselves are unsure of their position and of how they should behave with Australians. But it is worth noting that there is more pressure on the Displaced Persons to try to define their position than there is on the Australians to formulate precisely the relationships between the two groups. For reasons connected with their pre-migration history in Europe as well as their experiences in Australia, the Displaced Persons are sensitive to any signs of subordination or discrimination, and are therefore inclined to perceive their situation primarily in terms of rejection and inferiority where there is even the slightest evidence of such attitudes towards them.

5. Conclusion

In the foregoing pages, we have described who the Displaced Persons are, and the kind of social structure within which they live. For the understanding of the detailed analysis which follows it is important to keep in mind that,
in Western Europe before immigration, the Displaced Persons were unwanted and inferior, their future uncertain and hopeless in the extreme; and that, as immigrants in Australia, they belong to a poorly integrated minority group with an ill-defined, but inferior, position in the Australian social structure.
CHAPTER 5.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS

1. Economic Structure of the Community

The city of Goulburn is sometimes described as a "railway town". It is on the main line from Sydney to Melbourne, and on the junction of the branch lines to Crookwell, Taralga, Bombala, Canberra and Cooma. Goulburn was first connected to Sydney by rail in 1869; the railway workshops were begun in 1881. The Department of Railways has been for many years the largest single employer of labour in the city; the number of Railway employees in June 1953 being 1,164 (1), or 17% of the total work force.

The present occupational structure of the community is best indicated in Table 14, which summarises the number of persons in each industry in September 1953 (2).

State Government, local government, and to a minor extent Commonwealth Government, employees are scattered throughout a number of these categories. Between them, the principal government undertakings, including the State schools, Railways, Mental Hospital, District Hospital, Training Centre (Gaol), Abattoirs and Municipal and Shire

(1) Figures supplied by the Department of Railways.
(2) See p. 527.
Councils, employ a very large proportion of the total work force. Of the 6,994 persons in employment, 5,696 (82%) were wage or salary earners.

Wyatt (1) reports that throughout the history of the city, industries have repeatedly sprung up, only to disappear again. The enthusiasm and optimism of the period of commercial and industrial expansion of the late 1870's and 1880's have not proved justified, but the ambition to make Goulburn an industrial centre has persisted. Immediately after the last war, the prospects of spectacular industrial development seemed promising, especially in view of the move towards decentralisation in the economy of the country as a whole. Once again, however, these hopes have been disappointed, and the only new industry of any size that has been established in Goulburn in recent years is the City Abattoirs, opened in 1951. At June 1953, 92 factories employed 1,471 persons (2).

The post-war period of full employment and shortage of labour was followed in late 1951 and 1952 by the recession which affected the country as a whole. Factory workers probably suffered most. From March to June 1952, the 180 employees of the Chief Clothing Factory worked only

---

(1) Wyatt, 1941, p. 260.
(2) Figures supplied by the N.S.W. Bureau of Statistics and Economics.
three days a week (1). Pacific Chenille-Craft dismissed about 200 employees in January 1952, but began taking on workers again in May. Amalgamated Textiles dismissed employees in October 1951 and March 1952 (2). In September 1952, the local newspaper claimed that government institutions such as the Mental Hospital were finding it easy to obtain staff for the first time in years (3).

Although the local economy had largely recovered from this setback by the beginning of 1953, there has been no return to the extreme labor shortage of the pre-recession years. The following table sets out data on employment and building, as an illustration of recent fluctuations in the local economy.

(1) c.E.I., 6/6/52.
(2) idem, 11/3/52.
(3) idem, 4/9/52.
(4) Figures supplied by the N.G.N. Bureau of Statistics and Economics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(at December of each year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>Unfilled</td>
<td>Persons in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Vacancies</td>
<td>Receipt of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data on employment supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service; data on building supplied by the N.S.W. Bureau of Statistics and Economics.


Thus in 1948-49, when the first immigrants were arriving in Goulburn, the local economy was expanding and jobs were plentiful. As elsewhere, the Displaced Persons were placed in essential services which at that period were severely understaffed. The early arrivals were sent under contract to the Hardun quarries, the Department of Railways, the District Hospital, the Kenmore Mental Hospital and, in
lesser numbers, to other private and governmental organisations.

Table 4 sets out the numbers of immigrants employed in the Railways, Kenmore and the Pacific Chenille-Craft Factory (1) during the period 1948 - 1953. These are the three industries which have been the principal employers of immigrants. Kenmore employed its largest number of immigrants in 1949, the Railways and Pacific Chenille in 1951. Many of the employees who left the Railways and Pacific Chenille in 1952 were retrenched.

Tables 5 and 6 present an analysis of the occupational histories of 136 male and 40 female Displaced Persons, from the Employment Office records. The men have been employed principally in the Railways (54% of the sample), Pacific Chenille (17%), Catholic schools and homes (13%), the City and Shire Council (12%) and the Migrant Hostel (10%). Thirty-two percent of the men had been employed on farms, not necessarily in the Goulburn district. The women have mostly had jobs at the Kenmore Mental Hospital (43%), in hotels (23%), Catholic institutions (20%), the District Hospital (18%), Pacific Chenille (17%) and the Migrant Hostel (10%). In Section 3 we shall show that the contact

(1) Only those sections of Pacific Chenille and the Railways employing the main body of immigrants are included in this analysis. See note to Table 3.
of Displaced Persons with the Employment Office has diminished greatly since they completed their contracts; this means that this distribution of industries from Employment Office records represent the kinds of industries in which the Displaced Persons were most likely to be employed during their first years in Goulburn rather than the present situation.

The most recent material on the distribution of the Displaced Persons in the economic structure comes from the Population Survey of September 1953. Table 1 shows that the Displaced Persons were at that time distributed throughout a wide variety of industries, and that the Railways, the Mental Hospital, textile factories (i.e. Pacific Chenille and Amalgamated Textiles), the Migrant Hostel and hotels had the largest number of Displaced Person employees.

Table 2 shows that about half the men in the sample of Displaced Persons in this study, but only two out of 21 women were working in skilled occupations, which included chef, storeman, mechanic, tailor, hospital attendant, fireman and, flour miller. The remainder were all in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations. Two members of the sample were in white-collar or professional jobs; so far as is known, the only Displaced Person in such a position is a Polish architect who has arrived in Goulburn since the
research was carried out.

In summary, the Displaced Persons in Goulburn are located in the lower strata of the occupational hierarchy. There has been little opportunity for them to enter higher strata, and, as we have suggested in Chapter 4, those with ambitions for occupational mobility have tended to move out of the community—a process which probably has its parallel among the Australian population.


All of the Displaced Persons in Goulburn came to Australia under contract, with the exception of several married women with young children, who were not required to work under contract. The provisions of the contract were briefly that the Displaced Person should work for two years after arrival in the district and job to which he was directed by the Employment officers of the Department of Labour and National Service.

The principle of bringing immigrants to Australia under contract has often been questioned by Australians. The present study has, however, failed to reveal any strong antagonism to the contract system on the part of Displaced Persons (1). Most of the subjects came from Germany, where

(1) Bumby, 1952, reports general satisfaction of Displaced Persons in Australia with the contract system, which he regards as conducive to assimilation.
it was difficult for them to obtain employment; they were therefore likely to be well-disposed to a system which, they believed, ensured them jobs. The knowledge that they would be directed into employment was a source of security, not only economically but also psychologically since, on arrival, their command of English was so poor that it would have been difficult for them to seek jobs for themselves. There was more criticism of the Government's failure to provide employment for newly-arrived immigrants during the recession than of the contract system itself.

The subjects' positive attitude to the contract could also be explained partly by the fact that at the time of the study all of them had completed their two years' contract. Some may have been more critical of the system during the period when they were being directed into employment. In addition, the attitudes expressed by the Displaced Persons interviewed in this study may not be representative of the views of immigrant families who have been separated during the contract period, the wife and children living in a Holding Centre and the husband working perhaps hundreds of miles away. None of the families in the present study had been separated for more than a few months, and, most, not at all.

Two different assumptions seemed to underlie the immigrants' acceptance of the contract system. The less
common was that the Government not only had the moral right to require assisted immigrants to sign a contract, but that this was done partly at least in the interests of the immigrants themselves, to ensure their employment and freedom from exploitation. The more common assumption was that the Australian Government could naturally make use of this supply of directed labour to fill the "dirty jobs" which the Australians did not want, and that, since the Government was dictating the terms, it had every right to use Displaced Person labour in this way.

The administration of the contract was in the hands of the Commonwealth Employment Service, within the Department of Labour and National Service, which acted as the agent for the Department of Immigration, the same Commonwealth Minister being responsible for both Departments. There was a District Employment Officer in Goulburn, in charge of a District Employment Office. The functions of the Employment Officers, so far as they related to Displaced Persons, were to determine the labour needs within their district, and to place Displaced Persons in employment. They were also expected to act as advisors to Displaced Persons on all matters relating to their jobs, to mediate between employers and Displaced Person employees, and, where the grounds were considered adequate, to arrange
transfers from one job to another (1).

While the subjects expressed little criticism about the principle of the contract system, many had complaints against its administration. Some claimed that they had been victims of discrimination so far as their condition of work and accommodation were concerned, that they were subjected to treatment which would not have been meted out to Australians. These complaints came only from immigrants who had been directed to work at the Narulan quarries and on farms. The first job of many Displaced Persons in the Goulburn district was that of labourer in the quarries at Narulan, 17 miles north of Goulburn; Displaced Persons who had been employed in certain quarries agreed that the accommodation provided by their employers was extremely poor and far below the standard which they had

(1). The Departmental Handbook of the Department of Labour and National Service, April 1934, p. 27, briefly indicates that the Employment Officers are expected to take a general interest in the welfare of immigrants, "considerable post-placement follow up work is also involved in smoothing out difficulties which many newly arrived immigrants inevitably encounter. In this connection the District Officers work closely with the Good Neighbor Movement sponsored by the Department of Immigration." On p. 30, it is also pointed out that, since the Employment Offices institute one of the few widespread decentralised organisations of the Commonwealth - the only others being the Post Offices and Electoral Offices - "The public have tended to look to the District Employment Offices ... as the centres where they may seek advice and information on all subjects of Commonwealth administration."
been promised before being sent out to the job (1). Some,
but by no means all of the subjects who had been employed
on farms complained about poor accommodation and under-
payment; they felt that they were in a vulnerable position
to be exploited by farmers, and that their interests were
not, and to some extent could not be, adequately protected
by the Employment Officers. These complaints referred to
farm employment not only in the Goulburn district, but
elsewhere too.

The practice of employing newly arrived immigrants
in groups, e.g. in railway or caneworking gangs, was also
criticised on the grounds that it gave the immigrants no
opportunity to learn English nor to get to know Australians,
and in fact segregated them from the Australian community.

(1) There is further evidence to support these claims.
The G.E.P., 19.5.49, carried a news item, headed, "Housing
Baltas for Work at Marulan," reporting a statement by the
Health Inspector to the Illawarra Shire Council to the effect
that a "tent-camp" had been erected to house "Balt workers"
at Marulan, and recommending that the Portland Cement
Co. be given two months to erect permanent accommoda-
tion in place of tents. A second item, in the G.E.P., 30.5.49,
headed "Accommodation of Baltas in Auburn St.," reported that,
in reply to a request from the Goulburn Trades and Labour
Council, the City Health Inspector had investigated a boarding
house where 18 "Baltas" employed by the Portland Cement Co. at
Marulan were accommodated; the Inspector reported that the
sleeping quarters consisted of one dormitory of 6 beds, one
room with 5 beds, and 3 rooms of 3 beds each; although the
premises were reasonably clean, there was room for improvement
in the structural condition of the building; the City Council
agreed that the Health Inspector should keep the boarding
house within his notice.
The following three pages are to be regarded as confidential.
The operation of the Employment service in Coulburn itself requires more detailed discussion. The Employment Officer was in general sympathetic to the interests of the displaced persons, and administered the contract with much intelligent flexibility. It seems clear, however, that the treatment of all displaced persons was not uniform. The most useful approach to this problem is to analyse the extent to which immigrants were allowed to choose their jobs in the first instance, and the Employment Officer's response to their requests to be allowed to change from one job to another. In general, the women seem to have been treated with more consideration and leniency than the men; they claimed that they were often given some choice of employment, while the men said that they were "sent" to a particular job. Leaving aside differences in the treatment of men and women, we can distinguish three different ways in which the local Employment Officer dealt with the Displaced Persons. Some he smoothed the way for, giving them the best jobs available. These same people he also helped in many personal ways. The immigrants treated in this way usually came from a comparatively high class background, had a secondary school or university education and spoke much better than average English. It seems clear that the Employment Officer believed that such people were especially likely to suffer from their position as Displaced
Persons; he was able to help them by allowing them to move around until they found some comparatively congenial employment.

There is no sharp distinction between this first pattern of dealing with Displaced Persons and the second, where the Employment Officer's assistance was dependant on some material gain, or the prospect of material gain. Many of the subjects were reluctant to charge the Employment Officer with taking bribes, but ten (sixteen and four women) did so, and four of these claimed that they themselves had given him money or gifts to obtain permission to change their jobs. The Officer against whom these charges were made was eventually transferred to another district. Some of the local immigrants believe that this transfer resulted from an attempt to obtain money from a migrant under false pretences. It is difficult to estimate how far the subjects generalised from the alleged corruption of this official to the behaviour of other government servants. Two men indicated a cynical attitude which others might have been more willing to express among themselves than to the research worker. Cheerfully declaring that the Employment Officer took bribes, they felt that this was a fair deal between the Officer and the immigrants who were prepared to pay for a
good job. One said, "If you gave him money, he would look after you very well; the immigrants were stupid to offer him money, but he could have been stupid not to take it. He needs money too; and he gave good service in return." The other commented with disgust that the new Employment Officer was no good, "We can't take your money and he won't give you a good job."

Finally, the Employment Officer required some displaced persons to fulfill their contract to the letter, being perhaps more inflexible than necessary, and leading the immigrants to regard him as a regulation-bound bureaucrat, either indifferent or directly antagonistic to their welfare. Presumably, most of the immigrants who were treated in this way could have received greater consideration had they been willing to offer the necessary inducements, but none of the subjects who fall into this category was likely to have been looked after as were those whose treatment was first described above; they were all of low educational standard, and lower class background; they apparently aroused the antagonism rather than the sympathy of the Employment Officer, who may well have regarded them as trouble-makers and loafers.
Some of the subjects reacted defiantly to what they regarded as discrimination on the part of the Employment Officer. They walked off work to which they had been directed, found new jobs against the instructions of the Employment Officer, or informed him that they would rather be sent back to Europe than continue in employment from which he refused to release them. It seems likely that the threat of deportation was used widely by harassed Employment Officers dealing with recalcitrant Displaced Persons, and it was doubtless often effective. But many of the subjects of this study believed that deportation for failure to fulfill the contract was most improbable, and realized that this lack of an ultimate sanction for the contract was the government's vulnerable point.

Once their contracts had expired, the immigrants tended to seek jobs through the Employment Office only when work was hard to get. The evidence for this statement comes not only from information given by the Displaced Persons themselves, but also from the records of the local Employment Office. Table 7 shows that, between the beginning of 1951, from which date the records are complete, and May 1954, 90 Displaced Persons (71 men and 19 women) made their first contact with the Goulburn office; of these 90, 59 obtained their first job in Goulburn in 1951, 21 in 1952, 9 in 1953, and only one during the first five months of 1954. Although
these first jobs were not necessarily obtained through the Employment Office, the great majority of them were; what these figures show is a definite decline in the number of Displaced Persons registering at the Employment Office in each year since 1950. Table 8 gives information on the date of the last job entered on the 145 employment records held in the office at May, 1954; of these 145 displaced Persons, only 27, one fifth, were registered as having been placed in employment since 1952; a few in addition have applied for jobs since that date, but have not been placed. The figures of these two tables reflect to some extent the decline in numbers of Displaced Persons in the city during this period; but the drop in each table is much greater than the decline in total numbers, and clearly indicates that, once their contract is fulfilled, the Displaced Persons are likely to find employment through some channel other than the Employment Office.

Other means of finding employment are: to answer an advertisement, to apply direct to an industry, or to obtain a job through representations made on the immigrant's behalf by a fellow-immigrant or an Australian. Many immigrants kept a watch on positions advertised in the local paper, but it was only as a last resort that they applied for an advertised job, without any personal recommendation; often they would seek out an acquaintance who worked in an industry
which was advertising for employees and ask him to "put in a good word for them", or take them along to the manager. It is becoming increasingly common, however, for Displaced Persons to apply direct to some of the larger industries known to employ immigrants; they believe that they are usually likely to find jobs at the Department of Railways, the Mental Hospital and the Pacific Chenille-Craft Factory, and have no hesitation in approaching these employers directly.

But by far the common means of finding a new job was through representations made by a fellow-immigrant. In their inferior position the Displaced Persons could render each other little significant economic assistance, but help in securing jobs was one common mutual service; it was one of the new relationships within the Displaced Person which recurred repeatedly and approached a moral expectation. The value placed on such help varied, of course, with the availability of jobs. But it was not only the assistance which was appreciated; the Displaced Person who found a job through a fellow-immigrant already employed in the same place felt reassured that he would not be the only outsider among Australians. For preference, most of the subjects would seek employment where other Europeans were also employed, but limited opportunities often prevented this, while, as their facility in English
improved and they felt generally more secure, they were more willing to take work among strangers.

Only very occasionally did a subject obtain a job as the result of help from an Australian friend or acquaintance. Since this is a service which Australians could very well perform for immigrants, the rarity of this kind of relationship indicates the absence of close social ties between Australians and Displaced Persons.

The fact that immigrants have much more chance of finding jobs through the good offices of fellow-immigrants than of Australians has a further implication. Immigrants can help their fellows only to obtain the kind of jobs which they themselves have secured, that is, skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled jobs. Up to the present time, only two or three European immigrants, including both Displaced Persons, and others, have obtained white collar jobs in Goulburn. The incumbents of these comparatively high-status positions require not only more precise qualifications than those demanded for unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, but also a presence and manner which most local employers believe that the Europeans lack. Some Displaced Persons have the required qualifications, in training, experience and manner, and have tried to obtain jobs of this kind. Their failure to do so has largely been due to the fact that they lack the "right" contacts. From observations of other areas
where immigrants have entered these white-collar occupations, it seems clear that during the first period, entry is gained through personal contacts with Australians in relatively influential positions; once this foothold has been obtained and the immigrants as a class have proved their worth, the Australian employers are willing to accept more immigrants on the recommendation of those already employed, or even without it. The Goulburn Displaced Persons have not succeeded in breaking into these white-collar occupations, and, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, the Displaced Persons best qualified to fill jobs of this kind have tended to move away from the city.

4. Occupational Mobility

The available data on occupational mobility cover average duration of jobs, turnover in particular industries, and the number of jobs held by subjects during and since their contract period; these data are summarised in Tables 3, 4, 9, 10, 11 and 12 (1); the notes to these tables indicate how the material was collected, and its limitations. The discussion here will be confined to brief comments and interpretation.

The three industries which have employed the largest number of Displaced Persons are the Railways, Kenmore

(1) See pp. 216, 217, 222, 223, 225.
Mental Hospital and the Pacific Chenille-Craft Factory (1). The records of these industries from 1948 to mid-1953 show that, in each case, the majority of immigrants (2) have left after less than one year (see Table 3). The figures for the Railways and Pacific Chenille refer to males only; the distribution of duration of employment for ex-employees in each of these industries is almost identical. The tendency for Kenmore employees to stay longer in this job apparently reflects principally a difference between male and female employees.

By contrast to the employees who had left each of these industries by June 1953, the majority of those still employed at that time had been in these jobs for over a year, and a large proportion for over 2½ years, except that, because the Spinning Section of the Pacific Chenille Factory, to which all figures refer, had been closed down at the beginning of 1952, no Pacific Chenille employees had, at June 1953, been employed for longer than one year. The contrast between the duration of employment for former and present employees results to some extent from the fact that,

(1) These three industries have employed the largest number of Displaced Persons if men and women are combined; Tables 5 and 6 and interview material, especially from Employment Officers, provide the data on which this statement is based.
(2) As far as possible, all non-Displaced Person immigrants have been excluded from the data used for the tables, but because it has not been possible to be certain that no non-Displaced Persons are included, in all references to the population of study in these three industries we use the term "immigrants" rather than Displaced Persons. See note to Table 3.
given the limited duration of residence of the Displaced Persons in Goulburn, there is a probability that those at present in employment will have been in their jobs longer than those formerly employed. Retrenchments during the recession tended to offset this difference between present and past employees.

Material obtained from the subjects of this study also confirms the finding that the rate of occupational mobility among the Displaced Persons in Goulburn has been high; the average number of months per job for 24 Displaced Person males was found to be 19 (see Table 21), with a range from 10 to 24 for immigrants of different types.

A comparison between the duration of employment of Australians and immigrants has been made for Kenmore only. (See Table 9). The important finding indicated in this table is that there was very little difference in the duration of employment of immigrants and Australians who left between 1948 and 1953, and this despite the facts that the Displaced Person employees were under contract for a good part of this period, and that their maximum possible duration of employment in Kenmore was a little over four years. The tendency for Displaced Persons and Australians to stay much the same length of time in their jobs during this period suggests that their behaviour in this respect was determined by factors common to both categories; namely the
conditions of work in the Mental Hospital and the general economic situation.

Comparative labour turnover figures for Australians and immigrants were obtained only for Kenmore. Table 10 shows that, from the beginning of 1949 to mid-1952, the turnover rate for Australians ranged from 7.3 to 19.1, and for immigrants, from 11.5 to 40.7. In each six-month period, the rate for immigrants, male and female combined, exceeded that for Australians; breaking down the rates by sex, we see that the male rate was always higher among the immigrants, and the female rate sometimes lower among immigrants. Except for a very high rate among both Australians and immigrants during the first six months of 1949, and a comparatively low rate in both categories during the last half of 1952, the rates of the Australians and immigrants do not vary concomitantly throughout the period. One might have expected the rate for displaced persons to be higher in the last two years, when most of them had fulfilled their contract; in fact it is not, and the two highest rates occur before 1950, when most of the employees were still under contract.

The fact that the duration of employment of immigrants who left Kenmore between 1948 and 1953 is very similar to the duration for Australians, while the turnover rate for immigrants is considerably higher results from the following situation: the Australian labour force included a
a body of permanent employees who had been in the Hospital for a long number of years and who did not leave during this period; by contrast the immigrant labour force included only a very small proportion of employees who stayed over 2½ years. In other words, the duration figures take account only of the mobile section of the Australian workers, whose behaviour was very similar to that of the immigrants; but the turnover figures include also the stable, permanent Australian employees, of whom there could be no comparable section among the immigrants.

Table II analyses the relation of number of jobs during contract to number of jobs since contract, up to June 1953, for 34 male Displaced Persons. No similar analysis has been made for females because many of the married women have not been in continuous employment since their arrival in Australia. Although the numbers are not large enough to be conclusive, this table suggests that there is a relationship between mobility during the contract period and subsequent mobility: men who changed their jobs not at all or only once during the contract period have also tended to be occupationally stable since the expiry of their contract. If the contract did in fact control and direct Displaced Person labour uniformly, one would expect to find some inevitable variation in numbers of jobs during the contract period, but would not expect the relationship here
indicated. For these subjects, the contract was obviously administered in such a way as to allow a good deal of play to individual variability. If we combine these data with the Kenmore material on labour turnover, we can suggest that the occupational mobility of the scoulburn displaced Persons under contract was not very different from their motility in the post-contract period. But different factors have, to some extent, produced this similar result: during the first period, mobility was somewhat held in check by the contract, but stimulated by the availability of jobs; in the post-contract period, legal restriction on mobility disappeared, but the possibilities of mobility have been limited by the diminished employment opportunities.

The finding that present employees in Kenmore and the Railways had been in this employment longer than past employees, combined with the finding that displaced Persons who did not change their jobs often during the contract period have tended to remain occupationally stable, suggests the possibility that a selective process is at work, whereby the occupationally mobile immigrants have moved out of the community, while the occupationally stable have remained within it (1). In Table 11a the average number of

(1) Although the "occupationally stable" who have had only one job must have remained in the community, this is not tautological, since the "occupationally mobile" can change jobs within the community or move outside it.
months per job of 11 male Displaced Persons who left Goulburn between 1953 and 1954 was compared with the average for 20 who had remained; the results are not statistically significant, but are in the expected direction.

One might expect that occupational mobility would be reduced during recent years, as the Displaced Persons began to see some possibility of making a career in some particular organisation. It is only among Railway employees, and in a small section of these, that this factor seems to have had any significance. Both the Mental Hospital and the Railways offer some opportunities for a permanent career: starting in an unskilled job, an employee can become trained, take exams and gain promotion. At Kenmore the immigrant employees with a comparatively long period of service were mostly women who had not in fact sat the exams which, officially, they were supposed to do, so that this factor does not explain why they were more likely to remain at the hospital when they had once stayed there some 2 years or more. But it was clear that, once Railway employees had been in the service long enough for them to begin to move upwards in the hierarchy, and hence to see the possibility of a career in that organisation, they were less likely to change to another job. Taking the figures given in Table 3, we can see that, of 39 Railway employees who had been in the service more than one year, 26 were still in employment in
June 1953; by contrast, of 61 who had been in this job less than one year, 55 had already left. Only one of the 11 who had reached the rank of fireman had left, and he had been transferred to Sydney.

In conclusion, it should be emphasised that the numbers involved in the material presented here are too small to permit detailed analysis, and that there is, in any case, no justification for claiming that these findings are typical for Displaced Persons as a whole. The Goulburn Displaced Persons have, up to June 1953, changed their jobs on an average of about once a year. They belong to the section of the population likely to be affected both by economic prosperity and by a recession: in good times, they voluntarily change their jobs, and in bad times, it is they who are especially likely to be retrenched. In Section 6, we shall show that occupational mobility is related in a complex and indirect way to the immigrant's background and his achievements since migration.

5. Relation Between Pre-Migration and Present Occupation

Table 2 shows the relation between the kind of job followed by 57 displaced persons (36 men and 21 women) in their country of origin and in Goulburn. Two-thirds of the men and one-third of the women had been trained to some skilled or professional occupation in Europe, but of this 30, only five men were working in the same occupation in Goulburn.
One third of the men, but only two out of 21 women have acquired a new skill in this country.

The subjects who had been trained for an occupation which they were not following in Australia fell into three categories. In the first category were those who could have worked in the jobs to which they had been trained, but who did not choose to take the opportunities available. They found some other occupation more convenient for a variety of reasons: cheap accommodation was provided, the place of work was close to where they lived, the working hours enabled them to take a second part-time job or to spend time building a house, or the wages were higher than in their own occupations. Some of the men, e.g. building tradesmen, had part-time jobs in their own trade in their free time. In this category too, were men who planned to resume their former occupations once they had acquired the necessary capital and experience; for example, a builder who had been working as a handy man in a hostel during most of his three years in Australia hoped eventually to establish his own business. The second category consists of those immigrants such as teachers and professional soldiers, who have been trained in occupations which could not, at any time, be readily followed by immigrants in a new country, because of inadequate command of the language or lack of local qualifications and experience.
Subjects who have been trained in a skill or profession in Europe, who hoped to be able to follow this occupation in Australia, but who were prevented from doing so, not because of the nature of the occupation itself, but because their qualifications are not recognised in this country, constitute the third category. European-trained medics and skilled tradesmen are the best-known examples of such occupational groups. There were no doctors among the subjects of this study, but a University graduate in economics, an organist and choir master and several skilled tradesmen came into this category.

Nearly all the immigrants who are not working in the occupation for which they have been trained perceive their present jobs as inferior in social status to their pre-migration occupations. Even those who have acquired some qualifications in this country regard their new vocations as less valuable and important than those they formerly followed: a teacher has become a storeman, a merchant seaman is qualifying as a dental hospital attendant, a skilled photographer has trained as a chef.

Thirteen of the men and fourteen of the women had not been trained in any occupation in Europe. Only seven of these, five men and two women, had acquired a new skill in Australia. As we shall see, this is largely the section of the subjects who are more interested in economic
than in occupational achievement as such.

b. Occupational Demands and Satisfactions

In the preceding sections of this chapter we have been concerned only with the occupations of the Displaced Persons. When we come to consider what they want out of their jobs, we must extend the scope of the enquiry, for, while the demands of some individuals are centred on the content of their work others are interested primarily in the economic return, in security or status. Although, as the studies of the industrial sociologists have clearly shown, the work content of the job, the economic return and the psycho-social conditions operate interdependently to determine job demands and satisfactions, people do, nevertheless, tend to be influenced more strongly by one of these factors than by the other two in selecting, evaluating and leaving jobs. Statements on these matters provide the evidence on which the following analysis is based. It should be made clear that the job requirements referred to here are not the subjects' day-dreams or remote ambitions, but the satisfactions which, here and now, they want out of their work. In the following section, we shall consider the specific occupations which they aim to follow in the future.

The subjects of this study can be classified into four categories according to the predominant demands which they make of the job: money or material security, psycho-social security, symbolic status, or real status and
self-expression. Since this classification will form the basis of the discussion of education types in Chapter 10, the relevant material has been summarised in a single table (1). In the present discussion, we shall refer only to a few of the items in that table, leaving the elaboration of the four types to the later chapter. It should be clearly recognised that Table 21 is tentative because of the difficulty of classifying the subjects into the four categories in the first place. It must also be stressed that the variables are not necessarily independent; the analysis which follows will show how they are inter-related in each category.

The subjects to whom money is of primary importance are those who are willing to bear all manner of inconveniences, such as poor working conditions, unsatisfactory location of work, uncongeniality of the job itself, indifference or hostility on the part of, or towards fellow-workers or management, etc., for the sake of good wages. While, for these people, the threshold of demand for all conditions except money was low, it was nevertheless not exactly the same from one person to another; one man would draw the line at any very dirty work, while another baulked only at some socially stigmatised job such as night-soil carting or grave digging.

Almost half of the total of 38 subjects fall in
this first category. Their distinctive characteristics are as follows: they had a low standard of education; their class status in Europe was comparatively low; most of them lived as members of family units; their English ability was comparatively poor, and they were inclined to stay longer in a job than the subjects as a whole. They believed that they had the chance of a much higher standard of living in Australia than they could have achieved at home. Over half of the men had part-time jobs in addition to their regular jobs at the time of this study; four of the five women were keeping house as well as working. These subjects' comparative lack of fluency in English reflects partly their low educational standard, and partly their concentration on establishing themselves economically. They were in general satisfied with their jobs, in the sense that they felt that the work which they were doing was answering their principal need—economic security. Never having been strongly identified with a particular occupation, they were not thwarted by the narrow range of occupational opportunities available to them.

Three of the "economically oriented" subjects are typical in pre-migration occupational status; from the trends indicated in the table, we might have expected them to fall into one of the remaining categories. One of these was a Russian man, with a secondary school and agricultural college education, formerly an "astronomist" on a collective
farm; despite these comparatively high status characteristics, his family background and general outlook were very like those of others in this category. Of the two atypical women, one acquired her pre-migration occupational status from her husband who owned a small mechanical engineering business; her husband wanted above all to return to his own occupation and to have the responsibility of running his own business; but this woman was herself more concerned about financial security. The other woman was highly atypical: she matriculated and began a university course, had a career as bookkeeper both before and after marriage in her native country, and was married to a professional man; she spoke excellent English; she had settled down to an unskilled factory job, and valued her work only for the income it brought in. This woman was over forty when she arrived in Australia, a widow and responsible for a young family; she changed the demands she made of her job, in response to the potentialities of her new environment.

Subjects in the second category require primarily psycho-social security from their work; it is through attaining an accepted position in a familiar work group that these immigrants try to regain some of their lost stability and security. They are not occupationally ambitious, but seek some unobtrusive position which will save them from exposure to unfriendliness, rebuffs and reminders of their inferior
status. Once having found a job which provides them with security, they tend to stay in it even though better money or working conditions are offering elsewhere. While this category contains no immigrants with high educational qualifications or an excellent command of English, it is rare mixed than any of the four categories in educational qualifications and pre-migration occupational status. A close examination of these subjects suggests that they were of two distinct types: the first were poorly educated, and had probably at no time in their lives aspired to anything but humble occupations; never having had any conviction that they were endowed with unusual abilities, they had no ambition for personal distinction. The second type consisted of those with a higher standard of education who in their own countries aspired to occupational achievements, either in their own right or, in the case of the women, through their husbands, but who no longer had the strength or the hope to struggle further; they were people who had narrowed down the demands which they made not only of their jobs, but of life in general. One of the women expressed her feelings by saying, "I just want peace now; I feel that my turn is over."

The most distinctive characteristic of the members of this second category was that they tended to stay longer in their jobs than did subjects in the other three categories. All three of the women worked at the Mental Hospital, and two
In the study of the development of the prefrontal cortex, there are significant differences in the way the prefrontal cortex develops in different species. The prefrontal cortex is responsible for higher cognitive functions such as decision-making, planning, and self-regulation. These differences are influenced by genetic and environmental factors, which are still not fully understood.

In humans, the prefrontal cortex develops over a longer period than in other species. This is because the human brain continues to develop throughout adolescence and early adulthood. The development of the prefrontal cortex is important for the development of social skills, emotional regulation, and decision-making.

In contrast, in other species, the prefrontal cortex develops more rapidly. For example, in rats, the prefrontal cortex is fully developed by the time the rat is born, whereas in humans, the prefrontal cortex continues to develop until the age of 25.

The differences in prefrontal cortex development across species have significant implications for our understanding of brain development and its impact on behavior. Understanding these differences can help us develop more effective interventions for conditions such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and autism spectrum disorder (ASD), where prefrontal cortex dysfunction is thought to play a role.

In conclusion, the development of the prefrontal cortex varies significantly across species, with humans developing it over a longer period than other species. Understanding these differences is crucial for our understanding of brain development and its impact on behavior.
in Goulburn the kind of job which met their demands, and, as one would expect, they tended to stay a shorter average time in each job than the immigrants as a whole. Since the research was carried out early in 1959, four of the six have moved away from Goulburn, three of them to Sydney, where they hoped to find more congenial employment.

These subjects distinguished from the other categories in the following ways: they had reached a higher educational standard, all having had more than eight years schooling; all except one of them came from a comparatively high status occupational background in Europe. The English ability of these subjects was much better than average, and men tended to stay a shorter time in their jobs than the subjects as a whole. These were clearly people whose work requirements were far less compatible with the opportunities available to them than in the case of the two categories of subjects discussed above.

The last eight subjects fall into the category of those who demand "real" status and self expression from their jobs. It is admittedly often difficult to distinguish the individual who demands "real" status from the one who is interested primarily in "symbolic" status, but the two attitudes can be clearly differentiated in their extreme forms: The subjects who want "real" status are those who want jobs where they can use their special talents or training, who are ready to shoulder responsibility and who aspire to the respect and
prestige which the competent performance of their occupational role would bring. None of the subjects in this category had found in Goulburn a job which met his demands, and since the research was carried out, six of the eight have moved elsewhere, seeking, like those in the preceding category, more scope for the kind of job and style of life which they find congenial.

These subjects were, however, differentiated from those in the preceding category by their attempt to transform their humble jobs into roles more consistent with their demands. For example, a Hungarian who was formerly a teacher rose to the position of storeman in the Migrant Hostel; because he was competent and industrious, interested in the job and willing to give his time and attention generously to it, he was gradually allowed to assume much of the manager's responsibility; this gratified him; he felt that he had found a role which, to some extent, was a substitute for the profession which he could not follow in this country. Among the eight subjects in this category were also two who, in face of the difficulties of obtaining employment which would meet their demands, were slowly changing their ideas about what constituted a desirable job; one man, who had begun a University course in Europe and planned to resume his studies here, was gradually abandoning these hopes in favour of saving for a business; a woman who started a
correspondence course in architecture was finding the
difficulties of studying, working, and looking after her
husband insurmountable and, like the man just mentioned,
was beginning to value the economic rewards of a job more
highly than other aspects.

These immigrants who aspired to real status were
clearly distinguished from the subjects as a whole in the
characteristics listed in Table 21. They were the most
highly educated of any category, containing five of the
seven persons who had been educated up to matriculation
standard or higher. All of them came from a professional
or white-collar occupational background in Europe. Their
command of English was much better than average, and they
had changed jobs much more often than the total sample.

This discussion of the immigrants' work require-
ments has shown that those who are most likely to find their
demands met in Goulburn are the first category - the immigrants
who are interested primarily in the economic returns from
their work. Those showing tendencies to change the demands
which they make of a job are most likely moving from one of the
other categories to this first category; this is a 'realistic'
change in the sense that they have more chance of finding
employment compatible with these demands than jobs which ful-
fill any of the other three requirements. This is the kind
of shift in values which one would expect from an immigrant
group in the situation of full employment and high wages for skilled and semi-skilled work, on the one hand, and of barriers against entry into white-collar and professional occupations on the other.

7. Occupational Aspirations

In the preceding pages, we have been discussing the demands which the subjects seek to achieve through their occupational roles. We now turn to the more specific, though related, questions: what particular kinds of occupations do they hope to enter? How stable are these aspirations? To what extent has the content of these aspirations been derived from the Australian environment? The information used here was obtained by direct questions, such as "Have you any ideas about the kind of work you would like to do in the future?", and through many general discussions on the occupations and economic opportunities available, and ways of taking advantage of them.

The discussion on occupational goals will refer mainly to the men. The married women had not been obliged to formulate plans for the kind of jobs they would like; most of them did have definite opinions about their husbands' work and his future plans, but these could hardly be called occupational aspirations as applied to themselves. The married women took employment to help establish their
families economically, and looked forward to the day, some years hence, when they would be able to stop working and spend all their time at home. Most single and widowed women, of all ages, hoped that they would eventually have a husband to support them; the disparity in the sex ratio of the immigrants is so great that few women do remain long unattached. Only two of the 21 women for whom material was obtained could be said to have any concrete occupational aspirations for themselves. One of these, separated from an Australian husband, had ambitious plans for an artistic career. The other was married to a man much older than herself, could not have children, and felt the need to become trained in some intellectually satisfying occupation both as a substitute for family life and as a source of economic security in the future when she expected to have to provide for her husband and herself; she was the woman, previously referred to, who began a correspondence course in architecture, but abandoned it after a year.

The occupational aspirations of the men are constantly changing. Very few of the subjects were working towards some specific and constant occupational goal.

We can analyse the occupational and economic aspirations in further detail, by using the four-fold classification of the preceding section. The relevant data
are included in Table 21. The ambitions of the first category were focussed not on a particular type of work, but on the income which a job would yield. They therefore tended to be attracted in turn by a variety of apparently promising opportunities; for example, an immigrant with his mind set on a small mixed business in Brisbane today might switch his interest to a poultry farm out of Sydney tomorrow.

Remembering the instability of these aspirations, we can note that, of the 12 men in this category, five planned to have a farm, four a business, one to train for a skilled trade, one was already established in the occupations of his choice, and the last had only the vaguest ideas about what he wished to do when his job as a Hostel chef finally came to an end.

Right of the nine men who planned to have farms or business could be said to be making effective efforts to achieve their aspirations to the extent that they were saving their money carefully. Nine of the twelve already owned the dwellings, temporary or permanent, in which they were living.

Of the four immigrants who sought for psycho-social security in their jobs, one had no ambitions outside the Hospital where he planned to remain as an attendant, one had filed an application for entry to the United States, where he had relatives, one planned to buy a farm and the fourth had begun an accountancy course. Like the members of the first category, these immigrants did not have their minds
set rigidly on any particular occupation, but the very fact that they valued permanence and stability meant that their aspirations were likely to be more stable than those of the first category.

Those who were interested in the symbolic status of their jobs tended to have aspirations that were both fantastic and unstable. The disparity between what they wanted out of a job and what they could hope to achieve, as members of an inferior minority group, was so great that they sought a solution to their problems in unrealistic schemes which they talked over and planned endlessly, but which they had little prospect of realising. One man, with a wife and children to support, refused offers of low-status, semi-skilled jobs, but set up a photography business which was bound to fail because of inadequate capital backing, competition from well-established firms in the town and lack of the necessary contacts; after the business collapsed, the family was in severe financial straits. The other two men were farther from attempting to achieve their aspirations: one saw himself as a gentleman farmer, established on a small property like the one his family had owned in Europe; after four years in Australia he saved no money to this end, but was spending nearly all his income on good food, drink and tobacco, in an attempt to maintain some illusion of the dignity and ease of his former life.
The third man had never got round to enrolling in any one of the numerous correspondence courses whose prospectuses he had acquired; he was staking his ambitions for social recognitions on a politically sensational book which he claimed to be writing.

The occupational aspirations of the fourth category of subjects - those who wanted real status and self-expression out of their jobs - were also changeable. The discrepancy between their aspirations and the likelihood of achievement led them to centre their hopes on many alternative possibilities in succession; but four of the five were more realistic than the members of the third category, and more efficient in their plans for achievement. They had adapted their aspirations to the kind of opportunities available. This was the only category containing no-one who had ambitions to own a farm.

The instability of the occupational aspirations of the subjects as a whole is clearly related to their position as members of a newly-arrived, inferior minority group in a society with an open economic structure. All except those seeking above all psycho-social security were intent on establishing themselves economically and/or socially in the new society; they were still working out how they would do this, and they lent interested ears to any success stories that they might hear; being unfamiliar with
Australian culture, they often directed their hopes of achievement where, with more knowledge, they would realise no promise of fulfillment. The conviction that, despite the difficulties of entering the higher ranks of the occupational hierarchy, the economic system is open enough to allow them to improve their positions financially led them to entertain a variety of future plans.

The pattern of the future appeared to most of the subjects very unstructured and uncertain; anything could happen; another war would perhaps enable them to return home, perhaps make nonsense of any carefully-laid plans. Most of them felt that they were biding their time, waiting to see how events would turn out, not only internationally, but also in their own personal situations. Although many admitted that there was little likelihood of repatriation, nearly all had some feeling that their stay in Australia was no more than a temporary sojourn. In these circumstances, future plans were likely to have little conviction behind them, and hence to be highly fluid.

Combining together all 24 male Displaced Persons whose occupational aspirations we have been considering, we find that 13 wanted a farm or business, three a professional or white-collar job, two a trade; two planned to emigrate to the U.S., and four had no aspirations beyond their present jobs.
None of the six men who planned to establish themselves in business in Australia had been in business in Europe; their concrete ideas about the kind of businesses they wanted were developed in response to the opportunities which they saw in Australia; they did not aim to emulate a European model, but to set themselves up in an enterprise geared to Australian demands and run according to Australian patterns. None of the subjects who aimed to have a trade or a professional or white-collar job had brought these ambitions with them from Europe, while others had formulated them in Australia.

Most of the subjects had at some time or other entertained the idea of getting a farm in Australia. The kind of farming they had in mind was the semi-subsistence diversified production with which they were familiar in Europe. They planned to have an area varying from five to 25 acres, where they would run a few fowls, pigs and cows, and grow vegetables and some crops. Few of them acknowledged that their experience of farming in Europe might not equip them adequately to cope with Australian conditions, and almost none had any understanding of the economic structure which often makes small-scale farming uneconomic.
in this country (1). None of the subjects had ambitions to
own a sheep property of the kind commonly found in Australia,
and none anticipated that his farm would bring wealth com-
parable to that of the local graziers. Sheep fanning they
regarded as uniquely Australian - an undertaking which, as
newcomers and Europeans, it would be quite inappropriate
for them to engage in. Aspirations to own a farm, and
notions about the kind of farming which they would carry
out, were derived not from the Australian culture, but
from the immigrants' European background. Many of the
subjects regarded land as the surest basis of economic
security in bad times; believing that during a depression
they would suffer more than Australians, they felt that the
ownership of land would protect them from the worst hardships:
as long as you have land, you have at least the necessities
of life. Although it is very difficult to be sure about

(1) In an address to the Fifth Citizenship Convention,
January 1934 (published as a pamphlet, People Are Power),
Sir John Storey, Chairman of the Commonwealth Immigration
Planning Council, warned against thoughtless schemes for
extensive settlement of immigrants on the land. "There is
ample room for more people on the land in Australia, and the
markets for some farm products can be expanded. But settling
men on farms to produce goods which cannot be sold at prices
giving them a reasonable return is foolish, and can only
result in loss of capital which will fall on the general tax-
payer. The proper selection of appropriate types of farming
is essential to a successful scheme of migrant absorption in
rural areas. This is not theory, but is based on bitter
to experience... Clearly, Australia should determine the situation
of the farms and especially their size. Any scheme which is
designed to start settlements of the peasant type of small
holdings will fail in the future as such schemes have always
this, one has the impression that the ambition to own a farm was much more widespread among the Displaced Persons when they first arrived in Australia; the majority came from a rural background; the prospect of going onto the land signified above all continuity with the past, not only in occupation but in the whole style of life; no matter how greatly their new surroundings might differ from the old, land would remain everywhere the same. As they came to see more of rural life in Australia, many of them realised that there would in fact be little similarity between farm life in this country and in Europe, and at the same time, they became familiar with and attracted towards alternative occupations; for these reasons, the majority abandoned or at least shelved their ambitions to own a farm, and focussed their aspirations elsewhere.

A common complaint among the subjects, heard not only from those who hoped to have businesses or farms of their own, was the difficulty of obtaining credit. Sometimes these complaints were directed against the Government for failing to make use of the rural experience of immigrants, and consequently neglecting the interests of Australia with its sparse population and undeveloped territory. There was also the common feeling that Australians were interested in European immigrants as rural labour only, wanting to preserve for themselves the advantage of land
ownership. The difficulties of obtaining credit to establish businesses were also deplored; some subjects believed that banks, building societies and private individuals discriminated against immigrants in lending money, but this feeling was far from general.

Some also explicitly claimed that, only through establishing themselves in an independent economic venture, such as a farm or business, could they hope to attain success in the Australian economic structure. For a variety of reasons, which are all embraced in what we have called their inferior minority position in the community, they believed that they had little hope of gaining promotion to high status positions in established businesses or of entering the upper grades of the occupational hierarchy - the white-collar and professional jobs. But "working for themselves", they believed that there would be no obstacles in the way of their advancement, and that they would be able to obtain a high enough economic status to enable them either to take their place in the Australian class structure, or to be independent of it.

6. Economic Position

In the preceding pages we have been concerned mainly with the Displaced Persons' position in the occupational structure. We now turn to the question of their economic status in the community.
The Displaced Person immigrants have had little opportunity as yet to rise above the lower levels of the economic hierarchy. They arrived in Australia a maximum of five years before this study was carried out, most of them bringing almost no property with them. Many of the 1944 and post-war refugees had originally left their own countries with a large quantity of personal and household effects; but these had been sold or bargained to pay for food, lodging and travel and to secure privileges of all kinds long before the immigrants reached Australia. A very few, having saved money earned in post-war Germany, had arrived in Australia with some assets. Although some are now in skilled jobs, nearly all had unskilled or semi-skilled work during their two year contract period. These two factors, lack of assets and comparatively low-paid jobs, have limited the economic status which the subjects have so far been able to achieve.

But, within these limits, the economic situation in Australia has enabled and encouraged them to improve their economic position. They arrived at a time when the economy was buoyant, filled the jobs in which the labour shortage was most acute, and benefited from the exceptionally high wages for low-skilled work and opportunities for overtime. Many of them took part-time work in
addition to their main job (1). The majority of subjects had also been provided with cheap accommodation, and some also with board, during at least the first year or two after arrival, and many much longer.

The Displaced Person families included in this study had taken full advantage of the economic opportunities available, in that, in nearly all families both husband and wife had worked. Table 19 shows that, in 21 families in which both husband and wife were European (including families in which the wife was German), 17 of the wives had been in employment most of the time since their arrival in Australia. In three of the six families in which the wife was an Australian and the husband a Displaced Person, and in one case of a Displaced Person woman married to an Australian, the wife had worked most of the time since marriage. The average number of children per family was one; as Table 20 shows, ten out of twenty-seven married couples had no children, seven had one, nine had two and in one family there were three children. Of the twenty-eight children, only one was not living with his family in Goulburn. The small size of the family and the tendency for women to take employment outside the home were of course inter-related; at least five

(1) With reference to Displaced Persons in Australia, Murphy, 1952, p. 167, says: "Most immigrants are keen to take overtime work and to have their wives working, and a remarkable number of these manage, against all labour custom, to take two jobs at once."
of the married couples without children were postponing having a family until they were economically established. Where the wife was beyond the child-bearing age or could not have children or where there were grown-up offspring, the women usually felt that, at least for the time being, there was no good reason why they should not work. Of the women with children under school age at the time of the research, three had full-time jobs. Most families, then, consisted of no members, or only one member, who was not bringing in an income.

The subjects' capacity for thrift also affected their economic status. Although it is difficult to obtain data on savings, or to devise a standard for comparing the thrift of immigrants who have arrived at different times and in different circumstances, it seems clear enough that the Displaced Persons from a low status background in Europe have the greatest capacity for saving. Especially during their first two or three years in this country, many denied themselves all except the absolute necessities of food, shelter and clothing in order to put aside the greater part of their incomes.

Most of the married couples in Goulburn and some of the single men bought land or a house as soon as they could afford it. Real estate was the only kind of investment in which they were interested. The bankers and insurance
agents in the city confirm information given by the subjects that the Displaced Persons rarely invest their capital in fixed deposits, Government Loans, private companies or personal insurance. It was, however, quite common for immigrants to lend money to each other, often without interest, to help buy a car or property. Savings were usually kept in the Commonwealth Savings Bank.

An analysis of property ownership is, then, the only accessible means of assessing the economic status of the Displaced Persons. Material collected from the valuation Records of the City Council, compiled in 1953, showed that 44 properties were owned by Displaced Persons, and of these, 26 had dwellings on them. The average Improved Capital Value of properties with dwellings was £1,160, and of properties with dwellings completed, £1,876. The following table sets out the distribution of Improved Capital Values for the 44 properties; seven of these valued at less than £500 have dwellings on them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than £500</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500 - £999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,000 - £1,499</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,500 - £1,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2,000 - £2,499</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2,500 - £2,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than £3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The improved capital value of these properties is on the average low, because already completed houses bought by the Displaced Persons were mostly extremely old and structurally dilapidated, while new dwellings consisted usually of a two or three room building, put up by the occupants. Both men and women worked hard to make old houses liveable, or to build themselves a new dwelling; by using their own labour they not only saved money, but were also able to secure a home before they could have accumulated enough cash to pay to have the work done; when they needed the services of skilled tradesmen, they usually secured the help of a fellow-immigrant, sometimes paying him in cash, but sometimes reciprocating the service instead.

The dwellings built by Displaced Persons were, in nearly all cases, technically classified as "carages" or temporary dwellings; the immigrants had been granted "Permissive Occupancy" of these dwellings while erecting a permanent building on the land. Because of the accommodation shortage, the City Council has in recent years relaxed the regulation that the permanent building must be up to floor level before "Permissive Occupancy" is granted, and has been reluctant to take action against either Australians or immigrants who are not continuing with the construction of a permanent dwelling after being granted a "Permissive Occupancy." By May 1954, the Council was, however, beginning to put
pressure on property owners, including several immigrants, to proceed with the main building.

The Displaced Persons did not necessarily have full equity in the properties listed. There is much variation in attitudes towards borrowing money to buy or build a house. At the one extreme were those who, fearing that the mortgagors would have some unspecified and sinister hold over them or resenting what they regarded as a high rate of interest on the loan, paid for everything out of their savings. At the other extreme were those who applied to a bank or building society for a loan as soon as they thought they had the minimum deposit. It has not been possible to find out the full extent of the Displaced Persons equity in the properties listed, but of the six properties valued at £2,000 or more, four have been financed by the local building society and investment company; the fifth is being bought on terms from the City Council; whether money has been borrowed to purchase the sixth is unknown. Banks have also given loans for house building, some individuals have borrowed from fellow-immigrants, and one at least financed his house with a private loan from an Australian.

From the Population Survey of September 1953, we can estimate that there were at that time about 50 families in which one or both partners were Displaced Persons, and approximately an additional 70 single Displaced Person adults.
From the following table, we can see that the great majority of Displaced Person families were housed in dwellings which they owned or were paying off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Property with Dwellings</th>
<th>Property without Dwellings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Family</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Family and a Single Individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All except two unfinished dwellings of the 34 owned by the Displaced Persons were being occupied by their owners. One single individual who owned land without a dwelling did not live in Goulburn. Three families owned two properties each; and two properties were owned jointly by a family and a single individual; this means that the total number of family units or single individuals owning the 44 properties was 43. If the Displaced Person population of Goulburn is taken as 200, there is an average of about one property to 4.5 Displaced Persons, and an average of one property with a dwelling to 6 Displaced Persons.

The property owners represent that section of the 1952 Goulburn Displaced Person population who had both attained some financial security and had decided to settle at least for the time being, in the community. Others who have been at least equally successful in the past have moved.
out to buy property or business elsewhere. A number of people remaining in the community had also saved up enough money to buy property, but did not intend to establish themselves in Goulburn or were still making up their minds about the future. If we take the property owners as representing the most economically successful section of the Displaced Persons now in Goulburn, though not necessarily including the whole of that section, we can suggest that the successful Displaced Persons have already begun to move out of the lowest economic stratum of the community and that, with continued thrift, many of them will almost certainly continue to advance up the economic scale; but there has been no spectacular economic mobility.

The subjects of this study attached great importance to money and material possessions. Even those who were interested in their jobs primarily as a source of status, security or self-expression were still very money-conscious. The evidence for this statement is diverse and often fragmentary. It is found in the subjects' evaluations of their jobs, in discussions about future aspirations and means of achieving them, in judgments about fellow-immigrants and Australians. Three kinds of values underly this striving for economic achievement. There is firstly the value of maximizing financial gains; any activity which makes or saves money is good in itself, without reference to the purpose to
which the money is to be put. The immigrants' determination to secure some kind of dwelling of their own is primarily an expression of this value. Not only is it in the long run more economical for them to own a home of their own than to rent one, but a dwelling is a form of investment since spare rooms can be, and almost invariably are, let out to boarders; to own a home is also an assurance that, no matter what reverses the immigrant may suffer in the future, he is at least provided with one of the necessities of living. These financial values may or may not be rationally pursued; that is, the immigrant may no may not make the best use of his resources to achieve these values. Because of the difficulties of establishing standards by which to assess the rationality of the immigrants' behaviour, we can do no more than make some tentative observations on this point. Their behaviour is made the more rational by their eagerness to learn the value of money in the new society; in addition, the tenaciousness of their social ties with both fellow-immigrants and Australians means that they are to a large extent free of the personal obligations and loyalties which, in better integrated social groups, limit the degree of rationality in the pursuit of financial gain. On the other hand, their lack of knowledge and experience in such details of the Australian economic structure as real estate values and the legal processes involved in raising
loans and mortgages, limits the rationality of their behaviour; in addition, their caution in investing their money in anything except real estate also means that their resources are not always being used, objectively, to best advantage.

A utilitarian value may also underly the accumulation of material possessions. Tactonic achievement may be directed at securing goods which are valued for the content of activities which they make possible rather than for their potentialities as investments or sources of status and self-esteem. It was this utilitarian value which lay behind the kind of material possessions which the Displaced Persons accumulated on arrival in this country: clothes, toilet articles, radiators, hot water jugs, crockery. A dwelling, too, has this as well as other values. Possessions with utilitarian value need not necessarily, of course, be essentials of everyday living: a radiogram, for instance, may have primarily a utilitarian value to an immigrant who is deeply interested in music.

The value of securing status and security also underlies the accumulation of money and property. The acquisition of a house has this significance too to some extent, but more obvious examples of material possessions which serve these values are cars, radiograms, some household furnishings, jewellery and some clothes. Objects of
this kind symbolise success in this country. They provide
a standard of differentiation applicable to immigrants and
Australians alike; they are also a source of security
because they give the immigrant the feeling that he is
sharing activity in an organised culture, to an extent that
has in most cases been impossible since he left his own
country.

It is often possible to determine how far a
particular possession is valued for financial or utilitarian
reasons, on the one hand, or status reasons on the other,
by the immigrants' attitude to its outward appearance, use
or other external characteristics. The subjects readily
bought extremely old and dilapidated houses, and were proud
of the improvements they had made. By contrast, their
attitude to other material possessions was "nothing but the
best"; the four cars owned by Displaced Persons were all
bought second-hand, but were recent models and well above
the standard of the smallest and cheapest available; other
Displaced Persons who contemplated buying cars had a similar
attitude - they wanted "a decent car" when they got one.

While some clothes and household furnishings were primarily
of utilitarian value, others were clearly recognised as
"special", not for everyday use. Expenditure on these goods
often seemed out of proportion to income; several families in
which the combined weekly wages of husband and wife came to
a maximum of £28 paid £100 to £140 for radios, etc.
of this kind represented not so much sporadic outbursts of extravagance as recognised luxury-buying. What this kind of expenditure means to the immigrants we shall consider below.

Warner has shown that the immigrants in Yankee City tended to emphasise financial and utilitarian values during their first years in America, and began to acquire possessions for their status value only at a later stage (1). Some of the Displaced Person families in Goulburn were already moving from the first to the second of these stages suggested by Warner; having acquired clothes, a house, furniture, etc., they felt they could now afford to relax the stringent economy of the past few years and permit themselves a greater accumulation of pricarily status-giving possessions, such as expensive clothes, radiograms and cars. This does not of course mean that the financial and utilitarian values cease to concern them, but simply that the status-giving assets take on more prominence in relation to the other two. But to most of the single subjects this sequence of emphasising different values does not apply; they tended to begin acquiring status-giving possessions very soon after their arrival in Australia, and, although they may have saved up quite large sums of money, they have

(1) Warner 1945, p. 78.
not invested in possessions such as a house, whose value is primarily financial.

We cannot be sure that the primacy of economic values is a new phenomenon among these immigrants; in their home countries, too, they may have been motivated largely by their desire to accumulate material possessions. We can, however, try to find the particular significance of economic values to the subjects of this study in their present situation; such an attempt leads us to see that there are very good reasons why these values should have taken on overriding significance; it also becomes clear that the subjects themselves perceive these values in a context directly and often explicitly related to their positions as immigrants.

To many immigrants, money appears to be the one constant value in the disorganised life which they have been leading for the past decade. In Europe during and after the war, they became acutely aware of the fact that money could smooth their way in the most hostile and unfamiliar situations. In post-war Europe, the goods and services which money could secure were extremely limited; having now the opportunity not only to earn the money but also to gain access to the goods, they feel that the money itself has an enhanced value - it can now get them status symbols. To many immigrants, money has also become a symbol of their
regained freedom of individual action: by the kind of luxury-spending referred to above, they demonstrate, more to themselves than for the benefit of anyone else, that they not only have the money but also the liberty to spend it as they wish, without restrictions. It would be a gross oversimplification to interpret this attitude as a direct reaction to oppressions suffered under German or Russian rule during the war. A few of the subjects did value this freedom to accumulate money and to spend it as they wished because they had suffered such politically-derived restrictions. But this new-found sense of freedom also came from other sources. Young single people are free of all family responsibilities, their own master, in a situation where, because of other circumstances such as their relatively good financial position and the opportunities for mobility offered by the economy of the country at the present time, the possibilities for freedom of action are indeed great. In addition, both single people and those living in family units are to a considerable extent free from the group pressures which would normally channel their expenditure in commonly recognised and accepted ways. The subjects are not members of an integrated group; money means freedom because social restrictions on independent action are weak.

Money and material possessions have also assumed a special importance as a means of social differentiation.
among the Displaced Persons. Because of the difficulties of applying the common criteria for differentiation (such as occupation, education, family background and deportment) across national boundaries, and because of the irrelevance of some of these criteria in the immigrant situation, differentiation in terms of material success takes on a special importance; it becomes, as it were, the lowest common denominator in terms of which all immigrants can be rated in relation to each other and to the Australian population.

The significance of material possessions to people who have led an unstable and disorganized existence for some five to ten years is obvious enough and need not be elaborated upon. Other sources of security - membership in a family, local group, work group, associations - have been lost and are not readily replaced, but through money and material possessions the immigrant can build around him a milieu which is at least materially stable, and can, he believes, protect himself against hardship and insure that he will have some control over his own future.

Finally, the subjects specially value money and material possessions because of their inferior minority status in the community. Other sources of self-esteem and prestige do not operate effectively among the Displaced Persons: their status as Displaced Persons is more a source of humiliation than pride; they have little opportunity to feel important
or to gain respect through occupational achievement, through participation in associations or through becoming informal leaders of any kind. Economic achievement thus becomes the one available substitute for a variety of other kinds of achievements. It is also the one readily accessible means of proving their worth to Australians; many of the subjects react to what they perceive as contempt, patronage or lack of appreciation on the part of Australians with a determination to show that the Australians "haven't got anything over them". Sometimes they assert their equality, or even superiority, with such bitterness: one Hungarian would constantly repeat, "Money talk!"; on one occasion, he amplified, "You can do anything with money. I don't care what work I do to earn money. I'd clean lavatories if necessary. Money is everything". His wife added aggressively that she didn't mind what anyone did or said to her, or if her husband lost his job tomorrow; they had enough money to buy their own house whenever they wanted to; she would just snap her fingers at everyone; when she left the hostel she would take with her enough potatoes from their garden to last her a year and enough onions for two years! The underlying attitude here and among many of the subjects is that money makes you independent of the interest, help or friendship of Australians.

But on the other hand, the immigrant may want to be on an equal footing with Australians as a basis for establishing social
contact with them; he may feel that, only when he has a house and the usual material possessions, can he avoid the danger of feeling patronised or humiliated in his association with Australians - can he, in other words, enter into reciprocal social relations with them.

Although the majority of the subjects of this study placed a high value on economic achievement, most of them looked forward to the day when they would not have to put all their energies into acquiring money and possessions. Then they have "enough", they will turn to the fulfillment of non-economic values; they will pursue intellectual or artistic interests, take their place in community affairs, establish a family, visit their home countries. But for the time being, these things can wait. It remains to be seen how many of the subjects who now stress economic achievement will, in fact, ever feel that they can afford to divert their energies to the pursuit of other ends.
CHAPTER 6
SOCIAL PARTICIPATION - THE DISPLACED PERSONS
AND THE ORGANISED SOCIAL LIFE OF THE
COMMUNITY

1. Introduction

The Goulburn people achieve many of their communal purposes through a vast and complex system of associations; it is in the context of these associations that a great deal of the social activity of the community takes place. The term association is commonly used to mean any group of persons specifically organised to fulfil particular, shared interests (1). A further, but also common, limitation will be imposed here, in that the word will be applied only to those voluntary, non-economic groups through which the local people organise their recreational and cultural life and promote civic welfare — the groups which are commonly described as "clubs" or "societies".

Organised social activity in Goulburn is controlled by commercial enterprises and voluntary associations. The commercially controlled cinema is by far the most important

(1) See MacIver and Page, 1950, pp.11-15.
activity in the sense that the two picture theatres draw more people in total numbers, attract them from a wider cross-section of the community, and maintain their support more consistently, than does any other single activity in the city. But it is the voluntary associations which organise most formal social functions. Because the Goulburn Evening Post reports most of the activities of these associations, its files provide a useful source of information on the numbers and types of such groups. The following table classifies the 94 current associations referred to between October 1952 and the end of 1953, according to their principal official aims (1).

(1) Churches themselves are excluded, but church auxiliaries are included. Auxiliaries of all associations are counted as separate associations. Economic associations, such as trades unions or the Chamber of Commerce, are excluded.
ACTIVITIES OF 94 GOULBURN ASSOCIATIONS

1. Associations whose principal aim is service to the community, or some section of it:
   
   (a) connected with schools (including church schools) e.g. Parents' and Citizens' Associations 13
   (b) others e.g. Rotary, Apex, Quota Clubs, Red Cross 19

2. Associations whose principal aim is to further sectional interests which their members hold in common (many of these also perform service functions, but this is not their principal aim):

   (a) sports 17
   (b) religious (plus churches) 14
   (c) cultural 12
   (d) social 4
   (e) youth training (excluding religious groups) 3
   (f) political 2
   (g) miscellaneous 10

Total 94

The raison d'être of the first class of associations listed above is community service; most commonly, the members do not perform services in their own persons, but concentrate on raising money to contribute towards the assistance of numerous categories of people in need (e.g. war orphans, spastic children, old people, hospital patients), and towards
the support of institutions (e.g., hospitals, nursery school, children's homes). In order to raise money, these associations organise numerous social functions, such as dances, fetes and card parties. In groups of the second kind, members come together to promote some interest, other than service to the community, which they hold in common; their principal activities are to represent their sectional interests in the community and to organise functions, in addition to their meetings, at which these interests are expressed and furthered. The meetings of both kinds of association are themselves social get-togethers. The majority of associations are branches of, or in some way affiliated with, state-wide, nation-wide or even international groups.

A detailed analysis would be necessary to determine the composition of these groups, the hierarchy of prestige among them, and the effectiveness with which they achieve their aims. Some general impressions can, however, be given with confidence. Membership overlaps to a considerable extent, and most individuals who are office-bearers in one association also take an active part in other groups. Some associations are more prominent than others, in the sense that their activities are well-known in the community, the social functions which they organise draw the
support and interest of many persons beyond the members themselves, and they are believed to have considerable local influence; their officers are usually highly visible persons, with some prestige in the community. Prominent associations include the Red Cross, Country Women's Association, Returned Soldiers League, Rotary, Apex, the Liedertafel and the Turf Club. While there is some tendency for the most prominent groups to have the highest status in the community, prominence and status do not altogether coincide: the two most exclusive societies, in the sense that only persons of very high class status can be admitted to them, are the Lady Belmore Club and the Goulburn Club, whose activities are not reported in the local press, nor widely known in the community. There are also differences in social status between the prominent associations: the Red Cross is of higher status than the Country Women's Association, while the Rotary Club is of higher status than any other male association.

In relations within and among these numerous associations, sectional and personal conflicts are constantly played out. The structure and activities of such groups provide the opportunity for reinforcing or
changing social alignments. The important sectional cleavages are sectarian, political, class, occupational, and the newcomer-native dichotomy.

By local residents and by outsiders, the townspeople are repeatedly accused of being apathetic, lacking in public spirit, and un-cooperative (1): as one informant, herself a native, expressed it, "Goulburn is a dead town". It is often claimed that the city has degenerated from a once lively, cooperative and cultured centre; for example, in opening the 1949 Eisteddfod, the Mayor predicted a cultural revival, stating, "We seem to be on the road back to what Goulburn was in the field of musical culture about 25 years ago." (2)

Further evidence confirms this general indifference to civic affairs. Firstly, many associations complained of members' lack of support, and were trying to devise ways for increasing their membership, which was felt to be too small.

---

(1) For example, in July 1951, the Mayor and a leading business man severely criticised the lack of interest in civic affairs, G.E.P., 25/7/51, 26/7/51. Apathy concerning the following activities was condemned in the local press: building an old people's home, G.E.P., 25/10/49 and 10/10/50; annual meeting of the Eisteddfod, G.E.P., 2/6/49; meeting called by the Mayor to discuss foundation of a hostel for country girls in Sydney, G.E.P., 6/10/50; army recruitment, G.E.P., 1/12/50; failure to take advantage of instruction provided by visiting swimming teacher, G.E.P., 12/2/51; hospital board affairs, G.E.P., 19/8/53; failure of union members to support Six Hour Day, G.E.P., 7/10/53.

(2) G.E.P., 22/3/49.
for a city of such a size. Secondly, certain community goals, generally agreed to be highly desirable, had been mooted for years, but not yet achieved: one of these was an adequate hall, which the city badly needs, the other, an old people's home. Thirdly, activities, supposedly highly valued have been abandoned due to lack of interest: one of these is the series of Celebrity Concerts, inaugurated in 1950, with a membership of 240, and discontinued in 1953, because the membership had fallen to 147 and could not be increased; another activity which has faded out is the New Settlers League, whose history will be given in detail below.

Not all communal activities meet with apathy, however. Closer analysis suggests that variations in support and interest are affected by the following factors: status - a high status association, or an activity organised by such an association, is more likely to draw support than an association of lesser status; the content of the activity - "cultural" activities attract the least interest, and sporting events the most. The success of the Lilac Festivals also shows that the city can be shaken out of its state of apathy. The Lilac Festival is intended to become an annual event, the first having been held in October 1952, and the second and third in 1953 and 1954. All were considered to have been a great success; they elicited much
surprised and favourable comment on the cooperation and enthusiasm which the townsfolk showed themselves capable of. But the success has in fact been as much due to the solid backing of the local business interests, and the support of the visitors and old residents who have flocked to the city for the occasion, as to the interest of the community in general.

In conclusion to this brief note on the organised social life of Goulburn, it should be mentioned that there are two national associations in the 94 listed: the Greek Community, with a membership of about 130, and the Highland Society.

2. The Community Welcomes the Immigrants; the New Settlers League.

The first post-war immigrants arrived in Goulburn during a period of industrial and commercial expansion and labour shortage. Evidence that the local residents were ready to welcome immigrants, British and European, in the belief that they would solve labour problems and help promote economic expansion comes from several sources. Firstly, there is the comment associated with the planning of the Migrant Hostel in Goulburn. A number of migrant workers were already employed in the district by April, 1949,
when the Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution that
representations should be made for the establishment of
a hostel or dispersal centre for migrants in Goulburn;
by implication, these were to be European immigrants, and
the discussion indicated that they were to be brought to
Goulburn to build houses (1). Although the City Council
had been advised in a letter from Mr. Calwell that the
Government did not contemplate establishing a Displaced
Person Camp in Goulburn (2), it was officially announced
later in the year that a hostel would be built (3). The
progress of these negotiations and the building of the
hostel itself were reported in detail by the local paper,
always in favourable terms. The only note of criticism
indicated in the press came from the Trades and Labour
Council which was reported to have sent a letter of protest
to the Minister of Building Materials against the construc­
tion of a centre for Displaced Persons, when "the material
used in this centre could be more profitably used on
homes badly needed in Goulburn " (4). It was not until
August 1950 that the Goulburn Evening Post stated that the

(1) G.E.P., 12/4/49.
(2) G.E.P., 27/5/49.
(3) G.E.P., 9/9/49.
(4) G.E.P., 22/9/49.
immigrants to be housed at the hostel would not be Displaced Persons, as had been assumed up to that time, but British (1); this means that, although the hostel as eventually established was for Britishers, comments prior to this date indicated, not the attitude towards British immigrants, but towards Europeans. Newspaper comment continued to be favourable, and the arrival of the first British migrants in March 1951 was heralded with publicity about their happy adjustment in this country, their gratification with hostel conditions, and the asset that they represented to the community (2). To the extent that newspaper comment reflected or moulded local opinion, the attitude of the newspaper towards the establishment of a migrant hostel indicated that the community was ready to welcome both British and European immigrants.

Evidence from a second source gives a similar impression. Between 1947 and early 1952, a number of public statements of good-will and gestures of welcome to immigrants was made. Two hundred British tradesmen, passing through Goulburn on their way to Canberra in January, 1947, before any immigrants had arrived in Goulburn itself, were given "a warm welcome at the railway station" by the Mayor

(1) G.E.P., 29/8/50.
and other leading citizens (1). Similarly, the opening of the Migrant Hostel was marked by a Civic Welcome, attended by 1,200 to 1,500 Goulburn people; at this Welcome, the Mayor specifically included in his remarks the Displaced Person staff of the hostel, saying, "To those who have come from other parts of Europe - 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 our freedom-loving people... They will find Australia a generous and friendly country... Our people will be glad to welcome you (i.e., British and non-British) into our homes." (2). Several further examples of these expressions of good-will may be noted. In a Pastoral Letter, authorised by the Bishops and Archbishops of Australia, and read at the Roman Catholic Cathedral on 5th February, 1950, Australians were exhorted to be sympathetic and patient of language difficulties, and tolerant of difference in customs; parishioners were advised to introduce immigrants to their Parish Priest, to make them welcome in the local church and to inform them on the authorities who could provide assistance in obtaining jobs.

(1) G.E.P., 10/1/47.
(2) G.E.P., 2/4/51.
and accommodation for them (1). Speaking at the Southern Tablelands Group Conference, held in Goulburn in October, 1948, the State President of the Country Women's Association said: "I hope that when these people come into your areas they will be invited to your homes, and given a true Australian welcome. There is much valuable advice that you could impart which would greatly assist them to adjust themselves to their new surroundings" (2).

Immigration was similarly discussed at the District Convention of the Apex Club, held in Goulburn in July, 1949; at this Convention a Canberra delegate said that, "internal unity in Australia is vital and, with many thousands of migrants already here, it is essential that they be not allowed to drift into groups, but become an integral part of Australia and her way of life"; a Wollongong delegate suggested that immigrants "in be invited to attend Apex functions so that efforts could be made to learn more of their ways of life and to create a good feeling of friendship" (3). An Editorial stimulated by this Apex Convention expressed strong support for these viewpoints and proposals, commenting,

(1) G.E.P., 8/2/50.
(2) G.E.P., 14/10/48.
(3) G.E.P., 18/7/49.
"Realising that this assistance must come from the general public, the Apex movement has moved to give a lead, which, if successful, will result in many friendships being formed between its members and migrants and their families. It will also urge other organisations to welcome the new arrivals by inviting them to attend functions at which both sides will be able to learn more of each other. Such a scheme could have snow-balling effects." (1) A long article on conditions of European immigrants in the nearby township of Marulan concludes with the editorial comment: "And why can't a few of the city fathers - all agog to do their duty on roads and drains - form a welcome club in each centre, to provide a common meeting ground for displaced persons and Australians. With friendly help to become adjusted very quickly, the displaced persons will become absorbed into the population - without it ...?" (2)

Such were the public and official sentiments concerning the city's obligations towards the immigrants. In a later section, we shall examine how far these sentiments were put into practice in the incorporation of immigrants into the associational structure of the community. For the present, we are concerned with the public response in organising gestures of welcome, and the effectiveness of

(1) G.E.P., 18/7/49.
(2) G.E.P., 3/8/49.
these functions in making the immigrants feel at home in the community and giving them the opportunity to establish friendships with Australians. From the following evidence, it appears that the response was, on any count, disappointing, and that the activities which were organised did not achieve the officially stated objectives.

One of the most significant incidents occurred at the beginning of 1950. In January, the local Employment Officer, following an appeal made by the State Minister for Immigration, publicly requested local residents to invite New Australians into their homes on Australia Day. The suggestion was supported by the churches in the city; although a Roman Catholic priest commented, "It is unfortunate that we have to wait to extend personal hospitality to these homeless refugees for a speech at a citizens' convention which may have been made for propaganda purposes, rather than with any hope that it would be put into effect". When asked for his opinion of the scheme, the Mayor refused to comment. By the day following the appeal, only one invitation was forthcoming; a second invitation followed on the next day, and thereafter, the local newspaper, which had given the scheme generous publicity, made no further reference to it (1).

(1) G.E.P., 25/1/50, 26/1/50, 27/1/50.
Early in 1950, the Young Anglicans and the Apex Club gave entertainments for European immigrants. From the opening of the Hostel in March 1951 until May 1952, the following activities by local associations on behalf of immigrants had been arranged: British immigrants at the Hostel given a Xmas party by the Country Women's Association; British women from the Hostel entertained at the Country Women's Association Club rooms; welcome given to British immigrants by Baptists; fifty British immigrants from the Hostel invited to a preview of the Liedertafel play by the Day Nursery and Nursery School Association; two variety concerts given at the Hostel by the Highland Society; European immigrants entertained by Rotary; British immigrants taken for drives by Rotary members. Apart from Rotary's International Night and an evening at which European women were entertained by the Quota Club, and which almost certainly would not have taken place but for the presence of the research worker in the community, there appear to have been no further organised entertainments for immigrants since May 1952.

Most of these functions were stimulated by the opening of the Migrant Hostel, and were directed specifically at the British residing there. Only eight of the hundred
or more local associations responded to the challenge to "do something for the immigrants"; and only four made efforts to welcome European immigrants specifically. The activities organised were sporadic: five associations made one gesture of welcome, and left it at that; three followed their first function with a second or third. A gradual diminution of activities specifically organised for immigrants would, of course, be expected as the immigrants became incorporated into the associations as members; as we shall see below, this incorporation did not in fact take place.

Further evidence of the failure of these organised activities to achieve their objectives lies in the fact that the immigrants themselves did not respond with the expected enthusiasm. For example, in August 1951, the local branch of the Day Nursery and Nursery School Association invited 50 British migrants from the Hostel to what the Goulburn Evening Post at first called a "preview" and later referred to as a "final rehearsal" of a performance by the local Liedertafel Society; only five persons attended (1). Similarly, only a handful of Hostel residents attended a Christmas party arranged for them by the Country Women's Association in 1952. Since fewer activities have been

organised for European immigrants, there have been less opportunities for instances of unresponsiveness to occur; but only a small percentage of the European men invited to the second International Evening by the Rotary Club accepted the invitation. While it has been the indifference of the British immigrants that has been especially marked, the local residents have generalised this "ingratitude", as they regard it, to cover all immigrants, and have used these experiences to justify them in discontinuing organised efforts of hospitality.

The ineffectiveness of these efforts is further suggested by the attitude of the European immigrants towards them. Some expressed mild approval, and faith in the goodwill of the Australians responsible. The firm conviction that such gestures of welcome were sincerely meant, and that they would perform a useful function in assimilating immigrants into the local community, was, however, extremely rare. The most common attitude was one of disillusionment and cynicism. Some Displaced Persons felt that they were being patronised; two informants said that these functions made them feel like animals in a zoo. Immigrants also voiced doubts about the sincerity of the ideals expressed on these occasions: the observations of one informant who has attended two Rotary International Evenings can usefully
be quoted in detail:

"at the time of the meeting last year, about 50 (the figure is much too high) of the New Australians who attended were out of work, and I 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?' They are supposed to be a service club, but there is no service about them. They are all the rich business and professional men in the town; if they wanted to help the New Australians, they could find out the people who are not working in their own professions here and give them a break, try them out in the businesses they own, doing their own jobs. But they have never made the slightest attempt to do this."

More commonly, it is the failure of the Australian well-wishers to follow up these communal gestures with personal overtures of friendship that throws doubt on their sincerity; several informants complained of the fact that the Rotarians whom they met did not even recognise them in the street the next day; others said that a Rotarian could have given simple proof of his sincerity by inviting the migrant who had been assigned as his guest for a cup of tea after the meeting, but this was not done; neither did the "host" usually make any attempt to contact his migrant guest afterwards.

The abortiveness of the contacts made through such activities as these is the final criterion on which they can be judged to have failed to achieve their objectives. In the rare cases where an Australian offered private hospitality to a migrant whom he had met in this
way, the relationship did not persist. The factors which make it difficult for friendships to develop from such contacts will be discussed in a later chapter on primary relations. It seems clear that, in the beginning, immigrants and Australians had somewhat different conceptions of the nature of welcoming functions of this kind. Some immigrants, at least, took them seriously, and expected substantial concrete help and hospitality to emerge from the contacts with Australians made in this way; their disappointment provided justification for cynicism about the good-will of Australians in general. The Australians, for their part, regarded these occasions more lightly; they recognised a "duty" towards the newcomers, but, unlike the immigrants, they did not anticipate that these contacts would develop into anything but peripheral and superficial relationships. The situation was also an unstructured one for both parties, a point that will be dealt with in more detail later.

At this point, it is necessary to consider in some detail the history of the Good Neighbor Committee and the New Settlers League in Goulburn. Before 1950, there existed in several States organisations concerned with the assimilation of immigrants. After the first Citizenship Convention, sponsored by the Commonwealth Government in
January of that year, the Good Neighbor movement throughout Australia was placed on a semi-official footing, financial assistance for administrative costs being provided by the Commonwealth. The New Settlers League (or Good Neighbor Council as it is called in some States) is a co-ordinating body with headquarters in the capital city and branches throughout the State. The senior member of the organisation in each State is the State Secretary. Co-operation between the States is maintained through the Co-ordinator of Voluntary Assimilation Activities, appointed by the Commonwealth Government, and through the Citizenship Conventions, which have now become an annual event. Members of these councils consist, for the most part, of delegates from voluntary organisations and churches; the function of the councils is to co-ordinate the activity of these bodies in assisting immigrants, both European and British, to become assimilated into Australian life. It is part of their co-ordinating function to act as a clearing house for information and to provide a forum for the discussion of problems connected with immigration.

A Good Neighbor Committee was established in Goulburn in August 1950, largely at the instigation of the Assimilation Division of the Department of Immigration in Canberra. The movement had the backing of the Goulburn
Evening Post, which in June that year had published a prominent article on European immigrants in the district, presenting them in a most favourable light, and taking the citizens to task for indifference to their welfare, and quoting unnamed "migrant welfare officials" who stated that: "other than a few church functions there had never been any attempt to carry out the tasks of welcoming migrants in Goulburn. No permanent organisations existed for these ends, and there was not even an auxiliary body that had taken on the idea... officials feel that it would be in the interests of residents to make these New Australians into good Australian citizens by forming some committee with a view to introducing them to our way of life. They warn that if steps are not taken soon, little national minority groups will be formed"; the article concluded with the editorial exhortation, "Surely it is time that Goulburn did something for these people before the ... terminology (anti-foreign) is applied to them (i.e. to the citizens of Goulburn)" (1). Although the Good Neighbor Committee at first aroused much interest, it ceased to function after a few months, many of the activities which it might have been expected to undertake being carried out by the Employment Officer, who had been appointed Honorary Secretary. The Committee was officially disbanded when,

(1) G.E.P., 5/6/50.
following upon the appointment of a permanent State Secretary of the New Settlers League, a branch of the League was formed in Goulburn in October 1951. The new group of office-bearers and executive committee had only one member in common with the former Good Neighbor Committee, and the Employment Officer did not take office, nor was he elected to the executive. This first meeting was said to be an enthusiastic one; it was addressed by the State Secretary, attended by eleven British migrants from the Hostel, and by 23 Goulburn residents, representing some twelve local associations. Interest was also maintained at the second meeting, held in November 1951, and, like the first one, well-reported in the local press; according to the minutes, approximately 50 people attended this meeting. By April 1952, the numbers had dropped to fifteen, and it was decided to move the location of the meetings from the Town Hall to the Migrant Hostel. From that date until January 1953, the attendance fluctuated between twenty and eight, with an average of thirteen, excluding the Annual General Meeting in November 1952, at which 45 persons were present; of these, 28 were British migrants from the Hostel. The decline in attendance, repeated complaints at the meetings about the failure of local associations to send or even nominate representatives or to acknowledge notices
of meetings, and the fading out of the executive after four meetings, all indicated that the New Settlers League had failed to gain the wide and staunch support that had been anticipated. During 1973, there were repeated rumours that the Hostel was to be closed, and the number of residents did in fact decrease greatly; since, as will be seen below, the League had come to regard itself almost exclusively as a means of promoting the welfare of the British Hostel residents, these events meant that it was no longer felt to have any raison d'être. Towards the end of the year, meetings ceased to be held regularly, and the activities of the League were in abeyance. Despite efforts by the State Secretary to revive the branch, it was virtually disbanded in February 1974, when a meeting of four local people, the State Secretary and the research worker decided that the three-member executive should continue in existence but that no further meetings should be held or activities undertaken. The President and Secretary of the local branch were adamant that the League no longer had a job to do in Goulburn, since the Hostel was being emptied and the few immigrants remaining in the district were all being well assimilated; their case was not, however, strengthened by the additional argument that the League should be disbanded because of the impossibility of
securing the co-operation of local associations for further work (1).

(1) The details of the demise of the New Settlers League are illuminating enough to be recounted in full. Towards the end of 1953, the State Secretary became concerned at the apparent disintegration of the organisation, indicated to her by the absence of reports of meetings, and by failure to obtain answers to correspondence. The Secretary therefore visited Goulburn in December 1953, to discuss with the President and Secretary the possibilities of reviving the branch. At this informal discussion, with the research worker also present, the President reported that at the last meeting it had been decided to discontinue further meetings, but to retain three nominal office-bearers in case any matter needing their attention should arise. In the face of this lack of interest, the State Secretary secured the agreement of the two office bearers to the holding of a large public meeting in February; at their behest, she also said that she would be willing to spend two days before the meeting in Goulburn in order to stimulate interest. By the time of her return to Goulburn in February, the State Secretary had fully accepted the possibility that the branch could not be revived, but hoped that at least contact workers could be appointed so that the League would not be altogether unrepresented in the city. Interviews with local residents on the two days preceding the meeting made her somewhat more ready than she had been to accept the President's claim that there was no longer a job to be done in Goulburn, but she also became very much aware that no publicity whatsoever had been given to the forthcoming meeting, that the appropriate associations had not been approached, and that not even the Mayor had been notified. The indifference of the local office-bearers became even more apparent when the President failed to keep an appointment to take the State Secretary to a nearby township in the afternoon preceding the meeting, neither informing her that he could not keep the appointment nor apologising when she eventually got in touch with him. By the time of the meeting in the evening, the State Secretary felt that her attempts to keep the organisation going were certainly bound to failure; she was still, however, disappointed when the only people who turned up to the meeting were the two office-bearers (the third office bearer who had agreed to continue in a nominal capacity did not attend), a deputy for the Mayor, a former President of the League, and myself. The
fiasco was complete when, on being asked for the minutes of the last meeting, the President answered casually that they were not available as the former Secretary had moved to Sydney, taking the minute book with him, and "all efforts" to get it back had been in vain. The President's "Annual Report" consisted of a few comments, made without prepared notes, and reiterating his firm opinion that the New Settlers League no longer had any useful function to perform in the district. The meeting agreed that the present executive should continue in existence so that cases could be referred to it for help if necessary. The State Secretary gave a brief report of the activities of the New Settlers League in other places; being asked for my opinion about the need for further action on the part of the branch in Goulburn, I suggested that there was still an important job to be done in at least three respects, personal friendships and home visiting, incorporation of immigrants into associations and helping them to improve their English above the minimum level that most had now attained. These remarks were received with polite attention, but the situation was already too strongly structured in the direction of discontinuing the association as an effective group for anything but the most dramatic revelations to change the course of development. The meeting lasted an hour.
An analysis of the minutes of the meetings from the inauguration of the league in October 1951, up to February 1953 shows that 36 different items of business had been dealt with (each subject being counted once irrespective of the number of meetings at which it was discussed). Of these, 25 were directly concerned with the welfare of the British migrants in the Hostel, four related to European migrants, two each were concerned with immigrants in general, with the organisation of the New Settlers League and with matters not related to immigration; one related to a British migrant elsewhere. Most of the activity of the League was aimed at improving living conditions in the Hostel(1). To a lesser extent, the branch had some hand in organising social functions for Hostel residents; the only regular activity was a monthly film night, which continued throughout 1952.

The four items of business concerning European immigrants were the report that English classes for European staff in the Hostel had been arranged, and later discontinued; a resolution that a tax-free period should be allowed

(1) E.g., repairs to lighting, securing telephone, making representations to the bus proprietor to have passengers delivered to the Hostel compound.
European immigrants when they first entered the country; a report that the President had given help to a European ex-prisoner, and an inquiry concerning the eligibility of certificates of foreign tradesmen. At the Inaugural Meeting, the State Secretary had suggested that one of the activities which the branch might undertake was the establishment of an Advisory Legal and Business Sub-committee. In making this suggestion, she anticipated that such a Sub-committee would be especially useful to European immigrants, as had been found elsewhere. The Rotary Club responded with an offer to form such a panel, but, contrary to the spirit of the original suggestion, arrangements were made for the advisors to visit the Hostel, while there were no similar plans for the Panel to be made available to immigrants outside the Hostel. Although there was much talk about it, the Panel never, in fact, went into operation.

No survey of the minutes of New Settler League meetings can give a full picture of the activities of the association; in at least two respects, this picture is incomplete. Through personal contacts, the first President and other members gave both European and British immigrants much advice and assistance which, if reported at the meetings, never found its way into the minutes.
In addition, the minutes contain only one reference to action by the League on behalf of Hostel residents in the dispute over Hostel charges and cooking arrangements, which began in 1952 and continued through 1953; it seems certain that, from the end of 1952 onwards, when feeling among the British residents ran high on these issues, part of every meeting of the branch was devoted to discussing the rights and wrongs of the case, and the feelings of the branch were decidedly in favour of the immigrants. During this period, the branch did in fact become a forum in which the British immigrants presented their case to a few Goulburn residents, and attempted to use the association as a pressure group against the Hostel management. Almost none of this discussion was recorded in the minutes. Partly because the Goulburn members, while willing to indicate their sympathy with the British, were reluctant to come into this dispute, the discussion rarely became the subject for specific resolutions.

We may now try to assess the effectiveness of this association in achieving its aims. As previously stated, the principal purpose of the New Settlers League is to co-ordinate those activities of voluntary associations directed at the assimilation of immigrants and the provision of welfare services for them. The Goulburn branch did not
succeed in retaining the support of more than two local associations, the Country Women's Association and the Ministers Fraternal; there was virtually no associational activity to co-ordinate (1). By implication, the branch had also failed to achieve the further aim of stimulating local associations to undertake assimilation activities, as distinct from co-ordinating activities initiated independently of the League; no attempt was made to engage the interest of groups by suggesting particular projects to them. In place of achieving its original goals, the association became an instrument for promoting the material, and to a lesser extent the social, welfare, of the British Hostel residents. The branch was ineffective in interesting local associations in European immigrants, in representing the interests of this class of migrants, or even in making personal contact with them. Inquiries among Europeans in Goulburn revealed that only those on the Hostel staff and the few Dutch Hostel residents, knew of the activities of the league; most of them thought it

(1) The failure to achieve this aim was indicated in the First Annual Report, delivered by the President 24/11/52, in which it was stated: "Unfortunately some of the representatives of our member organizations have not even paid the League the courtesy of an apology for non-attendance at meetings ... Particularly am I disappointed in the lack of interest shown by the Churches."
was intended primarily for the British, while the great majority of other Europeans in Goulburn had never heard of its existence.

Finally, the branch must be pronounced a failure in the sense that it disintegrated while its original purposes remained unfulfilled, and when no provision had been made for any other group to take over its functions.

At least four factors have contributed towards this failure. In the first place, the New Settlers League was inaugurated at a time when the community was conscious of the presence of a migrant group in their midst because of the recent opening of the Hostel. At that period, there was some recognition of the need for such an organisation, but as time went on the need was felt to be more dubious or less urgent. It seemed more dubious because the League became identified with the British Hostel residents just at the time when this group of immigrants was involved in serious clashes with the Commonwealth Government; from press reports and interviews, it seemed clear that most residents of Goulburn did not know where their sympathies should lie in this dispute; few were prepared to support the British without reservation. This inevitably affected the attitude of residents to the New Settlers League. On the one hand it produced much scepticism about whether the
British merited sympathy and help, and thus justified inactivity. On the other hand, it made at least one association keep clear of British immigrants in case its members might thus be involving themselves in a controversy which was not their concern (1).

During 1952-1953, the need for some organisation such as the New Settlers League also came to appear less urgent. It was during 1950-1951 that the local residents were most acutely aware of the European immigrants in their midst: not only was the European population largest during these years, but the Europeans in Goulburn at that time were conspicuous because of their difficulties in speaking English, their obviously foreign manner and dress, and the fact that they were sometimes involved in fights and court cases. By 1952, they were less conspicuous in every way; at the end of 1953 and the beginning of 1954 citizens who had earlier been active in the Good Neighbor Committee and New Settlers League readily confirmed the claims of the President of the League that this body had lost its raison d'être, both for European and British immigrants. To the further inquiries

(1) This association was the C.W.A., the only group which had regularly sent a representative to the N.S.L. meetings, but which decided not to give a party for Hostel residents, promised for early 1953, because of the tense situation between the Management and residents of the Hostel at that time; the excuse given to the N.S.L. for this withdrawal was that the C.W.A. had particularly heavy commitments in other directions at that time.
of the State Secretary these local observers replied that very few European migrants remained in the community, those who did could speak English, had made Australian friends, and were settling in well. Evidence elsewhere in this study will show that in fact these claims were not correct; for the moment it is simply important to note that there is no longer felt to be an "immigrant problem" in the community.

Thus, at the same time as the local residents were becoming less certain of the unworthiness of the group with whom the New Settlers League had come to be identified, they were also losing any sense of urgency they might once have had concerning the need to help other sections of the immigrant population.

A second factor which led to the ineffectiveness and ultimate disintegration of the branch was its failure to secure an established, competent and experienced following (1). In this the League differs from other associations which have persisted through time and appear to be at least somewhat

(1) This statement might, in a sense, be regarded not as cause, but as a description of the failure of the association. It is, however, conceivable that an association can be effective, in the sense of achieving its avowed aims and persisting through time, without a following of this kind: it might, e.g., function through the leadership of a single individual, relying for support on a core of active members whose composition was constantly changing.
effective in achieving their aims, e.g., Red Cross, Country Women's Association and Rotary. All these groups contain a band of loyal and devoted workers, who have come to identify themselves with the association and, in some way, to derive status from their position in it. No such development took place within the New Settlers League; apart from the first President, who was in office for only one year, no individual or group in the community has accepted responsibility for the success of the League (1). When it showed signs of disintegrating only the State Secretary from Sydney felt an obligation to prevent such a debacle.

It is also suggested that with two or three important exceptions, the persons who did lend their half-hearted support to the association were incompetent and inexperienced. The incompetence consisted, briefly, in refusal to take the initiative in furthering any of the association's aims; being seriously ill-informed on matters

(1) An indication of the failure to secure an established following (i.e. a constant core of supporters) is contained in the following facts: the first executive of the N.S.L. had only one member in common with the executive of the G.N.C.; of the 14 persons named as office-bearers and members of the executive at the Annual Meeting in November 1952, only three had been members of the executive during the preceding year; and of the 23 local residents present at the Inaugural Meeting in October 1951, only two attended the Annual Meeting, November 1952.
with which the association was concerned; failing to keep order at meetings; failing to answer correspondence or keep the records of the association in reasonable order. These supporters were also inexperienced in that only one or two of the local residents came into contact with immigrants regularly. This inexperience meant that the Goulburn people who were members of the League had little knowledge of even the most elementary characteristics of the migrant population in the community, such as their numbers, sex and family distribution, places of work and residence.

A third factor which helps to explain the disappearance of the New Settlers League was failure to gain the solid support of people with prestige in the community. Although the first executive did not include representatives of the highest status professional group or the old families, it did contain upper middle and middle class, respected townsfolk; their support was not, however, retained, and by 1953, the office-bearers running the branch were an undertaker and a railway employee, neither with high local prestige, and a British migrant at the Hostel who had no links into the local community. The following considerations suggest that the branch's failure to draw the support of high status persons has been a factor in its disintegration.
The other associations which have persisted through time, and have gained the widest recognition, have all been consistently supported by at least a few high status persons. Moreover, because of its particular purposes, the League probably needs high status support more than many other associations: as a body intended to co-ordinate and initiate activity on the part of other organisations, it is clearly at a disadvantage with low-status office-bearers, in a stratified community of this kind. And finally, the League's failure to secure the support of high status persons made it difficult for the group to attain standing in the community as a whole; the few people who were aware of its existence at all regarded it as a body of no importance; there was thus no prestige to be secured by belonging to it; its final demise passed unnoticed.

The fourth and last factor which appears to have contributed to the disintegration of the League was the inadequate formulation and understanding of its purposes and structure. The concept of a body whose function is, not to undertake activities in its own right, but to initiate and co-ordinate action on the part of other associations, is an uncommon one in the community. Both the business conducted by the association and interviews with the interested persons showed that these functions had never
been clearly understood by the members; on the contrary, the League was perceived as another welfare organisation. As has been indicated, it did fulfil certain limited, but useful, welfare functions; the misunderstanding of the purposes of the League meant, however, that, so soon as there/nor longer any obvious "migrant problem", recognition of the need for such a body disappeared.

To recapitulate briefly the argument of this section on the organised communal effort to welcome immigrants: there appears to have been little opposition to the coming of either British or European immigrants in the first place, while all public and official pronouncements indicated that they would receive a hearty welcome. But the public responded without enthusiasm to the call to show hospitality to the immigrants; such functions as were organised did not result in friendships being formed with Australians, nor help to make the immigrants feel at home in the community; the New Settlers League, the one association specifically designed to take the responsibility for social assimilation, disintegrated after contributing almost nothing to this process.

3. Participation in Organised Communal Life and Associations

Participation of immigrants in commercialised entertainment can be described in a few words. The one
kind of organised entertainment patronised by immigrants of all ages and sexes is the cinema. There are good reasons why immigrants can enjoy this form of entertainment without suffering the reservations which deter them from taking part in other communal activities. They are familiar with the cinema: it is one of the few recreational activities common to both Europe and Australia; it has a positive value for this reason alone. Moreover, attendance at the cinema does not incur the embarrassments and difficulties of social intercourse involved in other forms of participation; in addition, the immigrant can and will go to the pictures alone when he would not attend other functions without a companion. A third reason is that many immigrants claim that the cinema improves their English; they feel that it is a less painful method of gaining familiarity with the sound of the language than mixing socially with English-speaking persons, one might anticipate that immigrants who know little English would not find English-speaking films enjoyable, but such a view is very seldom expressed; on the contrary, many immigrants claim to enjoy films even though they understand little of what is said.

Most of the young single men, and a few of the women, have at some time attended public dances, or dances
organised for the general public by some association. The dances most commonly attended by the Displaced Persons are the regular public dances in the Liedertafel Hall and those held periodically at the Migrant Hostel; these functions are not patronised by middle and upper class members of the local community, who regard them as not quite respectable, claiming that they are conducted in a disorderly manner, that there is much drinking, and that the women who attend are not "good types". On the other hand, migrants rarely take part in the more formal dances and balls organised and attended by the middle and high status members of the community.

Most subjects apparently went to these dances in the first place in an experimental spirit: dancing, like the cinema, was a form of entertainment to which they were accustomed, and in which many of them were competent; having little do do in their leisure time, they were prepared to join in the one kind of organised Australian social function to which they had ready access. But for most of them the experiment was a failure: they attended one, two or three dances, but failing to find the expected companionship and enjoyment, they did not continue. Both men and women were disappointed at what they regarded as the rough and uncivilised way in which the dances were
conducted: the row of chairs along the walls instead of the grouping of the dancers around tables to which they had been accustomed in Europe; the fact that liquor could not be served in the hall, but was drunk more or less secretively outside; the segregation of men and women between dances. The men also complained of the unwillingness of the Australian girls to dance with them. It is impossible to check on the validity of this complaint, but there is some suggestion that, if a European persisted in attending dances until he became known to the Australian girls, a group whose composition apparently remained fairly constant, and if he was in other ways agreeable and a good dancer, then he would be accepted by the Australians as a partner; but an early rebuff seems to have prevented many European men from persisting in their attendance at the dances long enough to gain this acceptance. Here, as in other situations, the Displaced Person often withdrew after one initial rejection, in order to avoid further rebuffs and embarrassment.

Some of the women Displaced Persons complained of drunkenness, and the rough behaviour of both European and Australian men towards them. There was no implication that they were being treated any differently from the Australian women present, but they felt that they were
degrading themselves, losing their self-respect, by exposing themselves to such treatment. It seems clear that these women were not at first aware that these functions were held in low repute in the town; it was from their own experience that they came to realise that it was the lower status townsfolk who attended them; they felt out of place and uncomfortable, and did not continue to attend after the first or second time. Not all the single immigrant women had this experience: some, for a variety of reasons, did not make any attempt to take part in these dances at all; a very few found them a congenial means of forming liaisons with the opposite sex, both European and Australian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associational Membership</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No past or current membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former membership discontinued</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current membership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table sets out the associational membership of 59 Displaced Persons during their period of residence in Goulburn. "Membership" means formal acceptance into a group, not simply attendance at functions organised by it. The associations in which five Displaced Persons have current membership are: Railway Institute, Liedertafel Society, and church auxiliaries. Only one Displaced Person has held office in an association. In short, the Displaced Persons take virtually no part in the diverse and extensive associational life which organises a great proportion of the total social activity of the community.

This last statement must, however, be qualified by reference to church attendance. The following table sets out church attendance of the 59 subjects included in the table above.

| Church Attendance of Fifty-Nine Displaced Persons, Thirty-Four Men and Twenty-Five Women |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| No regular attendance               | 20     | 14     | 34     |
| Regular attendance:                 |        |        |        |
| Roman Catholics                     | 7      | 4      | 11     |
| R.C's attending Hungarian services  |        |        |        |
| only                                 | 5      | 4      | 9      |
| Lutherans                            | 0      | 3      | 3      |
| Presbyterians                        | 2      | 0      | 2      |
| Total                                | 34     | 25     | 59     |


For the purposes of this table, a person is classified as a regular church attender if (a) he attended the usual Australian weekly services at least once in two months, or if (b) he attended special services as often as they were available. Reference to this second category of regular attenders is necessary, because there were two groups of immigrants in the community who attended certain services whenever these were held, but who never took part in the regular Australian services; these were the Lutherans who attended the monthly services conducted by a visiting pastor at Kenmore Hospital, and the Hungarians who took part in services conducted at the Roman Catholic Hostel at intervals throughout the year by a visiting Hungarian priest. There are two reasons why church attendance is not here counted as associational membership: one reason is that the immigrants did not regard themselves as "belonging" to the local church, unless they participated in some church activities in addition to the services; the other reason is that their church attendance had none of the characteristics of associational membership - there was no act of joining or being initiated into the local church, and they were not brought into social relations with their fellow-worshippers.
Although it was not possible to learn very much about the personal religious faith of the subjects, it was clear that they were not church-minded. Even the Roman Catholics, with every opportunity to take part in the same church organisation in which they had been members in Europe, had no sense of belonging in the local church; if they attended services, they did so as outsiders. In answer to a question, most subjects claimed that the churches had done nothing to help them in settling into the community, but this deficiency was an active grievance for only a few; the rest expected little help from the churches and were therefore not surprised when they met with indifference. The picture of the situation, as presented by the subjects, was confirmed by the local clergy, who claimed that the immigrants seemed to be too intent on establishing themselves economically to participate in church affairs, and that attempts to interest the Australian parishioners in incorporating the immigrants into the church community had met with little response.

It is thus clear that the Displaced Persons are outside the associational structure of the local community. Their conception of their own position does not include participation in organised groups. They are not identified with Goulburn itself, and hence have not the sense of social responsibility which motivates many Goulburn residents to
fulfil their share of civic obligations. Moreover they do not believe in the sincerity of the words of good-will uttered on official occasions; on the contrary, they feel that they would not be welcome into group life, nor be treated as equals with Australians; they would secure no advantages through associational participation - they would not be respected any more, nor gain an entree to the private social life of the community.

One final point must be noted before leaving this subject of associational membership. This is the attitude of the subjects towards national associations. The Greek community is the only group of this kind in Goulburn. In addition, the nucleus of a rational organisation did exist among the Hungarians, who, numbering 19 persons, are one of the larger Displaced Person Groups in the community. In January 1952, four Hungarian nuns who had been expelled from China took up residence in Goulburn. They occupied a large old house owned by the Roman Catholic Church, with the intention of running a hostel for women employed in the town. Because the building needed extensive alterations, the hostel was not opened until January 1954. In the intervening two years, the nuns became to some extent the focus of a Hungarian community in the city. About half the Hungarian-born kept in regular contact with them, attending
services conducted about four times a year by a visiting Hungarian priest from Sydney, taking part in the social gatherings organised by the nuns at these times and on the occasion of religious festivals such as Easter and Christmas, responding to appeals for money and clothing for Hungarian prisoners and other fellow-nationals in need, and, in a small way, helping with jobs about the hostel. These nuns brought together a number of Hungarians who were previously unknown to one another, in a small way created a centre for the preservation of some aspects of Hungarian culture, and provided an opportunity for the development of a sense of solidarity among the local Hungarians. This was, however, only the most attenuated form of a national community; the nuns never felt that they had the full allegiance of their fellow Hungarians, and were often disappointed in the lack of loyalty and responsibility among them. Since its strongest supporters moved away from Goulburn early in 1954, the group, apart from the nuns themselves, has virtually gone out of existence.

Because many immigrants believe that Australians disapprove of national clubs and newspapers, they tend to understate their interest in these matters, and even to express strong disapproval when they are either indifferent or approving. For this reason it is difficult to assess
the extent to which they read their own newspapers and to
gauge their attitudes towards national associations.
While probably 80% of the subjects had some knowledge of
the activities of national associations in large cities,
less than half had had personal contact with these associa-
tions, and only two had been active members. The contact
appears, for the most part, to have consisted in attending
some function organised by the association on an occasional
visit to Sydney or Melbourne. By the distance of Goulburn
from any centre where a national club was operating, the
subjects were prevented from being regular participants,
or from having their interest stimulated by frequent contact
with active members; most of the subjects had, indeed,
ever been faced with the necessity for having an opinion
on the question. The positive values which some informants
claimed for national associations were: to provide a centre
for the preservation of national culture, and in particular
for teaching children the language and cultural background of
their parents; to provide recreation and an opportunity for
social intercourse for people who have little else to do with
their leisure time; to send material assistance to fellow-
nationals in need in Germany and, in some cases, in their
own countries; and, finally, to promote the ultimate value
of maintaining solidarity with one's countrymen and loyalty
towards the country of origin. The negative values seen by other immigrants in the national associations were that they make the immigrants disinclined to take their place in the Australian community; that they give Australians the impression that the immigrants want to keep to themselves; that the leaders of such associations are opportunists, using their fellow-countrymen to further their own material benefit or political and social ambitions; that the associations represent the interests of particular political factions, not those of the immigrants as a whole. Very definitely, the national association does not represent a source of inspiration, nor a focus for ambition; its norms do not provide a standard of conduct.
In the preceding chapter, we were concerned with the Displaced Persons' relation to the organised group life of the Goulburn community, and in the next chapter we shall turn to the informal, primary relations of the immigrants - their cliques and friendships.

Before taking up this question, however, it is necessary to describe briefly another type of relation which has an unusual significance in the social life of the Displaced Persons; this is what we shall call the "service relation", which is one type of the relationship referred to by Tönnies as Gesellschaft (1) and by Weber as "associative" (2), and taken by Durkheim as the basis of his "organic Solidarity" (3). The prototype of such relations is exchange on the free market; it is, briefly, a relation directed at the achievement of a restricted, explicit and rational end, enjoining limited and specific obligations, and involving only the narrowest areas of the total personality and value-attitude systems of the

(1) See Parsons' most lucid analysis of Gesellschaft-Gemeinschaft relations, 1949, pp. 686-694.
(3) Durkheim, 1893.
participants. The Gesellschaft relationship is the opposite of the Gemeinschaft which, in its ideal form, occurs among members of what we have previously described as a highly integrated multi-purpose group.

Service relations are those Gesellschaft relations which are concerned with the exchange of money and goods or services. In highly mobile, large-scale urban communities, this exchange tends to approximate the ideal Gesellschaft type; but in a comparatively stable, small-scale community like Goulburn, such exchange takes on something of a Gemeinschaft character: this is made possible by the fact that service relations tend to occur repeatedly between the same persons, and the parties are usually known to one another outside this particular relation; they are more than complete strangers. They are likely to have some mutual friends or acquaintances or kin; the "seller" often knows the "buyer's" occupation and where he lives; the two parties may also have some knowledge of each other's habits, likes and dislikes in relation to the particular goods or services concerned; both "buyer" and "seller" perhaps derive a comfortable sense of sharing, of talking the same language, from this mutual knowledge, but it is the "buyer" in particular whose sense of unique importance is enhanced. Both parties are
probably familiar with some details of each other's personal history or present circumstances: a birth, marriage, illness or death in the family of either of them, or any other event a little out of the ordinary such as a holiday, or a purchase of a new house, is likely to be the subject of discussion as their business is transacted. People who are prominent in the town, in the sense that the daily press regularly records their activities, are known and recognised in virtually every secondary contact which they make, whether acting as "buyer" or "seller". The "buyer" - "seller" relationship is thus seldom limited to the business on hand; it is, rather, the occasion for augmenting the store of knowledge, and confirming attitudes of friendliness, or, occasionally, hostility.

Just because of the size of the community, the limitation of sources through which goods and services can be obtained, and the effectiveness of the channels of communication, most residents are involved in an extensive network of service relationships of this kind. These relationships are, however, tenuous: they can be ended by either party without notice, or, in a few cases, after giving only formal notice; while the personal nature of the contact provides a sanction for conformity
to the business code, lacking where these contacts occur between strangers, the relationship does not in fact involve socially sanctioned rights and obligations beyond the requirements of the business transaction itself. To give a more explicit example: it is not expected by either party that repeated kindly enquiries about the health of a member of the family should be followed by sending a gift, or visiting the sick person in the hospital.

It was not the immigrant's desire to practise his English, nor to familiarise himself with local shops and offices, nor to get to know Australians, which, in the first place, led him to make contacts with the Goulburn people; on the contrary, these relationships occurred inevitably because he had a job and because he had to acquire essential goods and services. Since the service relations were among the first contacts with Australians made by most migrants, and since, for some time, if not still, they were the most numerous of any contacts, it is important to know how satisfying and harmonious they were. In the early days, in Goulburn and elsewhere, the Australians' curiosity and inexperience in understanding the speech or wants of newcomers, combined with the immigrants' own feelings of incompetence in the
language and uncertainty about how they should behave or would be treated, often meant that to go shopping, to visit a hospital or government office, was an uncomfortable, if not agonisingly humiliating, experience. Among the subjects of this study, it was not only increasing fluency in the language and familiarity with the surroundings and routine which gradually dissipated such feelings; equally important was the fact that, as far as face-to-face-relations were concerned, incidents of unpleasant misunderstanding or friction were rare; the immigrants usually felt that they were treated with courtesy, and were not discriminated against. Most of the Goulburn Displaced Persons had gained complete self-confidence in moving around the shops and offices of the city; they did not expect to be insulted, laughed at or ignored just because they were not Australians; even those whose English was still very inadequate were able to avoid the possibility of embarrassment by confining their contacts to a few selected shops where they were known. When they moved out of the Goulburn community, however, much of their former uncertainty returned: in Sydney, for example, they might wander the streets for hours instead of asking a stranger the way, accept goods which they did not want rather than risk a rebuff from a shop assistant, or eat
repeatedly at the same restaurant because the staff had been friendly to them.

If you ask a European in Goulburn whether he knows many of the local people, he is likely to answer, "Yes, I know everyone", or "All the people in the shops know me", or "I've got friends everywhere". Further probing is likely to reveal two things. Firstly, he is probably exaggerating the number and intimacy of these contacts, because he would have you understand that he is no nonentity, but an individual recognised in the community, and because he wants to make himself believe that he is not without local ties. Being known, and called by name, gives him some sense of belonging to the city, of being identified as a member of it. Secondly, positions in many hotels are held by immigrants and most cafes, milk bars and fruit shops are staffed by Greeks; through these fellow-Europeans in strategic jobs, the immigrant also comes to know the Australians who work at the same places. He readily comes to feel that he, like the local resident, moves always among familiar faces. For many of the young unmarried men in particular, this network of contacts in shops, garages, hotels and other places of business, had a peculiar significance. Because these immigrants had no family life of their own, and few,
if any, private homes to visit, service relations took up much of their time and often provided their most important form of recreation.

But perhaps the special significance of such relations was the feeling of an ability to manipulate the social structure which they conferred. There seems to be little doubt that a person's self-esteem is in some measure dependent upon his ability to manipulate men and materials. As a new arrival, the Displaced Person was specially conscious of being manipulated by others; he had neither the material resources, nor the necessary familiarity with local institutions, nor the legal freedom (being under contract) to control his own affairs, and he was rarely in a position of authority over others. As time went on, the immigrants reacted to this situation in various ways; one way was to use their contacts with fellow-immigrants in strategic jobs to obtain some mild form of preferential access to goods and services. Such favoured treatment for themselves not only enhanced their own self-esteem, but, since it allowed them in their turn to do favours for other people, gave them the feeling of importance and belonging which comes from being "in the know", and, above all, permitted them a sense of superiority over Australians. With little
immediate hope of gaining equality with Australians in their control over more substantial resources, they nevertheless obtained considerable satisfaction from being able to get a meal in a cafe after hours, Australian cigarettes, Sydney bottled beer, or a drink after 6 o'clock.

Service relationships have thus assumed a special importance for the Displaced Persons. They do not belong to any effective group which can confer status upon them; they sorely need to be reassured of their own importance, but the means of securing this reassurance are severely limited. One way in which they seek to compensate for these deficiencies is by building up and personalising their service contacts, which have thus become, to some extent, a substitute both for primary relations and for position in some socially respected group.
1. Introduction

Work and other economic activities, such as running a household or building a home, occupy the greater part of the Displaced Persons' time. What leisure they have is spent mostly in the company of other immigrants. It is in the context of informal, loosely organised and usually tenuous friendship and clique relations that most of their non-economic and non-familial activities are carried out.

These friendships and cliques, which form the subject matter of this chapter, are one type of primary relationship. Drawing upon Cooley's original analysis of the primary group (1), and more recent elaborations, particularly by MacIver (2) and Shils (3), we may take the primary group as the small face-to-face, comparatively unorganised unit, with continuity of membership, which is found universally, and which is the most intimate and emotionally significant of all groups. MacIver has stressed the spontaneous and voluntary character of primary

(1) Cooley, 1911, pp.23-57.
(2) MacIver, 1950, pp.218-229.
(3) Shils, 1950, and unpublished lecture notes.
relations, thus distinguishing them from relations between people who come together "as representatives or delegates constituted, defined, and limited to allotted tasks by predetermined arrangements" (1). We might note however that the form of organisation which is usually taken as the prototype of the primary group, and which Maciver himself describes as such - namely the family - is not spontaneous but imposed from the viewpoint of the offspring. Although the family is, in this respect, exceptional, the ratio of imposition to spontaneity in the development of primary groups varies greatly (2). Pressures towards the formation of these groups come both from the relations prescribed among units in the larger social structures, and from the physical or cultural barriers which confine the possibilities of such groups within certain limits. It is

(1) op.cit., p.219

(2) E.g., if the organisation of a factory places a small group of workers in physical isolation and provides them with additional ready means of differentiating themselves from fellow-employees, then, other things being equal, a greater element of imposition is present than in the case where such a group develops within a large department whose members are physically dispersed and have an identical status within the factory organisation.
contiguity which, in the first place, usually provides the opportunity for primary relations to develop.

The particular form of primary group with which we are concerned here is the group of close associates formed within the larger structures of the occupational group, the Displaced Person group, the immigrant group as a whole or the local community. Following upon Warner's usage (1), we shall take the term "clique" to refer to this group of people who spend much of their leisure time together, who exchange advice, help and comfort, and who provide each other with psychological support.

It was possible to identify the cliques to which the subjects of this study belonged by questioning and by observation. Informants were asked with whom they spent their spare time, with whom they engaged in certain recreational activities, etc. It was also possible to observe the people who called on one another, the groups invited to different parties, and so on. Observation was the more useful of the two methods for obtaining this information, as the subjects were reluctant to name other members of their cliques and

(1) Although Warner, 1941, pp.110-111, defines the clique in general terms, as any non-kin primary group, the term is used throughout the Yankee City studies mainly for the kind of friendship groups with which we are concerned in this context.
suspicous of direct questions on this point.

We shall also be concerned in this chapter with friendships between two persons. Such a relation has the essential qualities of the primary group relation, but since the term "group" is usually reserved for collectivities of more than two persons, we shall describe a friendship simply as a primary relation. Each member of a clique is not necessarily in a friendship relation with all the others, and the intensity of such friendships as do occur within the clique varies greatly. A friendship is a special form of primary relation; it is even more likely than the clique to develop spontaneously and voluntarily, with the minimum of imposition; a greater degree of intimacy and a greater involvement of the total personality are also possible in this two-person relation than in any larger group. Because of the diverse living conditions of the subjects, with the ensuing variations in possible patterns of social interaction, it was not feasible to adopt consistent criteria for determining the existence of a friendship. When a relationship between two persons was characterised by some of the following features, it was regarded as a friendship: leisure time usually spent together; mutual exchange of confidences and discussion of personal affairs; each identifying the other as a
friend, whose company he sought, and whom he regarded as "closer" than most other acquaintances. As we shall see, the pair relations that will be called friendships in Goulburn are, for the most part, a very much attenuated form of the fully developed ideal type of this relationship (1).

2. Primary Relations Among Displaced Persons in Goulburn

The content of the activities in which friends and clique members join together can be broadly classified as mutual help and recreational participation. Mutual help is very restricted in scope and has not become in any way institutionalised; it consists largely in providing advice and information and giving a fellow-immigrant a favourable introduction to an Australian employer, official, etc. In order to appreciate the significance of this kind of assistance in such a group, we may pause to examine the channels through which an immigrant can acquire information and attitudes about Australian culture. These channels are the mass media of communication (reading, radio, films), personal contacts with local people, and contacts with other immigrants who have, or who are believed to have, some knowledge of Australian society. The reading

(1) For an analysis of the ideal type of dyadic relation, see Wolff's translations from Simmel, 1950.
ability of the subjects was so limited that very few of them did more than peruse the headlines on the papers or the captions under pictures. They used the radio for entertainment, and none listened regularly to talks or other "informative" sessions. Most of the subjects attended the cinema, but American films could not be expected to help them understand Australian institutions. As will be shown later, their contacts with Australians were extremely limited. This means that other immigrants provided their principal source of advice and information on meeting new problems. While we are not here concerned specifically with the accuracy or range of the immigrants' knowledge about Australia, it can be noted that striking distortions and inadequacies certainly derived to some extent from the fact that they obtained their information from other newcomers, and not from more reliable sources. The question of their facility in the language is relevant here: not only did lack of fluency in English mean that the sources which they could tap were limited; it also meant that they placed far more trust in the very much second-hand information related in a familiar tongue, than in the objectively more trustworthy information, direct from officials or other knowledgeable sources, given in a language of which they had inadequate command.
While the subjects sought advice and information from a wide range of acquaintances, particular individuals were generally believed to be especially qualified and ready to give assistance. Information on four individuals in this position was obtained. The most well-known was a Pole, very intelligent, from a high status family, self-educated to a high standard, and especially visible in the community because he was used as an interpreter by the police. Although not known to all the immigrants, he was acquainted with a large proportion of them, especially the Poles, Ukrainians, Lithuanians and Russians. He was often asked to help in writing letters and filling in forms, and to act as an intermediary between Displaced Persons and Australians. He had earned some reputation as a person who could arrange for divorces between immigrants in Australia and their spouses in Europe. As far as is known he did not use his standing with the police force to gain preferential treatment for immigrants; on the contrary, he was more interested in securing status in the Australian community than in gaining respect from fellow-immigrants, and would not have risked his prestige among Australians for the goodwill of an immigrant.

The contacts of the other three persons of this type were much more restricted, and largely confined to
their own work group or former work associates. One was an employee at the Mental Hospital, and the other two, a man and a woman, were on the Hostel staff. The woman was not a Displaced Person, but her contacts were almost exclusively with the Displaced Person group. Like the Pole, these three were exceptionally competent in English, particularly in the writing of English, and were looked up to as persons of superior education. They acted as interpreters in business deals and in contacts with officials, made translations, wrote letters, filled in forms and gave advice about the working of Australian institutions.

The role of these four individuals can best be described by the term "spokesman-advisor" (1). Partly at least due to their insight into the fact that the Displaced Persons did not constitute the sort of group which would respond to leadership, none of these four had tried to use his strategic qualifications to do more than gain the most ephemeral degree of respect and power; their power was, in fact, limited to the minor influence they exercised over the opinions of their fellow-immigrants. Already the function of these advisors-spokesmen is diminishing in importance as the Displaced Persons as a

(1) See p. 104.
whole become more competent in the language and more familiar with Australian institutions.

These four individuals had only the very much attenuated role of Lewin's "leader from the periphery": because they were more acceptable to the host society than were most immigrants, they were in the position to help the minority group, but were at the same time in a peripheral position in relation to the minority, for whom they often felt sympathy, but seldom respect. "Instead of having a group led by people who are proud of the group, who wish to stay in it and promote it, we see minority leaders who are lukewarm toward the group, who may, under a thin cover of loyalty, be fundamentally eager to leave the group." (1)

Mutual help extended beyond giving information and advice. Friends helped each other to find jobs, and performed sundry minor services. Four Displaced Persons building houses had been assisted by fellow-immigrants, the labour being paid for in cash or kind. There were several instances of friends lending each other mounts of £100 or more, without interest.

But often enough, one immigrant will demand more help, attention or consideration than another is

(1) Lewin, 1948, p.196.
willing to give; he will attempt to "exploit" the relationship. Exploitation, in this sense, is behaviour whereby an individual obtains goods, services or affection and consideration from another, without feeling himself obliged to reciprocate, while the other person regards such behaviour as an abuse of the relationship (1). Amongst the Goulburn Displaced Persons, this exploitation often took the form of trading on the common Displaced Person status, or on common nationality, "you are my countryman, so you should help me". Because these immigrants had little material wealth or social influence, only limited exploitation was possible; it took the form of borrowing money, of getting other people to pay for one's meals, to offer hospitality, to arrange introductions to Australians or to perform other sundry minor services. Not only was this behaviour itself disruptive of personal relations, but the knowledge that it was common made many people cautious about forming close ties with others: they were constantly wondering what their associates wanted out of them. This fear of being exploited provides at least

(1) The qualification that the one partner should regard the demands of the other as an abuse of the relationship is necessary, since a non-reciprocal relationship, far from being necessarily exploitative, is common between persons of different status in most societies.
part of the explanation for the lack of contact between the Displaced Persons and two European families who were established in the town before the war. One of these families is now very wealthy and the other comfortably off; fearing that, because of their prosperity, heavy demands might be made upon them by the newcomers, they have kept all contact at a minimum (1).

The social content of primary relations was more important than mutual helpfulness in that most friendship or clique activity was of a social or recreational nature, while the whole social life of the majority of Displaced Persons occurred within the context of their primary relationships with other immigrants. There were no acknowledged organisers of social life, but a few individuals played a more prominent part than others in arranging social activities. The sine qua non of assuming such a role seemed to be that one should have one's own home where one was free to entertain visitors. One family who would have liked to assume such a position was

(1) This fear of exploitation is only part of the explanation for the lack of contact between the Displaced Persons and these early arrivals; both families were Jews who had left Austria or Germany before the war to escape Nazi persecution; there were probably no more than two or three Jews among the Displaced Persons, most of whom were believed by these two families to have been well-indoctrinated with German anti-Semitism. On these grounds, then, one would not expect close relations to have developed.
prevented from doing so because their Australian landlady objected to visitors during the evening. Of two men who had become the foci of loose, informal cliques, one was a cheerful extrovert, somewhat willing to dominate others; the second was a nervous, insecure individual, anxious to have people around him all the time in order to reassure himself that he was liked and to stave off an uneasy loneliness.

It is a striking fact that this informal social life had very little of the stamp of the national culture of the participants, and in content was indeed only slightly distinguishable from the kind of social life common among Australians. Casual visiting, which often developed into a card game or drinking session, visiting hotels, the cinema, dance halls, sports events, etc., in the company of friends, going on trips outside the community, and home entertainment comprised the main social activities.

There was little organised effort to observe distinctively national occasions. If asked about this, the Displaced Persons answered, "How can we, away from our own country?", or "There are not enough of us in Goulburn to do that". A national day, an independence day, or the anniversary of some occasion of national importance (1),

(1) For example, some Baltic immigrants observed the anniversary of the mass arrests and deportations by the Soviet occupying forces on 13-14 June, 1941.
did in fact often become the occasion for a small party or an unpremeditated celebration, but many of these days went by unnoticed; on the other hand, most social gatherings occurred spontaneously, or on an occasion of some personal significance, such as a birthday, name-day or wedding anniversary, or in the course of entertaining visitors from another district. The traditional celebrations of Christmas and Easter were not usually observed, except in the most truncated form.

Two events within the past few years illustrate that the Goulburn immigrants, Displaced Persons and others, are not in any way organised to maintain their traditional cultures. In 1951, a Displaced Person who had become well-known as a singer was asked to arrange for the local Europeans to present some distinctive "item" for the annual Red Cross fete; he had to abandon the idea because he could not elicit the interest of other immigrants. In April 1954, the Goulburn Evening Post contained a news item on plans to elicit the cooperation of immigrants in the October Lilac Festival; "As a new feature, the Lilac Time committee has suggested an international night, when people of various nationalities ... can present a programme of events peculiar to their country of origin. With this in view, the committee invites the various groups to
discuss the possibility of displaying their national costumes in traditional dances and songs, and any presentation which might prove an attraction. There is a desire to welcome the efforts of New Australians during the festivities on a night which they can call their own, and during which they can delight the people of Goulburn in a novel way." (1) By June, the organisers of the Festival, having failed to attract the interest of any Europeans except the local Greek Community, had decided to abandon this plan, unless they could arrange for some European groups from Canberra to visit them for the occasion; this they were eventually able to do.

There were, nevertheless, distinctive features about the social life of the immigrants. Except where it was needed as a lingua franca, or when an Australian was included in the conversation, the language spoken was never English; it was either the individual's own language or a European lingua franca such as German or Russian. A great deal of emotional significance attached to music. Those subjects who were sophisticated in their tastes found a more or less adequate opportunity to indulge their love of music through radio broadcasts, record-playing, and attending the occasional concerts given in Goulburn. Those

(1) G.E.P., 1/4/54.
whose tastes were more parochial missed the music of their own countries deeply; they found much satisfaction in obtaining records of their national music from Sydney (1). But this interest in the music of their own countries was more a hobby than anything else; none of the subjects could be described as a serious student of the subject; the number of records in one's library was a more important source of prestige than one's musical knowledge. The significance of national music is that it provides one of the more readily accessible links with their past culture, and with an element of that culture which was familiar to them even though they left their own countries very young. But, as we have seen above, there were no organised groups for singing or traditional dancing.

Sometimes European food was featured at parties and on other relatively formal occasions, but, although appreciated, it was not felt to be essential; a woman prepared special national dishes as a gesture, not because the pressure of the group forced her to do so. The reasons why such expectations have not been built up are not hard to seek. Many of the women who are now housewives

(1) It would, however, be a mistake to interpret the very common practice of buying expensive radiograms as primarily a means of satisfying the immigrants' need to hear their own music; see p. 410.
left their own countries when they were still too young to have become competent cooks, and have not had the opportunity to acquire this art either in Europe or Australia. In addition, many of the women were still living, or had for a long time lived, in institutions such as the Hostel or Mental Hospital, where meals were provided and where cooking facilities were not available to them. While some women did regard Australian housewives as lazy, and related how their mothers would spend a whole day preparing a single dish, they nevertheless appreciated the ease with which Australian meals (as they know them) could be prepared, and were grateful enough to take advantage of this. The situation was, generally, that women who were doing their own cooking, using the kind of "continental" ingredients that could be obtained in the delicatessen, such as salami, sauerkraut and unsalted butter, made many everyday European dishes; but if they were entertaining, they rarely provided special national dishes, being more likely to serve a mixture of Australian and European food, or all Australian food, than all European food. The fact that many of the men were unmarried also made the preservation of national food habits less likely: they cooked the simplest and most accessible food, or ate in cafes; on visits to Sydney, they made a point of going to European restaurants, but
had become accustomed to eating Australian food as their daily fare.

Drinking habits have similarly changed. Nearly all the subjects drank tea, and some Nescafe as an alternative; very few bought ground coffee, partly because of the expense, partly because they were not accustomed to drinking pure coffee at home. Both the immigrants and the vendors of wine reported that the Europeans were much more inclined to drink sweet wines and liqueurs on arrival in Australia than they are now, although they still drank larger quantities of these than did Australians; spirits, and sometimes also beer, usually appeared in addition to the wines on any occasion when they were drinking together. It was much less common for them to drink what Australians would regard as distinctively European drinks, such as aqua vitae, bols or vodka.

In summary, then, we can say that the social life of the Displaced Persons contains a mixture of Australian and European features, that there appears to be very little group pressure towards the maintenance of national patterns, and that the distinctive features which remain are in very much attenuated form. The small concentration of persons in any single nationality, the dispersal of persons of different nationalities throughout different occupations
and places of residence and the large proportion of persons living outside family units, have all contributed to this attenuation, within a few years of arrival in Australia. Also important is the fact that there neither pre-existed in the community, nor have developed within recent years, any national associations; one would expect such associations to foster the development of intra-nationality primary group relationships, and to encourage the preservation of national cultural traditions. The small number of persons of any single nationality, combined with the diversity of nationalities in the Displaced Person group as a whole, act as a deterrent to the preservation of national culture, both because the formation of any sort of organised association becomes difficult and because relationships across national boundaries are very likely to develop. In groups consisting of persons of several different nationalities, highly distinctive national characteristics are not readily preserved; instead, common cultural features are maintained, or the participants together discover and perhaps adapt Australian patterns.

In Tables 22-26, the friendship relations among 40 Displaced Persons, 23 men and 17 women, are analysed. Briefly, this analysis shows that half the subjects chose friends only of the same nationality, and just over half
chose friends only of the same pre-migration status.

There was no significant difference between previously high and low status subjects in their tendency to choose friends of the same nationality, or same status (see Tables 22 and 23). One might have expected that high status subjects would be more likely to choose friends of different nationality because they would have to go outside their own national group to find associates of their own background; but this was not the case; of the nine friendship pairs in which the partners were of different nationality and in which high status persons were involved, three only were friendships between high status persons; of the remaining six, four involved a high status spokesman-advisor and a low status person who looked to this individual for help and support. That this leader-follower relationship is an important basis for inter-status friendships is confirmed by the fact that, of six friendships between persons of the same nationality but different status, four involved this hierarchical relationship.

Because of the fluctuation of clique membership and the short life of many cliques, precise data were difficult to secure. Information on 11 cliques,
containing 37 different members, is contained in Table 27 (1); three were homogeneous in nationality, three in industry and seven consisted of persons of the same status - five low and two high.

We may now combine the data on friendships and on cliques to discuss some general features of primary relations. Both friendships and cliques tended to be more homogeneous in status than in nationality, which is to be expected because of the diversity of nationalities represented among the subjects. Although international relationships were numerous, there was some suggestion of a cleavage between the Lithuanians, Poles and Russians (eastern Europeans), on the one hand, and all other immigrants on the other. This cleavage was not immediately apparent in the cliques, five of which contained members of both of these national blocs. But in the friendships, it was more obvious: although the chance of a subject forming a friendship outside his own bloc was only slightly less than the chance of a friendship within, only six of the 44 friendship pairs did in fact involve representatives from each bloc; or to put it differently, only 13 of the 40 subjects had

(1) See p. 544.
a friendship with an individual from the opposite bloc. Although there are numerous historical reasons why no great solidarity should exist within these two blocs, factors in the immediate situation help to explain such a tendency. The most important of these is probably pre-migration class status: the two blocs differ in the status of their members; only two of the 12 high status persons in the total sample were in the eastern bloc. But perhaps even more important than objective class differences were the relative statuses of different national groups as perceived by the subjects themselves: the Hungarians and Czechoslovaks, (and also the Estonians and Latvians, although these were few in number) regarded themselves as nationally superior to the allegedly backward and ill-educated Poles, Russians, and Yugoslavs (1). These over-all national judgments

(1) As we have already seen, see Table 1, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks and Baltic peoples have come in greater proportions from the white-collar and professional occupations than have the Displaced Persons from elsewhere. By other people, the Lithuanians were sometimes classed with what we have called the eastern bloc, and sometimes with other Baltic peoples.
mitigated against relationships even between persons of similar class status.

Because of the small number of subjects belonging to any one nationality, it is impossible to say whether people from certain countries were more likely to associate together than were others. What does seem clear, however, is that, despite the tendency for immigrants to choose their closest associates from among their fellow-nationals, the local conditions - a small total number of Displaced Persons, sharply differentiated from the rest of the community, diverse in nationality, and occupationally and residentially dispersed - favoured the formation of international friendships.

One further point concerning nationality and primary relations requires comment. Only two friendships occurred between persons of the same nationality, but of different status, in the same industry; these were the two pairs of friends involved in Clique 6; they represent the only instances of relationships of this kind. Moreover, in these two cases, the participants came to be employed in the same place because of a pre-existing friendship; there were no instances of persons of the same nationality but different status having originally formed a friendship while employed in the same
industry. A tentative explanation for this finding is as follows. Where persons of the same nationality are few, and are thrown together in their work, there is some expectation, on the part of both Australians and immigrants in general, that they will form friendships. Australians (or Britishers) in particular, having little understanding of class differences among the Displaced Persons, are likely to expect, even though they may not approve it, that immigrants of the same nationality will welcome one another as friends. This very expectation makes the high status immigrant anxious to dissociate himself from his lower status fellow-countryman, thus proclaiming that "not all of us Latvians are like X". Where immigrants are not working together, this expectation exerts less pressure; in addition, the friendship can probably stand the strain of more discrepancies between the two parties where they are not in continuous daily contact and where the friendship is not acted out in the more or less public work situation; the higher status immigrant is less likely to feel degraded or humiliated by association with a lower status compatriot, when this association is not known, or at least not obvious, to other people, such as Australian workmates or employer, whose respect he seeks.
Finally, in this discussion of the choice of friends within the Displaced Person group, it is necessary to comment on political factors. For reasons which have been pointed out in Chapter 2, I do not regard the data on political attitudes and ideologies as adequate, and we shall therefore make only brief and tentative comments, based as much on general knowledge as on the specific data with which we have just been concerned. In certain aspects, political and national factors are, of course, indistinguishable: antipathy between Czechoslovaks and Hungarians, for example, may be phrased in terms of the different degrees of support which they offered to the Nazi cause, or in terms of age-old disputes. At what we might call the sub-national level, too, political and socio-cultural issues are intertwined: for example, the political alignments of Serbs and Croats during the war have given additional significance to the traditional hostility of these groups. One might tentatively suggest that it is these intra-national cleavages that will have the most decisive effect on social relationships in this country: a Serb is more likely to form a friendship with a person of non-Yugoslav nationality than with a Croat, and vice versa; similarly with Czechs and Slovaks.
Both within and between national groups, considerable importance still attaches to the question of collaboration with the Germans during the war: Serb ex-Prisoners of War, Hungarians who emigrated in or after 1948, Polish forced labourers, and Czechoslovaks are especially likely to charge other Displaced Persons, particularly the Baltic peoples and the 1944-5 wave of Hungarian emigrants, with being German collaborators. It is impossible to be sure about subtle trends of this kind, but one has the impression that during the past few years, there has been an increasing readiness among the Displaced Persons to admit previously unacknowledged pro-German and/or pro-Nazi, sentiments. There are good reasons why this should be so: the general climate of public opinion in Australia itself, as elsewhere, has become more favourable towards Germany; the presence in the community of German immigrants who have been well received by Australians, and who, as a group, have much greater self-esteem than the Displaced Persons, has helped to make pro-German attitudes more socially acceptable; and finally, because, as the years go by, many anti-German Displaced Persons remember less acutely the sufferings caused by the Germans, they react less strongly than they once did to the expression of German sympathies.
It seems probable that, among most of the Displaced Persons, the strictly political, as against the politico-national, issues of their European background are no longer of decisive importance in determining social relationships, except for the minority of immigrants, often active in national associations, who have a strongly developed political consciousness. Amongst the remainder, there are many political opportunists - people who recognise that it is as inexpedient in their present circumstances to admit pro-German, or pro-Russian, views, as it once was to deny them. So long as the immigrant is not blatantly offensive in expressing his political ideas, he is accepted by many people with opposing views. Politics is thus a common topic of discussion in cliques and casual groups; wide differences in viewpoint, though they may cause arguments and quarrels, can be tolerated without disrupting social relationships altogether. We might note, however, that the common antipathy between pre-war and post-war immigrants of the same nationality is often expressed in political terms (1), the earlier immigrants often having

(1) The only national group which contributed both to the pre-war Jewish immigration and the post-war Displaced Person immigration was Hungary; in this case, the Jewish-Gentile and political issues are interwoven. See also Footnote
pro-Communist leanings (1).

Local conditions in Goulburn itself - diversity of nationalities, smallness of numbers and a common feeling of occupying an inferior position in the local community - have probably increased the probability of close association between persons of different political sympathies. Moreover, antipathies that were phrased in political terms were often clearly based, not on political, but on class differences.

To conclude this discussion of primary relations among the Goulburn Displaced Persons, it will be useful to describe briefly the history of two cliques. None of the eleven cliques was highly integrated, but Clique 8 was better integrated than most of the others. Of the four members of the group, the two Hungarians were a married couple; the Danish woman and the Slovak man intended being married when the woman had obtained her divorce from her first husband. There was a close friendship between the two women, and a less intense friendship between the Slovak

(1) Referring to the split in national associations, Murphy, 1952, p. 193, has pointed out that the pre-war immigrants "feel some attachment to the present governments of their country, both because they are the legal government and because they have no illusions about the pre-Communist ones."
man and the Hungarian woman, and between the two men; a slight antagonism between the Danish woman and the Hungarian man was kept well below the surface. All four worked and lived at the Hostel; they often ate together, isolated from the other Hostel workers; they spent a good deal of their evening leisure time talking and listening to music together; occasionally they would all attend the pictures or a concert, or go for a drive in the car belonging to the Hungarian couple. They shared a common interest in music and collecting records. The Slovak man tended to participate in clique activities less than the other three. The activities of the group did not follow any regular pattern, and were usually not planned in advance. There was some very slight differentiation of roles within the clique; the Hungarian woman, a good-natured, energetic and intelligent person, initiated action more than any of the other three, but it was her husband, a man much older than the others, who, in effect, exercised the greatest control; using his authority as head of the family to veto or modify activities proposed by his wife, he indirectly influenced group activities to a great extent. Although he was not recognised as a clique leader, both his wife and the other two deferred to him, because of his greater age, his education; and the respect accorded him in the Hostel as a whole. All four individuals
participated much more with each other than with any outsider, although the Slovak also belonged to another clique. At various times, each of them rejected offers of friendship from other Europeans and from Australians. They were all of high status, regarding themselves as socially superior to the remaining Hostel staff, and being accorded, though sometimes reluctantly, prestige by both staff and British residents. The other European employees were a little flattered on the rare occasions when they were invited to join this group; and, on the other hand, these four sometimes felt that it was a sacrifice to accept an invitation from the other, lower status, Hostel employees. Each of them individually was often asked for advice and help by the other members of the staff, but it could not be said that they formed a leading clique within the Hostel; their clique activities were directed towards their own entertainment and satisfaction and not towards the control of Hostel affairs.

The clique had come into being when the Dehish woman's marriage was breaking up, and had been consolidated when her husband finally left the Hostel early in 1953. But after the middle of the year, outside forces began to disrupt the integration of the group. Expecting that the Hostel would soon close, these four, like most of the other
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staff, were planning to move away from Goulburn and find other jobs. While these plans were often the subject of discussion in the clique, they were essentially individual projects; the possibility that the four members of the group would move elsewhere together was never seriously considered. Up to this time, matters which were of greatest day-to-day interest to each of them - their jobs, their relations with management, the residents and the other staff - they held in common; but now, immediate future plans were claiming the greatest attention, and this interest they did not hold in common. In addition, they were all unsettled by the uncertainty of the future.

At this time, the Hungarian couple began to form a new clique with the British Manager of the Hostel and his wife. The Slovak was transferred to another Hostel, and the Danish woman, feeling somewhat rejected by the Hungarians because of their new relationships, resumed a contact with an Australian family in the town, to whose invitations she had not previously responded. Shortly afterwards, the Danish woman and the Hungarians were transferred to other Hostels.

The history of this clique has been given in some detail to illustrate the processes by which such a group may develop, flourish and then disintegrate. It
was the support of this primary group that gave the Danish woman the confidence necessary to break up her marriage in the first place. These, her only close friends in Australia, encouraged her to end what seemed to them an incompatible relationship. Once the Danish woman's husband left the Hostel, it was natural that a clique should develop among these four. The group was held together essentially by their similar background, their common interests as members of the Hostel staff, and their common conception of themselves as socially superior to their fellow-workers; when other interests superseded these in importance, the clique began to disintegrate, the final stage of this process being brought about by the removal of one member, and the temporary incorporation of the remaining three members into two other cliques. It is a provocative fact that, objectively, the Hungarians and the Dane could have established friendships with the British and Australian family, respectively, at any time throughout the year: they were already acquainted, and the Britishers and Australians were friendly towards them; but it was not until the clique was already becoming less integrated that these three intensified their contacts with these outsiders; once this had been done, the original clique disintegrated further.
Clique 1 differed markedly from the group that has just been described. Its core consisted of a Lithuanian and a Russian. The Lithuanian built himself a garage, married, then invited the Russian and his de facto wife to share the accommodation. Because they had quite comfortable quarters in which to entertain visitors, and because the Lithuanian in particular, over-anxious to be accepted, was most hospitable, they became the focus of a loose clique of men who would call informally at the house, stay to talk, drink and sometimes play cards, or take the Lithuanian or the Russian off to the hotel for a drink. In addition to the five members noted in the table above, other peripheral members drifted intermittently in and out of the clique activities. Unlike Clique 8, the structure of this group was such that peripheral members could readily be lost, and others incorporated, without the structure of the clique itself being greatly altered. The two wives were usually in the background when the group gathered together, but sometimes they would have a party when the regular group was augmented by additional men, and by women.

Except for these occasional parties, the activities of the clique were highly informal, and not regularised in any way: they just happened spontaneously. His strategic position as owner of the house permitted the Lithuanian to
exercise some influence over the clique activities, but there did not appear to be any recognised leader in the group. One formed the impression that the group did not come together often enough for much differentiation of roles to have developed, but since I could not understand the conversation amongst the group, it is difficult to be sure of this.

It was not difficult, however, to ascertain the functions which the group fulfilled. All the members were of low pre-immigration status; had had little education, and had acquired only a poor command of English. They felt very much rejected by Australian society, and had mostly a negative orientation towards this country. The clique was a haven where they were safe from the fear of embarrassment and humiliation which made them uncomfortable with most Australians. They used the group to fill in their leisure time, and to express, clarify and discuss their ideas, particularly their ideas on the position of immigrants in this country, the attitude of Australians towards them, and the past and future of their European homelands; the grievances and disappointments which they could not, or dared not, express elsewhere they gave vent to here. Acceptance in this clique made it easier for them to tolerate rejection by the Australian community.
3. Primary Relations of Men and Women Compared

There was no significant difference between men and women in their tendencies to choose friends of the same or different industries, statuses, or nationalities (1). Among the 17 women and 23 men whose relations with other Displaced Persons were considered above, the average number of friendships for the women was 1.8 and for the men 2.5. But among the 46 persons (26 men and 20 women) for whom data on relations with Australians were obtained, the women showed a slightly greater tendency than the men to have formed primary relations with Australians: 7 women and 6 of the men having such relations.

What these figures cannot show is that the women in general engaged in less social activity than the men, and were less mobile throughout the community: they had less access to transport than the men, many of whom owned motor bikes which allowed them to call informally on their friends all over the city. The women rarely drank in

(1) See Tables 24-26, p.538-539.
had no substitute for the casual social life which the hotels provided for many men. Nearly all the women were employed, and also had some domestic responsibilities, with the result that their freedom to engage in social life was more limited than that of the men.

But the concept of the married woman's role also served to limit the women's activities. Both men and women, of diverse nationalities, education and status, thought that a woman's, and in particular a married woman's, social freedom should be more restricted than a man's. This attitude was indicated by verbal statements, by the commonly observed behaviour of the husband making his own arrangements for social contacts, while strongly resenting any suggestion that his wife should do likewise, and in particular by repeated comparisons between the standards which immigrants expect of their womenfolk and the conduct tolerated by Australians. Australian women were continuously criticised for neglecting their homes and families in favour of their own entertainment, and for showing too much interest in other men after marriage. The woman who wanted entertainment outside the home and was interested in social contacts with other men after marriage was regarded as immoral, and the husband who allowed her such freedom was a fool. Because there were so few unmarried Displaced Person women in the community, it was more difficult to find out the standards
which would apply to them, but comments on my own apparent complete independence of behaviour suggested what these standards might be. It was clear that many of the immigrants felt it improper for me to have the seemingly complete freedom of behaviour permitted by the fact that I had no husband nor family to defer to, owned a car, and lived in quarters of my own. It was obviously a source of wonderment to them that no-one, in particular no member of my family, took it upon themselves to restrict my freedom in any way, and it was often hinted, if not stated outright, that I would soon be put in my place if I married.

Whether such attitudes towards the woman's place in social life had already begun to cause conflicts in the pre-immigration period is not known, but certainly the experience of the subjects since coming to Australia had caused the men's and women's concepts of the woman's role to diverge a great deal, and conflict over this issue is common. The men continued to expect their womenfolk to be above all home-makers; they regarded the woman's participation in the economy outside the home as a temporary necessity brought about by their immigrant status, and did not expect this to affect the essential character of the woman's social relations. On the other hand, although there were no aggressively emancipated women among the subjects, many of the women were beginning to feel that
there was some injustice in these restrictions, and were showing themselves less willing to accept their traditional role. Their financial independence, the fact that in the Australian economy they function as individual economic units, not as family members, and their growing familiarity with the social freedom of Australian women, were all contributing to this change in attitude. Certainly not all the women were being affected in this way by these experiences: indeed some women were more "conservative" in this sense than many men. Conflict over the woman's role usually took the form of quarrels and arguments; the prominence of insinuations or accusations about the woman's association with other men, in such quarrels, suggests that the strong emotions surrounding this question of the woman's role were related to the fear of losing the woman, a fear which was especially poignant to the man because of his loneliness and insecurity, and especially realistic because of the low ratio of women to men among the immigrants, and the large number of irregular unions. (1).

(1) One might also suggest that there is a relationship between the common condemnation of Australian women for their immorality and the high rate of promiscuity and irregular unions among the immigrants themselves; shame and hostility are displaced from the in-group to the out-group.
4. Primary Relations With Australians in Goulburn

Before examining primary relations between Australians and immigrants in Goulburn, it will be useful to describe briefly the primary relations within the Australian community itself. No precise data are available, but the broad picture is clear enough. A large section of the community has been born and bred in the town or its environs, and is bound by kinship ties to a network of families; as the individual grows up, he enters into primary relations with a considerable number of his kin. In this community, too, neighbours are expected to be friendly to one another, and neighbouring often develops into a full primary relationship. Another important basis for the development of primary relations is provided by the numerous associations which have been discussed in Chapter 6. And finally, fellow-workers often become close friends; this is particularly common in large organisations whose employees are mobile throughout the State, which have a low labour turnover, and a strong sense of their own identity as a group; the principal examples of such organisations in Goulburn are the Department of Railways, and the Department of Education. Newcomers are especially likely to form their primary relationships through associational and work contacts.

The following table shows the number of subjects who had, and had not, primary relations with Australians in
Goulburn. The Displaced Persons to whom this table refers include the forty with whom we have been concerned in the preceding section, and an additional six (three men and three women) who either had primary relations with Australians only, or no primary relations at all and who were therefore not considered in the discussion of primary relations among immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Relations with Australians</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Primary Relations with Australians</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than a third of the subjects had some primary relations with Australians. Even this statement gives a somewhat exaggerated picture of the extent of such relations; of the thirteen subjects who had established primary relations with Australians, three were married to Australians and maintained almost no contact with the immigrant group; four had one Australian friend, but interacted predominantly with other Displaced Persons; three others were in close contact with several Australians, but had not been received into Australian homes; and the last
three had deliberately avoided associations with fellow-immigrants in order to establish themselves in the Australian community. Among the 46, the only persons who regularly took part in the home life of an Australian family were one among these last three, and one of the three who were married to Australians.

Both Europeans and Australians set limits to their relationships, each group in its own way. Goulburn society is organised into solidary cliques, into which newcomers only slowly gain acceptance. In this subtle process, the newcomer is at first admitted to certain kinds of activities: e.g. he is invited to some more or less formal occasion, such as an afternoon tea, a dinner or a party, or the local resident makes a point of calling on him informally and encourages the newcomer to do the same. In time, spontaneous arrangements to go for a picnic or to attend some public event together are made without ceremony. It is only when the relationship has become really intimate that the newcomer is invited to participate in personal, family celebrations like birthdays, wedding anniversaries, christenings and weddings, (except where these events are made the occasion for a large and indiscriminate gathering). The old resident feels that his friends of long standing are the appropriate persons to be invited on such occasions.

In this respect, the immigrants are treated much like newly arrived Australians. Except for those married to
Australians, none of the immigrants encountered during this survey had reached the stage of being invited to participate in the most intimate and meaningful family gatherings. But the immigrants themselves had a very different attitude to their primary relations with the local people. Although they made exceptions of certain Australians whose respect they did not greatly value, most Europeans did not encourage Australians to join them in activities which they believed would be harmful to their prestige: for example, a boisterous drinking party was not the kind of occasion at which they liked Australians to be present. But, on the other hand, they were anxious for their Australian friends to join them in the celebration of important occasions, such as birthdays and weddings and christenings: in contrast to the local people, they would sometimes invite a surprised Australian, almost a total stranger, to such functions. This behaviour can be explained, in the first place, by the fact that few immigrants have in this country the kind of long-established primary contacts which would form the counterpart to the exclusive group with whom the local resident shares such celebrations; whomever they invite - European or Australian - is a recent acquaintance. In the second place, the motivation behind such behaviour is to gain prestige by proving to themselves, their fellow-immigrants and the local community, that they are on close personal terms with Australians. Just
as the Australian may have a "pet immigrant" whom he produces on appropriate occasions as an interesting find, or a tangible proof that he is doing his duty by the newcomers, so the immigrant may have a "pet Australian" whom he brings forth to show that he is himself accepted by the host society, and is hence superior to other foreigners.

An examination of the means by which Displaced Persons establish primary relations with Australians will throw some light on the structure of these relations and on the factors promoting and discouraging them. It might be expected that subjects working in organisations where there were comparatively large concentrations of immigrants, would be less likely to make Australian friends than would subjects who worked mainly amongst Australians. In order to determine whether this was the case, the 28 subjects employed in the Hostel, Mental Hospital and the Railways were compared with the 16 subjects employed elsewhere (two women were not in employment); a statistically significant difference was found between the two categories of subjects, those employed in these three institutions being much less inclined to have primary relations with Australians (1).

(1) See Table 28, p. 142.
Of the 28 subjects in these three places of employment, the 13 who lived in showed about the same tendency to form primary relations with Australians as did the 15 in private accommodation. The female employees in residence at the Hospital and the male employees living in the Railway barracks had some opportunity to make contact with Australians living in the same quarters, but no Australians were in residence at the Hostel, and of all the European Hostel staff, including non-Displaced Persons, the only people who had gained an entree to the local community were two Greeks, who had been accepted by the established Greek community in Goulburn.

The Displaced Persons who remain in institutions such as the Railways, Mental Hospital and Hostel, once they have been released from contract, are a selected class: either such a place of employment is a haven protecting them from the necessity to fit into the larger community, or it is a temporary expedient, convenient for economic reasons. The people who are seeking incorporation into Australian society do not remain long in such institutions. For subjects living at the Hostel, Mental Hospital and Railway barracks, all on the outskirts of the town, distance and the inadequacy of the transport services were not only real barriers, but also provided an acceptable justification for inactivity. It was also important that these immigrants had
far less of the routine service relations with Australians than did those living privately; neither did they have Australian neighbours, other than their workmates, with whom primary contacts might be established. It is worth noting that their Australian fellow-workers at the Hospital and the Railways were themselves rather outsiders to the local community; the Railway employees living in the barracks were not likely to have been in Goulburn long and did not usually have their families there; many of the nurses at the Hospital were not local women, and those in residence tended to have their life centred in the Hospital, and took little part in the communal life of the city. A final barrier to establishing primary relations with Australians was the physical discomfort and inconvenience of living quarters, which made entertaining difficult.

Work contacts are the most common and stable kind of relations which the Displaced Persons have with Australians. Yet occupational propinquity provided no guarantee that primary relations would develop: of 33 subjects working among Australians, only five had formed a primary relation with an Australian fellow-worker.

We may now inquire how far the subjects living in private accommodation made close contacts with Australian neighbours. No primary relations between a Displaced Person and an Australian neighbour were recorded. The high rate of mobility of the Displaced Persons, most of whom had
had several different residences in Goulburn, at least partly accounted for the fact that stable relations with Australian neighbours had not developed. During a return visit to Goulburn in May 1954, it was found that some of the Displaced Persons living in houses of their own were beginning to establish friendly relations with their neighbours. But residential propinquity, like other kinds of propinquity, can aggravate tensions rather than consolidating bonds; in three recorded instances of tension with Australian neighbours, the immigrant families had withdrawn, their pride hurt, after some incident which they interpreted as a slight or unwarranted interference; in the three cases, the failure to establish friendly relations with their Australian neighbours confirmed the subjects in their conviction that Australians in general were hostile towards them.

As previously indicated, very few immigrants belonged to local voluntary associations. None of the 13 persons with Australian friends had formed these relationships through associational contacts. In the light of the fact that the Good Neighbour Committee and New Settlers League had been operating in the community for three years with the specific aim of encouraging the members of local associations to form friendships with immigrants, this is an interesting finding.
One final source of making primary contacts is casual meetings, in shops, cafes, hotels, parks, buses, at dances and the cinema, and in the street. Such casual meetings do not often develop into primary relations, as here defined, among Australians; despite the fact that the Australians pride themselves on their informality and hospitality, most of them are perhaps too cautious or suspicious to feel that this is a proper way to initiate a friendship; an individual should be located in an accepted position in the social structure before one associates closely with him, and in casual meetings of this kind, the background needed for "placing" the other person is lacking, although this deficiency may of course be repaired on further acquaintance (1). The behaviour of the immigrants, and the Australians' behaviour towards them, deviated from this accepted pattern. Not only did the immigrants often make friends among themselves through casual meetings, but they also sometimes established relations with Australians in this way. In four recorded instances, the Australians concerned had become aware of the immigrants qua immigrants, had struck up a conversation, and invited them home. There is little doubt that these immigrants drew the sympathy of

(1) Australians certainly vary among themselves in this respect: women, and persons of high status, are probably less favourably inclined to the formation of relationships through such casual contacts, than are men or persons of low status, respectively.
the local people because they were obviously having language
difficulties, or appeared lonely, or had no home life; 
certainly none of these Australians was in the habit of 
asking casual acquaintances to his home in this way. It 
is also worth noting that all four of these relationships 
had flourished briefly but faded out before or during the 
course of the research work. The abortiveness of many 
relations with Australians will be considered later; at the 
moment it is important to note that some Australians treat 
immigrants differently from their own people in this matter, 
that the pattern which is regarded as appropriate enough for 
immigrants is considered a lower-status, not very respectable, 
pattern among the Australians themselves, and that the 
relationship usually places the Australian in the dominant 
position, since, in such contacts, he is normally the one 
who follows up the casual meeting by issuing an invitation 
to the immigrant. The only way in which the immigrant can 
extend his primary relations — kin ties is, of course, 
by marrying an Australian; of three persons (two men and one 
woman), among the 46 married to Australians, only one seemed 
to have established close primary relations with the spouse's 
kin; this man's wife belonged to a large kin group with a 
strong sense of family solidarity, and he had been completely 
accepted into that group. The other two cases were unstable 
marrriages, in which the European partner seemed to be
deliberately avoiding close relations with the spouse's relatives.

One might expect that the range of an individual's primary relations might be extended through existing relations, by a cumulative process: that, in other words, the more Australians an immigrant associated with, the more opportunities he would have of meeting and becoming friendly with others. Among the Goulburn Displaced Persons, there was, however, no such simple expansion of relationships (1). Of the 13 persons who had primary relations with Australians, only two had extended these relations existing ones; one of these was the man, referred to above, who had become accepted into his Australian wife's kin group; the other had been introduced by one Australian business man to another business woman, with whom he had become friendly. While cases of the expansion of primary contacts in this way may well be more common than the present sample suggests, certain clearly discernible barriers make such expansion difficult. The most important barrier is that Australians do not treat their immigrant associates in the same way as they do newly-made Australian acquaintances. If a local resident has made friends with a newcomer, he feels it incumbent on him to introduce the

(1) Murphy, 1952, p. 195, has commented briefly on the same point, "there was no deepening of the contact between Displaced Persons and Australians or extension through it into other contacts".
newcomer to other local people. It is true that he often has some hesitation about asking a newarrival to join a gathering of locals whose parochial conversation the newcomer could take no part in, and it is equally true that newcomers may for months leave such gatherings with the oppressive feeling that they are very much outsiders and will never be anything else; but usually this feeling disappears, with increasing knowledge, familiarity and self-confidence. The Australian host does not treat his immigrant friends in quite the same way; if he is entertaining them more or less formally, i.e. on invitation, he either asks one or two specially selected friends whom he feels will help him through what he expects to be a "difficult" occasion. The Australian believes that he is thus avoiding embarrassment to the Europeans, whom he expects will feel more comfortable and at home if other strangers are not present. He also feels that it is not quite fair to his Australian friends to ask them to help him entertain Europeans (the way in which he usually perceives the situation), when he knows that they would much prefer to visit him in more familiar relaxed circumstances. He may also feel that, while he can take upon himself the responsibility to "help" and "take an interest in" immigrants, he has no right to foist his good intentions upon his Australian friends.

Of the thirteen subjects who had formed primary
relations with Australians, only three had made contact
with Australians above working class status in the community.
These three were exceptional in their almost perfect command
of English, their educational level, and the ease with which
they followed the outward forms of middle class etiquette
and interpersonal behaviour.

It seems clear that here, as elsewhere in the
relations between Europeans and Australians, a selective
process is in operation: Australians of diverse backgrounds
are impressed by immigrants who speak English well, and who
have a good address and appearance; conscious of the claims
to cultural superiority commonly made by European observers
and visitors long before the present migrant influx,
Australians may be quickly overawed by Europeans who appear
to be persons of education and experience, who enjoy positions
of prestige in their own countries. The more "presentable"
is an immigrant - in terms of speech, dress, bearing and
ability to follow Australian patterns of etiquette, the
more likely is he to have the opportunity of personal
contact with Australians, and hence of forming primary re-
lations with them. No direct causal sequence is implied:
it is certain that immigrants with some slight initial
advantage have often improved themselves, sometimes quite
deliberately, through the association with Australians
which this original advantage facilitated, and have thus
become more "presentable". Other Australians are especially
impressed by indications that an immigrant has worked in the underground, escaped from a concentration camp, or suffered hardships with the lost cause of some guerrilla band. Since the very mystery which shrouds the background of the immigrant can be an attraction, an Australian often obtains some vicarious prestige within his own circle through his association with an "interesting" European.

If Australians choose the kind of immigrants with whom they wish to associate, so also do the immigrants respond selectively to offers of friendship from different Australians, or attempt to cultivate some Australians and not others. Some of the subjects, for example, had rejected approaches from Australians whom they believed to be of low social status. It is necessary here to distinguish between the status consciousness of some formerly high-status Europeans and the feeling common among immigrants of all backgrounds that they have no opportunity to meet any but the lowest class Australians. A male immigrant from one of the Baltic countries put it like this, "the only people whom we meet are the 'dark people' the people who are ignorant and without education. Where would we meet anyone else? Only such people as these work in the kind of jobs we have. It is these people who bet, drink and gamble, who go out with other people's wives, and who are jealous of the New Australians". Sensitivity about their
own low status lies behind this concern over the status of the Australians with whom they associate. This sensitivity makes some immigrants, and not only those of former high status, cautious about offers of friendship from low status Australians. They fear that such association will jeopardise their own chances of establishing themselves as respected members of the community. They may also be on the watch for exploitation on the part of Australians. It is common for the members of a host society to exploit a minority in social, as well as economic relations (1).

One kind of social exploitation has already been indicated above: an Australian may cultivate the friendship of a European because of his curiosity value - a situation which the immigrant quickly recognises, and either resents, or turns to his own advantage. A different kind of exploitation occurs where the Australian makes use of a European social group to indulge in the kind of behaviour which is not encouraged, or even perhaps tabooed, among his usual associates. For example, an Australian may join a drinking

(1) The sexual exploitation of immigrant women by Australian men does not appear to occur widely, and is not greatly feared by the immigrants themselves, although it may have been something of an issue in the early years of the I.R.C. scheme when wives living in the Holding Centres, separated from their husbands, sometimes formed liaisons with the Australian or British staff. The reasons why this question is no longer an issue are presumably that there is no shortage of women among Australians, while amongst the immigrants the proportion of women is small; the women can therefore choose their companions from a large number of European males, especially attentive because they have little access to Australian women.
or gambling session with Europeans when he would not engage in these activities with the group in which he normally moves; or a married man may take his mistress to visit some European acquaintances for the evening when he would not think of paying a similar call on his Australian friends (1).

Because of their sensitivity to any sign of their inferior status, and hence to any form of exploitation, immigrants may sometimes reject overtures which they do not regard as genuine offers of friendship.

Europeans who have come from families of high status in their own country, or who wish to create the impression that they have done so, are likely to feel especially strongly their lack of opportunities to mix with people "of their own kind" in Australia. It is not uncommon for such immigrants to say, "No, I have no friends among the people I work with; I wouldn't want to have; they're not my kind". The Australians, for their part, feel that the immigrants should show their appreciation for being in this country, and a proper humility by gratefully accepting any offer of friendship made to them. One intelligent young

(1) It is common for an inferior minority group to secure the monopoly of tabooed activities, such as gambling, prostitution and the sale of illicit liquor. Among the Displaced Persons in Goulburn, only the kind of sporadic and unorganised incidents occur as are referred to in the text; gambling is, however, largely organised and controlled by the Greek community.
Hungarian neatly expressed the immigrant's situation in his account of the following incident:

"I was invited to the home of an Australian family; I didn't want to go because they were very poor class people, and I had nothing in common with them, and I knew that they did not behave properly and that I would not enjoy myself at all; but I did not refuse, because I thought, 'well, I am a foreigner in this country, and it wouldn't look good if I didn't go'; so I went, and I was very uncomfortable all the time."

It was not only on the basis of class status that the subjects selected the Australians with whom to associate. Some of them had, at various times, set out to win the sympathy or interest of a variety of local people whom they believed could be useful to them — employers, shopkeepers, and influential citizens of various kinds. The less subtle of the subjects adopted a humble, ingratiating manner to achieve this end; they would make presents and offer their services with such obvious intention that no-one could fail to recognise their motives. The more sophisticated used flattery, asked advice and listened gravely to opinions, in their attempt to secure an Australian "patron".

Often enough, in the relations between the members of an inferior minority and a dominant majority, a pattern of submissive, overt or behavioural conformity on the part of the minority members develops; the "white man's nigger" among the American Negroes is an example of this kind
of adaptation (1); The conformity is only external, "with the tongue in the cheek" so to speak. No such institutionalised patterns had developed between immigrants and Australians in Goulburn; Australians were, as a rule, quick to recognise the motives behind such obvious conformity, failed to respond, and the relationship did not persist. Nevertheless, a number of the immigrants had been involved in such relationships for a brief period at some time since they had been in Goulburn. Their attitude was, in some cases, frankly exploitative; they argued that, since, through no fault of their own, they were in the underprivileged position, it was legitimate for them to get what they could out of the Australians who, through no virtue of their own, had everything (2).

---

(1) See, e.g., Myrdal, 1944, p. 682. Among the Negro community, the motives of the "white man's nigger" are "assumed to be the selfish ones of attempting to benefit by playing up to the whites. His crime is... that he submits to excessive subservience and that he takes orders and carries them out against the interests of his own caste... To the white man he is a 'good' Negro, continuing the cherished tradition from slavery. He puts the white man into his 'natural' aristocratic role and becomes rewarded with condescending benevolence".

(2) The prevalence of this same attitude has been remarked by observers of Displaced Persons in Europe. See, e.g., Hulme, 1953, p. 71., quoting a doctor in the UNRRA Team at Wildflecken, "They are all professional DP's by now... we've welfared them into a permanent state of the gimmes". But the author herself goes on to show that this easy generalisation could not be applied to all the Displaced Persons.
Often not clearly distinguishable from the deliberate opportunism which we have called exploitation was the more unconscious demand for consideration, attention and affection. The underlying attitude here seemed to be similar to that note by Sterba in her study of Jewish displaced children in the U.S. (1), the attitude that one has a right to special consideration because of this past sufferings, that one's exceptional position merits exceptional assistance and interest. In several instances recorded in the present study, the immigrant became emotionally dependent on an Australian "patron". One local woman commented, at a time when she was trying to draw out of a relationship of this kind, "I resent 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".

As we have seen previously, there has been no orderly and even process whereby the Displaced Persons have become incorporated into the organised social life of the community; similarly, primary relations with Australians have followed no regular pattern of gradual expansion and intensification with time. Offers of friendship have failed to develop; disappointed and mistrustful after one or two experiences which they regard as failures, some immigrants have

(1) Sterba, 1949.
withdrawn into themselves or their immigrant group. Some of the reasons why close relations with Australians should often prove abortive have already been suggested in the discussion of primary relations among the immigrants themselves, and in the immediately preceding pages: namely, the difficulty experienced by many immigrants in maintaining any kind of close relationships because of their high level of anxiety and their insecurity; their status-consciousness and their sensitivity to being patronised, insulted, or exploited; the Australians' perception of the immigrants as objects of curiosity, or under-privileged persons to whom they owe a duty. We shall now examine the Australians' perception of the situation in more detail, and go on to suggest additional reasons why relations with Australians are as tenuous as they are.

In the course of the research, I often had to explain to Australians who I was and what I was doing; the spontaneous response to these explanations was usually a defensive one. Whatever explanation was given, the Australian would usually react as though some criticism of his behaviour or attitudes was implied; he would proceed to enumerate the many reasons why it was difficult to "help" immigrants, but would often enough claim that he felt "guilty" for not having taken a greater interest in them. From such reactions, and from numerous discussions about the immigrant
question in general, it became clear that many Australians felt that they had some obligation towards newcomers, and that this obligation was not being fulfilled. One might suggest that the immigrants are a source of discomfort and guilt feelings, and hence provoke an uneasy irritation, if not antagonism, partly because they present a very immediate reminder of distress, misery and, homelessness - a reminder of the kind of sufferings and failures which few people can afford to keep continually and clearly at the surface of their consciousness.

From these attitudes on the part of Australians, certain patterns of relations with immigrants followed: the Australian would make one effort to show his goodwill towards some immigrants, and, satisfied that he had done his duty for the time being, would wait some considerable time before making further contact; the immigrants, for their part, having interpreted the original overture as the beginning of a genuine friendship, were often disappointed or embittered when they did not receive the further attention which they expected. In these situations, relationships became strained because the immigrants and the Australians perceived the situation differently. From the Australians' attitude, it also followed that they were highly sensitive to any signs
of indifference or ingratitude on the part of the immigrants; rationalising, they were quick to justify their own dilatoriness by the lack of appreciation on the part of the people whom they felt they should help. Probably the most frequent comment made by Australians on the incorporation of immigrants, both British and European, into the social life of the community was, "they don't want our hospitality; they prefer to keep to themselves".

Another reason for the abortiveness of relations between Australians and immigrants is that, with the best will in the world on both sides, the initial social interaction is likely to be uncomfortable for everyone. Whether the occasion is a formal or informal one, the European is often uncertain about how he should behave; how he should dress, when he should arrive, whether he should take a gift for his hostess, and if so what sort of gift, whether he should contribute something to drink to a party, what he should serve to eat and drink if he himself is entertaining, what subjects he should and should not talk about, whether he should address fellow-guests by their Christian or surnames, what time he should leave his host's house, etc. etc. Any one of these and numerous other behaviour patterns can cause tension within the immigrant, and awkwardness in his relations with Australians. If the contacts are maintained, these differences become far less troublesome, partly because the
immigrant learns the behaviour patterns expected by the Australians, partly because both sides come to accept the differences, to speak about them openly, perhaps to joke about them, and no longer to be embarrassed by them. We might suggest that cultural differences are not necessarily a barrier against the establishing of close personal relations, and that these differences can even strengthen the relationship by providing a unique bond between the parties: the common goal of introducing the newcomer smoothly to the behaviour patterns of the host community. Such a development is not, however, likely to occur when the behaviour patterns of either party are negatively evaluated by the other; if the immigrant thinks that the Australian with whom he is associating does not know "the right way to behave", he will hold himself aloof from any acceptance of differences which might imply that he regards the Australian's behaviour as correct; similarly, if the Australian identifies the immigrant's behaviour with non-respectable behaviour in his own society, he has to overcome emotional resistance before he can accept these traits and, without embarrassment or irritation, help the immigrant to learn the new behaviour patterns.

In summary, the failure of the Displaced Persons to develop primary relations with Australians is due to the insecurity and anxiety which make it difficult for them to
maintain affective ties of any kind, and to their unaccepted and unofficial inferior status in the community. In close personal relations, their inequality with Australians becomes apparent: it is usually the Australian who has the material equipment - a home, privacy and financial means - to initiate social contacts with the immigrant, while the latter is more likely to be dependent on the Australian's hospitality. If the relationship develops, it is to the Australian that most of the obligations fall, while the immigrant enjoys an unequal share of the privileges; until the immigrants are more thoroughly established, this inequality is inevitable, since it is the Australians - even though they are not old residents, nor influential members of the community - who are in the position to perform far more services for the immigrants than the immigrants can return. The fact that relationships between immigrants and Australians have not been stabilised and regularised means that both sides are highly conscious of any signs of insincerity or exploitation on the part of the other; and this very sensitivity further jeopardises the relationship. The crucial aspect of the situation is that these Displaced Persons, far from accepting their inferior status, resent it strongly, while the Australians, though officially welcoming the immigrants as equals, in practice do virtually nothing to incorporate them into the social life of the community on an equal footing. Neither the immigrants'
expectations nor the Australians' ideals fit the actual situation, and the awareness of these discrepancies places a strain on all close relations between the members of the two groups (1).

5. Primary Relations Outside Goulburn

Information on the relationships of the subjects with people outside Goulburn is weak for two reasons; the immigrant's own perception of these relations was often more uncertain than his perception of relations within the community, and there was no opportunity to check on the information given. In most cases it seemed that the informant could give only a vague or inconsistent picture of his relations with people outside Goulburn because these relations were in a state of flux. For example, one subject claimed that he had old friends whom he visited in Sydney; after several interviews, it emerged that these friends had been much more successful financially than himself, that he was beginning to feel embarrassed and unsure of himself when

(1) Murphy, 1952, p. 195, has also commented on the failure of the Displaced Persons to make personal contact with Australians, "The more balanced D.P. in Australia quickly made similar approaches (to those made by Displaced Persons in other countries)... through work-mates, church contacts, and, if they had found a room, through their neighbours. They joined sports clubs, went drinking, attended dances and functions, got invited home and invited others in turn. Yet as every Displaced Person I spoke to testified, this rarely produced more than a superficial response. After a couple of invitations, duty seemed to have been fulfilled, and although relations remained perfectly cordial there was no deepening of the contact or extension through it into other contacts".
he visited them, and that the friendship, as a result, was rapidly being attenuated.

Some general observations on the range of relationships outside the community can, however, be made. For the present purposes, the villages and towns in the immediate vicinity of Goulburn (e.g. Taralga, Marulan) are regarded as being within the Goulburn district. There is no necessity for precise delimitation of the boundaries of the district, for relationships occurred either with people living at a distance of 20-30 miles, and well within the Goulburn service area, or with friends in more distant places, such as Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Newcastle and Cooma. Of 56 Displaced Persons for whom data were obtained, only 10 made regular visits to friends outside the district. A person was placed in the category of a regular visitor, if he visited friends elsewhere (whether the same friends or not) about once in two months or more often. Once again, it was not difficult to draw the dividing line, for the great majority of those outside the "regular" category either never left the district at all, or did so only during their Xmas or annual holidays.

Of the 10 persons who regularly made visits to people outside the community, all except four went to Sydney only. Of these four, two visited relatives in Cooma, one visited friends in Canberra and Sydney, and one went to Sydney
and Melbourne. The people whom three of the ten went to visit were kin; the remaining seven visited friends. In all cases except one, the friends were of the same nationality as the subjects. The exceptional individual had a number of semi-official contacts, of various nationalities, in Sydney and Melbourne.

Of the 46 persons who did not make regular visits outside the community, 16 were known to have kept in touch with friends elsewhere, and in most cases to have visited them occasionally, 11 were known to maintain no contacts outside the community, and for the remaining 19 the data were not adequate. Information on the nationalities of the persons with whom the 16 kept in touch is not complete, but these contacts were apparently mostly persons of the same nationality as the subjects themselves - either friends from Europe, or friends made at some previous place of residence in Australia. It might be noted here that, while very few relationships established by the immigrants in the course of their wanderings remain at what we would call a fully primary level, after the parties have been long separated, the majority of Displaced Persons are acquainted with a large number of fellow immigrants scattered over a wide geographical area, for since leaving Europe they have been brought into close contact with other immigrants in a variety of circumstances - on the ship, in holding centres and hostels, in
work groups and in the community at large. Although they keep in touch with only a few of all those with whom they have at one time or another been closely associated, they hear indirect news of each other, and have some intermittent contact. The dispersal and mobility of the Displaced Persons in general means that the extra-community contacts of any one individual are likely to be dispersed over a large area, rather than concentrated in one particular locality.

It has been said that 16 of the 46 subjects maintained intermittent contact with persons outside the community. This means that they exchanged letters, and probably paid occasional visits, or were visited by their friends. Most immigrants who took a holiday some time during the year made this the occasion for renewing acquaintance with friends in other, often distant, places. No cases were recorded of immigrants having the usual kind of Australian holiday, i.e. taking a rented house at some holiday resort, or staying at a holiday boarding house or hotel; usually they stayed with friends, often with several different groups of friends in different places.

This dispersal of a large number of former associates over a wide area, when combined with other features of the Displaced Persons' situation, has important implications. It gives the immigrant some interest in and
knowledge of places, occupations etc. in Australia which he has not himself experienced. From their descriptions of these far-flung contacts, it also seems clear that the subjects gained some sense of security and self-esteem from these relationships: this vast new country gradually becomes a less alien place when it is known to be dotted with familiar faces; by contemplating his many friends in many places, the immigrant tries not only to reassure himself, but also hopes to impress Australians and fellow-immigrants he that he belongs, that/is somebody, that he is known and accepted in the larger society outside the immediate local group.

It is in the light of his position in the local community that the Displaced Person's wide range of contacts outside thus assumes significance. He balances off, so to speak, the uncertainty and disappointments of his position in Goulburn itself by elaborating, at least in his imagination, the range and meaning of these outside contacts. But these associations provide more than a mental compensation: they also act as a magnet attracting the individual to other places where he hopes for greater financial prosperity, for readier acceptance in the Australian community or for a happier position among his fellow-immigrants. The thought of how other Displaced Persons are prospering in other places is unsettling to many immigrants; and many of those who have left
the community have gone to join friends elsewhere.

6. Conclusion: the Tenuousness of Primary Relations

In this chapter we have described the primary relations of the Goulburn Displaced Persons - with whom they join in social activity and what they do. Although all except one of the 46 subjects had at least one primary relation, it is important to emphasise that the great majority felt that their close relationships were in some way unsatisfying and uncertain, that these relationships did not have the stability, warmth and sincerity of the friendships they had known at home. Much of the time, they were lonely or in fear of loneliness.

Without positing any origin or basic causes for this situation, we can suggest three important contributing factors, all of which the Displaced Persons themselves usually recognise quite clearly. In the first place, their position as an inferior minority group in this particular kind of country town social structure means that the activities to which they have access do not provide an adequate milieu within which primary relationships can be expressed, developed and lived out; the communal activities in which they would have participated with their friends in Europe are lacking in Goulburn - the cafes, dances, parks, theatre; they have not found a substitute in the sports events and associational activities to which they have access; neither have they the
facilities - nor perhaps the inclination - to elaborate their social life within the home to replace the communal activities that they miss. The single people in particular, and family members without homes of their own, complain that there is nothing to do; friends and cliques, instead of participating together in the social life of the community, talk and often drink, endlessly, become bored and irritated with one another, separate, then drift together again because no other more attractive way of passing the time presents itself.

A second factor contributing towards the dissatisfaction with primary relations is related both to the inferior minority status of the Displaced Persons and to their small numbers and the diversity of their composition as a group. Because they have little access to association with Australians, they are forced to seek the company of other immigrants. But, because of the diversity of nationalities and social background among their fellow-immigrants, and because of the small size of the group as a whole, it is not easy for any individual to find the kind of person or group that would be most congenial to him; friendships develop between persons who have nothing in common except their loneliness and boredom, and there is an ever-present feeling that this is not the right kind of relationship, not what one really wants, but the best that is
available for the moment.

Both of these factors are closely related to the third - the tenuousness and instability of all close relations. The Displaced Persons are a group by default, and the continuous resistance to identification with the group involves uncertainty and irresponsibility in personal relations. Moreover, they are an unusually mobile group; friends are continually being separated, and the bonds between them naturally attenuate with distance. Many of the Displaced Persons have also developed attitudes to personal relations which make it difficult for them to establish mature and binding ties of any kind. Having been deprived of their families and all their old associates from their homelands, and having been subjected to repeated separation from friends and acquaintances since leaving their own countries, many Displaced Persons have become cynical about the permanence of human relations, or, without bitterness, have ceased to be surprised or hurt by their instability. Attitudes of distrust and suspicion of others, and the fear of rejection, which may derive from "real" experience in war-time and post-war Europe, or may be primarily a projection of the individual's own hostility, are extremely common, and detrimental to the stability of personal relations. For example, the Displaced Persons can rarely be relied upon to keep appointments, but are extremely sensitive to failure on
the part of others to adhere to arrangements, readily interpreting this as a personal rebuff. Similarly, a refusal of an invitation, no matter what the reason, or hesitation in complying with some request for help are quickly interpreted as signs that they are being rejected. There is also often an unrealistic demand for consideration, affection and approval; when entertaining, for example, they will often provide far more food and liquor than is required, press their guests into consuming it and feel uncomfortable and hurt when they refuse. These characteristics, related also to anxiety, insecurity and lack of self-confidence, are all detrimental to the stability of personal relations.

The exploitative attitude is a further obstacle to the maintenance of affective ties. Whatever psychological factors may have predisposed some immigrants towards such exploitative behaviour more than others, it seems likely that the social environment of the Displaced Persons since leaving their own countries has accentuated such tendencies. Exploitative behaviour represents a particular kind of non-conformity: it occurs either where an individual rejects the accepted norms of the social group in which he moves, or where the group itself is so poorly integrated that its norms are ill-defined, do not adequately cover all the relevant behaviour, and are weakly or inconsistently sanctioned. Most of the Displaced Persons have had much experience of this
second kind of situation, and it seems likely that their
exploitative attitude to personal relations has been con-
solidated in the course of this experience. It is not
suggested that experience in poorly integrated groups
necessarily leads to non-conformist behaviour of any kind,
nor to this particular type of non-conformity, but it does
seem likely that, if the individual lacks membership in
an integrated group at a time when the deprivations threaten-
ing him are severe, then this ruthless individualistic,
competitive behaviour will be encouraged.

Although this study was not directed specifi-
cally towards the psychological condition of the Displaced
Persons, the data outlined above very clearly indicate that
there are strong neurotic tendencies in the group. These
neurotic tendencies contribute towards — although they are
far from providing the whole explanation for — the poor
integration of the group, which in turn accentuates the
neurotic tendencies. Whatever the origin of these tend-
cencies — and one can readily guess at the traumas, depriva-
tions and uncertainties out of which they might have
developed — it seems, from information supplied by inform-
ants (1) and from an article by Shils on "Social and Psychological

(1) In a talk given to the A.C.T. Good Neighbour Council
on 28/10/54, a former Polish Displaced Person, Dr. K.
Zakrzewski commented on the high incidence of mental dis-
orders among Displaced Persons in post-war Europe.
Aspects of Displacement and Repatriation", published in 1946, that they were manifest among the Displaced Persons in wartime and postwar Europe, and that in Europe (as in Australia) such tendencies were an obstacle in the way of social solidarity. Murphy (1) confirms the existence of these tendencies among the Displaced Persons in Europe and in Australia, citing their neurotic behaviour as one reason why they have not been socially accepted into the Australian community. From two American studies (2) of Jewish Displaced Persons, one referring to children only, the picture of neurotic behaviour among such immigrants is further revealed; the unreasonable demands made by the Displaced Persons on the Jewish welfare organisations with which the writers of these two articles were connected provide a particular case of the kind of exploitative behaviour to which we have previously referred.

(1) Murphy, 1952.
CHAPTER 9.

ORIENTATION TOWARDS REFERENCE GROUPS AND IDENTIFICATION WITH MEMBERSHIP GROUPS

1. Reference Group Theory

The Displaced Persons conceptualise both their immediate and more remote social environment in terms of categories and groups of persons; to some of these they themselves belong, to others they do not; towards some they have a favourable attitude, while others represent everything that is worthless or undesirable. It is to the question of the Displaced Persons' conceptions of the groups which have significance for them that we now turn. The discussion will be ordered in terms of the immigrants' "orientations towards reference groups" and "identifications with membership groups".

The term "reference group" has only recently been introduced into the literature of sociology (1), and is used with diverse meanings. This is not necessarily to be regretted, but the concept can be justifiably adopted in the present study only if it sharpens the analysis through being given some distinctive connotation. The two major difficulties in the use of the concept are: whether it should be applied to groups whose norms the individual judges and acts by, or to groups in relation to which he

(1) The term was first used by Hyman, in The Psychology of Status, 1942.
evaluates, or assesses his satisfaction with, the position of himself and his own group: and whether or not the term should be used for groups to which the individual belongs, or only for out-groups. To determine the most useful meanings that can be attached to the term, we shall refer to some recent discussions of reference group theory. It should first be made clear, however, that the phrase "reference group" is one of convenience only, and that the persons to whom an individual orients himself may constitute a category rather than a group; they may, for instance, be all the persons of a certain age, or in a certain occupation (1).

M. and C.W. Sherif take the reference group as the group whose norms guide the behaviour of the individual, "the major source of the individual's weighty attitudes are the values or norms of the groups to which he relates himself, that is, of his reference groups. In fact, the values or norms of his reference groups constitute the major anchorage in relation to which his experience of self-identity is organized." (2)

Newcomb applies the concept of the "reference group" mainly to the group whose norms the individual shares: "If

(1) Throughout their analysis of the contribution of The American Soldier researches to reference group theory, Merton and Kitt, 1950, take account of the differences between groups and status categories. Eisenstadt, 1954 (b), p.194, similarly emphasizes that the norms to which an individual orients himself need not necessarily be tied to a group.

a person's attitudes are influenced by a set of norms which he assumes he shares with other individuals, those individuals constitute for him a reference group ... The significant thing about a reference group is, in fact, that its norms provide frames of reference which actually influence the attitudes and the behaviour of a person" (1). The reference groups whose norms the individual shares are not necessarily membership groups. In concluding his discussion of norms and reference groups, Newcomb states that at a later stage he will show "that reference groups provide frames of reference for perceiving oneself" (2); but it is significant that in this later discussion (3), Newcomb uses the term "reference group" hardly at all, and discusses the perception of the self only in terms of membership groups. We can conclude that Newcomb, in practice, uses the concept of the reference group to refer primarily to the group whose norms influence the individual's behaviour.

A recent paper by Eisenstadt (4) shows how the concept of the "reference group" can be used even more generally. The writer points out in this study that it is the norm "that serves most as the frame of reference towards which an individual seeks to orient himself, and

(1) Newcomb, 1950, p.225.  
(2) Idem, p.232.  
(3) Idem, pp.298-334.  
(4) Eisenstadt, 1954 (b).
that only in some specific situations is such a norm tied to a concrete group" (1). Eisenstadt then adopts the term "reference norms", and proceeds to analyse his material on immigrants in Israel to show how these norms function as a mechanism of social control, the situations in which they are evoked, the communication of reference norms through formal or informal leaders, and the situations in which communication is not effective. This analysis is a most useful contribution to the study of values and social control, but the concept of the "reference norm", used very much in the traditional sense of social norms, standards or values, seems to add nothing to the analysis.

In the original sense in which it was used by Hyman, the reference group was the group in relation to which the individual evaluated his own status and his satisfaction with that status; Hyman also used the concept of the "reference individual" in the same way. In an experimental study, Hyman showed that subjects evaluated their subjective status differently according to the reference groups with which at the time they were comparing themselves; the three reference groups presented to the subjects were the total population, friends and acquaintances, and the occupational group (2).

(1) Idem, p. 194.
(2) Hyman, 1942.
In their analysis of the contribution of The American Soldier researches to reference group theory, Merton and Kitt also adopt the concept of the reference group as the group to which an individual relates himself in arriving at a self-evaluation; "he appraises the situation within the frame of reference (interpretive variable) yielded by comparing himself" with some other group of persons(1). For these writers, the crucial aspect of the reference group is not that it provides norms and behaviour patterns which the individual wants to adopt himself, but that it provides a standard for assessing satisfaction or deprivation.

It is in this sense that we shall use the term here: the reference group is the group to which an individual refers in arriving at self-evaluations. The crucial aspect in the choice of such reference groups is their status; he compares the rights, privileges, obligations, worth or recognition of his own group with those accorded to some other group. It is only by virtue of the fact that the two groups have certain characteristics in common that the comparison is relevant: to make the point clear with an extreme example - farmers are not likely to take hospital patients as their reference group. It is through comparing

(1) Merton and Kitt, 1950, p.46.
themselves to other professions that teachers commonly assess and express the relative deprivation of their own position; this does not mean that they wish to take over the norms of the medicals, lawyers, etc., as such, but that they aspire to an equivalent status in the total social structure.

Although it seems profitable to take the reference group as the standard for self-evaluation, it is not intended to make an artificial distinction between the way in which an individual assesses his own position and his assessment of other people's positions. Whether people use exactly the same reference groups, in the same way, in their judgments of other individuals as in their self-appraisals is a question which does not seem to have been explored, but certainly there must be a high degree of consistency in the standard by which both evaluation are made.

We now turn to the second difficulty that has arisen in the use of the reference group concept: should the term be applied to groups to which the individual belongs, or only to groups of which he is not a member? Hyman did not deal with this question explicitly; although many of the reference groups he found to be relevant
to the subjects' evaluation of status were membership groups, some were out-groups, and the reference individuals were, of course, "out-individuals". Hyman devotes a brief discussion to the "autistic" and "realistically motivated" use of reference groups: where the subject compares himself to an out-group which has what he wants, but with which there can be no actual contact, and whose status he has no hope of achieving, the use of the reference group is "autistic"; where he compares himself with an out-group which has what he wants, and whose behaviour and status he can hope to emulate, then the use of reference group is "realistically motivated" (1).

To M. and C.W. Sheriff, the reference may or may not be a membership group; moreover, where the individual is resisting the pressure towards conformity exerted by a membership, and is being "pulled in the opposite direction" by another reference group, then his membership group is not his reference group. It is hard to see, however, how an individual could ever remain an active member of a group without relating himself to it, or to some degree accepting its norms, in which case the membership group would constitute, according to the definition of these writers, a reference group. It is because they have restricted the

(1) Hyman, 1942, pp.22-23.
use of the term "reference group" to groups towards which the individual has a positive attitude, groups whose norms he willingly accepts, that M. and C.W. Sherif have found it necessary to assert that membership groups are not necessarily reference groups (1).

In another recent publication, Eisenstadt distinguishes between reference groups and "the actual membership group roles which an individual performs", the reference groups being the groups through which "an individual orients himself beyond his immediate roles toward some wider roles and parts of the society" (2); but in the subsequent analysis in this paper, Eisenstadt shows that the individual may also assume roles in what he has called reference groups, such as the Youth Movements; at this stage, he employs the term "basic membership groups" (3) to distinguish such groups as the family and school from such reference groups. Eisenstadt's original bases for distinguishing

(1) M. and C.W. Sherif, op. cit.
(3) Idem, p.182.
between the reference and membership groups thus prove untenable: not only can one have a role in both types of group, but it seems highly probable that the "basic membership groups", as well as the reference groups, serve to orient the individual towards the norms and values of the larger society. Because Eisenstadt gives so little empirical content to the theoretical discussion, it is difficult to know what kinds of units are included in his reference groups, but they are clearly very diverse - some, like the Youth Movements, are the voluntary associations integrating the individual into the larger social structure, which are found in all complex modern societies, and which represent legitimate and realistic foci of aspirations; others are groups or categories of persons whom the individual values highly and with whom he compares himself, but whose ranks he has no notion or no hope of joining.

Newcomb uses the term reference group to cover both groups in which the individual has membership and those to which he does not belong: "If a person's attitudes are influenced by a set of norms which he assumes that he shares with other individuals, those individuals
constitute for him a reference group ... All membership groups probably serve as reference groups for their members to some degree and in some ways. But not all reference groups are membership groups" (1). Taft, by implication, uses the term reference group only for membership groups, and does not mention the significance of groups to which the individual does not belong (2).

In their analysis of the contribution of The American Soldier researches to reference group theory, Merton and Kitt have referred to this problem, and have pointed out the difficulty of distinguishing between membership groups and non-membership groups in the case of any particular individual (3). Although Merton and Kitt include membership groups as reference groups, they declare that "it is the problems centred about this fact of orientation to non-membership groups that constitute the distinctive concern of reference group theory. Ultimately, of course, the theory must be generalized to the point where it can account for both membership and non-membership group orientations, but immediately its

(2) Taft, 1953.
major task is to search out the processes through which the individuals relate themselves to groups to which they do not belong" (1). The value of reference group theory is that it shows how apparently diverse items in human behaviour "may all represent cases of individuals becoming identified with reference groups to which they aspire or in which they have just achieved membership" (2).

In their analysis of material obtained from a standard of living study in France, Stern and Keller apply the term reference group to non-membership groups only, and suggest a useful approach to the relation of membership-group to reference group orientations (3).

For our present purposes, it seems useful to follow the approach of Merton and Kitt, and Stern and Keller: the reference group will be taken as the group to which the individual does not belong, or in which his membership is in some way uncertain or unrecognised. The reference group then becomes one type of group in terms of which the individual evaluates himself - the non-membership-group, or out-group.

Up to this point we have spoken mainly of the reference groups chosen by the individual. But the sociologist will usually be interested in the reference

(1) Merton and Kitt, 1950, p.50.
(2) idem, p.104.
(3) Stern and Keller, 1953.
groups to which whole categories or groups of people orient themselves. As Merton and Kitt point out, it is not the diverse, idiosyncratic references of individuals with which we are concerned, but the "frames of reference held in common by a proportion of individuals within a social category sufficiently large to give rise to definitions of the situation characteristic of that category" (1). In short, we are interested in the reference groups (or categories) to which specific groups (or categories of persons) orient themselves. With this focus of interest, it would be unprofitable to include membership groups within reference groups. If one is interested in the orientations of the individual, it is meaningful to say that he compares himself to other members of his own in-groups. But if attention is being directed to the orientations of a category or group of persons, then it does not make sense to say that the group compares itself to itself (2). This consideration, then, provides a


(2) It is not necessary to elaborate this point further here, but it should be noted that it might well be useful to analyse the differences between groups whose members constantly compare themselves to other members of the same group, and groups whose members are more likely to compare themselves with out-groups; groups of the former type would presumably be highly competitive.
further reason for distinguishing membership from reference groups.

By using the term "reference group" in this way, we can profitably extend the framework for the analysis of groups, presented in Chapter 4. One of the criteria for group integration was taken to be the extent to which the individual members of a group are identified with it - that is, their feeling of belonging in the group, their readiness to act as members of the group, to acknowledge loyalty and responsibility to other members, and their evaluation of the worth of the group. The individual evaluates himself in terms of the status of groups with which he is highly identified: his own feelings of satisfaction, success, worthwhileness and recognition are, to a considerable extent, dependent upon the status of the groups to which he belongs. The relationship between the reference of the individual towards out-groups and his identification with in-groups now becomes clear: he may continue to evaluate himself in terms of groups with which he was formerly identified, or he may evaluate himself in relation to groups which he aspires to join - the process which Merton and Kitt describe as "anticipatory socialization" (1). In either case, it might well be

(1) Merton and Kitt, 1950, pp.87 et seq.
difficult to establish whether the group in question is for the individual a reference or membership group, for he might act occasionally and irregularly as a member of a group to which he formerly belonged or into which he is moving. But in the third case, the question does not arise: here the individual takes as his reference group some group to which he never has belonged and is never likely to - it provides a relevant comparison and no more: the employee compares himself to the employer, or the residents of one town to those of another.

For our purposes, a reference group is, then, an out-group or category to which the members of an in-group or category orient themselves in evaluating their own position in the social structure. If one takes the reference group as a group whose norms the individual shares, then the orientation towards the reference group is always positive: the reference group is a highly valued group.(1) But if the concept is used as we have defined it here, the reference group may be one towards which the individual is negatively oriented: his behaviour may be directed towards differentiating himself from the

(1) Merton and Kitt, op. cit., have indicated but not explored this question of positive and negative orientations towards reference groups; see e.g. p.52. Having taken the reference group as the group whose norms the individual assumes he shares, Newcomb then goes on to say that an individual is oriented to a negative reference group when his "attitudes are influenced by a set of norms which he shares to the
from the members of another group, and he may assert his own superiority by reference to the inferiority of the out-group. Very often, of course, a group has a positive orientation to certain aspects of an out-group and a negative orientation to other aspects.

For the great majority of people, their belonging to a particular nation is never brought into question. Loyalty and responsibility towards one's country, and judgments about its culture and social structure may vary greatly, but one usually has little opportunity to reject association with one's own countrymen, and the question of aligning oneself with an alternative nation does not arise. But the distinctive characteristic about the Displaced Persons is that their national membership is uncertain. They neither act, nor feel themselves, nor are recognised, as full members of the nation in which they grew up or of the country where they now live.(1) For most of them, country of origin has

(1) This feeling is probably a common characteristic among immigrants in general. But the feeling of belonging nowhere is particularly poignant for the type of immigrant with whom we are here concerned— they are the displaced. Describing the impact of the first resettlement scheme, Hulme, 1953, p.182, says, referring to the Belgian colonel telling the DPs of the scheme, "His hands flew about as if he were wrapping up an invisible package. You could feel all eyes on that airy package that contained a new life, an unheard-of wage, a hole in the ground to work in and citizenship eventually, citizenship with a real identity card to prove that a man belonged to one of the recognized branches of society and no longer to this unknown place of the displaced."

(cont'd. from previous page) point of understanding them (or so he assumes, at least) but not to the point of accepting them" 1950, p.226. This represents an unsuccessful attempt to fit the idea of the negative reference group into the concept of the reference groups as primarily a norm-providing group; only by attenuating the meaning of "share" "understand" can the two ideas be fitted together, and this is inconsistent with the meaning of "sharing norms" used throughout the rest of Newcomb's analysis. M.C.W. Sherif(op. cit.,p.46) as
virtually ceased to be a membership group and become a reference group. While they certainly act as members of Australian society in a great variety of ways, they regard themselves as members of a distinct group within Australian society: they perceive "Australian society" as composed of Old and New Australians, the Old Australians and their culture constituting more a reference, than a membership, group for them. The immigrant responds in several different ways to this loss of certain national membership: he may strenuously, and perhaps ostentatiously, maintain his association with his home country; he may put all his efforts into becoming a full member of the host society; or he may find a poor substitute for national membership in identification with the immigrant group itself.

In the following pages, then, we shall consider the immigrant's attitudes towards his country of origin and Australia, primarily as reference groups, and towards his fellow-nationals and fellow-Displaced Persons in Australia, primarily as membership groups. Instead of maintaining a reigid distinction between reference and membership groups, we shall show the process whereby emphasis changes from membership to reference group, and

previously noted, restrict the use of the term reference group to the group with whose norms the individual is positively identified.
vice versa. We shall also briefly mention several reference groups of the kind that never were, and never will be, membership groups - namely Germany, Russia, and the U.S.A.

2. Orientation towards country of origin

Virtually all of the Goulburn Displaced Persons were still oriented towards their country of origin: they evaluated their present behaviour and status in relation to the culture in which they grew up, and in terms of the particular group to which they belonged at home. Since all of the Displaced Persons countries are now under Communist control, there is no opportunity for emigrants to continue to be closely associated with the cultural or political life of their homelands, on a non-face-to-face basis, as has been possible for migrants of other types (1). But the opportunity does exist for participation in world-wide associations of exiled national groups, some of which, with their own press and "government-in-exile", are

(1) In the years before 1939, e.g., some Italians in Australia, often with the encouragement of the Italian Consuls, became Fascists, participating in an organisation which was centred in Italy and which thus linked them in joing activity with the political life of their home country. See Borrie, 1954, pp.122-123, and 150-151.
organised into something like a transplanted model of the country of origin. To this extent, it is possible for Displaced Persons, through their national associations in Australia, to continue as active members of their national group, as a political and cultural unit. Since these national associations exist almost exclusively in the capital cities, and since the obvious milieu for conducting activities of this kind is the metropolis, one would not expect a country centre like Goulburn to attract or retain many immigrants with these interests; and of all the subjects, only two were taking an active part in national associations linking them with emigrants elsewhere, particularly in Germany and the U.S. An additional small minority of the Goulburn Displaced Persons retained some slight interest in these extraterritorial national groups, through letters and newspapers sent by friends and relatives in Germany, the U.S., the Argentine and Canada in particular.

On a different level, a large proportion of the subjects had, however, maintained a position, however peripheral, in groups which are centred in their countries of origin, for they continued to exchange letters and gifts with relatives and friends at home, and to perform services for them.
Because of differences in opportunities for maintaining contact with the home country, the subjects have been classified into two categories: Balts, Ukrainians and Russians in the first, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks, Poles and Yugoslavs in the second. In the following table, "contact" means regular writing or receiving of letters or gifts; contact is said to be "almost discontinued", where the intervals between contacts are becoming markedly longer. It should be pointed out that a number of the subjects classified in the category of "contact maintained" have much less contact than formerly: some, for instance, once wrote to several friends as well as family members, while they now correspond only with the mother or one sibling; as long as at least one contact is being preserved, however, the subject is placed in this category. "No contact" means that the subject has no direct contact with any individual of his own nationality abroad, or perhaps only very intermittent contact at intervals of two years or more (1).

(1) It would be useful to distinguish between the subjects who have never had any contact at any time since leaving their own countries, and those who formerly had some contact which they have discontinued; information on the immediate post-emigration period is not, however, considered reliable enough to allow this distinction to be made.
Contact with Home Country, or Fellow-Nationals Outside Australia, for 42 Displaced Persons.
27 Men and 15 Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Balts, Ukrainians and Russians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contact maintained with individuals or national groups in Germany, U.S.A.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No such contact, or contact almost discontinued</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Hungarians, Czechoslovaks, Poles, Yugoslavs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contact with home country maintained</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No contact with home country, or contact almost discontinued</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No contact with home country, but contact maintained with own nationals in Germany, U.S.A., the Argentine, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emigrants from countries occupied by the Soviet - Balts and Ukrainians - and Russians themselves, had, for the most part, not been in communication with friends or relatives at home for several years. Most of them doubted whether letters written home would ever reach their destination; some believed that any attempt at communication would bring harm to their families and friends; many had heard of the extensive population movements within their
home territories, and, as the years had gone by without any news, they had come to accept the likelihood that, if still alive, their families had been removed from their homes; many too knew or believed that no members of their immediate families were still alive. After several years of silence, many had accepted the futility of trying to obtain news of their families and friends, and were afraid of the news that they would hear. Most of these people had tried to suppress all thoughts of their families and friends at home. Some of the older immigrants from these countries might think wistfully of eventually returning, even of claiming properties due to them and living out the rest of their lives in comfort and peace, but far more common was the belief that far-reaching social and economic changes were, in a sense, depriving them of a homeland to which to return. The break with the past had been virtually complete, and the possibility of returning home to resume the threads of a former life was remote and unreal.

Displaced Persons of Hungarian, Czechoslovak, Polish or Yugoslav nationality, on the other hand, were able to keep in touch with their home countries with little difficulty; very many of them maintained a regular correspondence with families and friends; they
sent parcels and money, and arranged for medical supplies to be forwarded to their families through international business firms. Some emigrants from these countries also claimed that they endangered the safety of people at home by writing, and for this reason had severed all contact; but it seems likely that failure to maintain contact is the result of other factors. Although one cannot be sure what these factors are in any particular case, it is possible to indicate the most common ones: some emigrants have left an unhappy family situation which they want to forget; some, with a wife or husband at home, believe that, by severing all contact, they can safely contract a second marriage in Australia; others again, particularly Hungarians, Czechoslovaks and Yugoslavs, emigrated to escape the penalties of some illegal act and are therefore unwilling to make their whereabouts known at home.

The maintenance of contact does not necessarily indicate that the immigrant retains strong affectional ties with his family, nor that he continues to feel himself in sympathy with them, and part of their life. Among the subjects of this study, those who continued to have this positive, strong orientation towards their families at home were very much in the minority. Such
people were distinguished by the following behaviour: they wrote and received letters regularly and frequently; they went to some pains to find out how they could best be of service to their families, and found much satisfaction in making up parcels for them, and arranging for medical supplies to be sent to them; they spoke warmly and with interest of their families.

One gains the impression that this now rare pattern of identification with families at home was once common among the Displaced Persons, many of whom will readily admit that, while they keep in touch with at least one member of their families, the gulf between them is widening. Most of those in the category of "no contact" and "contact almost discontinued" are immigrants who formerly kept in touch with people at home, but had ceased, or virtually ceased, to do so by the time this research was carried out. When they first arrived in Australia they were anxious to share their impressions of the new country with the people they had left at home; their long letters were written from the same viewpoint held by the people who were to read them. But in time they had described all the curiosities of the new country; their experiences placed the scene around them in a perspective which those at
home no longer completely shared. On the other hand, as their interests and aspirations became increasingly focussed in this country, they came to feel less interest in their families at home, and even less sympathy for their privations. One decisive indication of the attenuation of identification with the immigrant's family at home is his impatience or resentment at requests for help. Even if the immigrant does not fear that his family or friends at home are trying to exploit him, he may nevertheless deny that they have any right to expect anything from him: he has himself experienced bad times, he has had to make his own way, and he should not be expected to sacrifice any of his hard-earned prosperity for the benefit of those at home (1). On the other hand,

(1) A woman had left Europe with the firm intention of bringing her aged grandmother out from Germany as soon as she had saved the money for the fare. She and her husband have now bought a car; they are saving for a house or farm, and feel that they themselves need the money which would be required for the grandmother's passage. They are also worried that the grandmother might become a financial burden; not yet having a home of their own, they do not want to take on the responsibility of finding accommodation for her; while, once they have their own home, they are not sure that it would be sensible to have her living with them. It seems clear that all these reservations would not have weighed with the immigrant at the time she left Europe; they are adduced now to justify what is in effect the attenuation of her sense of family responsibility and her affectional ties with her grandmother.
it is very likely that he has himself encouraged impossible expectations among the people at home by exaggerating his success in this country; partly because he does not want to distress those whom he has left behind, partly because he wishes to impress them and partly to build up his own self-confidence. The immigrant, by glossing over the failures and disappointments, exaggerating the achievements and adding a few imaginary touches, often paints a glorified picture of his new life in his letters home (2). To the extent that he feels the necessity to do this, to make it appear that he is living up to the expectations of his people at home, he is still identified with them. And it is little wonder if, once he has built himself up in this way, his friends and relatives look on him as a source of material help.

The Goulburn Displaced Persons were thus acting less and less as members of groups which included their families and friends at home. For nearly all those who retained some manner of membership in such a group,

(1) One woman described her husband's present occupation as "boilermaker and useful", adding, with a wry smile, "and toilet cleaner, but I don't write that home to my family".
identification was being attenuated, and for those who no longer had such membership, the country of origin was becoming less and less significant as a reference group. On arrival in Australia, most of the Displaced Persons took their country of origin (or sometimes Germany) as their major reference group; although most of them still compared their present situation with some standard provided by the country from which they had come, they were increasingly using Australian society, or some group in Australia, as the major basis of comparison.

We can now ask, what were the Displaced Persons' conceptions of their countries of origin? Was the homeland a positive or a negative reference group? Sometimes, the subjects compared themselves to people in their own country under the present Communist regime, but for the most part, the home country meant the country as it was at some period before 1939. Sometimes, too, the Displaced Person compared his present position with the status which he occupied at home. Insofar as the positions which he holds in Australia are different from those he had at home, he may arrive at a self-evaluation by comparing himself to people in similar positions at home: he may compare
himself as an immigrant in Australia with minority group members in his own country, or he may compare himself as a low-skilled worker with persons in that occupational category at home.

Orientations towards country of origin varied from extreme ethnocentrism to complete rejection. The ethnocentric immigrants asserted the superiority of their own nation over all others, irrationally, emotionally and aggressively. Since everything at home is, or was, better than anywhere else, they had little hope of feeling satisfied with their position in Australia. Their self-esteem was based, not on their ability to meet the standards of their own society, but simply on the fact that they represented a superior culture - not on what they did, but on the unquestionable fact of what they were.

The extreme negative orientation towards country of origin was found only among four subjects, all of whom had been voluntarily in close association with the Germans during the war. One was an ethnic German, who seemed never to have been strongly identified with any country. Whatever the sequence of events which led the other three to throw in their lot with the Nazi cause, they were trying to justify the implied defection by denying the worth and importance of their countries of origin. All of these
subjects too had much admiration for German might, discipline and endurance, although their experience of the German racial ideology had prevented them from presuming to any identification with the Herrenvolk themselves. Despising countries from which they had come, they have sought for a positive reference group elsewhere - choosing Germany, or the immigrant group in the U.S. or the Argentine.

Between the two extremes of ethnocentrism and a highly negative orientation came the majority of subjects, who had a positive orientation to some aspects of the countries from which they have come, and a negative orientation to others. We are not here concerned with variations in the immigrants' judgments of the different aspects of life in their native countries, but with variations in the choice of aspects with which they compare their present situation; their comparisons may be focussed on their country of origin as a social, "cultural", religious, political or economic unit. Of the numerous choices possible, we shall discuss only the two most common: the "cultural" and economic. With some immigrants, pride in the intellectual life and achievements of the home country - its "culture" - was
based on a secure foundation of knowledge; the individual felt that geographical distances from his home country should not prevent him from pursuing his cultural interests and keeping himself informed about cultural and political developments at home; he accordingly obtained books and newspapers in his own language, bought records of familiar music, and, when the opportunity arose, expressed and satisfied these interests through discussion with fellow-countrymen. With the passage of time, however, although the underlying feeling of affection and loyalty for his home country might remain unimpaired, his interest in and knowledge of contemporary events and developments were very likely to wane; this results from the inadequacy of his channels of communication, from his failure to become associated with a group of similar interests, or from his own involvement in the immediate problems and interests of his new environment. Feeling guilty of disloyalty for having so quickly and easily allowed his interest to decline, he might periodically make a special effort to revive it. Although an immigrant of this kind might have an objective attitude to the faults and failures of his own country, he was more likely than other Displaced Persons to assess his own worth by his ability to live up to what he regarded as the best cultural and moral traditions of his
country - his ability, in other words, to be "a good Pole etc".

Immigrants with little education, and slight familiarity with the intellectual heritage of their own countries, and belonging to the less privileged strata in their home countries, were more likely to orient themselves towards the economic aspects of their own societies, and, in this respect, the country of origin constituted a negative reference group. They evaluated their present position in Australia by contrasting it to the position of the working class at home, with its low standard of living, compared to the rest of the society, and meagre opportunities for upward social mobility.

For subjects of diverse backgrounds, the home country constituted a positive reference group from the viewpoint of social and recreational life. Virtually all of the subjects felt that they had a better social life in Europe than here. As the immigrants themselves were usually aware, this comparison reflects not only the difference in patterns of social life in Europe and Australia (1), but also the difference in their own

(1) See also Murphy, 1952, p.198, in Australia, the "increased leisure which the short working week affords is spent at home, in the garden or on the beaches, and even the cinema is not much frequented. Compare this with the intensely social life of a Yugoslav or Italian
position - as strangers, often without friends or relatives or any secure status in this country; this particular comparison seems to be made less and less as life here takes on some stability for them, and they come to identify themselves with some primary group of family or friends.

3. Orientation towards Australia

The orientation of Displaced Persons towards Australia can be understood only in terms of the reasons which impelled them to come to this country in the first place. Very few originally emigrated for the purpose of settling permanently in another country, and probably none planned to migrate to Australia at the time of leaving home. A period of one to ten years elapsed between the original emigration and arrival in Australia. After the war, most Displaced Persons considered a number of alternative plans for their future: repatriation, settlement in some European country, emigration to Canada, village, or even with Poland and Germany, and one sees how great a difference has unknowingly been developed between Europe and Australia, and how much of what the continental European regards as normal living is absent despite the great superficial similarity of the two cultures. The D.P. ... has no inkling that the society which he is attempting to enter virtually does not exist by his standards or at least has a very different form from what he expects, and in consequence he will regard his failure to succeed as due either to social hostility or to personal defect."
the U.S., South America, or Australia. In most cases, it was only because repatriation was felt to be impossible that some alternative had to be chosen. Sometimes, the Displaced Persons deliberately chose Australia as their alternative, but more often they came to this country because other opportunities for resettlement had failed to materialise, or because it was of no consequence to them where they settled if they could not return home. Four reasons guided those who did deliberately choose migration to Australia. Some believed that this country would be more remote than any other from the scene of a third war. Others hoped that in Australia they would be safe from the reprisals of their own governments or the Soviet authorities; those who had resisted Soviet pressure to be repatriated, or who had escaped illegally from Communist governments established in their own countries believed that Australia's geographical isolation would protect them from further persecution. The hope that Australia, being a young and undeveloped country, should offer economic opportunities similar to those available in the U.S. during the last century, attracted others. A very few of the Displaced Persons, probably mainly Yugoslavs, appear to have chosen Australia because they had relatives settled here before the war.
The Displaced Persons, then, did not migrate to Australia with any strong positive orientation to the social, cultural or economic system of this country. A few Poles, Balts, Hungarians and Czechoslovaks settled in before the war, but no tradition of migration to Australia had been established in these countries, and hence no idealised conception of Australia, or the future of immigrants here, had developed. Very few of the Displaced Persons conceived of Australia either as a land of golden opportunities, or as a bastion of freedom and democracy. In the course of their experiences since arrival, their attitudes to this country have been elaborated and diversified, and their original conceptions consolidated or changed. Some of the complex forces which have contributed to this process have been, or will be, discussed elsewhere in this study; they need be only briefly listed here.

At first, the immigrants' lack of facility in speaking or reading English and their narrow range of contacts with Australians made them especially susceptible to the influence of other factors: namely, their observations of Australian behaviour, material culture and the natural environment, the treatment which they received from officials and employers and the reactions of their fellow-immigrants. At this time, there were great
opportunities for distortion and projection in their perception of Australia, Australians and their own situation in this country, because of their uncertainty in interpreting Australian behaviour. Many Displaced Persons are still in this stage, but most of the subjects have moved into a second stage where their observations are more accurate, in the sense that they more correctly understand the meaning of Australian behaviour, while their opportunities for observation and communication with Australians have become more numerous and diverse. New influences have now come to bear upon them: the press and radio, fellow-workers, and the Australians met in the course of the increasing community contacts. Greater facility in the language and the gradual distribution of the immigrants throughout the community, at least residentially and occupationally, have exposed them to these new influences.

The sources through which even the most assimilated subjects of this study learn about Australian culture remain, however, extremely limited. As we have already seen, friendships with Australians are rare, and the Australians with whom social contacts are made come mainly from the lower class; there is very little participation in local associations, or in communal, social, political or religious activities; for most of the subjects the ability to read
English is still so limited that they buy the best-illustrated newspapers, and only skim through the text. The subjects thus have direct experience only of certain restricted areas of Australian culture: they are most familiar with the occupational patterns and social status of the unskilled or semiskilled labourers, with the cultural patterns, attitudes and beliefs of the lower class, with the happenings which claim the attention of the sensational press, with the public forms of recreation, such as the cinema and dances, with the professional and business practices of doctors, lawyers and storekeepers, and with the operation of one or two government departments, such as Labour and National Service and Immigration. The areas of Australian culture with which they have had virtually no contact are countless; here it is important only to emphasise that they have little experience of family life, only the most superficial contact with the religious, political and cultural life of the country, and very little knowledge of Australian history, or the technical, scientific, cultural and military achievements which Australians claim as a source of national pride.

For all of the subjects Australian society and culture constituted a most important reference group. We shall be concerned here with the general orientations
towards Australia as a whole, which occur more frequently in the thinking of the subjects than particularised orientations to some section of Australian society, such as the "working people" or "the Goulburn people". Most of the subjects had an ambivalent attitude towards Australia, with the result that it is impossible to say that this country constituted a definitely positive or negative reference group for them. We shall examine in some detail the content of the most common attitudes to Australia, firstly as a social and cultural unit and secondly as a political unit, and attitudes towards the way in which the subjects evaluate their present position in terms of these conceptions will be noted as we go along, and summarised in the following section.

The most highly valued aspect of Australian society and culture was the standard of living enjoyed by the working class. Even those subjects who followed professional or white-collar occupations in Europe, and who are in a less favourable financial position in Australia, agreed that economic opportunities are much better for working people in this country. The subjects compared the situation in Australia to their own countries, where marked differences in income, particularly between white-collar workers, on the one hand, and skilled and unskilled labourers on the
other, resulted in differential access to valued goods and services: they appreciated the fact that in this country wages are high enough to enable even the unskilled labourer to save, and thus to acquire material possessions. High wages were also seen as giving the worker an opportunity to move out of the wage earning group into the category of businessman or farmer, and thus further to improve his financial position. It is accessibility to material goods that makes the greatest impression on the immigrants. They seldom perceive the favourable economic position of the workers as giving access to non-material values such as leisure or participation in the social and cultural life of the community.

The subjects were also favourably disposed to other aspects of the economic situation which impinged closely upon them: in particular, full employment and the standard of the working conditions. Some were nevertheless critical of less immediately relevant features of the economic situation. There was a common belief that very ill-defined "big business" interests (1)

(1) Many of the subjects identified these "big business" interests with the Jews, but I did not explore the question deeply enough to know just how often an oblique reference to the Jews was intended.
manipulate basic features of the economic structure, such as the level of employment and the channels into which credit flows; political influence was believed to make this control possible; immigrants and the majority of Australians are alike powerless to combat it. It is because of this overriding power of the "big business" interests that the individual with a little capital to establish a business or farm of his own has such difficulties in securing capital. Similarly, the trades unions were believed to exercise an undue control over the workers; the interests which they serve are not those of the working class as a whole but of a small clique, ambitious for personal gain or the advancement of some unacknowledged cause such as communism.

The attitudes of the subjects to other aspects of Australian culture were more diverse, and explicit rejection of certain elements was more common than in the case of the economic situation. Most of the subjects felt that Australia was lacking in "kultur". A variety of evidence was adduced in support of this claim: the absence of formality and respect in interpersonal relations; the concentration of leisure-time interests on drinking, gambling and sport; indifference to any kind
of music except popular American music; lack of refinement in patterns of social life, in particular the absence of the European style of café, the liquor restrictions, and the unsociability of dance halls; difficulties in obtaining "service" from shop attendants, waiters, tradesmen, etc.; the lack of support for the higher arts of music, opera, theatre, etc. To some immigrants, the bare, limitless and unpopulated Australian landscape is further evidence of lack of "kultur". The belief in Australia's cultural inferiority has become one of the most commonly expressed and most explicitly formulated of the distinctive beliefs of the Displaced Persons group.

The tendency to disapprove of the pattern of family life and the upbringing of children in Australia was also common throughout the group studied: once again the intensity of this disapproval varied, but it was on the whole more emotionally charged than the unfavourable attitude to Australian culture; this is to be expected, since contact with family life in Australia is likely to threaten, or at least bring into question, the patterns in which the immigrant has been reared and which he is attempting to preserve in this country. As we have already seen (1), this contact is having its effect upon the

(1) see p. 303.
Displaced Persons' conceptions of family roles. The most common general criticism of family relations in Australia was that family members show little affection or responsibility towards each other: Australian women were believed to marry for money or position rather than for love; after marriage, all close association with one's family of birth ends; aged parents are shown no respect, and their children feel no obligation to provide a home for them, nor to support them. It was also claimed that the individual family members are too independent: husband and wife have individual friends and take part separately in social life; social participation of parents and children as a family group is rare. Relations between family members were also said to be too materialistic: the practice whereby wage-earning children pay board to their parents was deplored, because a business arrangement of this kind is inappropriate in the relations between parents and children; it was also claimed that in other financial matters such as borrowing money, family members are "treated like strangers". The immigrants believed that there is little respect for the marriage bond, and that the standards of sexual morality for both men and women are loose. Women do not take their role as mothers, home-makers and wives seriously enough: they work outside
the home, they have much social life beyond the confines of the family and they evade as far as possible the more arduous duties of the home-maker. The upbringing of children also incurred severe censure: they are adequately disciplined neither by their parents nor the school, allowed too much freedom of movement, given too much money, and not taught respect. As one informant wryly expressed it: "this is certainly a democracy - for the children too."

Even an impressionistic comparison between the family systems of the European countries from which the Displaced Persons have come and the system in Australia shows that there is much justification for the claim that these significant differences do exist. But once again it is important to stress that the subjects have formed their impressions from a highly selective contact with Australian culture: they are influenced by the sensational press; they are highly exposed to the evidences of broken homes, undisciplined children and marital infidelity, which in a country town readily become public knowledge, while they have little of the personal contact with the more stable families in the community which would offset these impressions of disorder in family life. In addition, for reasons which have already been put forward in Chapter 8
the Displaced Persons are sometimes brought into contact with Australians wishing to escape from the conventions of their own community into a group where they believe they can with impunity ignore the moral conventions of their own community.

The Displaced Persons varied considerably in the value which they placed on Australia as a political unit. For the present, we shall be concerned simply to outline the kind of positive and negative evaluations which have been found. Some subjects emphasised the features of the political and legal systems which the Australians themselves regard as fundamental and in which they take pride: democratic government, freedom of speech and association and movement, and equality before the law. Some of the immigrants declared that these are the very values to which their own countries were devoted before the war; the Czechoslovaks and Baltic subjects were especially likely to claim a close bond with Australia on these grounds. Others valued these features of the Australian system just because they were lacking in their own countries: this was particularly noticeable among the Russian and Ukrainian subjects.

Also common was a variety of attitudes ranging from mild criticism to extreme cynicism and deprecation of
Australia as a political unit. It was claimed that Australia is backward and that the government does not take adequate responsibility for development. For example, social services, in particular unemployment and sickness benefits, were said to be very inferior to those available in the subjects' own countries, or, more commonly, in Germany. The government's failure to provide adequate housing, to develop the country's natural resources or to encourage modern technical developments was also regarded as a sign of backwardness.

Another common criticism of Australian government was that it lacks authority. This criticism did not refer to the control of the economic system, but to the apparent ineffectiveness and laxity of all kinds of administration. The law should be more strictly enforced; employers should be more exacting in their demands on employees; the first consideration in the treatment of criminals and the insane should be to provide adequately for their confinement rather than their welfare (1).

(1) During the period of the research, the British migrants in the Goulburn Hostel were involved in a dispute with Commonwealth Hostels Ltd.; taking the law into their own hands, they defied hostel regulations, boycotted the dining room and cooked in their own quarters. The Displaced Person staff unanimously deprecated this action, for reasons arising out of the continued hostility between staff and residents since the foundation of the Hostel; but, more important in the present context, they also despised the government for failing to enforce the regulations; one
A related criticism was that the authority of government
does not cover a wide enough range of personal behaviour (1).
But the inadequacy of government authority was most
commonly remarked upon in relation to the education system:
under the Australian system, children are not required to
study hard nor long enough, nor does the authority of the
school extend beyond school hours, as it did in Europe
where the extra-school social life of the children was
largely controlled by the education authorities.

Scepticism about the political and legal system was
also common: Australia is not in fact the moral power which
its citizens like to believe. The country is not run by
the people but by the vaguely defined "big business" interests
referred to above; these interests were held responsible for

young man commented: "you must not be too soft with these
people; what you need is a dictator; I would like to see
the police called in and give some of these people a hit
over the head with their batons; you wouldn't hear any
more of them after that; this sort of trouble didn't
occur in the camps in Europe."

(1) Hospital authorities were regarded as lax because
they did not take responsibility for the moral behaviour
of the nurses employed.
a variety of enormities, ranging from the large annual losses sustained by Commonwealth Hostels Ltd., to the housing shortage and a defence policy which indirectly supports the sinister forces conspiring to ensure that there is always warfare somewhere on the globe. The freedom, equality and integrity of Australian government were often questioned (1); it was commonly believed that government officials could be bribed; it was claimed that censorship was used to prevent the publication of books or the showing of films which could be detrimental to the reputation of the government. Occasionally, the immigrants would also venture some cynicism about the ideology of the Allies in the war: the Western powers were motivated by self-interest, rather than the defence of freedom; or the war was manipulated by all-powerful, amoral forces, related to the previously mentioned "big business" interests; the way in which the war was conducted by the Allies was by no means morally superior to that of the Axis powers, as proved by the merciless

(1) E.g., after reading a newspaper report about interjectors being removed from a political meeting where the Prime Minister was speaking, one immigrant declared that this was the typical behaviour of a government using its control over the police to stifle criticism and opposition.
bombing of Germany, the treatment of Prisoners of War, the looting in occupied countries; many British soldiers recognised the futility or worthlessness of their own cause and deserted to the German army.

Much criticism was also directed against the so-called "nationalism" or "nazism" of Australia. It was claimed that the Australian people have, like the Germans, an intense sense of their own uniqueness and importance, an unwarranted conviction in the rightness and superiority of their own culture and an intolerance of all other peoples. The evidence for this claim came mainly from the Australians' treatment of immigrants and will therefore be considered in the following section.

Some subjects felt that the Australians had acquired their overwhelming sense of superiority from Britain. They conceived of Britain as a country which, in the past, had arrogantly asserted her superiority over the many defenceless peoples whom she had subjugated. The denial of any feeling of affection or loyalty to Britain was very common. Among the grounds for this rejection, two occurred again and again. One was that Britain could not be trusted nor relied upon, since she had let down the countries of Eastern Europe and even Australia herself during the war. Britain had pledged
help to Poland in case of attack, but had allowed her to be overrun by the Germans; Poles had fought with the Allies in large numbers, and the country had been promised her freedom after the war; this promise had been dishonoured and Poland was allowed to fall under Russian influence. At Yalta too, Britain had failed to keep her pledge and had sold out the Baltic countries to Russia. The grievance of the Yugoslav Nationalists was that, by transferring the weight of support from Mihailovitch to Tito, Britain let down the people who had been her true allies and encouraged the establishment of the Communist regime. With some cynicism the Displaced Persons also sometimes pointed out that Britain similarly failed to fulfil her obligations to Australia after the fall of Singapore.

The subjects also deprecated the financial control exercised by Britain over Australia. Britain has "milked Australia dry". She has so organised the economic system of the country that she buys raw materials cheaply and sells the manufactured products at a great profit; fearing competition, Britain has seen to it that Australia has not developed industrially.

Other reasons for rejecting any sense of affiliation with Britain are less commonly heard, but nevertheless current in the thinking of the group:
Britain's social system, with its aristocracy, noble titles and House of Lords is old-fashioned; it belongs to an era which the countries of Europe grew out of many years ago. The Royal Family is similarly a useless, meaningless and costly survival of a past era; some informants were tolerantly prepared to grant that the Australians should be allowed their Queen if it pleased them, but that the existence of the monarchy imposed no demands of loyalty or affection on themselves; others, however, denounced the monarchy as a disguised form of dictatorship (1). Other grievances occasionally mentioned were the British treatment of demobilised Allied soldiers, and the behaviour of the British Army in Germany at the end of the war.

(1) The following remarks came from a young Hungarian: "X couldn't understand why the British should make such a fuss about Hitler or Mussolini when their own Queen was to them what Hitler was to the Germans; the only difference is that the feeling is much stronger here: you would go months without seeing a picture of Hitler in Germany, but every day the paper here has pictures of the Royal Family; at school he learnt that the British national anthem is the only one which has anything about the ruler in it; all the others refer to the people, as they should."
Apart from the few subjects with a positive evaluation of Britain, the attitude of the informants could be briefly summarised by saying that they denounced her for her breaches of faith, despised her for her weakness and regarded her cynically for pretending to be the champion of freedom and democracy which she is not. Britain is weak in the sense that she is no longer a world power in comparison to the U.S. and Russia. She is also weak economically, and the contemplation of this weakness gives some immigrants no little pleasure; as one informant said, "Britain won the war, 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." These subjects had little sympathy with the ties of sentiment which they believe to be the only bond maintaining the affection and loyalty of Australians towards Britain. They regarded Australia as a colony, dependent upon the mother-country; they believed that this relationship was entirely in Britain's interest, and that Australia would be better off either as an independent nation, or within the American orbit.

Finally, in this evaluation of Australia as a political unit, we may note the attitude of the subjects towards the political parties in this country. While
many of the subjects had made a positive or negative evaluation of one or other of the leading political parties, the sense of having thrown in one's lot with one party was extremely rare. Most informants had only a vague and very restricted knowledge of the differences among the several parties. They developed their conceptions of these groups in terms of the political ideas which they held before coming to this country. Those subjects with strongly anti-Soviet views were especially responsive to any suggestion of Communist sympathy on the part of political parties; they were thus likely to be opposed to the Labour Party, on the grounds that socialism eventually leads to Communism. They also tended to regard trades unions as tools of Communist policy. On the other hand, some immigrants thought it natural to give their support to the Labour Party, as the representatives of the working people: in this case, the Liberal Party was rejected as the tool of the powerful industrialists and businessmen. On the other hand, the Liberal Party was sometimes approved because of its explicit anti-Communism, as indicated by the Referendum and the policy of exposing Communists in trades unions; it also drew some support from immigrants of formerly high status, who had as little
sympathy with working class in Australia as they had with such people at home. The Country Party meant nothing to most of the subjects; those who had formed any attitude towards it regarded it as the instrument of the wealthy land-owners, a section of the community with whom they had no identity of interest.

All of the subjects felt that there were defects in Australia's attitudes and behaviour towards the Displaced Persons, although some were considerably more bitter on this score than others. The burden of their complaint was that by virtue of being immigrants, they were regarded as inferior and hence rejected from full acceptance into the Australian community. The perceived Australian attitude was held to arise, not only from traditional factors such as the British sense of racial and cultural superiority, but also from jealousy and fear of the immigrants: the Australians, in particular the working people, fear economic competition from the immigrants, and are jealous because of their material achievements.

The avowed aims of the policy of assisting Displaced Persons to migrate to Australia were to contribute to the solution of a humanitarian problem, and to increase the Australian population so that the country's resources might be developed and adequate manpower provided for her
defence. Most Displaced Persons cynically regarded the humanitarian motive as a cloak for the less altruistic aims of providing manpower and increasing the population. Some explicitly stated: "Australia is not interested in us, or what becomes of us, but only in the children we produce." Criticism of the operation of the immigration policy was also common: corruption, incompetence and indifference on the part of the selection officers in Europe meant that Australia obtained a very poor selection of I.R.O. migrants; the segregation of migrants in work groups and hostels prevented them from learning the language and becoming assimilated into the community; the conditions of living provided were not adequate - reasonable provision for the housing of immigrants should have been made before bringing them to the country.

There was little criticism of the contract system as such, while some subjects felt that it performed a useful function in assuring them of employment on arrival in Australia. Much criticism was, however, levelled against the failure of employment officers to allocate immigrants to work in which they had been trained. There was also a strong feeling against trades unions, professional bodies and the government for the difficulties of gaining recognition for European trade and professional qualifications;
this was usually interpreted as a form of discrimination against immigrants and as further evidence of Australian nationalism and superiority. This seems, however, to be far less of a source of grievance at the present time than it was two or three years ago, the reason being that some migrants have now succeeded in gaining recognition of their qualifications, while others have moved the focus of their aspirations elsewhere.

Some subjects also believed that they suffered discrimination from those in authority. Most complaints referred to discrimination on the part of employers or supervisors, but there were also occasional complaints that shop assistants had ignored a European customer and attended to an Australian, and that business firms had refused credit to immigrants on the same basis as Australians.

Most of the subjects also believed that there was official and unofficial pressure on them to become rapidly assimilated. By this they meant that they were expected to learn the English language immediately, and to speak only English, to adopt Australian customs, dress and food habits, and to refrain from associating in national or immigrant groups, or from developing national institutions such as a press or schools. They felt that
Australians resented them being different. Sensitivity to this pressure to become Australian was indicated in the strong reaction against any attempt at domination from Australians whose authority the subjects did not recognize. Fellow-workers of the same status who tried to dominate them in any way were strongly resented; unwanted advice from neighbours or casual acquaintances was interpreted as interference; attempts to make them conform to the Australians' demands, e.g., the requirement that they should speak English in public, were regarded as an unwarranted attack on their liberty. The narration of some incident which had annoyed them often began with a phrase such as, "Isn't this supposed to be a free country?"

Most of the subjects also believed that Australians, in particular better-class Australians, did not wish to associate with them socially: they were surprised and usually sceptical when an Australian showed a personal interest in them, wondering immediately what he wanted of them. There was a common belief that the immigrants most likely to gain acceptance into the Australian community were those who had some value as curiosities or some interesting talent; but such acceptance was likely to be short-lived, for the novelty would soon wear off; the interest which the early immigrants in Goulburn attracted
had declined with familiarity. They often suspected that they were being patronised.

The way in which the subjects perceived the attitudes of Australians towards them was clearly illustrated in the incidents of conflict or misunderstanding which they recounted. Thirty two incidents were recorded from 16 Displaced Persons, nine men and seven women. The subjects' perceptions of the attitudes of the Australians involved can be classified under the following five headings:

1. Hostility, persecution, general prejudice - 8 incidents
2. Patronising attitude, treating the immigrant as an oddity, implying his inferiority - 8 "
3. Discrimination on the part of those in authority - 7 "
4. Interference with personal liberty, attempt to subordinate - 7 "
5. Lack of understanding, sympathy, interest - 2 "

This material cannot show how widespread, nor how deep, was the feeling that Australians are hostile towards immigrants; what it does show is that, to the extent that the subjects perceived a cleavage between themselves and Australians, they saw themselves in the inferior, vulnerable status, and
the Australians in the position where they can at least attempt to assert their superiority over the immigrants.

The positive and negative orientation towards Australia can now be briefly summarised. Australia constitutes a negative reference group in that its culture is inferior and backward (although Australians don't realise this), its people lack a due appreciation of responsibility and discipline, pretend to a democracy and freedom which they do not practise, have a false sense of their own importance and worth, and are inhospitable to strangers. In comparing themselves to the Australians as a negative reference group, the Displaced Persons perceived of themselves either as representatives of their own nation, or as immigrants in this country (1). The comparison between themselves, as immigrants, and Australians was usually focussed on the claim that, through

(1) Besides perceiving himself as an immigrant or a representative of his national culture, the Displaced Person can also evaluate this satisfaction or worth in a number of other roles, using Australia as a reference group. He can, e.g., evaluate himself as a skilled worker, a professionally trained person, the head of a family, a member of a particular church. The discussion would become too elaborate and complex if these diverse role-perceptions were included, but it should be remembered that the analysis in the text does not exhaust the possibilities.
their thrift and hard work, the immigrants are demonstrating their own equality with Australians, or superiority over them, and their independence of Australian respect or acceptance. This is essentially an attempt to establish status by asserting one's ability to be so successful as others with much greater advantages. The function of this kind of orientation in the adaptation of the individual immigrant is to stimulate his ambition.

As the elaboration of their attitudes and feelings showed, the subjects were very often making an oblique self-evaluation when they compared Australian culture with their own; such comparisons, even when stated in apparently objective terms, are usually to be interpreted as self-appraisals by immigrants, perceiving of themselves as representatives of their own countries, in relation to Australia as a reference group. For example, when an informant says, "the family in Australia is not so close as at home, and the members don't help each other as much," she is, in a mild way, asserting her own worth, laying claim to some prestige, as a representative of the superior culture. The function of such comparisons in the adaptation of the individual is obvious enough: by belittling Australia, the individual compensates for his failure to gain acceptance in the Australian community;
by proclaiming himself a representative of a superior culture, he attempts to attach himself some of the prestige which his inferior immigrant status denies him; by emphasising the faults and deficiencies of the Australians' treatment of immigrants, he locates the blame for his disappointments and failures outside himself.

The positive orientation to Australia was focussed sometimes on the norms and sometimes on the status of Australian society. Here again, the subjects made the comparison in terms of themselves as immigrants, or as representatives of their home countries. As immigrants positively oriented to the norms of Australian society, they evaluated themselves in terms of their conformity to the local patterns; for example they were proud, or ashamed, of their competence in English, their knowledge of Australian forms of etiquette and eating habits, their familiarity with Australian traditions, history, politics, etc. As immigrants positively oriented to the status of Australian society, they evaluated themselves in terms of achievements, and their success in gaining an entrée to the Australian community.

Perceiving themselves as representatives of their country of origin, positively oriented to the norms
of Australian culture, they emphasised the social, cultural or political values held in common by their own society and by Australia: democracy, personal liberty, respect for law, lack of class distinctions, etc. Their self-esteem, and their right to respect, were based on the claim that they had always shared the basic values of the dominant, Australian, culture (1).

The immigrants sometimes evaluated their present position in terms of the attention or respect which, as nationals of a particular country, they felt should be accorded them. These subjects believed that they should be granted the acceptance into the Australian community which they wanted, because they came from a "superior" country. Czechoslovaks, Hungarians and Baltic people, for example, often maintained that, coming from countries with a comparatively high standard of living and educational level, they had more right to

(1) It is also theoretically possible that an immigrant, positively oriented to Australia, could base his comparisons on the worthlessness and unimportance of the country which he represented. Comparisons of this kind were made occasionally by subjects who wished to show their humility, or to ingratiate themselves with the research worker; they were expressed in some such terms as, "I come from a poor little country; only a few people speak my language; we are not of any importance in the world today; therefore I am not important myself; why should Australians bother about me; I must adapt myself and learn to get on with Australians."
respect than had immigrants from the "backward" countries of Poland, Russia, the Ukraine and Yugoslavia, who would never contribute anything to Australia except their labour.

The function of these several forms of positive orientation, in the adaptation of the individual, is to prepare him to take his place in the Australian society; to evaluate himself in terms of the norms of the local community, and to aspire to the status of the Australians are steps in the process of becoming fully identified with the new society. This is the "anticipatory socialization" previously referred to (1).

4. Naturalisation

Studies of immigration sometimes take naturalisation as an index or criterion of the immigrants' orientation to his new country, or, more generally, of the extent to which he has become assimilated (2). We may now inquire, what is the significance of naturalisation to the subjects of this study, and whether there is any relationship between the Displaced Person's intention of becoming naturalised and his orientation towards Australia.

(1) See p.333.

(2) For example, Fields, 1938, Gosnell, 1929, and Poignant, 1949, take naturalisation as an index of assimilation. On the other hand, Gessain and Doré, 1946, p.108, and Borrie, 1954,
Briefly, the present requirements for naturalisation, as set out in the Commonwealth Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948, are as follows: an alien becomes eligible for naturalisation if he has resided in Australia during the twelve months immediately preceding the application, if in addition he has had at least four years' residence in Australia during the eight years preceding the application, if he intends to reside permanently in Australia, if he has lodged a Declaration of Intention to become naturalised at least two years before, and if he has satisfied other requirements of character, knowledge of English and understanding of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship. The most important nation-wide disabilities of the alien, as compared to the British subject, are that he has no vote for Commonwealth or State elections and is not eligible to stand for Parliament, he cannot become a permanent public servant, and he is ineligible for old age or invalid pensions, or, in the

pp.141, 191 and 222, specifically reject naturalisation as an adequate criterion of assimilation.
case of a woman, for a widow's pension (1).

(1) This does not mean that, on becoming naturalised, an alien automatically becomes eligible for those social service benefits, for all claimants, including British subjects, are subject to residential requirements: five years' continuous residence in Australia in the case of widows' and invalid pensions, and 20 years continuous residence in the case of old age pensions. The most important of the additional disabilities which apply in certain States relate to land ownership and access to state-owned housing: in Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania, aliens have the same rights of land ownership as have British subjects; in N.S.W., there is no restriction on the alien's access to or control over freehold land, but, in order to retain a crown land holding, he is required to become naturalised when eligible; in South Australia and Queensland, official permission must be obtained before an alien can acquire freehold or crown land; there is very little freehold land in the Northern Territory, and official permission is required before an alien can become a lessee or sub-lessee of crown land; once such permission has been granted, an alien is required to become naturalised within eight years of such permission being granted; there is no restriction on the acquisition of freehold land by aliens in the A.C.T., nor of crown lands outside Canberra City; within Canberra City, official approval has to be obtained for an alien to acquire a lease of crown land. In N.S.W., aliens are not eligible to apply for tenancy of a Housing Commission home, unless married to an Australian spouse; restrictions on the access of aliens to government housing also apply in Victoria and Tasmania; no official restrictions apply in the A.C.T., Queensland, South Australia or Western Australia.
The attitudes of the Goulburn Displaced Persons towards naturalisation were determined less by their recognition of the objective, legal advantages of British citizenship, than by their perception of themselves as an inferior out-group in the community. Very few of the subjects regarded naturalisation as primarily a symbol of new loyalties and full membership in Australian society, and none expressed the feeling that citizenship would make them more truly Australians than they would be otherwise. But to be an Australian is at least to be something - as one informant put it, "We are only New Australians now; that is like being a 'DP' - just nothing; if you went to America and said, 'I am a New Australian', what would that mean?" There was also a common feeling that naturalisation would confer a certain equality with Australians, that, while it would not alter the attitude of Australians towards an immigrant, it would at least minimise the Australians' right to feel superior. Many subjects also regarded it as expedient to become naturalised, although very few had in mind any particular benefits which they hoped to secure thereby in the immediate future: some were vaguely aware that naturalisation would
qualify them for certain jobs and occupational privileges for which an alien is not eligible, and those who were in government employment were well aware that they could not become permanent public servants until they were British subjects; some felt that an Australian passport was better than no passport at all; others were anxious to avoid the status of an enemy alien in the event of war. The importance of expediency as a motive for becoming naturalised has been commented on in other studies (1). In a pamphlet on Naturalization Procedure: Notes Prepared by the Commonwealth Department of Immigration for the Information of Delegates to the Australian Citizenship Convention, 1954, the Explanatory Memorandum circulated in Parliament with the Nationality and Citizenship Bill 1948 is quoted to show that one reason for the introduction of the Declaration of Intention requirement in this Bill was to discourage the "opportunistic" attitude towards

(1) E.g., Gosnell, 1928, in a report of a study of 3,500 foreign-born in Chicago, points out the importance of economic incentives in naturalisation; in his study of Polish immigrants in France, Poignant, 1949, suggests that the rise in naturalisation figures in the 30's may have been due to fear of forcible repatriation; Borrie, 1954, has indicated that the advantages of citizenship in securing jobs during the depression, the desire to own property, and the experience of the war, have been important factors in motivating Italians in Australia to become naturalised.
naturalisation, by at least ensuring "that the application
is not submitted on the spur of the moment merely with the
object of immediate material gain, but is the result of
ma ture co ns idera tion. II (1)
Amongst the Goulburn Displaced Persons, objections to becoming naturalised did not necessarily involve
a negative orientation to Australia, nor signify that the
subject did not wish or intend to remain permanently in
this country.

Some Displaced Persons were unwilling to

sever the last symbolic tie with their country of origin;
in particular, those who were most conscious of being
"political refugees" were reluctant to take the citizenship of another country.

Some would have accepted

Australian citizenship, but were unwilling to become
British subjects.

Some feared that, by becoming natural-

ised, they would risk losing their freedom to return
home, if this ever became possible.

Some hoped that,

by refraining from taking out Australian citizenship,
they would protect themselves against the possibility of
being called into the Australian army,
In the light of these attitudes towards the
advantages and disadvantages of becoming naturalised it
is clear that we should not expect to find any strong

(1) Naturalization Procedure,

195~, p.~.


correlation between orientation towards Australia and intention to become naturalised. In the following table these two factors are related, and it is shown that there is a slight tendency for subjects with a definitely positive orientation to Australia to be more interested in naturalisation than subjects with a negative or ambivalent orientation. As we shall see in the next chapter, education and socio-economic background appear to be more important than orientation to Australia in determining whether a Displaced Person applies for naturalisation.

Orientation to Australia in Relation to Naturalisation, for 16 Displaced Persons, 24 Men and 14 Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naturalisation</th>
<th>Orientation to Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Intention by June, 1953</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Declaration of Intention by June, 1953</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As none of the Goulburn subjects had been in Australia long enough, by June 1953, to become naturalised, we have used the lodging of a Declaration of Intention, which can be made at any time after an alien has completed one year's residence in Australia, as an indication that a subject will become naturalised when eligible.
5. Germany, Russia, the U.S.A., South America and Canada as Reference Groups.

It seems clear that Germany, Russia, the U.S.A. and South America were much more significant as reference groups to the Displaced Persons at the time they left Europe and during the early period after their arrival in Australia, than they are today. The stimulus for the Displaced Persons to compare themselves to people in these countries is diminishing. We shall therefore only briefly note the most common orientations towards these groups. Particularly among subjects from the Baltic countries and Hungary, Germany was taken as a positive reference group - the epitome of efficiency, discipline, strength and endurance; only to a few Poles was Germany an extreme negative reference group. But for many of the subjects, especially those from the Baltic countries, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, Russia, or Russian Communism, was an important negative reference group, embodying all the elements of personal and political tyranny which they most strongly rejected; in comparing their present position with what it had been, or would be, under Communism, these subjects emphasised not the ideological issues, but the operation of Communism in subjugated or controlled countries.

It seems certain that, while they were in Western Europe awaiting resettlement, many Displaced Persons
regarded the U.S.A. as a very strong positive reference group; many now in Australia had at one time hoped to gain entry to the U.S., and all knew of friends or relatives who had succeeded in migrating there. Six of the Goulburn Displaced Persons said that they still had some hope of getting to America, and at least three of these had made applications for visas. The subjects compared themselves, as immigrants to Australia, with immigrants in the U.S.A., claiming in particular that Americans were much more hospitable than Australians towards strangers, that there was more opportunity for private enterprise, and hence more chance of financial success, and that there were no obstacles in the way of practising the profession or trade in which the immigrant had been trained in Europe. Although some informants did certainly idealise the position of immigrants in the U.S. in this way, others specifically rejected American materialism and self-confidence. Occasionally, the subjects would take immigrants in Canada or South America as a reference group.

6. Patterns of Reference Group Orientation

In the preceding discussion of reference group orientations among the Goulburn Displaced Persons, four
different variables have been indicated: positive-negative orientations to country of origin, tendency to use country of origin as a reference group, positive-negative orientations to Australia, and the roles in which the subjects perceive themselves in relating themselves to Australia as a reference group. "Tendency to use Australia as a reference group" is not a variable, because all of the subjects are continually relating themselves to the Australian community. The variables will be considered in the following combinations: the tendency to see oneself as a representative of one's national culture will be related to positive-negative orientations to Australia; and orientations to country of origin will be linked to orientations towards Australia.

As we have pointed out above (1), comparisons between country of origin and Australia are usually to be taken as self-evaluations of the immigrant, perceived as a representative of his own culture, in relation to Australia as the reference group. An analysis of 81 comparisons made by 35 Displaced Person subjects shows that the greater the number of comparisons made, the greater is the proportion of comparisons unfavourable to

(1) See p. 397.
Australia; or, to summarise the details given in the following table, the ratio of comparisons favourable to Australia to those unfavourable was 13:24 for the 26 subjects who made only one or two comparisons altogether, but for the nine subjects who made more than two comparisons, the ratio was 7:37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons Unfavourable to Australia</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table was computed from comparisons made by the 35 subjects on 17 different items; several comparisons on the one item made by the same informant are counted only once; there were no instances of an informant making inconsistent comparisons on the same item. Three comparisons in which the comparative evaluation of Australia and country of origin was uncertain have been omitted altogether. Comparisons were occasionally suggested to the subjects by myself, but, in these cases, only those are included where the subject spontaneously elaborated on the suggested comparison.
These findings mean that subjects with a negative orientation to Australia are the ones most likely to think of themselves as representatives of a different culture. And, conversely, immigrants with a positive orientation are less inclined to think of themselves as representatives of another culture. The question of which comes first, the orientation or the role-perception, is not relevant, for they reinforce one another. The negative orientation may be based originally on the divergence of Australian from European culture; but, as the immigrant faces personal disappointments, he is likely to elaborate this negative orientation, and to stress the fact that he is different from the people whom he holds responsible for his failures and who, he believes, do not accept him as an equal. The nexus between role-perception and orientation is thus adjustment, or the immigrant's perception of the relation between his achievements and aspirations. This nexus will be further elaborated in the next chapter.

We now turn to the relation between orientations to country of origin and to Australia. The data that have been used to determine these orientations for each subject include not only the comparisons which have just been analysed, but also many other non-comparative comments and
judgements. Insofar as comparisons have been used as data, the positions of subjects in the several country-of-origin and orientation-to-Australia categories have not been determined independently: a comparison which is, in some degree, unfavourable to one, must be, in some degree, favourable to the other. The following table is therefore to be interpreted, not as a correlation between the two sets of orientations, but as a means of isolating certain important patterns, or combinations of orientations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation to Country of Origin</th>
<th>Orientation to Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentric</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent - more positive than negative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent - more negative than positive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows the distribution of the several orientation patterns throughout the sample. Of the 12 theoretically possible combinations, only seven occur, and these will be grouped into five for the sake of convenience. The ethnocentric individual is the one whose psychological security depends on his affiliation with a powerful or important group; by defending and proclaiming the superiority of "his" group, he is maintaining his own self-esteem; but so precarious are his security and self-esteem that he cannot afford to acknowledge the virtues of other groups - hence his negative orientation to Australia. In a different situation, these are the individuals who might be rigidly and blindly attached to a kin or religious group; among immigrants, it is the, idealised, country of origin that is likely to become the focus for an attachment of this kind.

The four subjects with a negative orientation to both their countries of origin and Australia are all people who project their own extreme aggressiveness onto others; they are as incapable of acknowledging, spontaneously and generously, virtue in other individuals as they are of developing abiding loyalties to any group.
The third orientation pattern consists of an ambivalent, more positive than negative, orientation to country of origin, and a positive or ambivalent orientation to Australia. This category includes nearly all the subjects with some understanding and appreciation of their own cultural traditions; they are people with a comparatively cosmopolitan outlook and some capacity for being objective about their own experience; they have enough ego-security to permit them to admit the weaknesses in their countries of origin and to acknowledge the value of Australian culture, even though they are not fully accepted into Australian society. An ambivalent, more negative than positive, orientation to country of origin and a positive or ambivalent orientation to Australia constitute the fourth pattern. To most of the people in this category, love for the homeland was based on familiarity with the local community and its parochial culture, and perhaps also on a deep attachment to the soil. But, because of the hardships they suffered at home - due to economic factors, war or foreign oppression - there are also negative elements in their feelings about their own countries. Like the subjects in the preceding category, they can be comparatively objective and realistic about both their own countries and Australia.
The fifth and last category consists of those subjects with an ambivalent, but predominantly positive orientation towards country of origin and a negative orientation to Australia. The four people in this category are heterogeneous in background and social characteristics; the one thing which they have in common is that their own personal unhappiness in this country has very strongly coloured their views, with the result that they are incapable of being objective in their judgements of Australia. Immigrants in other categories have also experienced personal unhappiness, but, for various, reasons, have retained some objectivity. With these four subjects, personal failure and difficulties have accentuated a tendency to look backwards towards an idealised past, or forwards towards a future of fantasy, in their own countries, and to see only the opposite, negative aspects of the Australian environment.

7. The Concept of Identification

We turn now to the Displaced Persons' conceptions of the collectivities, or groups, as the case may be, in which their membership is quite definite and unequivocal - their fellow-nationals in Australia, and their fellow-Displaced Persons. The degree and pattern of identification
are determined by three factors. Firstly, there is the extent to which the individual feels that he belongs to a group, his acknowledgement of membership; this involves his own conception of himself as acting as a member of a particular group, as conforming to or deviating from its mores; data for this factor are obtained from the individual's statements about group memberships, and his interpretations of his own behaviour in terms of group standards. The second factor is readiness to act as a member of a group; this involves the individual's attitudes towards social relationships with other members of the group, and his loyalty and responsibility towards them. Here data are obtained from expressions of opinion about associating with fellow-members and the obligations and sacrifices which the individual feels can justifiably be expected of him as a group member. Since we have already discussed the social relationships of the subjects in the previous chapter, and since the actual relationships are determined not only by the individual's attitudes but also by the opportunities available, we shall be more concerned here with willingness or readiness to associate with other members of the group than with the reported or observed relationships.
An assessment of these first two factors is also obtained from the individual's responses in crucial situations which force him to acknowledge, through statements or actions, that he recognises certain group memberships as having primacy over others. For example, a Displaced Person may be a party to a quarrel among workmates, involving his fellow-nationals, other Displaced Persons and Australians; in taking sides, he has to declare his identification with one group or another. The only near-crucial situations afforded by the material of this study were the occasions when a subject received an appeal for help from a fellow-countryman or another European; reactions to such appeals provided a useful indication of the Displaced Person's sense of loyalty and responsibility to other members of these groups.

The third factor is the evaluation which the individual places on the group and its activities. He has a positive or negative evaluation of a group, according to whether he regards its activities and goals highly, or is critical or highly antagonistic towards them. Statements about the group provide the relevant data for this factor.

These three factors do not vary concomitantly. Identification is strongest where there is an explicit and
willing acknowledgement of membership in a group of which the individual feels proud, where the individual associates readily with his fellow-members, and gladly recognises loyalty and responsibility to them. The weakest identification occurs where the individual admits group membership only because external circumstances or personal or physical characteristics force him to do so, where he avoids association with his fellow-members, where he takes out-groups as his positive reference groups, where he holds the group in contempt, and recognises only those obligations which are forced upon him by expediency or external sanctions. This negative identification is the "group self-hatred" to which we have previously referred (1).

In addition to these two extremes, a variety of possible combinations of the three factors involved in identification is possible. For example, an individual may have no antagonism towards a group which he is forced to belong to, but at the same time may feel only the minimum of loyalty towards it; that is, he may remain free from emotional attachment, simply taking his membership for granted. Willingness to form social ties with fellow-members may or may not be linked with

(1) See p. 112.
acknowledgement of responsibility or a high evaluation. The recognition of obligations towards a group may be associated with a positive evaluation, but, on the other hand, through a strong sense of duty or because of personal loyalties, an individual may admit responsibility to a group whose activities he regards as ill-starred, insignificant or immoral. Or an individual may idealise a group without feeling called upon to fulfil obligations towards it; this combination of attitudes is often found where an individual's membership in a group is becoming very much attenuated; if he ceases altogether to act as a member of the group, but retains a favourable attitude towards it, and judges himself in terms of its standards, then it has become a positive reference group for him.

It will now be clear that the concept of identification adopted here derives from, but is not identical with, that current in psycho-analytic writings. Freud and his successors have generally used the term to apply to the relation of one individual to another, while we are here applying it to the relation of the individual to a group. Moreover, in psycho-analytic theory the concept has its place in the development of the personality: the child's earliest emotional tie to his father is in the
form of identification - the father is taken as the model; at the same time, he develops an emotional attachment to the mother, and out of these two affective ties emerges the Oedipus complex. In Freudian thinking, the important element in the process of identification is the wish to be like, to act like, to take the place of, another person; and it is through this process of identification that the individual assumes the moral standards of his parents; capacity for identification with other individuals in later life depends on these first identifications within the family. In our usage of the term, we leave aside the question of how the individual first acquires the capacity for forming such emotional ties, and we emphasise two aspects of the concept as used in the psychoanalytic literature - the aspect of feeling oneself at one with another, and the aspect of taking over the standards of another. The individual who is strongly identified with a group is the one who shares the goals, values and norms of behaviour of other members of the group, and who feels that his own welfare, self-esteem and destiny are bound up with the fate of the group as a whole.
None of the subjects appeared to feel strongly that one should associate with fellow-countrymen just because they were of the same nationality; even those who acknowledged some obligation to help their fellow-countrymen in need did not admit any similar obligation to social intercourse. Most subjects did feel, however, that it was natural to be interested in meeting one's own nationals and to form friendships with such people; one of the principal values of such relationships was that they provided an opportunity to speak one's own language. There was also a common attitude that, while it was natural to enjoy the company of one's compatriots, one had every right to be discriminating and should be free to reject such association. Such an attitude is probably most characteristic of high-status persons (or persons claiming high status) who wish to avoid being forced into association with fellow-countrymen regarded as socially inferior. It is not only the social relationships which such high status immigrants wished to escape, but they were also anxious to avoid being associated in the eyes of the Australian community with their lower-status compatriots.
Less common was outright rejection of association with fellow-countrymen. Various reasons were given for this attitude: immigrants have a better chance of learning English if they do not mix with their own people; they already know all about their own countrymen, and can learn nothing more from them, while, on the other hand, they should take the opportunity to associate with Australians and understand this country while they are here. Others again feared that fellow-countrymen were likely to take advantage of their common nationality to exploit each other, and did not wish to expose themselves to this danger; some too expressed the issue as an ideological one, claiming that the tendency to associate with one's compatriots is an expression of the kind of nationalist feeling which has had destructive effects in Europe, and which should be deliberately avoided. Pride in country of origin and contempt for fellow-countrymen were reconciled through the claim that the immigrants represent the least desirable section of the society from which they have come, or have been corrupted in the emigration process.

While all of these reasons doubtless had some motivating force for certain immigrants, they should not always be taken at their face value. Sometimes they are rationalisations for a deep-seated withdrawal which derives
from the individual's early experience, and sometimes they are simply the kind of explanations which the subject thinks the research worker will accept or understand. To anticipate briefly the analysis which will be made in the Chapter 10, we can suggest that the immigrants who specifically reject association with their fellow-countrymen fall into two classes. The first consists of those whose rejection is part of a deliberate plan to achieve certain aspirations within the Australian social system. The second class consists of those whose rejection is due to unconscious forces which they do not fully understand nor control: fellow-countrymen can be a constant reminder of past sufferings and present disappointments, and are hence avoided, or the attempt to dissociate himself from the weak and inferior group of his fellow-nationals may be a means of preserving his own self-esteem.

Attitudes towards national associations provide no criterion of the national identification of the subjects of this study. Few of them have lived for any length of time in the cities where such associations are operating; in general they have had no opportunity to assess their advantages and disadvantages, nor any need to formulate opinions about them. It has already been
pointed out in the Chapter that, while some subjects see positive values in national associations, the majority are indifferent or antagonistic to them.

A criterion of identification is the evaluation placed upon one's fellow-countrymen as a group. The kinds of attitudes on this question have already been implied in the discussion on readiness to associate socially with fellow-countrymen. Those subjects who placed a high value on their compatriots in Australia based their claim on one or more of the following criteria: the admirable culture and social system of their country of origin; the fact that their country suffered during the war as the victim of German or Russian oppression, or both; the fact that the immigrants themselves represent a selected group who have endured hardships and privations, or who, as political refugees, have fled their countries for the sake of their convictions; the fact that the immigrants are making a valuable contribution to Australian life, culturally or economically.

Few of the subjects felt that they could justly be proud of all their compatriots in Australia, but some were more insistent than others on distinguishing the valuable from the worthless elements. Such judgements are made on a basis similar to that applied to Displaced
Persons as a whole, which has previously been discussed in Chapter 4. It may be noted here, however, that there was some tendency for informants to claim that fellow-countrymen of whom they disapproved were not in fact genuine members of their own national-cultural group (1). This process of denying national identity with persons of whom one disapproves has its counterpart in claims that an approved person belongs to one's own, valued, nationality (2).

(1) E.g., a Hungarian asserted that two fellow-immigrants whose behaviour and attitudes he deplored were not "real" Hungarians, but that the wife was originally Russian and the husband German; a Lithuanian woman similarly claimed that an immigrant generally known as a fellow-countryman of hers, and a person for whom she had no respect, was in fact an ethnic German.

(2) Examples of this are rare; in one case a Hungarian claimed that a Slovak friend was really more like a Hungarian than a Slovak because he came from an area which had formerly been under Hungarian rule. Although it is not often possible for an immigrant to ascribe his own nationality to another immigrant in this way, it is quite common for one immigrant, e.g., a Latvian, to claim that a valued friend of another nationality, e.g. a Pole, has in fact the characteristic qualities of a Latvian, and is not a typical Pole at all! See Nadel, 1951, pp.147-150, for a discussion of group names. "If, for the observer, the names are pointers to a conscious group unity, they are also, for the people, a means of indicating and maintaining that unity as they desire it to obtain". p.148.
9. Identification with Displaced Persons in Australia

As indicated earlier in this chapter, the immigrant is a person whose membership in any national group is in doubt. This equivocal status is accentuated in the case of the Displaced Persons because they arrived in this country without valid passports, and many of them are technically Stateless. Identification with the Displaced Person group has come to be, in some ways, a substitute for national identification; however reluctant he might be to claim membership in a group which he believes to have been despised and discriminated against in Europe, and regarded as inferior in Australia, he has at least a recognised status of some sort as a Displaced Person; this is one group in which he is certain of membership, whether he likes it or not. The informants were all very conscious of being Displaced Persons, often applying the word "DP" to themselves or to some other immigrant in a selfconscious or derisory manner. For most of them the kind of life which they led in Europe from the end of the war until emigration was determined almost exclusively by their status as Displaced Persons. Once in Australia, they were still officially classified as Displaced Persons, and were labelled with names, such as "Balts" or "New Australians", which indicated that they
occupied a common position in this country, irrespective of their nationality: differences in nationality were deliberately ignored by officials, and remained a mystery to the Australian man-in-the-street. Most subjects explicitly denied any wish or obligation to act as members of the group, and expressed little admiration or respect for Displaced Persons as a whole, apart from their economic achievements. But at the same time, they retained their membership in the group, because there was virtually no alternative: membership is nearly involuntary.

While association with fellow-countrymen was sometimes regarded not only as natural, but as right, the attitude towards association with fellow-immigrants in general was somewhat different: the most common attitude was that one associates with other immigrants, not because it is especially good to do so, but because these are the only social contacts available, and one has much in common with them, being fellow-Europeans and fellow-immigrants. Some of the subjects clearly found satisfaction in identifying themselves with an underprivileged group; "we are just poor New Australians" they would say, hoping thus to elicit sympathy or help, or striving to place the responsibility for an inner sense of worthlessness on their,
involuntary, membership of an inferior group. The claim that their inferior status was not due to their own shortcomings, but to factors outside their control, such as the prejudice of the Australians, justified a variety of attitudes and behaviour which they recognised as unacceptable to the Australian community: failure to acknowledge obligations to their employers, neighbours, the community or the government; the free expression of aggression against Australians; concentration on their individual material welfare; the instability of their family life. The acknowledgement of membership in a low-status group was a mechanism of adaptation which gave a rationale to their behaviour, and at the same time left them free to pursue their material goals.

Some subjects withdrew from association with fellow-Europeans on the same grounds as those noted above for rejection of fellow-countrymen; but their perceived low status in the Australian community was probably the strongest
factor motivating immigrants to disassociate themselves from the Displaced Person group. Subjects who rejected their fellow-immigrants were anxious to show Australians, and other immigrants whom they also regarded as atypical, that they did not approve of the behaviour of the group, share their values, nor wish to be linked with them. Some subjects who placed this low value on the Displaced Person group continued to associate with their fellow-immigrants, while displaying contempt for their inferiority and weakness and likely exploiting them to the full. Others withdrew from all close social relationships, while some made positive efforts to be accepted into the Australian community.

10. Basic Values

In the preceding pages we have described the subjects' attitudes towards their own country, to Australia, to their fellow-nationals and to other Displaced Persons in Australia. The values underlying the judgements made by the subjects and their acknowledgements of belonging to a particular group have been indicated throughout the discussion. Only a brief summary of these values is required here. As would be expected from their intellectual background, very few of the subjects had a coherent, explicit, organised value system. It is possible, however, to indicate that the values
underlying their political and national attitudes tended to recur in certain combinations, and that these combinations reflected the influence of recognised ideologies. At a very general level, two distinct patterns can be discerned.

In the first pattern, the basic values are respect for the equal rights for all individuals, without reference to their belonging to a particular category, freedom of thought and movement, and the absence of rigidity in the class structure. We might call these the "democratic" values.

In the second pattern, certain classes of individuals are held to be more worthy than others, and are privileged accordingly. Because of this differential worth, strong leadership of an individual or elite and a hierarchical social structure are believed to be essential for the efficient working of the state; in the interests also of this efficiency, discipline is highly valued and it is accepted as essential that all subversive elements should be eradicated (1). It is right that the

(1) In the course of a heated discussion with a British migrant, a Hungarian explained that a government must rid itself of all opposition in the same way as the Migrant Hostel canteen had to get lorries to come every day to take away the rubbish for the pigs.
scope of state control should extend into all aspects of the individual's life. Strength and power are highly valued, and weakness despised. These values are very clearly similar to those promulgated in totalitarian philosophies, and more particularly, in the doctrines of the Nazi Party (1). An individual who shares values of this kind and who has been under Nazi influence need not necessarily, however, have a positive orientation towards Germany as a nation;

(1) See, e.g., Metz and Thomson, 1950; Spitz, 1949; these are similar to the values which underly Parsons' "Universalistic-Ascription" type of society, 1952, pp.191-194.
this value system attracted many who admired Germany as a model of strength, discipline and efficiency, although they felt, and feel, no loyalty to her as a country. On the contrary, most of the subjects, including those who shared these totalitarian values, understood very clearly that, in different degrees, they were regarded as inferior by Germans, and experienced German antipathy to Displaced Persons after the war ended.
CHAPTER 10

PATTERNS OF ADAPTATION

1. Introduction

In the course of this study we have described the composition and structure of the Goulburn Displaced Person group, the occupations, economic and social positions, attitudes and aspirations of its members, their orientations towards their countries of origin and to Australia, and their identifications with the immigrant group as a whole and with their fellow-nationals in this country. Up to this point, we have dealt with selected areas of social and cultural behaviour, and in each area we have been able to distinguish certain recurring patterns of characteristics, behaviour and attitudes. In this chapter our focus turns to the individual immigrant as a total social personality; we shall inquire whether the patterns which have been distinguished tend to occur concomitantly in particular individuals.

Such an inquiry assumes that it might be possible to arrive at some general typology of "social personalities" by combining the several social and cultural patterns that have previously been identified. Although it is unnecessary here to argue out the validity of type concepts, we can note
that a controversy over this issue has arisen, particularly in psychology, and that weighty criticisms, revolving mainly around the continuity, rather than discontinuity, of human personality, have been levelled against typological analysis. We shall here follow such writers as Becker, Gardner Murphy, Kimball Young and Adorno (1), in suggesting that type concepts are not only legitimate and fruitful, but in some (albeit disguised) form necessary for bringing order into the apparently infinite diversity of human behaviour.

The four types or patterns of adaptation to be described in this chapter have been arrived at empirically; they are not ideal constructs derived originally from sociological or psychological theory. We have already described this typology in embryonic form, in Chapter 5. It early became clear that the Displaced Persons differed greatly in the meaning which they attached to their jobs; these differences were obviously and directly related to their over-all aspirations, to their concepts of the kind of life which they wanted to lead. When the subjects were divided into four categories according to their dominant aspirations, it was found that the categories differed markedly in a number of factors relevant to the inquiry.

(1) Becker, Feb. 1940; Murphy, 1947, pp. 734-760; Young, 1947, pp. 301-336; Adorno et al, 1950, pp. 744-752. Park and Miller, 1921, and Eisenstadt, 1959, have applied type concepts to the study of immigrant groups.
Although in some factors the differences were not significant and the overlap was great, a certain cluster of factors showed a decided discontinuity from one type to another. Moreover, as we shall show, these discontinuities were more numerous and significant than they at first appeared, for apparently similar features took on different meanings according to the context in which they occurred, or, in other words, according to their relationship to other features; "primary relations with Australians", for example, had a very different meaning to different types of immigrants.

These patterns of adaptation have not been derived from, nor do they correspond to, any of the psychological types which have been established clinically or statistically by psychiatrists and psychologists. It seems very likely that further, more psychologically directed, research would show that there is a theoretically meaningful link between these patterns of adaptation and recognised psychological syndromes; it might well be that the psychological personality is a limiting factor, rather than a determinant of adaptation type permitting a number of different adaptations, according to the situation in which the individual operates, but ruling out certain other kinds of adaptations.

Our adaptation types contain, indeed, a great deal less data on mental processes than would be required for
analysis in terms of psychological types. But they contain more data than is commonly given in the sociologist's description of the "social personality" or "person", for the description of the person, in this sense, is limited to the role, or system of roles which an individual fulfills (1). From this viewpoint, one of the typical persons found in the Displaced Person group is the male unskilled wage earner, head of a family, householder, neighbour, member of an informal clique of fellow-immigrants, subscriber to a national newspaper, and legal alien. It would be possible to identify a number of systems of roles in this way among the subjects of this study. But it has seemed profitable to focus our typology around the way in which the subject perceives his roles and his over-all future aspirations rather than around the objective requirements of the role itself.

In the following analysis of the four types of adaptation, we shall try to show, though sometimes tentatively, that the several factors involved are not accidental congeries, but systematically related, that they make sense in terms of

(1) See Nadel, 1951, p.93, "We might here speak of different 'aspects' of a person, or of different 'roles' assumed by it, or simply of different 'persons'".
recognised psychological and sociological processes (1). The data on which the following discussion is based are summarised in Table . For each of the four adaptation types, this Table gives information on nationality and migrant type, age, family status, education, pre-migration occupational status, English ability, average number of months per job, present occupation, home ownership, residing in or out of Goulburn by May 1954, associational membership, church attendance, primary relations with Australians, primary relations outside the Goulburn community, identification with fellow-countrymen in Australia, orientation to home country, orientation to Australia, and naturalisation.

All of the readily classifiable patterns distinguished throughout the preceding chapters have thus been included. Contact with home country has been omitted because any classification of Displaced Persons in these terms is misleading unless opportunities for contact are taken into account (2).

(1) See Adorno et al., op. cit., p. 749, "We regard those types as being scientifically most productive which integrate traits, otherwise dispersed, into meaningful continuities and bring to the fore the interconnection of elements which belong together according to their inherent 'logic', in terms of psychological understanding of underlying dynamics."

(2) See p.
Classification according to democratic or totalitarian values has also been omitted because nearly a third of the subjects for whom all other data were available could not be classified in this way. The Table includes data on 38 Displaced Persons in all, 24 men and 14 women. No significance should be attached to the distribution of the four types within this sample, although I would assume that the "economically oriented" type, to which 17 of the 38 subjects belong, would also be the most common in the local Displaced Person group, and indeed in the Displaced Person population in Australia as a whole.

In the discussion which follows, the salient features of each type are emphasised; variations, except where they can be seen to constitute in some sense a sub-type, are ignored. The discussion draws not only on the data presented in the Table but also on additional material, not readily tabulated. Each type will be described in terms of social characteristics, assimilation, adjustment, identifications, and orientations.

2. The "Economically Oriented" Type

The "economically oriented" Displaced Person has usually had only a primary school education, or less, and comes from a background of low occupational status in Europe. His social assimilation has been minimal. He has taken his
place in the occupational and economic structure of the community, contributing labour rather than skill in his job, but filling a useful function at a time when labour was in short supply. He has put his money into land or a house. He has established service relations in the local community, and may have made some contact with Australian neighbours. But this is the limit of his social assimilation: he takes no part in the associational civic or political life of the community, and, if he has any contacts with the local families or with the church, they are superficial and not very meaningful to him. His cultural assimilation has often been a little more far-reaching: his English is usually just good enough to enable him to cope with the most essential contacts; he has adopted certain essential patterns of work behaviour and interpersonal relations; but the most far-reaching changes have resulted from his acceptance of the new material culture - food, household furnishings and equipment, personal effects. His adoption of new material objects, like his adoption of leisure patterns current in the Australian community, has been largely necessitated by the absence, or at least inaccessibility, of alternatives.

The immigrant of this type is usually well-adjusted occupationally and economically. He changes jobs less often
than immigrants of any other type. Since the kind of work in which he is engaged matters little to him, he is in a position to choose the most lucrative job available; he compares the standard of living and the opportunities for upward economic mobility which he enjoys here with the conditions in his home country, and finds himself much better off than he was, or would have been, in Europe. Economic affairs - his job, saving money, amassing material possessions - occupy his energies and attention; he literally concentrates his time and thought on the economic achievement that is open to him, not concerning himself unduly about the indifference of the host society, nor the poverty of his social and cultural life. The restriction of his social contacts within the local community expresses the value placed on thrift: travelling to visit friends elsewhere is an unnecessary waste of money. While this concentration on attaining economic security is a reaction to the impecunious and economically vulnerable position of the refugee and a response to the economic opportunities available in this country, it is also related to the fact that this type of immigrant, in his own life during the inter-war years, and perhaps in the traditions of his family for many generations, has suffered economic deprivation
or hardship. He knows what it is to want, and, within the limits of his present situation, he is guarding himself against economic insecurity in the future.

This type of immigrant is likely to have reached some fairly satisfying social adjustment by restricting his contacts largely to fellow-Europeans. But he remains always conscious of his failure to gain the acceptance and friendship of Australians. He could never be incorporated into the local social life through associations, whose formal atmosphere makes him feel conspicuous and uneasy, but the personal, informal contacts with Australian workmates and neighbours have not been forthcoming, or have proved abortive.

He has not been accustomed to positions of prominence, power or public respect at home, and he does not seek for this kind of recognition here. His self-esteem depends, above all, on his ability to make good financially, to provide economic security for himself and those dependant on him. It is through economic symbols, and not through any other medium, such as occupational achievement, associational membership or cultural contribution, that he seeks to gain respect, or at least the recognition that he is somebody, from both fellow-immigrants and Australians.
The "economically oriented" immigrant associates with fellow-countrymen or fellow-Europeans, because he feels comparatively comfortable in their company and shares common understandings with them; but he admits little responsibility for the preservation of his national culture in Australia, nor does he feel strongly about maintaining the identity of his fellow-countrymen as a national group, nor recognise that the Displaced Persons have any particular collective obligation to assist fellow-countrymen in need (in Germany for example) or to work for the liberation of their homelands. He is the kind of immigrant who feels that it is taking him all his time to look after himself, and that he cannot rightly be expected to assume additional group responsibilities.

Because the immigrant of this type comes from the less privileged section of his country of origin, there are strong negative elements in his orientation to his home country. But it does not follow that, because he believes that he has some chance of finding economic security in Australia, he will necessarily feel gratitude, affection or loyalty to this country. On the contrary, his attitude to Australia is much more likely to be ambivalent or negative than positive. It is just because he remains an outsider to Australian society - not identified with it - that he can take full advantage of his position in the minority
group. In the extreme instance, he regards any official or private group or individual in the host society as an object which he can legitimately exploit to the full; but more commonly, he takes what satisfactions he can get, without exploitation, but also without accepting more than the minimum of obligation and responsibility to the local community or to any group in it. It was to provide labour and produce children that he was brought to this country, and if he fulfills those requirements, he can see no reason why more should be expected of him. He is less likely than the majority of Displaced Persons to have any interest in becoming naturalised.

Of all four types of immigrants, the "economically oriented" has made the most realistic adaptation in terms of what the local community has to offer. Particularly once he has learnt the language and the routines of everyday life in the community, his requirements can be met with the minimum of adaptation on the part of the local people, who are required simply to accept his presence, and little more. The outcome of the neat consistency between his requirements and aspirations and the available opportunities is that he is more likely than most other Displaced Persons to settle down in Goulburn, and to acquire a home there. Having found himself, not of his own choosing, in Goulburn, he remains
there, although he might well have followed the example of many of his fellow-immigrants, and explored seemingly more attractive opportunities elsewhere; he may still do so, for, except perhaps for his vested interest in property, he has no ties to bind him to Goulburn. As time goes on, however, he may acquire ties, particularly through his children, and inadvertently come to recognise this as his new home.

3. The "Security Oriented" Type

The "security oriented" immigrant is the one who seeks above all a clearly defined, unobtrusive position in the community, where the demands made upon him will be minimal. The educational and pre-migration occupational status of immigrants in this category is more diverse than in the case of the other three types. He may come from a low status, poorly educated, ambitionless background, apparently making much the same kind of adaptation in this country as in Europe, or he may have curtailed his demands and aspirations in the process of migration.

The social assimilation of the "security oriented" Displaced Person, like that of the "economically oriented" one, has been minimal: it is only in his occupational and economic activities that he is incorporated into the local
social structure, as a skilled or unskilled worker. His very diffidence and self-effacement mean that he is likely to be passed over by Australians. The cultural assimilation of the "security oriented" immigrant is a complex problem. If he comes from a comparatively well-educated, high status background, he is likely to take an intellectual interest in the new culture, learning the language industriously and informing himself about the country and its people through the radio, newspapers and books. But these skills, knowledge and attitudes remain, in a sense, sterile, for they are but slightly relevant to his everyday activities, and are not communicated to other people; he knows, or anticipates, that the Australians with whom he comes into contact are neither well-informed on the subjects which interest him, nor responsive to his more earnest enquiries, while he finds few fellow-immigrants to share his serious interest in the new country. His interest in Australian culture is a form of "anticipatory socialization" to which we have previously referred; but in this case the process is likely to be an abortive one, for the chances of the Australian community becoming a membership, rather than a reference group, for the "security oriented" immigrant are slight. One might well suggest, however, that, even though he never becomes socially assimilated, his orientation
towards Australian culture is still adaptive, for familiarity with the cultural milieu is itself a source of security - it reduces the threat of the unknown. Moreover, knowledge of the culture places him on an equal, or even superior footing, to the ill-informed Australians with whom he comes into contact; even if the Australians are not aware of it, or do not respect him for it, he carries this sense of superiority in his own head and it helps him to bear disappointment, embarrassment and humiliation.

But, on the other hand, the well-educated "security oriented" Displaced Person may try to engross himself in the culture of his country of origin; he learns only the minimum of English, and takes no interest in Australian culture; he withdraws culturally, as he also withdraws socially, into an intellectual world of his own - a world which takes as little account of the surrounding Australian environment as it does of contemporary political and cultural events in his own country. But, in a community like Goulburn, this attempt too is sterile and unsatisfying; the migrant community is too small and too diverse for this kind of orientation towards one's country of origin to secure group support - one is lucky if one can find an occasional fellow-countryman with whom to exchange
ideas; when the individual no longer has the opportunity for communication, the content of his cultural interests loses some of its meaning for him; the hiatus between his interests and his opportunities for expressing and furthering them leaves him dissatisfied.

The cultural assimilation of the poorly educated "security oriented" Displaced Person, from a low status background, is less complex and varied; it is, like his social assimilation, minimal. Australian workmates and fellow-immigrants provide the only sources of knowledge and attitudes about the new culture; but his seeking for security above all else, his avoidance of threatening situations, means that he is exposed to the minimum of contact, and hence acquires the minimum of cultural knowledge from these sources.

It is possible for this type of immigrant to secure a good occupational and economic adjustment, particularly if he finds employment in a non-competitive organisation, where the pressure towards achievement is not great, and where there is comparative security of tenure. He is not especially ambitious to accumulate either money or material possessions; if he succeeds in saving money, it is an indirect outcome of his restricted mode of life rather than the result of deliberate thrift.
He feels that he is as well off financially as he could expect to be.

The social adjustment of the "security oriented" immigrant tends to be precarious. He seeks to make his whole life within the work group, the family and perhaps within a small familiar clique; if he succeeds in finding a niche in such a primary group, he asks for nothing more. But because of the mobility of the Displaced Person group and the general instability of primary relations, he does not usually find such a stable niche. Although he may establish good relations with Australian fellow-workers, he does not readily expose himself to the risk of rebuffs or ridicule; even though his book knowledge of English might be quite good, he has little confidence in speaking the language, the slightest accent or grammatical error making him feel conspicuous. His approaches to Australians are therefore cautious, and he does not readily make Australian friends. After one or two disappointments, in his relations either with Europeans or Australians, he is likely to withdraw into himself, to become the prototype of the social isolate, living in the past or in a future of fantasy.

The immigrant of this type is more likely than the majority of immigrants to be strongly identified with his fellow-countrymen in Australia. This attitude again is an
expression of his seeking for the familiar and the predictable. Like the "economically oriented" type, however, he has little interest in collective action to preserve national traditions or further national interests.

The "security oriented" Displaced Person is more likely to have a positive than a negative orientation to his country of origin, although, if he is of low status background, he may share the feeling of other immigrants of similar status that life in his home country for people of his class was hard. His regrets about the loss of his home country are regrets for what is comfortable, familiar and stable; he is not a chauvinist in any sense, but no country other than his own could adequately meet his security needs. Though he may willingly admit the high standard of living and economic opportunities in Australia, these things have little value for him. He may or may not have a positive orientation to this country; if he has, what he appreciates are the friendliness and helpfulness of fellow-workers, and the social and political freedom; if he has not, it is lack of hospitality and personal warmth that he complains of. His disinclination to become naturalised reflects the feeling that to renounce his former allegiance is to abandon one important basis of his precarious security.
Like the first type, the "security oriented" immigrant has made an adaptation which is realistic in terms of what the local community has to offer. He is more likely to stay in the community than any other type of immigrant. He is also likely to acquire a home of his own, although this does not become a goal on which all his energies are concentrated, as it often does with the "economically oriented" immigrant. This type of immigrant may not achieve the stable, close primary relations that he would like, but in a comparatively small-scale and immobile country town like Goulburn, he fairly readily attains the familiarity with places, people and cultural routines, which are some substitute for more personal relationships. His presence in the community, like that of the "economically oriented" immigrant requires the minimum of adaptation on the part of the Australians, who are only too glad to leave him in peace, to allow him to remain inconspicuous. He is probably more acceptable to the Australians than the first type of immigrant, whose financial achievements, constituting something of a threat in a competitive system, are likely to arouse jealousy and hostility; but, on the other hand, mild resentment may be directed at the "security oriented" immigrant for his withdrawal, his "keeping to himself", which may be interpreted
as an indication of a sense of superiority on his part.

4. The "Symbolically Oriented" Type

The "symbolically oriented" immigrant is one whose self-esteem depends essentially on the acknowledgement of other people - not simply of his family and immediate acquaintances, but also of the community at large. This social respect is more important to him than the content of what he does or how he lives: he will take an ill-paid but "respectable" job rather than risk loss of status by working in a lucrative but not socially valued occupation; he will preserve at all costs the outward forms of respectable dress and mode of living, even though this means depriving himself of more tangible material benefits or long-term economic security; his choice of associates will be determined more by their social standing than by their personal qualities. He is the person whose self-esteem depends on the preservation or acquisition of certain forms of behaviour and material culture; his adherence to particular forms is rigid; he is not adaptable.

The typical "symbolically oriented" immigrant has had a secondary or tertiary education and comes from a professional or white-collar occupation in Europe. His social and cultural assimilation have been uneven. On the
one hand, his incorporation into the occupational structure of the community has been less successful than with other immigrants: he has not taken such opportunities as are available for acquiring new trade skills, for he aspires to a less humble white-collar occupation; as a result he is more likely to remain in an unskilled job unless rescued by some influential Australian. Because of his occupational instability - he stays a much shorter time in each job than does the average immigrant - he is often regarded as shiftless, aiming too high and impossible to satisfy by his Australian employers. But he is more likely to have made Australian friends than any other type of immigrant, even though he often has difficulty in keeping them. He also tends to be very competent in English, and to have adopted Australian patterns of inter-personal behaviour without difficulty. This category contained the only two persons in the sample who, except for a slight accent, could readily have been taken for Australians. The immigrant of this type deliberately adopts the cultural patterns of Australian society in order to achieve his status aspirations; he may pass through a stage of "anticipatory socialization" to full identification with the host society, or the "anticipatory socialization" may prove abortive, as he feels himself rejected by the Australian community and turns back to the
immigrant group.

The occupational adjustment of the "symbolically oriented" immigrant in Goulburn is likely to be poor. His aspirations cannot be met in the local community; dissatisfied, not with the wages but with the status of the job and the opportunities it provides for mixing with "the right kind" of Australians, he moves from one place of employment to another. Although he usually admits that his income is appropriate to the kind of work he is doing, there is a great disparity between the amount of money which he feels he needs and what he has. He is not thrifty, and saving for a future rainy day has no meaning for him; he uses his money here and now to acquire the symbols of what he means by "gracious living". Although in Goulburn the purchase of land or a home was not the only proof that an immigrant had accumulated savings, it is nevertheless of some significance that none of the six persons in the "symbolically oriented" category had acquired land or a house, although three of them, at the time of the research, contemplated remaining in Goulburn with their families. They could not afford a home, because they lacked the values required to accumulate the necessary savings, as other types of immigrants had done.

The social adjustment of the "symbolically oriented" immigrant usually involves many difficulties. He has often
been accustomed to some respected position in his country of origin - through his occupation, through associational positions, through family membership or class status, or a combination of these. This recognition is still essential to his self-esteem, but the means for achieving it are not readily available. Despising the Displaced Person group as a whole, he is most likely to dissociate himself from them altogether, but may on the other hand find some satisfaction in asserting his superiority over less educated and lower status fellow-immigrants - if he cannot get into the big pond, he can at least be "the big fish in the little pond". He is more likely, however, to try to gain social acceptance among Australians. But he has difficulty in making contact with the middle or upper class Australians and does not wish for the friendship of those from the lower class, even when this is available. If he does establish relations with local people of the required class status, he is usually self-conscious about the lack of reciprocity in the relationship, since he has not the financial resources to participate on an equal footing with the Australians. It is this type and the "economically oriented" immigrant who are most likely to have an exploitative attitude to their relations to Australians.
Although we have not the data to make a comparison between the several types of immigrants in terms of personality organisation, it is perhaps worth noting that, out of the 26 subjects, those who showed the most marked personal disorganisation and inability to cope with their situation were all in this category (1). One woman, who had married an Australian after a brief acquaintance, and later left her husband and baby, was diagnosed by a social worker as a psychopath. A second was, according to a psychiatrist who knew her well, a neurasthenic. The third woman had recently developed ulcers and spent some time in hospital. One man was occupationally unstable to an extreme degree, and had shown himself incapable of providing financially for his wife and family, or making a home for them; he had become dependant on two Australians who had helped him. The ineffectiveness of the second man had not become so obvious, because the demands being made upon him were slight; while he was supposed to be preparing a home for

(1) Except for one woman, who had been committed to a mental hospital for several months, diagnosed as a schizophrenic, and whom I have placed in the category of those who aspire to "real status", although she is close to the borderline of the "real" and "symbolic" status categories.
his wife and family who were shortly to join him, and while he dreamt of establishing them on a family farm, he was spending nearly all his money on an attempt to maintain the mode of living to which, as an army officer in Europe, he had been accustomed. The third man had obvious paranoid tendencies, but lived a sufficiently self-contained existence for his pathological symptoms not to have disrupted his personal relations. In addition, the three males in this category and one of the women had future plans that were grandiose and fantastic. It is not surprising that the "symbolically oriented" immigrant should show these signs of personal disorganisation, for the very rigidity of his requirements means that he is lacking in maturity and flexibility. In some situations, he could afford to be rigid, but as an immigrant with limited opportunities, he cannot.

The "symbolically oriented" immigrant is more likely than any other type to reject any identification with his fellow-countrymen in Australia. Since European immigrants are of inferior status, to associate with them is not only belittling to his own self-esteem, but also, he feels, jeopardises his chances of prestige among Australians. He, more than any other type of immigrant, is likely to push
his life in Europe into the background, to underplay, if not deny, his past; his adoption of Australian cultural patterns may represent an ostentatious conformity. The one relationship which he usually seeks with other immigrants is that which places him in some kind of leadership role.

The positive orientation to the home country of this type of immigrant is usually expressed in terms of the opportunities provided for doing things, being someone and leading a good life. The ambivalent orientation to Australia comes from his admission on the one hand that, for the majority of immigrants, economic conditions in Australia are good, and his complaint, on the other, that Australia mistakenly makes no place for the high-status immigrant of his own type. He wishes to be accepted into the Australian community without necessarily placing a high value on the people or culture of the country. His comparative readiness to become naturalised reflects an intellectual conviction of the advantages of citizenship, partly at least associated with relatively high educational standard, and his desire for social assimilation.

5. The "Real Status" Type

The "symbolic status" and "real status" orientations are less clearly distinguishable than any other two of the four
types. Social status, recognition and respect are also important to the latter type, but there is no rigid clinging to certain symbols of status. Rather, the "real status oriented" migrant is the one whose self-esteem depends more on the content of what he can do or be, on the opportunities he has for self-expression, as the performer of a particular role, than on the prestige attaching to the role as such. The professional person and the creative artist are ideally the prototypes of this social personality. Perhaps the most typical "real status oriented" immigrant is the one who is willing to forego a comparatively high income and to accept a position of inferior status in order to continue an occupation in which he was skilled in Europe, and which he had come to regard as an essential part of his self.

The "real status oriented" immigrant shares with the "symbolically oriented" a high educational standard and a professional or white-collar background in Europe. He has taken his place in the occupational structure as a skilled or unskilled worker, sometimes having industriously acquired a new skill since immigration. Like the immigrant of the previous type, he tends to move around from one job to another a great deal. He may have made some contact with Australian associations, but his participation remains largely within the immigrant community. A high educational
standard and a willingness to identify himself with the new society are likely to have helped him to acquire competence in English. The middle or upper class behaviour patterns in which he has been brought up need little modification to make him acceptable to Australians of similar class status. His knowledge of internationally-recognised music and literature will readily provide a link with Australians of similar interests.

The occupational adjustment of this type of immigrant in Goulburn is unsatisfactory, both because, if he has professional qualifications, they are not recognised, and because the openings for an immigrant in the kind of job he wants are meagre. But he nevertheless takes his low-status job seriously, putting into it the same energy and treating it with the same responsibility he would show towards more congenial employment. He gets some satisfaction out of the competent performance of even a humble task, and is therefore better occupationally adjusted than the "symbolically oriented" type. His economic adjustment seems to vary. Unlike the "money oriented" immigrant, he is rarely thrifty, and, like the "symbolically oriented", he spends money casually and spontaneously, often without planning ahead. Sometimes, he has as much difficulty as some of the "symbolically oriented" immigrants in budgeting
effectively on his present income. Only one of the eight Goulburn Displaced Persons in this category had acquired a home.

It is his social adjustment that this type of immigrant feels to be most inadequate. At some time since arrival in Australia, he is likely to have made contact with an Australian association, feeling that it is up to him to make the effort to participate in the local communal life. But he has not thereby found either the interest or the companionship which he hoped for.

Similarly, he may at some time have had the opportunity of making personal contacts with Australians, but these are not likely to have been maintained. With this type of Displaced Person, as with the "symbolically oriented" type, a low-status occupation is a barrier to meeting local people of the required status, not only because such a job brings him into contact largely with lower-status Australians, but also because he is sensitive enough to the local class evaluations to realise that a person in an unskilled or semi-skilled job cannot usually participate naturally and on an equal footing with middle and upper class Australians.

It is also possible that this type of immigrant, like the "security oriented" type, is especially sensitive to his inferior status qua immigrant; even though he might retain
an inner sense of his own worth in comparison to Australians, and even a sense of his intellectual superiority, he is nevertheless diffident in overt behaviour, inclined to be defensive rather than aggressive.

The social adjustment of this type of immigrant within the immigrant group cannot be adequately understood through a study of a community such as Goulburn only, for it is this (and the "symbolically oriented") type of immigrant who is likely to move away to the metropolis. While he remains in the country, he maintains links with fellow-nationals of similar background and interests in other districts, particularly in the larger cities. He is more likely than any other type of immigrant to keep up primary relations outside the community, and to maintain contact with his fellow-nationals as a group elsewhere, through the national associations, newspapers and friends. He is more or less culturally sophisticated and cosmopolitan; whether or not he actually visits the metropolis regularly, he feels more at home there than in the country; he can be tolerant of the local community and its parochial culture, but does not wish to identify himself with it. Within the community, he associates with fellow-immigrants, often not of his own nationality, but of similar background and intellectual interests, or with immigrants of lower status for whom he acts
as an advisor-spokesman.

Once again our comments on the psychological condition of the immigrant can only be highly tentative. There is some slight evidence that the "real status oriented" Displaced Person is marked by a strongly developed sense of duty; of personal and social responsibility. These qualities have enabled him to adapt himself to the uncongenial occupations that he has had to follow in this country. His intellectual background has also helped him to retain a somewhat objective and balanced perception of his own present situation. Some sources of disorganisation nevertheless remain: there is a great discrepancy between the kind of life he wants and his present situation; neither does the future seem very hopeful. But he has not accepted the fact that life will always be like this; he feels - even though he may doubt it intellectually - that his present state is temporary; as one woman put it, "I can't say whether I am happy or unhappy; I feel at the moment that I don't know what I am, or what is going to happen; in a few years it will all be settled, but just now ...".

The willingness of this type of immigrant to identify himself with his fellow-nationals is partly the outcome of his consciousness of the intellectual culture of his own country. But it may also result from the fact that he will be accorded
a certain respect from his fellow-countrymen, because of former class status, occupational achievement or education qualities which are not so readily recognised by other Europeans or by Australians. He, more than any other type of immigrant, is likely to feel a sincere responsibility for preserving the culture of his own nation among immigrants in Australia.

The "real status oriented" immigrant usually has an ambivalent-positive orientation to his home country and a largely positive orientation to Australia. He sees his country of origin as a place which gave him opportunities for self-expression and a good life, irrespective of his evaluation of its economic and political system. If he has negative attitudes to Australia, they refer mainly to this country's unwillingness to recognise professional qualifications or to encourage the immigrant to enter white collar and professional jobs, and the reluctance of middle and upper class Australians to accept immigrants of similar class status as equals. Positive attitudes refer largely to the legal and political freedom of the country, the relative unimportance of class distinctions and the economic opportunities. This type of immigrant is likely to take a sincere interest in Australia's intellectual and cultural
achievements (1). He is more likely than any other type of immigrant to have put in his Declaration of Intention to become naturalised; this is an expression partly of his generally positive orientation to Australia, partly of his more or less realistic grasp of the advantages of citizenship.

By contrast to the first two types, the "symbolically oriented" and the "real status oriented" immigrants have requirements and aspirations which are strikingly incompatible with what the local community has to offer. The incompatibilities lie in the impossibility of getting the kind of jobs they want, of participation with middle and upper class Australians, and of satisfying their intellectual interests. In addition, as immigrants, as people of little wealth, as newcomers to the community and as low-status workers, they have little opportunity to secure the communal respect that they want. And they are, at the same time, something of a discomfort to the community itself. While the "guilt" of

(1) The question of whether an immigrant who is strongly attached to the intellectual culture of his own country is more or less likely than other immigrants to interest himself in the intellectual life of his new country has received little attention in the assimilation literature, but Mortara, 1949, p.44, notes the problem in his discussion of immigration to Brazil: "The level of education attained by immigrants may have two opposite effects. The tendency of those who were taught in their motherland is to cling consciously or otherwise to the culture they have acquired; those who cannot read or write feel little compunction about losing something they never possessed. On the other hand, those who possess a genuine cultural background are far better fitted than illiterates to assimilate a second culture."
the local Australians can be directed towards any newcomer, it is the immigrants of apparently or obviously good education and former high status who are most likely to elicit this feeling. The local people feel that it is these immigrants who must suffer the most in their present situation, and for whom some special effort should be made, but at the same time they resent any show of intellectual superiority, being ready to label the immigrant as "arrogant". The incompatibility between these two types of adaptation and the roles available to the immigrant in the local social structure is reflected in the fact that such immigrants are less likely than those of the first two types to acquire homes and settle in the community. They tend to move off to the metropolis.

6. Conclusion

Of the four types of adaptation distinguished among the Goulburn Displaced Persons, the "economic" and "security" orientations are the most appropriate to the local social structure, while the "symbolic" and "real status" orientations are strikingly inappropriate. These types have been described as they appear at a particular point in the general adaptation process; the relationship of the several
factors composing each type and the relative importance of different factors will presumably change with time. The types will evolve. At the same time, the individual immigrant is likely to change his dominant orientation, with the result that he may approximate now to one type, and later to another. Here the culture of the host society exercises a selective process; already there is a tendency for some "symbolic" and "real status" immigrants to move towards the "economic" orientation.
III. Conclusion
CHAPTER II

THE PROCESS OF ASSIMILATION

1. Introduction

The voluminous literature on the biological, economic, demographic, political and social aspects of assimilation includes a large and heterogeneous section devoted to the social and cultural history of immigrants after their arrival within a host society. Closely related, both theoretically and empirically, to the study of immigrant assimilation is research on long-established minority groups, such as the Jews, or the Negroes in the United States, and on societies composed almost entirely of recent diverse immigrant groups, such as Hawaii.

Comprehensive field studies of local groups of immigrants as they function within an established community - studies of the kind familiar from the work of the anthropologist in pre-literate societies - are, however, rare. The most adequate studies of this kind are: the researches of Warner and his school on immigrants in the class system of of American cities (1), Pauline Young's study of the Russian Polokon community in Los Angeles (2), Galitski's study of

(2) Young, 1929.
Fournierians in Chicago (1), Reynolds' research on British
Immigrants in Montreal (2), Wirth's study of the Jews in
Chicago (3), Lunch's report on Wisconsin Norwegians (4),
Little's study of Negros in Cardiff (5) are probably the
most adequate studies of this kind. While the United
States has made the greatest contribution to the analysis
of immigration in general, at the present time the most
fruitful socio-pychological research is coming from other
countries; the sociological studies of the assimilation of
Jews in Palestine, being carried out by Eisenstadt at the
Hebrew University, Jerusalem (6); the research on coloured
minorities in Britain, under the direction of the anthro-
pologist, Kenneth Little; and the studies in various
countries which come principally within the field of
demography and population studies, and which have been to
come extent stimulated and co-ordinated by Unesco (7).

(1) 1924.
(2) 1929.
(3) 1928.
(4) 1940.
(5) 1948.
(6) Eisenstadt, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1953, 1954 (a) and
Clemons et al., 1955. A general volume, combining the results
of the Unesco-sponsored research in Australia, Belgium,
Brazil and France, is being prepared by D. W. Clark.
The task of this concluding chapter is to relate the findings of the present study to the general body of knowledge on the assimilation of immigrants. The relevant problems can be subsumed under three headings: factors affecting assimilation, indices of assimilation and the definition of assimilation.

2. Factors affecting assimilation

The factors affecting the kind of experience which immigrants have in a new society and the group structure and self-perceptions which they develop are of two kinds: the first four - the pre-migration background of the immigrants, their absolute numbers and proportion in the total population, the extent of their biological and cultural distinctiveness from the host society, and their psychological condition - affect the experience of the immigrants but do not form part of the assimilation process. The remaining seven factors - occupation, status, success, discrimination, segregation, integration of the immigrant group and ideology of the group - both affect the continuing experience of the immigrants, and themselves constitute part of the assimilation process.

Comparative studies of immigrants from different socio-economic backgrounds in the same milieu are few (1),

(1) The best study of this kind is that of Reynolds, 1935, who compares the adjustment of artisans, labourers, domestics and clerks among British immigrants in Canada.
but a great deal of the literature throws light on the effect of pre-migration socio-economic status on the experiences of immigrants. It is only the comparatively small refugee movements that have included a large proportion of high status emigrants; e.g. the exiles who left Russia at the time of the Revolution, the Jewish exigration from Germany, Austria and other European countries in the thirties, and the war-time and post-war emigrations of anti-Nazi and anti-Communists. Some studies of such high-status refugee groups, like Fields' *The Refugee in the United States* (1) and Platz's slight study of Jews in Victoria (2), tend to be laudatory and defensive, designed to combat jealousy or hostility - or, more specifically, anti-Semitism - within the host society. The most illuminating material on the experiences of middle- and high-status immigrants is contained in Maurice Davie's study of the 1930 refugees into the United States (3), Kent's more superficial survey of the same group of refugees (4), and Dore's brief study of Russian emigres in France (5). The sensitive reports of five successful distinguished refugee scholars in the United States are

(1) Fields, 1938.
(2) Platz, 1948.
(3) Davie, 1947.
(4) Kent, 1955.
(5) Dore, 1947; Bassin and Dore, Jan.-Feb., 1946.
especially valuable (1).

Most of the assimilation literature refers to the recent large-scale migrations from poor rural areas to industrialized, urbanized countries, with a comparatively high standard of living (2). The opportunity to secure a higher standard of living than he could ever have envisaged in Europe has been an important factor in encouraging the American and Canadian immigrant, from a poor socio-economic background, to concentrate on economic achievement. Although few of the displaced persons, in contrast to the nineteenth century immigrants to the United States, originally emigrated for the purpose of economic advancement, we have noted this

(1) Crawford (ed.), The Cultural Migration: the European Scholar in America, 1953. The papers published in this book were presented as the Benjamin Franklin Lectures, spring 1952. The aim of the papers is explained by W. Rex Crawford in the introduction, p. 1, "By asking each of the five distinguished lecturers to comment on his own experience, and to some extent that of others in his own field, frankly expressing his criticisms of the methods used and the results achieved by American scholars in his discipline, and the gains to American scholarship resultant from the intellectual migration of the thirties, as well as his hardy surmises in the American academic milieu, we hoped to elicit concrete contributions that could throw light on this limited but important area of acculturation."

(2) In his Introduction to Crawford (ed...cit., W. Rex Crawford states, p. 1., "In spite of all the attention that has been given to the taking of America by race migration from Europe, one important aspect of the movement has received scant attention. The uprooted and transplanted intellectual deserves our study quite as much as the Polish peasant in America."
same concentration on financial success among the low-status
dislocated persons in Goulburn.

The intellectual, aristocrat or industrialist
who emigrates to another country where he does not have
immediate entrée into the counterpart of the groups to which
he belonging at home faces more complex problems of occupa-
tional and economic adaptation than does the peasant or
labourer. Several alternatives present themselves, although
his freedom to choose one or another of them may vary greatly.
He too may concentrate on financial success, his wider
experience and better education sometimes enabling him to
exploit his lower-status countrymen for his own ends (1).
He may take a poorly-paid inferior job, either reconciling
himself or not to the complete change in his way of life.
He may derive himself severely in the early period of
immigration to make possible a later return to the kind of
occupation and style of life to which he was accustomed.
He may find a niche for himself as a professional or a semi-
political leader within an established immigrant colony (2);

(1) Huccek, March 1934, p. 617, refers to one of the adapta-
tions of the Czechoslovak intelligentsia in America as the
practice of underhand and often criminal schemes on co-
patriots. Heynor, Jan. 1935, p. 427, describes the "arasital
exploitation" of lower-status persons by Hungarian intelli-
gentsia in Detroit.

(2) See Huccek, op. cit., and Heynor, op. cit. Gassain and Dore
report that Americans and Russians in France who have not been
able to regain their former status retreat to their own
colonies. In his general study of immigrants in the U.S.,
Smith, 1939, p. 68, claims that the "unsatisfied" desire for
often enough, the people who have failed to secure status within the larger society return to a more protected and secure position in the immigrant group, becoming the upholders of group traditions and integration (1); this kind of adaptation, however, brings its own problems, for new tensions attend the redefinition of the relations between high- and low-status fellow-nationals, which is necessitated in the immigrant situation. It is the very small minority of high-status immigrants who are fortunate enough to be welcomed into congenial groups within the host society, immediately upon arrival; this may be the experiences of immigrants who arrive in small numbers, with wealth and connections in the host society; it was also the experience of some Jewish refugee scholars of the thirties, like those who contributed to the cultural liberation referred

Footnote (2) continued from page 474.

recognition is an important factor in the development of immigrant colonies. Rather than be nobody in an American community, the immigrant intellectual turns to a group of his own countrymen where he can win approbation."

(1) See Rousell, op. cit.; in his study of the Jewish community in Chicago, "Ir</ref thr. 1928, traces the history of those who have tried to get out of the ghetto, failed and returned "to become the apostles of nationalism and racial consciousness", n. 270.
to above (1).

It seems likely that European immigrants of middle or high social class acquire new cultural skills more quickly and with less effort than do immigrants from a low-status background, other things being equal. In moving to English-speaking countries, they apparently learn English with such greater facility than does the average

(1) Davis, op. cit., Chapter 17, and Kent, op. cit., pp. 111-117, describe the comparatively favourable position of the refugee scholars of the thirties, but as these authors also point out, even under the most favourable conditions, the assimilation to a new academic environment may make great demands upon the immigrant. In his paper on "The Study of Literature", in The Cultural Migration, Henri B. de Guide, p. 49, describes the chances to which the immigrant scholar in the U.S. must become adjusted, including the changes in the status of the academic person. "The first enthusiasm of the foreign-born scholar for the freedom and informality of American academic life soon wears off. Some disappointment often ensues, before deeper values are appreciated. The intellectual in Continental Europe was surrounded with a more resplendent halo, and his vanity was flattered. He had only a perfect share in the goods of this earth, since they should rightfully go as a solace to those who cannot enjoy the pleasures of the spirit. But in a stratified society he held an enviable rank. He was the heir to the medieval cleric or to the Renaissance humanist. He was invited by high officials or by ambassadors, consulted by fine ladies on what to read or what to think of what they should pretend having read. Articles hurried or letters and by professors were printed on the first page of newspapers, and carried weight with the public. Several European countries had been governed by professors whom the Spanish or French intellectual had known at the University... Students hardly dared disturb him... Colleges existed for the sake of the professors there; and students were but an adjunct which had to be put up with, unlike America, where professors were expected to serve the public and respect in them the potential alumni. No such reverence for intellectuals prevailed in the New World."
immigrant, partly because they are likely to have some
familiarity with the language before emigration, partly
because of their higher educational level, partly because
they are more likely to appreciate the necessity of
language competence (1). In addition, they have behind
them a more varied experience, and are equipped with certain
knowledge and behaviour patterns which allow them to move
with comparative ease through different societies; they
apparently take their place in the group life of the host
society more quickly and smoothly, though of course not
without some friction and difficulties, than do their lower-
status fellows (2). For example, the more or less illiterate

(1) See Davies, op. cit., p. 156, "The refugees have made an
extraordinary record in acquiring a knowledge of English. It
is safe to say that no other non-English-speaking immigrant
group has learned English so rapidly and so well in a compar-
able period of time." See also Kent, op. cit., Chapter 4.

(2) In his general study, American Minority Groups: A Study
in Racial and Cultural Conflicts in the U.S., Donald Young
states, "The high level of secular education in northern
Europe, the relatively greater industrialization, the familiar-
ity with representative government, and the Protestant
religion, gave to immigrants from this area greater facility
for assimilation than those coming from countries predomin-
antly agricultural with low literacy and the Catholic faith." Davies,
op. cit., and Kent, op. cit., report that the refugees have, in
general, made a highly adequate occupational, social and
cultural adjustment. Davies, p. 156, states, "The situation
of the refugees in this respect (social and cultural adjustment)
has been unusually favourable. They have become adjusted to
a greater extent and in a shorter period of time than was the
case with other immigrants of recent decades." Eva Yousse, 
Aug. 1944, p. 378, also reports that among aliens in Canada,
those from urban areas (and hence of comparatively high status)
are rapidly acquiring the culture of the people among whom
they live." Moré's studies of Russian emigrants in France,
peasants from the nookiest parts of Europe were regarded
by even the lowest class Americans as boorish and uncultivated
in the extreme, and had to learn a commodity of new habits
if they were to mix with Americans even on the most super-
official level. The movement of centers of the intelligentsia
from one society to another is also facilitated by the fact
that the intellectuals throughout the Western world share
a large area of knowledge and interests in common: interna-
tionally recognized music, literature and art provide a
basis for common understanding and joint activity. By
contrast, the immigrant familiar with only the parochial
culture of his local community has much greater difficulty

Footnote (2) continued from page 477.

Doré, 1947, and Gessin and Doré, Jan.-Feb. 1946, illustrate,
however, the situation where middle- and upper-class intel-
lectuals have failed to become integrated into the host
society. In her study of Displaced Persons in the U.K.,
Stedulia, March, 1952, suggests that the intellectuals among
the Displaced Persons may face more difficulties than is
commonly recognized; re "mental breakdowns", she says,
"Opinions vary strikingly as to whether intellectuals or
single peasant trees are hardest hit. Intellectuals, it
is said, are more flexible, have more friends, prestige and
interests, and do not succumb so readily. This can be true
where there is scope for the expression of interests and
the acquisition of prestige through one's employment or other
community activity. But for many intellectuals, recreation
of an interrupted career in medicine or art or politics, for
example, has been completely cut off. The...

Physical and emotional strain of beginning to use
middle age resources not hitherto utilized proves to be an
equally serious factor in bringing on mental disturbances."
in finding meaningful points of contact with other peoples, particularly in societies which have an "urban" rather than a "folk" culture.

Thus, even though we have limited our discussion to the broadest and most extreme differences in socio-economic background, we can see that no general statement about the relative ease of assimilation of immigrants from different backgrounds can be made. The variations in background - based on family, wealth, occupation, and rationality - are in fact infinitely greater than we have even been able to indicate. We can however suggest that, while all immigrants have many experiences and face many problems in common, the difficulties of those of formerly high status revolve particularly about problems of occupational and social status while those of formerly low status are more likely to be centred on the learning of new cultural patterns (1). While our own study provides evidence for the different experiences of immigrants of different backgrounds, it also suggests the importance of a factor which is little emphasised in the literature - that immigrants of different backgrounds are often received and treated differently by members of the host society. In inter-personal relations, and in contacts with officials, they are given

(1) See Davis, 1947, p. 176, "Much more so than other immigrants, the refugees are concerned about their social status."
more attention and help; but on the other hand, in their
attempts to gain recognition for professional qualifications,
they experience a much more serious kind of rejection than,
say, an unskilled labourer could ever encounter.

A second important factor in the assimilation
process is the absolute size of the immigrant group, its
proportion in the society as a whole and in particular
communities and the rate of intake. The scattered refer-
ences to this factor throughout the literature all suggest
that the smaller the total number of immigrants, the less
their proportion in the community or society, and the slower
their rate of arrival, the more smoothly and quickly are
they assimilated into the host society (1).

(1) See Smith, op. cit., p. 154, "If the flow of immigrants
into an area is slow and gradual they are more readily
accepted. If, however, the aliens come in large numbers the
natives become fearful." Fairchild, 1947, too claims that
the numbers of immigrants are of decisive importance in the
way they are received and the place they take in the community;
it is in the light of this contention that he states, p. 122,
"There are good grounds for believing that the numerical
restriction of immigration came just about in the nick of time,
and that if the current had been allowed to continue and to
increase in the former proportions for another two or three
decades, irreparable injury to the national integrity of the
U.S. might have ensued." Kent, op. cit., pp. 170-176, found
that the dispersal of the refugee intellectuals was a definite
aid to assimilation; he quotes an informant, p. 172, who
declared, "One refugee is a novelty, ten refugees are boring,
and a hundred refugees are a menace." Further evidence that
small numbers or proportions are conducive to easy assimila-
tion comes from Ohrn's study of Japanese college students
in the U.S., Dec. 1944; Burns's study of Hiltzro-Americans,
October 1951; Smith's study of Orientals in the U.S., 1937;
Collins' study of Negroes and Jews in Britain, March 1972.
It has been generally recognised in the literature that the number of immigrants is significant because opportunities for associating with fellow-nationals vary according to the size of the group, because in-group marriage and formal organisation are possible only in a group of minimum size, and because, both directly and indirectly, size affects the visibility of the immigrants in the community. The Goulburn Displaced Persons were comparatively small in total numbers and in proportion to the population of the community, but highly visible because the arrival of this particular type of immigrants was a national event of some importance, partly because their coming to the community was sudden and attended with publicity, and partly because of the homogeneity of the local population (apart from the well-established Greek community). As the number of Displaced Persons has dwindled to the point where they constitute only about one percent of the local population, their position as a minority group in the community has become a little more established, and the local people, being less conscious of them as a "problem", have relaxed their efforts to welcome and help them. From the history of the Displaced Person's in Goulburn, one might thus suggest a modification to the

Footnote (1) continued from page 430.

In his contribution to One America, ed. Brown and Houcek, Revised Edition 1947, Mauricio Davia, p. 543, lists relative numbers and rate of arrival as factors affecting the rate of incorporation of immigrants into a society.
general opposition on size in relation to assimilation: 
although there is less call for hostility or discrimination 
and less opportunity for conflict between immigrants and 
the host society where the number and proportion of immigrants 
in a community is small, the absence of overt conflicts and 
problems of adoption may give a curious impression that the 
immigrants are being readily absorbed into the community; 
on the contrary, they may be leading a separate, but incon-
scious existence, loosely organised like the Displaced 
Persons in Goulburn, or socially isolated from one another 
as well as from the host society.

A third commonly recognised factor affecting 
imigrant experience is the extent to which the physical 
appearance and culture of the immigrants differ from those 
of the host society. Warner states, "the greater the 
difference between the host and immigrant cultures, the 
greater will be the subordination, the greater the strength 
of the ethnic social systems, and the longer the period 
necessary for the assimilation of the ethnic group.....
Second, the greater the racial difference between the 
populations of the immigrant and the host societies the 
greater the subordination of the immigrant group, the 
greater the strength of the social subsystem, and the longer 
the period necessary for assimilation. Finally, when the 
combined cultural and biological traits are highly divergent
from those of the host society the subordination of the
group will be very great, their subsystem strong, the
period of assimilation long, and the processes slow and
usually painful." (1).

While acknowledging that the processes referred
to in Werner's propositions are of a most basic and wide-
spread kind, we may note two modifications. The first
has been described by Fairchild in the following words.
"The difficulty of assimilation is not necessarily pro-
portional to the difference between the two nationalities
involved. It has been asserted that the English are among
the hardest people to assimilate in the United States just
because they cling most tenaciously to the minor distinctions
between their nationality and the American." (2). In other
words, where other forces are sustaining the identity and

(1) Werner, 1945, pp. 285-286. See also Davies, 1927,
p. 275; Smith, op. cit., Ch. 11; Donald Young, 1932, p. 275.
Eisenstadt, Nov. 1957, p. 17b. In his study of inter-racial
marriage in Hawaii, Adame, 1937, pp. 278-279, comments,
"where race differences are involved it is expected that
assimilation will go on more slowly, that conflict of a more
intense and persistent character will be found and that
there will be a corresponding development of the more extreme
types of personality."

(2) Fairchild, 1947, p. 116. Smith, op. cit., p. 144,
also comments on the difficulties of assimilating the
English in the U.S., in such the same context, "Immigrants
from the northern European countries have been, in the main,
more readily assimilated than those from other areas.
The English, however, are an exception. Even though they
are closest to us culturally, a pride, engendered by their
lofty imperial position tends to inhibit acceptance of
traits from another culture."
group consciousness on the immigrants, cultural differences may be more or less deliberately exaggerated and kept alive, the immigrant group maintaining "dialectical" codes of behaviour, "intended to be distinctive of group membership." (1) The fact that such dialectical forms are not developing to any marked extent amongst the Wodleburn Displaced Persons indicates their lack of interest in maintaining their distinctive group identity.

Another modification to Warner's proposition is that the significance of the biological and cultural differences will vary according to the homogeneity of the host society and the rigidity or permissiveness of its culture, and that groups within the host society are likely to differ in what we might call, from this viewpoint, their receptivity towards immigrants. Wodleburn provides an example of a fairly homogeneous community cautious in welcoming both new ideas and new people; the personal pressure towards conformity is strong, and anything that savours of the esoteric is either rejected with suspicion or hostility, or accepted as an amusing or interesting novelty - like the soups of travellers. The only terms on which immigrants of very different background can be accepted into this community are as curiosities, or as conformists to local culture. In strong contrast, is the academic or bohemian community, which may set a high value...

on diversity and innovation, and a low value on whatever constitutes the "local", homespun culture; in such a situation, the immigrant finds a ready place, as the contributor of new culture patterns our excellence.

A fourth factor affecting the experiences of immigrants in a new society - often referred to in the literature, but never, so far as is known, studied systematically - is their psychological condition. We do not here refer to the immigrants' attitudes or feelings towards the process of emigration or the new society, but to the stability of their personalities, on the one hand, the neurotic tendencies on the other. For are we concerned here with how common such neurotic tendencies are in immigrant groups, but only with their effect upon the immigrants' experiences.

For studies by Murphy, Rawley and Sterba, previously referred to (1), it is clear, as one would certainly expect, that

(1) Murphy, 1952; Rawley, 1949; Sterba, 1949. Kent, op.cit., pp. 214-217. See this to say about what he describes as "the refugee psychology", "not all refugees have it, nor is it confined to the recent exiles. Among all immigrant groups (and the native too) there are some individuals having the traits of the type. Perhaps an unusually large number of refugees had it in a somewhat exaggerated form. The elements of the 'refugee psychology' are several: A constant looking back to the halcyon days of yore, in the old country..., idealization of the past..., an almost superhuman attitude toward the new life, surroundings, and associates. This aggressiveness sometimes took the form of hypercriticism, sometimes a sullen resistance and sometimes a bitter withdrawal..., feeling that America owed the refugees a great debt which could be repaid with appropriate recognition and an ample flow of dollars..., feelings of persecution and of being victimized by prejudice..., a conviction of personal and cultural superiority."
neurotic behaviour intensifies difficulties arising elsewhere and introduces new sources of strain in the relations between immigrants and members of the host society, and seriously impairs the extent to which the immigrants can utilise the occupational and social opportunities and the special assistance (as from relief organisations or such bodies as the New Settlers League) that are available to them. The Coulburn study has illustrated how the neurotic tendencies of many Displaced Persons have contributed towards the general instability of their relations with one another and with outsiders, and have operated against the integration of the displaced Person group.

It is possible for neurotic behaviour to become the statistically normal, or the expected - though not necessarily the valued or sanctioned - behaviour of a group. In this case, individuals whose personality structures are well-balanced and stable, attach to themselves some of the "neurotic gain" by taking on the behaviour patterns of the neurotic. It seems that such a process might well have occurred among the Displaced Persons; there are probably many less genuine neurotics among them than the statements of some observers might suggest; but as a group, they have cultivated certain, typically neurotic, tendencies: exploitation, dependency, the demand for special consideration because of one's unique sufferings. This has been partly an
opportunist process - a means of taking the best of their position both as an inferior group and as the liberated victims or persecution - partly an escape to their extreme inability over the next four to thirteen years - a inability which has given an advantage to the individual who has difficulty in establishing stable personal relations.

The relationship between the personality of the individual and the structure and culture of the group is thus seen to be, as always, reciprocal, the poorly integrated group permissive, and even encouraging, behaviour and attitudes which are further detrimental to group integration.

The remaining factors to be discussed both affect the total assimilation process, and are themselves part of that process. The kind of occupations which immigrants enter to a considerable extent determine the pattern of relations which they are likely to establish with the host society, and the areas of the host society's culture with which they come into contact and which they are required to master. We can illustrate the significance of this factor by reference to three very different occupations which immigrants commonly enter. As a farm worker, the immigrant is in close personal contact with a local family, but tends to be isolated both from other immigrants and from the communal life of the host society; his total adjustment depends greatly on the personal relations which he establishes
with the family of his employer. As a worker in a large city factory, the immigrant is required to grasp the principles underlying the formal organisation of the factory and the trade union, but may need to learn only the rudiments of the language of the host society, and take only the minimum of personal contact with fellow-workers; his life outside the factory may be nobody's concern, with the result that he may remain altogether socially isolated, or interact only with fellow-immigrants. As a qualified person, able to work in his own profession, as may in the course of his work be in continuous contact with members of the local community, e.g. as clients, patients, or students, and hence may be required to learn much of the local culture; he may also be expected to take his place immediately in the formal associations of his profession and in the private social life of the university, hospital, etc., where he works. These three situations illustrate that the immigrant has different experiences in different occupations, because of variations in the demands made upon him, and in the opportunities for social contact and cultural experience (1). On this point, the Coulburn study has shown how immigrants employed in

(1) One of the most valuable studies of the different problems of adaptation facing immigrants in different occupations is contained in Reynolds' study of British immigrants in Canada, op.cit., where the occupational experiences of artisans, labourers, clerks and clerks are compared.
groups, and living at their place of work, are protected by their occupational environment from the necessity to adapt themselves beyond the minimum degree. This study also shows that immigrants and Australians can work side by side without establishing any contacts which carry over into their extra-work lives, and that the immigrant can be well-adjusted occupationally, although remaining socially segregated from the host society, learning little of its culture and being in no way positively identified with it.

The status of an immigrant group is clearly both a result and a determinant of the kind of experience which its members are likely to have. As we have previously indicated (1), an immigrant minority is not necessarily of low status. We can suggest that the higher the status of the immigrant group in the community, the easier it is for an individual immigrant to gain acceptance in the host society. This situation rests partly upon the general mathematical proposition, so to speak, that the higher the status of an individual in the community, the more people there are, on his own level and of lower status, who are willing or able to associate with him, or be in any way identified with him. But it also rests upon the fact that the higher the individual's status the greater are his self-confidence and ease in association with other groups, and the

(1) See p. 149.
less is he likely to feel the pressure to belittle, underplay, or deny part of his social personality in his contacts with outsiders. The immigrant from a high status group can become socially assimilated into the host society while retaining — and indeed being valued for — his distinctive characteristics (1); this is the experience of Americans in many sections of Australian society. One of the most demoralizing factors among the coalburn displaced persons was the conviction that, in order to get on with Australians or to find a place in the community, they had, as it were, to shed the greater part of their essential selves.

Apart from the status of the group as a whole, the success of the individual immigrant is another factor which obviously affects his experiences. In societies such as the United States, the immigrant, like the low-status native, can use the basic values of success and achievement to gain recognition and prestige, and eventually probably

(1) Park and Miller, 1921, vol. 47-48, referring to the peasant and low-status immigrants in America, state, "But the most serious condition results from the loss of status and the consequent diminished sense of personality when the immigrant encounters American conditions... Then the immigrant comes to America, not only must he leave behind the community which was the basis of his personality and self-respect, but here the very signs of his personality (dress, language, and so forth), which in his own country were the signs of his self-respect, are regarded with contempt and used the occasions of his humiliation." See also Smith, op. cit., no. 170-173.
acceptance, in the larger society. An open occupational or economic system may thus facilitate assimilation (1). On the other hand, achievement can be a means of securing independence of the host or recognition of the host society; success is most likely to have this meaning for the immigrant when it has failed to give him the access to the values of the larger society which he had hoped for: if, despite his achievements, he is still not good enough for the local people, then he will demonstrate that he needs them as little as they want him. In connection with this last attitude, it is worth noting that, just because an immigrant is outside the life of the community, he has an unusual degree of freedom in pursuing his own self-interest. Since he does not take part in the associational life of the community, he avoids the demands to which members of

(1) See e.g., Warner, 1952, p. 131, "When the class system of the adopted country, such as America, is progressive and allows the ethnic to come in, the result is highly dis- cursive to the minority group. Their children respond to the attractions of the class system by breaking their ethnic ties and identifying with the social symbols of the larger community." See also Lysell, 1944, p. 91 "From the viewpoint of the struggling immigrant himself, the bank class structure, which thrust him to the bottom of the social heap, did not seem to be a rigid social determinant. In two or three generations, if not in one, the immigrant and his descendants moved into, and identified themselves with, the dominant American group, and - with luck and ability - took their position in the higher strata." For further evidence, see Shaw's study of Leonards in the U.S., Jan.-Feb. 1952; Broock and Young, and Hald's study of Japanese Canadians, 1930; Beynon's report on Hungarians in Detroit, Jan. 1936; and Smith, op. cit., pp. 168-170.
associations are constantly subjects, to give money, time and thought to the service of the community; similarly, he is under little pressure to outlay money in order to keep up appearances; the very fact that he does not take part in the everyday social life of the local community means that he does not need to return hospitality, to entertain on the same level as Australians, or to have the household equipment, clothes etc. required to lead a more or less organised social life.

The effects of discrimination, both legalised and unofficial, and prejudice on the experience of immigrants, and minorities in general, are thoroughly documented in the literature (1) that we need to refer here only to a few points of particular relevance to our own study (2). While

(1) A very useful compilation of studies in discrimination and prejudice is to be found in Race, Prejudice and Discrimination: Readings in Intercultural Relations in the United States, edited by Arnold L. Rose, 1951. Smith, op.cit., Chapter 12 also refers to the relevant literature.

(2) It is worth noting that, in answer to the question, "What is likely to be the position of European immigrants in Australia in another twenty years?", O.S. emphasised the determining effect of prejudice and discrimination, "This depends on Australian good-will. Unless land is unlocked for them, unless social difference is dispersed and Eurocrats are integrated, unless the present "anti-race bias" is abandoned, unless they are given reasonable civil rights - they will desert. Those who remain will either organise themselves in separate settlements and will become Australians, with an adjective "Creep" or "new", leaving Australia in their own way, or will remain dispersed all over, forgotten and contented." The reference to the U.S. in the remainder of the answer is, of course, typical, "But, if a fair treatment will be given to them, including civil rights, Australia will become another U.S., where both Pole and Englishman, Greek and
discrimination and prejudice are themselves indicative of
the fact that the victims are not fully incorporated into
the host society, there is also a wealth of evidence to
show that these factors have a decisive influence on the
structure of the immigrant group and on the ideologies and
personalities of the individuals within it. The process
whereby discrimination increases group self-consciousness
and integration, which may in turn intensify the discrimina-
tion, has been repeatedly observed (1). The effect of
discrimination on the integration of the group is, of course,
dependent on all the other factors in the situation. The
Goulburn study has illustrated a situation in which the
mobility and diversity of the members, their limited capacity

Footnote (2) continued from page 492.

Italian, such as other "races", will become real Australians,
ready to fight and die for their adopted country, just the
same as they do for the U.S.A. They would take a "new"
Australia."

(1) The following references will illustrate the diverse
sources providing evidence for the effect of discrimination
on group integration: Historical studies of immigrants in
America by Hansen, 1940, and Hawlick, 1941; Janowsky's study
of minorities in East-Central Europe, 1947; general contem-
porary studies of immigrants in America by Pauline Young,
June 1936, Rose, 1940; Rose ed., 151, Pauli, 1925; 1926;
individual studies of immigrants in Hawaii by Clich, March
1942, and Adams, 1937, of Mexicans in the U.S. by Garin, 1930,
and much, 1946, of Japanese in Canada by LeViolette, 1945;
and by Charles Young and Reid, 1939, of Norwegians in the
U.S. by Dods, Dec. 1940, of Jews in the U.S. by Vitro, 1928,
of the religious communities in Canada, by Dawson 1936.
For co-ordinated action and group identification and the
possibilities of individual achievement within the larger
society have offset the effects of perceived prejudice and
minor forms of discrimination in integrating the group.
In lieu of integration two other reactions to inferior
status have emerged—extreme individualism and "group
self-hatred" (1).

If prejudice makes life difficult for the
immigrant, it also gives him an excuse, often acceptable
to the group and to himself, for his own failure. By
laying the blame for all kinds of inadequacies on the

---

(1) See above p. 112. A. and C. Rose, 1935,
p. 210, describe group self-hatred like this, "A well-
known phenomenon among members of minority groups is
hatred of the group, its culture, its members, and even of
oneself because one is a member of the minority group.
This is called group self-hatred, and it may be thought of
as the opposite of group identification. It manifests
itself in all the expressions of prejudice that characterize
the prejudiced members of the majority group. Also it
manifests itself in a desire to escape all identification
with the minority group—the person forsakes, tries to
repress, or becomes an emotional advocate of raping.

Although Rose, Prejudice and Discrimination, the set of
readings edited by Rose, 1931, contains a section headed
"Group Identification and Group Self-Hatred," the only
contribution to the problem of self-hatred are the brief
introductory comments of Rose, which follow closely his
closer analysis in America Divided, from which the above
quotation is taken, and the papers by Lewin, previously
referred to which is here reprinted, "Self-Hatred among
Jews." The literature on minority group identification
contains no systematic and comprehensive account of this
subject of self-hatred.
indifference or hostility of the host society, the
immigrant is able to preserve his own self-esteem (1).

The question of segregation is closely related
to that of discrimination and prejudice, and the effects
of this factor, too, are obvious enough not to require
elaboration here. Where extreme discrimination and prejudice
occur, complete segregation minimizes conflict. Whether
segregation is voluntary or enforced, covers all areas of
living or applies residentially and socially, but to a
lesser extent occupationally, it minimizes the participation
of the immigrant in the larger society and his first-hand
experience of the host society's culture, and maximizes
the integration of the immigrant group (2). Among the
Goulburn Displaced Persons, occupational and residential
segregation were common during the first years after their
arrival in Australia, and particularly during the contract

(1) See Syrdal, 1944, p. 766, referring to the Negroes in
the U.S.: "A third temptation is to exaggerate the accusation
against the whites and so use the caste disabilities to
cover all personal failures... the whites' race prejudice
and the general fact of belonging to a group that is dis-
criminated against provide a real excuse for sub-standard
performance and for beliefs which are just as effective as
the old inferiority doctrine and personally less unflattering.
The effects, however, are even more thoroughly
desensitizing. There is not only cohesiveness but more con-
soling self-satisfaction." For further evidence, see Donald Young,
1932, pp. 587-588.

(2) See Smith, 1938, pp. 175-176; L. A. and E. Rose, 1945,
Chapter 6; Syrdal, op. cit., Ch. 20; MacWilliams, Winter, 1945;
Wirth, 1928.
period; at this time, the contacts of the immigrants with
Australians were extremely limited, and they had little
incentive or opportunity to learn English. Some Displaced
Persons, like the Hostel and Railway employees who continue
to live in accommodation provided at their place of employ-
ment, have voluntarily chosen this modified form of segrega-
tion, either for economic reasons, or because it minimises
the adaptation which they have to make to the larger society.
While in the first instance the effects of segregation were
to draw the attention of the community to the immigrants,
and to arouse it to a sense of obligation towards them,
the more time went on segregation meant that the local people readilyecame unaware of the immigrants, remaining ignorant of
their numbers and distribution, how well they were learning
the language, what problems they were facing, etc. The most
striking thing that emerged from discussions with officials
of the Few Settler League and with Cooraboree people at the
time when the League disbanded was the general ignorance of
even the most elementary facts about the local Displaced
Persons. The integration of the immigrant group, itself
the result of a combination of factors, is both affected
by the group's experiences, and in turn affects those
experiences. Although there is clearly a close relation
between the integration of the immigrant group and the
participation of the individual in, and attitude towards,
the host society, numerous modifications of the relation occur. In this study, we have seen a form of the "group-self-hatred", in which complete integration is imposed on the group from outside, but the degree of integration is low, while the extent of participation in the society, learning its culture and identification with it are also slight. In the extreme case of group self-hatred, such as that described by Levin, it is the very failure to become absorbed into the larger society, or assimilated, that produces a poorly integrated group structure, "It is a well-known fact that the task of organizing a group which is economically or otherwise underprivileged is seriously hampered by those factors whose real goal is to leave the group rather than to promote it." (1). Another modification occurs where the immigrants acquire the culture of the new society and come to identify themselves with it as a group. Here the integrated immigrant community is itself the agent of assimilation. Through its leaders, press and associations, it informs the immigrant about the new culture, stimulates his interest in it, and helps him over difficulties such as poverty, unemployment, and sickness, which would be likely to retard absorption into the larger society.

We have now arrived at one of the crucial issues relating to the question of assimilation. One viewpoint is

(1) Levin, 1948, p. 195.
out by Kent, "The forces that tie the immigrant to the isolated foreign-born community impede assimilation...The wide dispersion of the refugees intellectuals is a definite aid to integration into American life." (1) This fear that immigrant communities were retarding assimilation underlay the Americanization movement after the First World War (2). Most contemporary students, particularly in America, tend, however, to stress the social and psychological value of the organized immigrant community, claiming that it can, as we have indicated above, act as an agent of assimilation, that it provides the individual with a cultural background, and hence a source of pride and self-esteem, that it gives emotional security and the certainty of belonging, that it is an effective agent of social control, and that, for all these reasons, it provides a safeguard against the demoralization of the immigrant which, in its extreme form, expresses itself in crime, mental disorder and suicide (3).

(1) Kent, op. cit., p. 175.

(2) For useful summaries of the Americanization movement, see Davis, 1948, Chapter 13, and Fairchild, 1925, Chapter 9. See also Hill's article, "The Americanization Movement," written when the movement was at its height, J. A. J. B., May 1919.

(3) See, e.g., Galitz, 1928; Match, Sept., 1927; Wirth, 1928; Ladd, 1930; Charles Young and Reid, 1930; Gruenler, Feb., 1940; Pauline Young, June, 1936; Dawson, 1936. A promising, but rare approach to the study of the relation between group integration and personal adjustment is made by Chevalley, 1947, in her analysis of 4,000 case records of a social service organization in France, between 1926 and 1930; one of a number of interesting findings was the tendency.
Some students have gone beyond this to the point of advocating "cultural pluralism", which is, in effect, a social policy whereby groups of diverse cultural backgrounds should be allowed and encouraged to develop along their own distinctive lines, within a common legal and political framework which in no way favours one group more than another (1).

Since the purpose and significance of immigrant communities vary so much among themselves, there seems to be little value in a theory or policy which treats them as

Footnote (3) continued from page 497:

for the number of cases to be in inverse ratio to the size of the national group; the implication is that, the larger immigrant groups provide a more stable and secure milieu for their members than do the smaller ones.

(1) The main theme of one of the most comprehensive surveys of immigrant groups in the U.S., One America, ed. Brown and Roweck, 1957, Revised Edition 1967, is that cultural pluralism should replace the melting-pot theory as the basis of assimilation theory and policy. Louis Adamic has popularised the idea in a series of publications, including From Many Lands, 1937, and Nation of Nations, 1945. As a classic example of cultural pluralism one might cite the French Canadians, in that there is, as Waseel, 1921, p. 274, points out, a highly developed loyalty to French culture and to American citizenship. A. C. Rose, 1948, states that cultural pluralism, as usually expressed, in effect implies segregation, with all its disadvantages: Prejudice, p. 174, that cultural pluralism is compatible with democratic ideals only if it "(1) allows members of ethnic groups to leave the culture and group of their ancestors if they so desire; (2) allows persons not born in an ethnic group to participate in the cultural development of that group if they so desire; (3) recognises the existence of cultural groups not based on race or ethnic ancestry."
homogeneous. While well-integrated communities of political exiles, strongly oriented in their thinking and activities towards the home country, may perform some of the useful functions listed above, few, if ever, the most extreme cultural pluralists would argue that politically-dominated communities of this kind should be encouraged. (1) It is, in fact, only the immigrant community which is positively oriented above all to the host society that will fulfill the values to which we have previously referred. This group orientation is a further example of the "anticipatory socialization" which we have discussed previously at the individual level (2). Psychologically and socially, this is perhaps the ideal acculturation process; it allows the immigrant to feel his way into the culture of the host society, while minimizing the threat of insularity and "not belonging". When the process takes this form, the order of full absorption is as follows: knowledge of the new culture

(1) See p. 

(2) Eisenstadt describes such communities in this way, Nov. 1957, pp. 176-177, "in so far as the immigrants' status- aspirations are blocked by discriminatory practices or cultural and professional imcompatibility, they may evolve negative ('regressive' or aggressive) symbols of identification, usually with the encouragement of those immigrant leaders who feel most acutely the different status dilemmas. The transformation of immigrant leadership from the traditional to the new accommodating and formal type is then neither smooth nor successful, and the new leaders, instead of promoting assimilation, become the bearers- of negative identification, and the various formal associations sponsored by them, foils of such resentment."
is acquired first, and tried out, as it were within the immigrant group; identification with the host society develops, and leads the individual to seek participation within the larger social structure; the three facets of assimilation continue to interact upon one another, although there may be some considerable time-lag between the acquisition of the culture of the host society and identification with it, on the one hand, and participation on the other. When participation becomes general throughout the immigrant group, the group ceases to be well-integrated. But this is a long-term process; and in the meantime, the host society is, in some degree or other, a pluralistic structure (1).

The Galbraith material illustrates how the poor integration of their group intensifies the psychological instability and geographical mobility of the Displaced Persons, permits a great deal of deviation from local and traditional mores, and militates against the retention of their national cultures. But this study also shows how the poor integration of the group allows the individual freedom to utilize to the full the economic opportunities of the host society; he concentrates on his own achievements unhampered by group obligations or restraints. And since it is these

(1) as Linderstidt points out, Nov. 1959, p. 168 "there usually develops a 'pluralistic' structure or network of sub-structures - a society which is, to some extent composed of different sub-systems which are allocated to different immigrant ('ethnic') groups."

economic achievements which will give him at least the potential for full incorporation into the host society, the poor integration of the group is, to this extent, conducive to assimilation.

The extent to which an immigrant group has a distinctive, strong and institutionalized ideology is so closely related to integration that only one or two further comments are required (1). In the analysis of any group, it is important to distinguish between an ideology which is the focus of action in the immediate situation and beliefs and values which, though they may in fact be the main de facto of the group, have ceased to be fully relevant — that is, to provide a stimulus for co-ordination of activity (2). Where an immigrant group does nothing to maintain the national culture which its members nostalgically remember, or where it fails to organise itself to express its grievances or right its wrongs, the common ideas themselves become stultified and stereotyped, and increasingly lose their power to stimulate group action. It is

---

(1) Discrimination has, in general, been given greater weight as a factor promoting the integration of immigrant groups. Inleesen, Dec. 1956, has made an interesting study of the Southwest Idaho Basques, in which he shows that enslavement occurs in the absence of discrimination or relocation of immigrants to an inferior status; he claims that the factors promoting enslavement are strong, ethnic pride and stubborn retention of their own language, the isolated nature of their occupation and the fact that they follow a different religion from the surrounding natives.

(2) Nelson's term "ideological group" can be applied to this type of group. Nelson, 1971, p. 187.
because they recognise this insidious process that the elite, the core of leaders dedicated to the maintenance of the group, constantly exerts its influence to retain the leaders of the ideology which binds them together, and the obligations which that ideology entails. Among immigrant groups, this elite commonly operates within the framework of national association. Displaced persons, elites in this country try to maintain the devotion of their fellow-nationals to the following obligations: to keep responsibility to liberate the Iron Curtain countries; to send material assistance to countrymen in Germany (some because of sickness or for some other reason have not been eligible for resettlement), to support special schools for teaching the national language, history etc. to the children of immigrants; to give material assistance to fellow-immigrants in need in Australia. The situation in this country suggests that the wide dispersal of the members of a single nationality over a large geographical area reduces the effectiveness of the influence of these elites.

2. Criteria of Assimilation

Having discussed the most important factors affecting the experience of immigrants in their new country, we turn now briefly to the question of indices of assimilation. The literature abounds in studies which take certain
comparatively easily observable criteria as indicative of
such more subtle and comprehensive changes among immigrants.
The most commonly used criteria are naturalisation, facility
in the language of the host society and retention of own
language, intermarriage, residential and occupational
segregation, and, to a lesser extent, the manifestations
of disorganisation - delinquency, crime, mental disorder
and suicide (1). While all of these criteria clearly have
an important bearing on the question of assimilation it is
perhaps worth emphasising that little can be deduced from
them unless additional data are available on the social
context within which they occur. (2). As we have seen in
the cultural material, naturalisation (3) and facility in
English (4) occur with different meanings among

(1) Useful general discussions of these criteria are to be
found in Smith, 1923, and L. and C. Rose, 1948.
(2) See also Linscott, Nov. 1949, p. 171, "the numerous
criteria and indices of adaption used and implied in the
literature on immigration... cannot be used as absolute
measuring rods, or to compare the degree of adaption in
various countries... such comparisons are not valid, for
they assume that the importance of each index is equal in
tall these countries and at all periods of their evolution.
In reality the importance of a criterion will vary in
gaccordance with its function in the institutionalisation
of roles and in the evolution of a positive identification
in each social type."
(3) See pp. 403-409.
(4) See Chapter 10.
immigrants of different types. Similarly occupational and residential segregation, in the mild form in which they occur in Coulburn, may be a temporary economic measure, or may imply withdrawal and fear of contact with the wider community. The same reservations presumably apply in interpreting the remaining criteria which do not fall within the scope of our study. One might also point out that, while the need for careful comparison between the manifestations of disorganisation among immigrants and the host society is generally recognised, the attempt to compare these indices with rates for the immigrants' home country is seldom made; yet the significance of these criteria can surely be understood only in terms of their variation from the norms of the country of origin.
4. The Assimilation Process

The multiplicity of definitions of assimilation testifies to the complexity and variety of the behaviour to which the term is applied. Each definition reflects the special interests of the writer or the outstanding features of the particular immigrants being studied. Although the weight given to each may vary, and one or another is sometimes ignored altogether, it seems that there are always three aspects to the assimilation process: what we have called social assimilation, cultural assimilation and identification. The concepts of assimilation and the minority group are inter-related: a necessary con-comitant of full assimilation is that immigrants cease to be assigned or to think of themselves as having a collective status qua immigrants.

Although the process whereby the immigrant comes to participate in the social groups of the larger society, to adopt its culture and to identify himself with its values and destiny is uneven and variable (1), a minimum of social and cultural assimilation is always essential, the very first step in the assimilation process is almost invariably an adaptation to the occupational structure of

*(1) See Galitzi, op. cit., p.172; Munch, op. cit., p.781, with reference to the Wisconsin Norwegians, states, "An almost complete cultural assimilation has not always been followed by the expected social assimilation." See also Pauline Young, June 1936, p.421.*
the host society, and at least the first years which he spends in the new society are marked by a severe limitation of his activities, or his total "life-space". The process is uneven in the sense that the immigrant may go far towards assimilation in one of the three aspects, while remaining almost completely unassimilated in the others. A considerable degree of social and cultural assimilation may, for instance, be simply for the sake of expediency, the immigrant having developed no loyalty or affection for the host society, but remaining rather as a parasite in relation to it. On the other hand, a low degree of cultural and social assimilation, resulting not from lack of enthusiasm or effort, but from, for example, old age, low intelligence, sickness, personality difficulties, or geographical isolation, may be associated with a positive orientation towards the host society - a willingness to become fully identified with it if only given the opportunity. The assimilation of the poorly educated housewife often follows this pattern.

In our study of the Displaced Persons in Goulburn, we have tried to show that variations in the assimilation process can be systematically ordered in terms of the responses of different personal-social types to a particular set of local conditions. Each type becomes elaborated within the limits imposed by these conditions, which not
only vary greatly even within Goulburn itself, but take on a different meaning for different immigrants. As Thomas and Znaniecki put it, "The individual subject reacts only to his experience, and his experience is not everything that an absolutely objective observer might find in the portion of the world within the individual's reach, but only what the individual himself finds. And what he finds depends upon his practical attitudes toward his environment, the demands he makes upon it and his control over it, the wishes he seeks to satisfy and the way in which he tries to satisfy them." (1)

The four types distinguished here presumably recur amongst European immigrants. Elsewhere, and, it seems likely, would require modification and elaboration, rather than expansion, in other studies. The most significant distinctive local conditions are: the small size and national diversity of the Displaced Person population, the absence of any pre-existing groups of fellow-nationals in the community, the fact that jobs, though always available, could be obtained only within the lower ranks of the occupational hierarchy, the rigidity of the local class structure and the exclusiveness of the associational life of the community.

In addition to these peculiarly local conditions which have had a significant effect on the experience of the Displaced Persons, there are other, perhaps more basic factors which, it seems likely, are encountered by the Displaced Persons throughout Australia, and which have often been present in other immigrant-absorbing countries. These conditions are the inferior status of the immigrants, their ill-defined, or unstructured, position, and the pressure towards conformity being exerted on them from the host society. In analysing the Goulburn material, we have tried to show that these conditions have a considerable "objective reality", but at the same time the past experience of the Displaced Persons, and even in some cases their national traditions, have made them extremely sensitive to inferiority or pressure of any kind. The evidence indicating that these three conditions have loomed large in the experience of Displaced Persons elsewhere in Australia is abundant, if fragmentary. The issues of inferiority and forced assimilation are raised repeatedly, and the question of ill-defined status is often implied, in a great variety of contexts: in private discussions, at formal meetings (1), in publications

(1) For example, the theme that immigrants, and in particular European immigrants, are not welcome in Australia occurred again and again in the talks and discussion at the First
of national associations (1) and in documents produced by

Migrants' Conference in Australia, organised by the Migrants' Associate Committee of the New Settlers League of N.S.W., held in Sydney 16th October, 1954. In an introductory address prepared by representatives of some 14 nations, including Britain, it was stated, "It is our view that the creation of a sympathetic understanding and benevolent public opinion with reference to new settlers is the first and only realistic step towards making such assimilation remotely practicable and towards helping immigrants feel that this country is, indeed, a new home for them and not just a place on the map where they happen to be living and working and where they remain on sufferance ... we believe that the reason why many migrants show an inability to settle down happily is not material at all, but is due to the absence of this benevolent and understanding approach in an appreciable, and often vociferous segment of the community, which tends to regard the European settlers with a hostility which is, unfortunately, not invariably disguised ... we wish to make our homes here and we wish to become one with you, but we feel that we are giving as well as receiving, indeed, that we are giving as much as we are receiving, and we quite naturally regard the rather general attitude of condescension, even when good-natured, as somewhat tactless and out of place."

(1) See, for instance, the article by T. Maklicki, called "The Right Approach", in The Polish Bulletin, Jan. 1952, from which the following quotation comes, "First of all let us consider the widely used expression 'assimilation'. To my mind, and I know to a very great majority of migrants the expression is an improper one and to some even objectionable. The word 'assimilation' has a definite flavour of the complete merger of one substance or thing with another, the former thereby completely losing its own identity. To apply that meaning of assimilation to human relationships is to regard human beings as mere chemicals or substances and to act with complete disregard for human feelings. For a group of foreign people can only be assimilated in another nation by the effluxion of time, and that takes more than one generation; or by the strong attraction that nation's culture and a way of life has for a foreign
Displaced Persons (1) and non-Displaced Person observers (2).

While the characteristic features of the Displaced Persons - concentration on economic achievement, lack of

But you cannot assimilate by force or by fear, by decree or by pretty phrases and speeches. Generally European migrants came here with something at least not inferior to Australian culture, ... The second argument against the use of the word 'assimilation' is that it bears unhappy memories for all those who were subjected to ruthless policy behind the Iron Curtain. And so it creates resentment, subconscious rebellion and in effect brings opposite results ... And so let me tell you one thing: the less there is talk about assimilation, the less we hear of irresponsible utterances to the effect 'that as we brought you out here it is we who will say what you will do and how you will live and think', the sooner will they settle down and the more of them would make good Australian citizens. But any kind of force, by irresponsibility, by over-anxious assimilation they could be driven out of this country and we could witness a mass exodus at the first opportunity."

(1) See, for example, P.S.'s comments, "'Integration' is the only solution of the serious social and other problems. There cannot be any hope of 'assimilating' them. To assimilate them means to absorb the various nationalities into the Australian pattern of society. This won't work: It won't work because Australia is a very young nation, while Europe has reached the flowering of her culture, and 'there is no pupil over master.'"

(2) See, for example, Murphy, June, 1952, p.47, "We ... know that, allowing for certain racial differences, the greater the distance between the old and new social cultures, and the greater the speed at which the change from the one to the other (i.e. assimilation) has to be made, the greater will be these strains and their consequent effects. In Australia today the immigrants who are most exposed to such strains are the Displaced Persons, for the distance between their old cultures and the Australian one is quite wide and the pressure put upon them, by the public and by officials, to assimilate quickly is great."
community responsibility, instability of personal relations, expediency, and neurotic tendencies - did not originate in the Australian environment, they have certainly been consolidated under the impact of these basic conditions. The attempt, sometimes ill-judged and futile, sometimes rational and successful, to overcome insecurity and to free himself from the fact or the feeling of inferiority to Australians underlies much of the Displaced Person's behaviour.
Table 1.

Pre-Migration Occupation of 32,660 Male Displaced Persons Entering Australia 1949, By Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY</th>
<th>Professional, Administrative, Commercial, Clerical</th>
<th>Domestic and Protective</th>
<th>Craftsmen</th>
<th>Operatives</th>
<th>Labourers</th>
<th>Rural, Fishing or not stated</th>
<th>Indefinite or not stated</th>
<th>Not gainfully employed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>725 6</td>
<td>302 2</td>
<td>4,065 32</td>
<td>1,811 14</td>
<td>1,811 14</td>
<td>3,287 25</td>
<td>782 6</td>
<td>188 1</td>
<td>12,971 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>366 9</td>
<td>160 4</td>
<td>1,343 33</td>
<td>473 12</td>
<td>304 8</td>
<td>1,138 28</td>
<td>170 4</td>
<td>82 2</td>
<td>4,036 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>108 6</td>
<td>53 3</td>
<td>678 40</td>
<td>221 13</td>
<td>127 8</td>
<td>430 26</td>
<td>49 3</td>
<td>21 1</td>
<td>1,687 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR incl. stateless</td>
<td>125 7</td>
<td>40 2</td>
<td>533 29</td>
<td>189 10</td>
<td>379 21</td>
<td>376 20</td>
<td>162 9</td>
<td>42 2</td>
<td>1,846 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>619 16</td>
<td>85 2</td>
<td>1,289 33</td>
<td>427 11</td>
<td>484 12</td>
<td>588 15</td>
<td>296 7</td>
<td>156 4</td>
<td>3,944 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>308 13</td>
<td>48 2</td>
<td>653 26</td>
<td>334 14</td>
<td>446 18</td>
<td>382 15</td>
<td>216 9</td>
<td>84 3</td>
<td>2,471 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>146 14</td>
<td>17 2</td>
<td>326 32</td>
<td>126 13</td>
<td>151 15</td>
<td>102 10</td>
<td>79 8</td>
<td>62 6</td>
<td>1,009 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>960 19</td>
<td>141 8</td>
<td>637 33</td>
<td>274 14</td>
<td>131 7</td>
<td>195 10</td>
<td>82 4</td>
<td>89 5</td>
<td>1,909 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>413 15</td>
<td>146 5</td>
<td>994 36</td>
<td>380 14</td>
<td>338 12</td>
<td>306 10</td>
<td>133 5</td>
<td>77 3</td>
<td>2,787 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,170 10</td>
<td>992 3</td>
<td>10,518 32</td>
<td>4,235 13</td>
<td>4,171 13</td>
<td>6,804 21</td>
<td>1,969 6</td>
<td>801 2</td>
<td>32,660 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data on which this table is based were classified for the use of the Australian National University by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. Mr. W.D. Borrie, of the Department of Demography, A.N.U., has kindly made available to me the analysis of the occupational data carried out by his Research Assistant, Mr. D.R.G. Packer. It is not certain how representative of all male Displaced Persons the 1949 immigrants are, but the 32,660 here classified represent 43% of the total adult male Displaced Persons who have entered the country.
Table 2.

Relation between Pre-Migration and Present Occupation. 57 Displaced Persons, 36 Male, 21 Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Occupation</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled or Professional</td>
<td>Unskilled or semi-skilled</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Skilled or Professional</td>
<td>Unskilled or semi-skilled</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in new skilled occupation acquired in Australia.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new skill acquired; working in unskilled or semi-skilled occupation.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in same occupation as in Europe.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table refers only to Displaced Persons at present in employment. A "Skilled or Professional" occupation is taken to be one requiring specific and standardised training, which, when successfully completed, entitles the individual to some diploma, degree, title etc. which is generally recognised, beyond the particular place of training. Subjects placed in the category of "No Occupation in Country of Origin", were either too young to have been employed before leaving their own countries, or, in the case of women, were unemployed housewives; subjects who had no occupation at home, for either of those reasons, but who worked for Germany during the war and/or for the Allies after the war, are also included in the category of "No Occupation in Country of Origin".
Table 3.

Duration of Employment in Relation to Place of Employment, for 170 Former Displaced Person Employees, and 61 Displaced Persons in Employment at June 1953.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Employment</th>
<th>Immigrants Formerly Employed, Left by June 1953</th>
<th>Immigrants Employed at June 1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenmore (male) &amp; female</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2½ years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2½ years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note to Table 3: The figures for Kenmore Mental Hospital refer to both men and women. The Department of Railways employs a very few women, mainly in the Refreshment Rooms, hence all figures are for men. The Spinning Section of the Pacific Chenille-Craft Factory employs very few women, and the four immigrant women who had been employed there up to June 1953 are excluded. The Kenmore figures cover all nursing and attendant staff. The Railways figures refer to all employees in the Mechanical, and Way and Works Branches, classified as Labourers, Cleaners, Firemen, Fuelmen, Firelighters and Fencers. The Pacific Chenille figures refer only to male employees in the Spinning Section. The figures for all three industries are intended to refer to Displaced Persons only, but, in the case of past employees, it was not always possible to find out whether the immigrant was a Displaced Person or not. Neither Kenmore nor Pacific Chenille has ever employed more than a very small number of non-Displaced Person Europeans; the Mechanical and Way and Works Branches of the Railways had 13 German and 11 Italian employees in June 1953. Where an individual has had two or more separate periods of employment in any one of these three industries, each period is counted independently, as though for different individuals; as a result, the total figures are slightly - but only slightly - larger than the total number of individuals employed. The question of transfers does not arise in the case of Pacific Chenille. When an employee has been transferred from Kenmore to another Mental Hospital, he is included here as one who has left, since a transfer means moving away from Goulburn. Transfers of Railway employees are not, however, included, since they usually involved moving to another branch of the Department in Goulburn. This means that, while the figures for Kenmore and Pacific Chenille are intended to cover all Displaced Persons who have ever been employed in either place, the Railway figures are incomplete, transfers being counted neither as "left" nor "still employed". The reason why no Pacific Chenille employees at June 1953 had been in employment longer than 12 months was that the Spinning Section had been closed down for the first four months of 1952.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kenmore</th>
<th>Railways</th>
<th>Pacific Chenille-Craft</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Force at end of year</td>
<td>Work Force at end of year</td>
<td>Work Force at end of year</td>
<td>Work Force at end of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-June 1953</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See note to Table 3.
### Table 5.

Industries in which 136 Male Displaced Persons have been employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southburn:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Department of Railways.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pacific Chenille - Craft Factory.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Catholic Institutions.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. City and Shire Council.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Migrant Hostel.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hotels.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kenmore Mental Hospital.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Building firms.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Abattoirs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Training Centre (Gal).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cafes.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Twenty-nine other industries in each of which 4 or less of the Displaced Persons sample have been employed.</td>
<td>4 - 1 Less than 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Side Southburn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employed at any time or place in rural work.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cement works at Marulan or Berrima.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. W.C. &amp; I.C., Burrijjuck.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.

**Industries in which 40 Female Displaced Persons have been employed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goulburn:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kenmore Mental Hospital.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hotels.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Catholic Institutions.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. District Hospital.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pacific Chenille - Craft Factory.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Migrant Hostel.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chief Clothing Factory.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Domestic Service.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Five other industries in each of which only one member of the Displaced Person sample has been employed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Goulburn:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employed at any time or place on farm (usually as domestics).</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.

Time of First Arrival in Goulburn-90
Displaced Persons, 71 Men and 19 Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data for this table were obtained from the records of the Department of Labour and National Service, supplemented by other sources. The table includes information on all displaced persons whose first contact with the Goulburn Employment Office occurred after the beginning of 1951, and who worked in, or close to, Goulburn itself. Because most cards on which no action has been taken since 1950 have been destroyed, records of displaced persons arriving in Goulburn before 1951 are incomplete, and have therefore been excluded from this table.
### Table 2.

**Year of last job on Employment Records, 145 Displaced Persons, 123 Male and 22 Female.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>To May 1954</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The data for this table were obtained from the records of the Department of Labour and National Service. The tabulation starts at 1951, because most cards on which no action has been taken since 1950 have been destroyed.
Table 9.

Kenmore Mental Hospital. Duration of Employment of 264 Australians and 56 Immigrants, who left 1948-1953.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left during the period</th>
<th>1 month</th>
<th>1-12 months</th>
<th>1-2½ years</th>
<th>2½-4 years</th>
<th>over 4 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.7.48-12.1.49</td>
<td>3 11.5  0</td>
<td>0 19 73.1  0</td>
<td>0 3 11.5  0</td>
<td>0 1 3.9  0</td>
<td>0 0 0  0</td>
<td>0 26 100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.49-29.6.49</td>
<td>3 8.3  0</td>
<td>0 20 55.6  6</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>3 13.9  0</td>
<td>0 0 0  0</td>
<td>3 8.3  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.6.49-11.1.50</td>
<td>3 9.1  0</td>
<td>0 18 54.5  3</td>
<td>75 0</td>
<td>1 6.1  0</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>2 6.1  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1.50-28.6.50</td>
<td>0 0  0</td>
<td>0 7.2  8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>1 6.1  0</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>2 6.1  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.6.50-10.1.51</td>
<td>3 10.3  0</td>
<td>0 9 31.0  2</td>
<td>50 0</td>
<td>1 5.6  0</td>
<td>1 22.7</td>
<td>2 5.6  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1.51-27.6.51</td>
<td>1 4.5  1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11 50.0  1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1 5.0  0</td>
<td>1 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.6.51-9.1.52</td>
<td>5 16.1  0</td>
<td>0 9 29.0  3</td>
<td>60 0</td>
<td>1 6.1  0</td>
<td>1 22.7</td>
<td>2 6.1  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.52-24.6.52</td>
<td>4 12.9  1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10 53.6  0</td>
<td>0 32.3</td>
<td>2 33.3</td>
<td>3 9.6  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6.52-7.1.53</td>
<td>3 15.0  0</td>
<td>0 11 55.0  1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1 5.0  0</td>
<td>1 33.3</td>
<td>3 9.6  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.53-24.6.53</td>
<td>1 5.9  1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4 23.5  3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>4 23.5</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 9.9  4</td>
<td>7.1 118</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>27 48.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>3 32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.

Employees who left Fernmore Mental Hospital, in 6-monthly periods Jan. 1949-June 1953, as percentage of average work force, Australian and Immigrant, Male and Female, for each period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Male Australian</th>
<th>Female Australian</th>
<th>Male Immigrant</th>
<th>Female Immigrant</th>
<th>Total Australian</th>
<th>Total Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1.49 - 29.6.49</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.6.49 - 11.1.50</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1.50 - 28.6.50</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.6.50 - 10.1.51</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1.51 - 27.6.51</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6.51 - 9.1.52</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.52 - 24.6.52</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6.52 - 7.1.53</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.53 - 24.6.53</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11

No. Jobs During Contract in Relation to No. of New Jobs Since Contract, to June 1953, for 34 Male Displaced Persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Jobs During Contract</th>
<th>No New Jobs Since Contract</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.

Average Number of Months Per Job in Relation to Residence in Goulburn for 31 Male Displaced Persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Average Number of Months Per Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Goulburn early 1953; left by May 1954.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Goulburn early 1953; still there May 1954.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Brides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data for this table were obtained from the Population Survey, September 1952. It includes all deaths in the Mental Hospital, with the exception of those in a separate mental hospital for demented old persons.
Table 14.

Industrial Distribution of Total Population of Goulburn Compared to Distribution of Displaced Persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Displaced Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Construction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Authority &amp; Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement, Hotels etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15.  

Age Distribution of 217 Displaced Persons, 158 Male and 59 Female, Compared to Total Population, Goulburn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Displaced Persons</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+, and not stated</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 16.

Conjugal Condition of 196 Displaced Persons, 136 Male and 60 Female, Compared to Total Population, Goulburn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugal Condition</th>
<th>Displaced Persons</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>4,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>4,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed, Divorced and</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9,398</td>
<td>9,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Married Persons as Percentage of Population over 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The excess of 26 married male Displaced Persons over married female Displaced Persons results from the following factors. A number of males are married to German women, most of whom apparently continue to give their nationality as German, since the Population Survey shows 18 females of German nationality (of whom 4 are children), and 21 German-born females (of whom 4 are aged under 20); as the German women are not in general the wives of German men (only 2 of the 20 male German nationals being married), it can be assumed that they are the wives of Displaced Persons; it is therefore estimated that 14 of the Displaced Person Males are married to women classified as of German nationality, which leaves an excess of 12 married males over married females. This excess is accounted for partly by the fact that more Displaced Person males are married to Australians than are Displaced Person females, and probably also by the fact that a number of Displaced Person males have wives in Europe. One might expect that this last factor would affect the figures for both men and women, but the field study revealed no women who were separated from husbands still living in Europe (all of those who had ever been married being either widowed or divorced), while it revealed three men in this category.
Table 17.

Religion of 196 Displaced Persons, Compared to Total Population of Goulburn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Displaced Persons</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Indefinite, None, No Reply</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Tables 15-17: The data for these tables were obtained from the Population Survey, Sept. 1953. The discrepancy in the number of Displaced Persons given in Table 15, on the one hand, and Tables 16 & 17, on the other hand, arises from the fact that the only tabulation available for age was by birthplace, while the tabulations for religion and conjugal condition were by nationality. The discrepancy between the number of persons whose nationality was one of the Displaced Person countries, and the number listed as born in one of these countries results mainly from the fact that I have omitted 24 Stateless persons from Tables 16 and 17; nearly all of these are inmates of the Training Center (Gaol).
Table 18.

**Educational Standard of 129 Displaced Persons, 109 Male and 20 Female**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Standard</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary only</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Secondary, but no Matriculation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation, but no higher education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University course, complete or incomplete</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The data for this table were obtained from the records of the Department of Labour and National Service. Extra-school technical training has been ignored in making the classifications. Individuals with Primary schooling only may have had anything from 3 to 7 years at school, and very occasionally 8; the median number of years for such individuals is 5.
Table 19.
Employment of Wife in Twenty-Seven Families
In Which Husband or Wife is a Displaced Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment of Wife</th>
<th>Has Worked Most of Period Since Arrival or Since Marriage</th>
<th>Has Not Worked Most of Period Since Arrival or Since Marriage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband Australian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband European</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife European</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20.

Number of Children Per Family in Twenty-Seven Families
In Which Husband or Wife is a Displaced Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childless Couples</th>
<th>All Children Born in Europe</th>
<th>All Children Born in Australia</th>
<th>One Child Born in Europe one in Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Husband and</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Australian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Husband European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Australian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wife European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note for Table 21: The column "Family Status" classifies subjects according to whether they are at present living as members of family units or not; some of those not living in family units are married, being separated from their spouses in Australia, or with a spouse still in Europe. In cases of de facto marriage, each partner is counted as a "Member of a Family Unit." In the column "Pre-Migration Occupational Status", women who were not working in their countries of origin are classified according to the occupation of their fathers, or, if married, their husbands; men who were too young to have an occupation before emigration are classified according to the occupation of their fathers.
Table 22.

Choice of Same Nationality or Different Nationality Friends, 12 High Status Displaced Persons Compared to 28 Low Status Displaced Persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No. Subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose Only Same Nationality Friends</td>
<td>Choose At Least One Different Nationality Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 0.476, not significant.
Table 23.

Choice of Same Status or Different Status Friends, 12 High Status Compared to 28 Low Status Displaced Persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No. Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose Only Same Status Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 1.808, not significant.
Table 24.

Choice of Same Nationality or Different Nationality Friends, 23 Male and 17 Female Displaced Persons Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No. Subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose Only Same Nationality Friends</td>
<td>Choose At Least One Different Nationality Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 2.556, not significant.
Table 25.

Choice of Same Status or Different Status Friends, 23 Male and 17 Female Displaced Persons Compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Choose Only Same Status Friends</th>
<th>Choose At Least One Different Status Friend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 0.250, not significant.
Table 26.

Choice of Same Industry or Different Industry Friends, 14 Male and 10 Female Displaced Persons Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No. Subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose Only Same Industry Friends</td>
<td>Choose At Least One Friend in Different Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Clique</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Pre-emigration Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>All male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 Ukrainian</td>
<td>5 occupations</td>
<td>All low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Lithuanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>All male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 Poles</td>
<td>4 occupations</td>
<td>2 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Slovaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>All male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Pole</td>
<td>3 occupations</td>
<td>2 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hungarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Greek high in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Australian-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>born Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>All male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Pole</td>
<td>2 occupations</td>
<td>3 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Latvian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>All male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 Lithuanian</td>
<td>3 occupations</td>
<td>3 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>All male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 Hungarians</td>
<td>2 occupations</td>
<td>2 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>All female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Hungarian</td>
<td>1 occupation</td>
<td>2 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dane</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clique</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Pre-emigration Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hungarian m, f</td>
<td>1 occupation</td>
<td>4 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovak m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dane f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hungarian m, f</td>
<td>2 occupations</td>
<td>5 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hungarian f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ukrainian f, m</td>
<td>1 occupation</td>
<td>4 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latvian m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slovene m, f</td>
<td>1 occupation</td>
<td>3 low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austrian f</td>
<td>1 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28.

Primary Relations With Australians, 28 Displaced Persons Employed in the Hostel, Railways & Mental Hospital, Compared to 16 Displaced Persons Employed Elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Employment</th>
<th>Primary Relations With Australians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Primary Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostel, Mental Hospital &amp; Railways</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed elsewhere</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 6.545, significant at the 2% level.
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