Abstract
The origin of the word 'ghetto', it is universally agreed, is in the Jewish quarter of Venice in 1516. It was a common practice in medieval times to segregate Jews in a particular area of cities, often outside the city walls or, as in the case of Venice, on the periphery. In London, Jews were excluded from the City and took up residence in the Aldgate area on the outskirts. This remained a strongly Jewish area until the bombing of the Second World War. Similar situations were found throughout Europe. These ghettos were not necessarily poor or disadvantaged areas. Some, as in Amsterdam, were quite prosperous. In modern times Jews began to disperse more widely, but the persistence of Jewish institutions such as synagogues in the former ghetto areas meant that they retained their Jewish character, often for centuries. Ghetto areas grew rapidly in eastern Europe in the nineteenth century as laws were passed in Tsarist Russia confining Jews to a large area of the empire (the Jewish Pale) and then driving them from their rural settlements (the shtetls) into cities where they were confined within particular areas. Thus when the mass Jewish emigration to America started in the 1880s most migrants already had the experience of living in exclusively Jewish villages or urban areas of Poland and Russia. Other European Jews, while not so confined, had also experienced life in concentrated areas of cities, although this was much less common than in the Russian or Ottoman empires. When east European Jews settled in America they tended to live in concentrations such as the Lower East Side or the Bronx in New York. Despite much dispersal to outer suburbs in America there are still Jewish concentrations in many major cities.
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REPORT ON METROPOLITAN GHETTOES AND ETHNIC CONCENTRATIONS

The Concept of the Ghetto in an International Context

The origin of the word 'ghetto', it is universally agreed, is in the Jewish quarter of Venice in 1516. It was a common practice in medieval times to segregate Jews in a particular area of cities, often outside the city walls or, as in the case of Venice, on the periphery. In London, Jews were excluded from the City and took up residence in the Aldgate area on the outskirts. This remained a strongly Jewish area until the bombing of the Second World War. Similar situations were found throughout Europe. These ghettos were not necessarily poor or disadvantaged areas. Some, as in Amsterdam, were quite prosperous. In modern times Jews began to disperse more widely, but the persistence of Jewish institutions such as synagogues in the former ghetto areas meant that they retained their Jewish character, often for centuries. Ghetto areas grew rapidly in eastern Europe in the nineteenth century as laws were passed in Tsarist Russia confining Jews to a large area of the empire (the Jewish Pale) and then driving them from their rural settlements (the shtetls) into cities where they were confined within particular areas. Thus when the mass Jewish emigration to America started in the 1880s most migrants already had the experience of living in exclusively Jewish villages or urban areas of Poland and Russia. Other European Jews, while not so confined, had also experienced life in concentrated areas of cities, although this was much less common than in the Russian or Ottoman empires. When east European Jews settled in America they tended to live in concentrations such as the Lower East Side or the Bronx in New York. Despite much dispersal to outer suburbs in America there are still Jewish concentrations in many major cities.

The term 'ghetto', then, became transferred from its European origins to North America in the nineteenth century. It normally referred to an area of a city which was wholly or largely Jewish. In contrast to Russia, however, there was no legal obligation on Jews to live in such areas and they eventually began to disperse as they became more prosperous. Some attempts were made to inhibit this movement through the practice of restrictive covenants, which prevented property from being rented or sold to Jews. This
practice, which is now illegal, was extended to Blacks and to other ethnic groups. As other major immigrant groups arrived in America they tended to concentrate in areas to which the term 'ghetto' was also applied. This concentration, as later in Australia, was largely caused by the practice of 'chain migration', whereby original settlers (almost always single males) paid for their relatives to emigrate and then became responsible for settling them, in the absence of any public services. This gave rise to the many Chinatowns, Little Italies, Little Warsaws and so on which characterised American and Canadian cities between the 1880s and the 1940s.

The reasons for such concentrated settlement were various. Some ethnic groups, especially east European Jews, took a ghetto tradition with them which they reproduced. Others, such as the Chinese, congregated together partly for protection against a hostile majority. Others, such as Italians, were sponsored and employed by relatives and lived and worked in markedly Italian neighbourhoods. Many industrial cities attracted east Europeans in large numbers as factory workers. The characteristic pattern of non-English-speaking settlement in North America was the 'ghetto' or 'ethnic concentration'. These helped sustain ethnic institutions, languages and practices for several generations, despite strong assimilationist traditions in both the United States and Canada. It should not be overlooked that many NES immigrants did not settle in such concentrations and that considerable numbers opened up agricultural areas such as Saskatchewan and Minnesota.

As immigrant settlement in North America was largely unregulated and determined by an uncertain labour market, several social problems grew up in these ghetto areas. These were not necessarily more acute than in deprived areas inhabited by native Americans or Canadians or by British and Irish immigrants. Indeed, the major concentrations of white poverty in both countries remain in rural areas such as Appalachia or the Canadian Maritimes, which were not settled by late nineteenth century European immigrants but by earlier settlers of British, Irish or French origins. Nevertheless, the distinctive ethnic character of urban concentrations gave rise to the belief that they were undesirable. Chinatowns were characterised as sinks of vice and corruption, especially as the great majority of their inhabitants were single males. Jewish ghettos were very law abiding, although there were some noted Jewish criminals during the Prohibition period of the 1920s. But Jews were often despised by the Anglo majority because of their poverty and foreign character. The Mafia grew out...
of the Italian (and specifically the Sicilian) concentrations of New York, Chicago and San Francisco. The high levels of crime and gangsterism in the United States in the 1920s consolidated the myth that ghettos were breeding grounds for crime. As many of them were also slum areas it became the aspiration of most second generation Americans and Canadians to 'escape from the ghetto' into the suburbs. They did, however, often retain sentimental links with original neighbourhoods of settlement such as the Lower East Side, which continues to cater for Jewish tastes long after it has ceased to be an area of Jewish settlement. Suburban Italian-Americans will still eat in Mulberry Street, New York or at Fisherman's Wharf, San Francisco.

By the 1940s there was even a sentimental attitude towards the ghettos, just as there had originally been towards the 'old country'. Families moving to the suburbs retained social and commercial links with the original districts of settlement and writers (such as Mordecai Richler in Canada or Chaim Potok in America) regretted the loss of neighbourhood solidarity involved in moving on. However, from the 1940s the term 'ghetto' acquired more sinister meanings, until today it is always used in a pejorative sense. This was due to developments in North America and in Nazi-occupied Europe. In the United States a process of *ethnic succession* had been observed by the Chicago University sociologists dominating urban studies from the 1920s. Those moving out were replaced by new immigrants, firstly from the country of the original settlers but increasingly from new and poorer sources. As most of the urban ghettos were built between the 1860s and 1914 they gradually deteriorated into slums, especially where rigid rent control operated, as in New York. Large scale Black movement from the rural southern States began during the Second World War, especially into New York, Detroit and Chicago, but also into southern cities such as Washington, Atlanta and Richmond. This has continued as southern rural industries such as cotton have reduced their labour force, and has spread westwards towards California as population has moved towards the 'sunbelt'. In Canada the movement into inner-city areas was mainly of overseas immigrants and social problems comparable to those in the United States did not arise. From the 1950s there was considerable movement from Puerto Rico, Mexico and Central America. Official United States policy now recognises two major disadvantaged groups - Blacks and Hispanics. While they are widely dispersed, they tended to move into former ghetto areas or to form new ones, to the extent that cities such as Washington, Miami or Los Angeles (without historic immigrant ghetto locations) had Black and/or Hispanic majorities by the 1980s. The new ghettos, which included large public
housing estates (as in Bedford-Stuyvesant, New York), became centres for crime and social disruption, with exceptionally high levels of unemployment and drug abuse. Thus by the 1960s, when there were major urban risings in some cities, the term ghetto was being equated not just with ethnic concentration but also with social disaster. The great majority of ghetto dwellers, on this definition, came from the American continent.

In Europe the Nazi policy of confining Jews within urban ghettos, as a preliminary to moving them to extermination camps, was followed from Vilna and Warsaw in the east to Amsterdam in the west. The tragedy of these ghettos destroyed any sentimental loyalties which had previously attached to them. For the past forty years the word 'ghetto' has implied: ethnic concentration by a disadvantaged minority in bad, or even disastrous, social conditions which should not be tolerated either by the individuals living there or by the wider society. There is no way in which the term can be used as a neutral expression and it should be avoided in public policy pronouncements or speeches. However, it is still legitimate to use it as a social scientific expression so long as it describes the outlined conditions. In popular usage, of course, it persists in such terms as 'intellectual ghetto' or even 'middle-class ghetto'. Such usage is also derogatory, implying isolation from the broader society.

Dictionary definitions reflect the experience of the past forty years and of the specific cultures from which the dictionary has emerged. Thus The Concise Oxford Dictionary (British) describes a ghetto as 'part of a city, esp. slum area, occupied by minority group(s); isolated or segregated group or area'. The American Random House College Dictionary defines a ghetto as 'a section of a city, esp. a thickly populated slum area, inhabited predominantly by a minority group'. The Concise Macquarie Dictionary (Australian) is much kinder, simply referring to 'a quarter in a city in which any minority group lives'. This could include the very middle-class suburbs in which most Australian Jews live. It has no connotation of social disadvantage, reflecting the Australian reality that ghettos in the American sense do not exist in Australia. However, it cannot be assumed that the term is completely neutral in Australia, as historically it has often been used to describe a deplored situation.

The academic study of ghettos and ethnic concentrations has been dominated by American social scientists. British analysts of urban life were more concerned with slum problems which did not have an ethnic basis. Their studies gave rise to the 'garden
city' movement and to the great expansion of public housing schemes in this century, many of them based on 'garden city' principles. British concern with ethnic ghettos began in the 1960s after the influx of Caribbean immigrants and a series of race riots involving them. The major work in Britain has been done by Professor John Rex of the University of Warwick. In the British context most concern has been with 'coloured' immigrants (officially known as New Commonwealth with Pakistan - NCWP). These have been strongly concentrated in areas of poverty and poor housing and, to a lesser extent, in public housing. However the living conditions of many Indian immigrants have been superior and approximate more closely to conditions generally found in Australia. Classic 'ghetto' conditions of the American kind have been studied in Birmingham and in various parts of London. Settlement in industrial cities has been common in textile and clothing areas in Yorkshire, Lancashire and the East Midlands. There is now a general body of literature in British social science concerned with these settlements. However, this has had little influence on Australian social scientists who have infrequently taken up this area of study and when they have done so are more influenced by American work. The major relevant studies in Australia have included:

- the work of Professor Frank Jones on the Italian community in Carlton (Jones, 1962)
- the work of Ian Burnley on immigrant settlement in Sydney (Burnley 1985)
- the general work by Johnston, which includes Melbourne-based studies (Johnston, 1971)

There has also been some work on urban Aboriginal settlement, especially for Alice Springs and Adelaide.

This small body of academic literature does not compare in scope with that completed in the United States, Canada or Britain. Urban studies relevant to immigrant settlement are weakly developed in Australia and many major metropolitan districts are completely unanalysed. There is virtually nothing which might be termed a 'general theory' of immigrant or ethnic minority settlement patterns in Australia. The consequent reliance on overseas (and particularly American) studies can create misleading impressions.
The Concept of the Ghetto in the Australian Context

Australian public figures have been expressing a fear of ghettos for many years, despite the fact that ghettos in the North American sense have rarely existed in Australia. The main models on which such fears have been based include the American, the British, and the local experience of 'Chinatowns'. Jewish settlement in Australia has been very small by American standards and much of it in the nineteenth century was from Britain or Germany, where ghetto traditions were very weak. Settlement from anywhere other than the British Isles was very spasmodic and limited until the late 1940s. Much of it was in rural areas. Nor was there the massive movement into the cities which characterised Black American ghetto formation. Aborigines were few in numbers and most lived remote from the cities until the 1950s, being banned from settling in Perth altogether until 1948. Anxiety about ghettos was suggested, nevertheless, as recently as 1988 in the Office of Multicultural Affairs survey, which found that 55% of general respondents thought that multiculturalism led to urban concentrations of minorities (question J 1 G).

The American model has already been outlined and has been very influential on Australian thinking for many years. There are very important differences between the two experiences, however, which are often overlooked. There is no Black or Hispanic hinterland population from which Australian ghettos might be peopled. Immigrants to America came in vast numbers and were largely uncontrolled until the 1920s. In Australia, despite proportionately high immigrant numbers, the great majority came from similar cultures until the 1940s. Others were very tightly controlled from the 1880s. The greater distance to Australia discouraged the poor and those who (because not British) were ineligible for assisted passages. Despite the early experiments with pauper and convict immigration and the sponsorship of orphan 'farm boys', Australian immigration policy did not favour the urban poor. Urban poverty was much more a product of the two major depressions of the 1890s and the 1930s than of a mass influx of the European poor. The Asian poor were, of course, excluded by the White Australia Policy.
There were, then, few examples of ethnic slum concentrations in Australia in the past. The constantly expressed fear of ghettos largely reflected general opposition to non-British settlement based on imperial patriotism and on then fashionable racial theories. The limited British experience with Irish and Jewish immigration was also influential. In the nineteenth century massive emigration from Ireland (while it mainly went to North America) created pockets of Irish immigrants in some British cities, especially in Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow and London. Historians have argued that the poorest Irish favoured England and Scotland, because they could not raise the fare to North America. Irish immigrants to Australia, after the convict period, were much more prosperous than those going to Britain and most were given assisted passages to settle on the land. The Irish settlements in Britain were notorious for their poverty and squalor as their inhabitants were nearly all unskilled rural labourers. They were also mainly Catholics and religious prejudice was a factor in public condemnation of them. The worst slum conditions in major British cities (including East London) were often found in Irish-settled areas. In Australia similar prejudices against the Irish were quite strong in the nineteenth century. The rise of Irish-Australian Labor politicians, especially after 1916, lent credence to the idea that there were large Irish ghettos in the major cities comparable to those in Britain. However, recent historical research suggests that this was rarely the case. Until the depression of the 1890s the Irish-born lived mainly in rural areas. After that there was some concentration in districts such as Paddington and Surry Hills in Sydney or Richmond and North Melbourne in Victoria. These were poor neighbourhoods but scarcely comparable to the tenement slums of Glasgow or Liverpool. There were few areas in which Catholic Irish formed a majority. No municipality or electoral district in any metropolis has ever had the majority concentration found not only in some British cities but even more markedly in American Irish strongholds such as Boston. Despite this, the myth of 'Irish ghettos' remained very strong at least into the 1950s in Melbourne and Sydney, though it was not widely held anywhere else.

The British experience with Jewish immigration after 1881 caused some alarm in Australia and eventually led to the first British legal restrictions on alien immigration in 1905. Refugee immigrants escaping Tsarist ghettos and persecution, crowded into East London with their focus on the historic Jewish settlement in Whitechapel. This was an area of slum conditions and great poverty and there was considerable anti-semitic feeling which continued into the 1930s. No similar development occurred in
Australia until the 1920s when a small Yiddish-speaking migration concentrated in Carlton and Brunswick in inner-Melbourne. This was met with great hostility which was extended to refugees from the Nazis in the late 1930s. Again, as with the Irish, both the numbers and the poverty of the new arrivals was much less apparent in Australia than in America or Britain. Living conditions in inner-Melbourne were such as to create a State commission of enquiry into slums which reported in 1938. But the great majority of those living in slum conditions, including those in Carlton, were not immigrants.

Apart from Irish and Jewish 'ghettos', the third Australian experience (which was shared with America and Canada though only marginally with Britain) was of Chinatowns. The mass emigration from south China which followed the Opium Wars of the 1840s created large Chinese settlements throughout southeast Asia. In Canada and the United States similar settlements grew on the west coast in cities such as San Francisco and, later, Vancouver. In Australia the arrival of Chinese gold-seekers from 1853 had little immediate impact on the major cities, although the Little Bourke Street area in Melbourne has been settled by Chinese ever since. Most Chinese went to rural and mining areas and stayed there into the 1890s.

Chinese urbanisation, other than in Melbourne, took place in three distinct situations: on market gardens on city outskirts (such as in Alexandria, Sydney); near the city markets (as in Dixon Street, Sydney); and in tropical towns such as Cairns, Cooktown, Darwin and Broome. In Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and Darwin, such Chinatowns remain in central locations and have grown very large and prosperous since the 1970s. Elsewhere they have disappeared. In the nineteenth century, and especially in the 1880s, Chinatowns were depicted as sinks of iniquity, a journalistic tradition also followed in relation to San Francisco and London's Limehouse. They were especially associated with gambling, drugs and the 'white slave traffic'. It is not clear to what extent these depictions were based on reality, but they were remarkably similar in all the English-speaking societies. Chinese had been deliberately segregated in camps on the Victorian goldfields in the 1850s and, because of their religious and dietary preferences, often lived in closed communities - or appeared to do so to the outside world. However, those who prospered tended to move out of the Chinatowns and many married European women in the absence of suitable Chinese partners.
These three situations - the Irishtown, the Jewish ghetto and the Chinatown - formed the basis for most Australian attitudes towards immigrant settlement and were interpreted through British and American experience as much as through Australian. Australian attitudes towards ethnic concentration show considerable continuity for over a century. In 1881, Sir Henry Parkes' government in New South Wales issued instructions to Italians arriving in Sydney after the ill-fated scheme to settle them in New Britain had collapsed. They were completely dependent on public assistance. While stating that the government would not force them to reside in any particular localities, they were warned that there would be no assistance for them if they chose to settle together. 'The customs of the country and other circumstances render it undesirable, indeed almost impossible, for them to settle down altogether in one locality. Even if this were practicable it would not be for their own good to do so'. *(Address to the Italian Immigrants; Sydney, 21st April, 1881).* With the arrival of large numbers of Southern European immigrants in the Queensland canefields, the Ferry Report of 1925 *(Report of the Royal Commission on Social and Economic Effect of Increase in Number of Aliens in North Queensland, Brisbane, 1925)* argued that: 'it is desirable that aliens be not permitted to arrive in any one district in such numbers as to become a majority of the workers in such district' and that 'the unemployed migrants in any district, if possible, should be diverted to other districts and given an opportunity of engaging in some productive enterprise other than the growing of sugar-cane.'

While official concern with the formation of ethnic concentrations has declined markedly since the 1950s, there is still a residue of opposition at the level of public opinion. A letter to the Melbourne Age (2 September 1989) claimed that: 'this country is being flooded with ghetto-forming nationalities whose mother tongue is not English and who make no attempt to integrate within the community.'

---

**Australian Experience of Settlement before 1940**

As suggested above, Australia had a very limited experience of ethnic minority concentration in the first 150 years of European settlement. German settlement was most apparent in rural areas of Queensland and South Australia from the late 1830s and there are still some areas where Lutherans of German descent form a majority.
Significant German settlement in cities such as Adelaide, Melbourne and Brisbane, did not create noticeable concentrations. Apart from the Irish Catholics (often regarded as an alien minority although British subjects), the Germans and the Chinese, few ethnic minorities were created. It was a conscious desire of governments that Australia should remain a British society. The only colony to extend assisted passages to aliens on a regular basis was Queensland which sent large numbers of Germans and Scandinavians to rural areas. All assisted passage schemes encouraged rural settlement and it was frequently stated right through to the late 1920s, that all immigrants should be settled in rural areas as far as possible. Of course, this did not happen but it was a continuing theme in settlement policy that Australia was a rural society which needed population in its 'empty spaces'.

Australia soon became, as it remains, one of the most urbanised societies in the world. Its cities grew largely by overseas immigration although there was a steady movement from rural areas from the 1890s. Whether coming from overseas or from the hinterland, nearly all new arrivals were of British and Irish descent. They had no reason to settle particular suburbs other than those dictated by their employment or by their income. Most favoured outer suburbs rather than the city centres, which became progressively depopulated. Virtually all immigrants spoke English, belonged to established religious denominations and were British subjects. There were no social, political or cultural reasons for them concentrating in particular localities. Location was determined almost entirely by personal preference, employment and income. There was a tendency for Catholics to be found most concentrated in poorer areas, which reflected the less skilled character of the Irish-descended workforce. Scottish-descended Presbyterians were more common in upper-class suburbs than the norm, reflecting their economic success. But many working-class suburbs, such as Footscray and Coburg in Melbourne, or Auburn and Botany in Sydney, had mainly English-descended populations.

Chinatowns were the best-known 'ghettos' to most pre-war Australians and were noticeable in Little Bourke Street, Melbourne; Dixon Street, Sydney; Fortitude Valley, Brisbane; and Rose Street, North Perth. The rigorous implementation of the White Australia Policy meant that all were becoming moribund. Jewish settlement in St Kilda, Carlton and Brunswick in Melbourne and Bondi in Sydney was replenished by refugees and immigrants in the 1920s and 1930s, but not without strong complaints from
Australian public figures and the media. Small Jewish communities survived in Perth, Adelaide and Brisbane, but most provincial communities had started to die out and few now exist. Jews were acceptable provided they were not too noticeable, a point strongly made to new arrivals by Australian Jewish organisations. There were none of the anti-Jewish demonstrations and marches which characterised London in the 1930s. Most Jews lived in middle-class areas, a trend which continued until there are virtually none left in the pre-War working class settlement suburbs such as Carlton.

Otherwise there is very little in Australian historical experience to explain the strong opposition to ethnic ghetto formation which characterised many public statements in the late 1940s and the 1950s. Small Southern European and Middle Eastern communities had formed between 1900 and 1940, though the majority of Mediterranean migrants, like the Chinese before them, lived in rural and provincial areas or were itinerants. Some of these communities consisted of market gardeners on the outskirts such as Croations in Swan Shire (WA), Maltese in Sunshine (Vic.), Italians in Fairfield (NSW), Macedonians in Werribee (Vic) or Bulgarians in Fulham (SA). These often formed a nucleus for post-War settlement in districts which became suburbanised. They were following an earlier Chinese tradition of practising traditional small-holding agriculture by servicing major cities. They certainly did not form 'ghettoes' in the sense which is usually applied to inner-city concentrations.

Immigrant settlement was found in 'zones of transition' in major cities. These zones are characterised by a transient population taking advantage of cheap rentals and casual employment. Such areas have the potential for ghetto development in the American sense of areas of multiple disadvantage and social deprivation. This potential was slight in Australia. Such zones were small in extent and were not predominantly inhabited by ethnic minorities. Inner-city populations of NESB origins were found in all the metropolitan centres, if in small numbers. In Brisbane there was a significant Greek presence in West End, which remains the major Greek concentration today. Russians were also found nearby in Woolloongabba, where they maintained two churches. Italians, who were much more numerous on the north Queensland canefields, had a presence just to the north of the city centre. In Sydney there was a Lebanese settlement at Redfern Park, Greeks in Newtown and Italians in Leichhardt. These formed a nucleus of institutions and family connections for much larger post-War migrations. In Melbourne there was a Greek community in the northeast corner of the
City and in neighbouring Fitzroy and a small Italian population which had its origins in Lygon Street, Carlton in the 1920s. Settlers from Macedonia and other parts of Yugoslavia established a presence around Gertrude Street, Fitzroy, as they did in North Perth. Adelaide, despite its earlier German influence, had only a small Greek and Italian settlement. No other cities were large enough or ethnically varied enough to have a ghetto potential before 1940. Even those cities which did have NESB immigrant populations had such small concentrations of them that nothing approximating a majority enclave could possibly have formed. This did not prevent public spokesmen from denouncing such small concentrations as there were. Most visible ethnic concentration was close to city centres and thus rather obvious. There were, however, often large groups of market gardeners on the outskirts whose presence caused little comment.

All such pre-War settlements are much better described as 'ethnic concentrations' than as 'ghettos'. Despite their strength in 'zones of transition' and their male preponderance, they were not particularly prone to crime. Many served as contact points for compatriots working in the bush. Apart from a few clubs, churches and shops they did not intrude on the otherwise Anglo-Australian character of the city centre and were almost completely absent from the suburbs. Proportionately greater concentrations existed in many rural areas, especially on the north Queensland canefields, in the Murray-Murrumbidgee irrigation districts and on the Kalgoorlie goldfields. This latter settlement of Italians and Yugoslavs was disrupted by the race riots of 1934, the only such to occur on a major scale in pre-War Australia. Otherwise, aliens were seen rarely if at all, mainly as itinerant hawkers (Lebanese and Indians), as cafe owners (Greeks) as cane cutters (Italians), or as market gardeners (Chinese and Croatians). Aborigines were just beginning to move towards country towns. They were the majority in the Northern Territory and northwestern West Australia. Otherwise they were still being concentrated on 'missions', a deliberate public policy which continued into the 1950s, giving rise to such large Aboriginal concentrations as Cherbourg and Palm Island (Qld) and, later, Papunya and Yuendumu (Northern Territory). There was a very small Aboriginal presence in major cities, mainly in 'zones of transition'.

Apart from Aboriginal settlement (which resulted from internal transfers), three basic patterns of NESB settlement had emerged by the 1940s. They were:
• **Rural Settlement:** this took a number of forms, including *agricultural farming* (as with Germans in South Australia, the Wimmera, the Riverina and southeast Queensland; Italians in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area, the Queensland canefields and the Victorian Murray; or Indians and Chinese in the New South Wales and Queensland banana industry); *storekeeping and catering* (as with Greeks and Lebanese throughout rural Australia and Chinese in many areas); *itinerant labouring* (as with Croatians and Macedonians in Western Australia; Maltese and Spaniards on the canefields). There were movements between these categories, as with the acquisition of farms by former labourers.

• **Provincial Settlement:** this included *mining* (as with Croatians at Broken Hill; Italians at Wonthaggi and Corrimal); *industrial towns* (as with Greeks at Port Pirie); and *provincial cities* (as with Greeks and Chinese in Darwin; Japanese and Malays in Broome). There were also Jewish communities in several provincial cities such as Newcastle, Ballarat and Toowoomba but these were not generally replenished by NESB Jewish immigrants.

• **Metropolitan Settlement:** this is the only form of settlement to which the term 'ghetto' was applied. It included *zone of transition* settlement (as with Chinese in Melbourne, Sydney, Perth and Brisbane; Greeks in Fitzroy, West End and Marrickville; Lebanese in Redfern; Macedonians in Fitzroy and North Perth; European Jews in Carlton; Italians in Carlton and Leichhardt); *peripheral market gardening* (as with Chinese in several cities; Greeks and Italians in Werribee; Croatians and Italians in Cabramatta and Leppington; Croatians in the Swan Shire; and Bulgarians in Fulham); *suburban settlement* was rare except for Jews who settled in St Kilda and Caulfield in Melbourne, Bondi and Woollahra in Sydney, and comparable areas of Perth, Adelaide and Brisbane. Many of these were not of recent NES origin. Many individuals settled in suburban areas but did not form recognisable enclaves.

Many of these settlements formed the core for post-War communities. Others, especially in provincial cities, did not and gradually disappeared. The 'core areas' of Southern European and Chinese settlement in the major cities often remain as commercial centres even today. The flavour of life in these small communities before World War II can be gained from the writings of David Malouf (for Brisbane Lebanese)
or Amirah Inglis (for Melbourne Jews). Far from being isolated enclaves, the settlements were shaped by strong assimilationist pressures through schools and other institutions, which usually separated the locally-born generation from their immigrant parents and grandparents. The major 'ethnic' function of such communities was to act as a retreat from the surrounding majority culture if it became too hostile or to serve as a reference point for new arrivals or for visitors from the bush. They did not impinge very markedly on their majority neighbours. Nor were they strongly resented despite the openly expressed assimilationism of all Australian institutions and most citizens before 1950. Unfortunately no similar reminiscences exist for the Chinese communities.

**Settlement Patterns of Post-War Immigrants**

All the pre-War settlements were very small, despite the occasional hysteria which they created. Only the isolated street (such as Dorrit Street, Carlton for Italians) ever had a preponderantly NESB character. Only the small and declining Chinatowns were at all visible as NESB commercial centres. There were no metropolitan districts which were not completely dominated by Anglo-Celtic Australians. This pattern did not start to change until the 1950s, with the rapid addition of many thousands of NESB immigrants under the post-War migration program which began in 1947.

Post-War migration has gone through several stages, each one contributing new populations of differing origins which created differing settlement patterns. Throughout the past forty years the largest component has been English-speaking, with a recent shift in emphasis from the United Kingdom towards New Zealand. No concern was ever expressed publicly about the settlement of large British immigrant populations in such cities as Adelaide and Perth, despite the very heavy concentrations which have arisen in places like Elizabeth or Rockingham. As in the past, white English-speakers have always been excluded from any discussion of ghettos or enclaves even when they have numerically dominated large suburban areas. Public policy was very concerned that NESB immigrants should not concentrate. It still remains one of the agreed principles of immigration policy that 'while migrants will have the same rights as other Australian residents to choose their place of residence individually or collectively, enclave settlement will not be encouraged. Immigration
policy will not consider communities for mass movement to Australia in situations where closed enclave settlement would occur'. This position, adopted in 1979 with bipartisan agreement, echoes official stances taken as long ago as the 1880s in New South Wales.

To avoid ethnic concentration in the major cities, most Displaced Persons arriving in the first wave from 1947 to 1952 were located in remote camps and put to work on rural construction projects such as the Snowy Mountains Hydro Electricity Scheme. Once the two year compulsory labour obligation was completed, very few remained in the camp areas, although there is still some ageing Polish settlement near the original camps in Tasmania and the Hunter Valley. Most moved to the cities but only temporarily (if at all) to the zones of transition. The East Europeans had few if any compatriots who could form a settlement nucleus as there had been very little pre-War immigration from their countries. They began a process which had not previously been important - settlement in new outer industrial suburbs. This was particularly marked in Victoria and South Australia, where the Liberal governments were anxious to industrialise and to attract labour and capital. There was also some settlement in the two coal and steel complexes of Newcastle and Wollongong but very little in Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia or in rural and provincial areas.

The East European communities were very anxious to maintain their languages and cultures - a task which many saw as a political imperative. This did not necessarily involve settling in closely-knit districts. The characteristic settling point for post-War refugees, in which many of them still live, was the outer suburbs (Sunshine, Keilor and Broadmeadows in Melbourne; Bankstown, Fairfield and Auburn in Sydney; and Woodville and Enfield in Adelaide). They rarely developed shopping or commercial centres with a distinctive 'East European' flavour, except for European Jews, whose settlement pattern was different as it was based on moving into existing Jewish communities. Focal points were mainly in club houses, such as the Ukrainian centre at Essendon or the Polish Club in Ashfield. Community life tended to be inward looking, within such clubs, rather than outward looking through restaurants or shopping streets.

The suburbs being settled were very scattered, lacked basic facilities and commercial focal points, but had cheap land and industrial employment. This process of settlement, which was well advanced by the 1950s, might be termed utilitarian suburbanism. It
was shared with many working-class British immigrants and was later followed by many Southern Europeans and more recently, by Indochinese and Latin American refugees. It was 'utilitarian' because the new suburbs had no previously formed character and were settled because of their proximity to employment and the cheapness of land rather than because of their physical attractiveness or any existing reputation or facilities. British, Dutch and German immigrants were more likely to choose areas on the more fashionable side of the major cities, to which young Australian-born families were also moving in increasing numbers. They usually had greater resources, in the sense of more acceptable skills and qualifications, including a high degree of mastery of English.

The build-up of immigration in the 1950s and 1960s created very large concentrations of NESB settlers in these outer suburbs. Locations such as St. Albans, to the west of Melbourne, or Fairfield to the west of Sydney, now contain far larger numbers and far greater concentrations of NESB Australians than had ever been experienced before in urban settings. In terms of gross numbers, the industrial outer suburbs contain more NESB immigrants than any other broad category of settlement in Australia. This trend was begun by the post-War Displaced Persons and has continued ever since, despite the different origins and lifestyles of many who have come after them. Such areas can scarcely be called ghettos in any of the senses normally used in Australia or elsewhere. Their housing stock is new, as most were not developed until forty years ago and many are more recent. They are certainly not zones of transition. Apart from some public housing estates, they are based on individual home ownership rather than rental. Census data shows such suburbs to be every bit as characterised by familism (domination by the 'traditional family' of parents and children) as Anglo-Australian suburbs. Nor are they dominated by a single ethnic group. Their settlement history is rather one of successive layering of new waves - East Europeans in the 1950s, Southern Europeans in the 1960s and 1970s and Indochinese and Latin Americans in the 1980s. While some no longer have an English-speaking majority among adults, this does not make them single-origin ghettos but rather NESB concentrations.

A majority of NESB immigrants since the late 1940s have settled in suburbs of this type around Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide and Perth. Such settlement has been less common in Brisbane, which has the lowest NESB proportion of the five major metropolises,
though comparable situations exist on a smaller scale in Wollongong, Geelong and Newcastle. NESB settlement in Canberra (close to the national proportion) is also suburban although not directly related to manufacturing employment, which scarcely exists there. Even in Brisbane a major residential concentration of Indochinese, Italians and Greeks has developed in the outer southwestern industrial suburbs around the former Wacol migrant hostel. Local government areas characterised by this type of settlement include:

- **Sydney**: Fairfield, Bankstown, Holroyd, Blacktown, Liverpool, Auburn.
- **Melbourne**: Sunshine, Keilor, Broadmeadows, Whittlesea, Altona, Oakleigh, Springvale, Dandenong, Moorabbin.
- **Adelaide**: Woodville, Enfield, Port Adelaide, Salisbury.
- **Perth**: Cockburn, Stirling, Bayswater, Bassendean, Fremantle
- **Geelong**: Corio Shire

Unincorporated suburbs of other cities with this type of settlement include:

- **Brisbane**: Wacol, Darra, Inala, Macgregor, Carindale
- **Wollongong**: Albion Park, Cringila, Dapto

Few of these areas could be termed 'disadvantaged' at the time of their settlement in the absolute sense which might be applied to inner-city slums. Because of multiple earner households, some include the highest levels of family income for their metropolis. Lack of sewerage, made roads and transport has largely been remedied since the 1970s and there is adequate provision of schools, churches and other public facilities. However, the recent rundown in manufacturing employment has created problems in these outer suburbs, including youth unemployment and delinquency. They have poor higher educational provision, which the recent creation of the University of Western Sydney is designed to remedy. Their inhabitants are 'working class' in any conventional sense of the term, especially those of Maltese, Yugoslav, Turkish or Latin American origin. In the Australian context of award wages and conditions this does not make them poor. But it does make them vulnerable to industrial restructuring and unemployment. As home purchasers, many find interest rates burdensome. This is a particularly severe problem in Sydney, where house prices greatly exceed those anywhere else.
A growing problem in such suburbs has been youth unemployment, delinquency and violence. A recent description of Cabramatta (Sydney), after the fatal shooting of an Australian-Yugoslav teenager, summarises a situation also found in comparable outer suburbs: 'A spokesman for Cabramatta police said the shooting was not the most violent incident in the area in recent times and police were getting 'a little blase' about regular Saturday night violence. But he said the proximity of the shooting to the police station was 'a bit unnerving' for the officers working there. Local people said violence was not unusual outside dances held at the hall. Shots had been fired at previous gatherings, but always at the ground. Violence has escalated in the suburb over the past few years. A 15-year-old youth was charged with murdering a Vietnamese man with a machete-type weapon in the main street last Saturday night and there have been several other murders over the past two years. Police numbers have been doubled in the area over the past 12 months to cope with rising crime, including car theft, breaking and entering and violence. Police raids have led to the confiscation of knuckledusters with screws fitted, machetes, swords, axes, fighting sticks and knives. Although police admit there is a problem with crime and violence in the area, they say it is not getting any worse and that media reports of incidents have blown them out of proportion.' (Age, 4 September 1989).

A developing culture of violence, possibly influenced by television and videos, presents problems for residents of some of the utilitarian suburbs in which the majority of NESB immigrants are now raising their families. Its most open manifestation was in the Milperra shoot-out in western Sydney in 1984. An expert who has studied youth issues in the northern suburbs of Melbourne has argued that 'we must firmly state our belief that without swift and positive action, Australian cities will face considerable problems in community relations between young Asians and other community groups'. The study further claims that 'police forces themselves are concerned at the difficulties of communication they face, particularly with young Indo-Chinese'. (Cahill and Ewen in The Challenge of Diversity - Policy Options for a Multicultural Australia, AGPS, 1989, pp.54 - 55). However, the problem does not only concern Asians. Indo-Chinese were not involved in the Milperra shoot-out at all, nor were any implicated in the fatal shooting at Cabramatta in September, 1989. A problem is also developing similar to that found in some American, Canadian and British cities, of lack of good police/community relations. This was highlighted in August, 1989, with the conviction
and dismissal from the force of a Cabramatta police officer found guilty of assaulting a Vietnamese in July 1986. There is a need for much more study of the developing social situation in areas of high concentration of young NESB II Australians. These have often lost the culture of their parents but may have replaced it by a highly Americanised alternative which stresses violence and anti-social behaviour as norms. They are often the victims of changing employment patterns, which render the unskilled and poorly educated very liable to unemployment for long periods.

Any public policies directed towards 'ethnic enclaves' must acknowledge that outer suburban living is the chosen lifestyle of increasing numbers of Australians, whether of immigrant or native origins and regardless of language or culture. Because the outer western suburbs are virtually unknown to many middle-class Australians, they have tended to be neglected. Politically they form the core of Australian Labor Party support, including nearly all the safest Labor seats in the country. Yet many policy makers, because of their middle-class backgrounds as much as their Anglo-Australian ethnicity, are completely unaware of the realities of life in these areas. Any attempt to measure, or to provide for, the needs of NESB Australians must take into account their numerical concentration in areas of utilitarian suburbanism.

The second wave of immigration, which began in the 1950s, was from Southern Europe, principally from groups which already had some small Australian presence such as Italians, Greeks, Maltese and Yugoslavs. To these were later added Spaniards, Portuguese and Turks, who had little or no previous history of Australian settlement. While many of these, particularly the Maltese, followed the road into utilitarian suburbanism, a high proportion preferred the course which Australian officials and opinion leaders had always feared. Like their pre-War counterparts, many settled in zones of transition or in adjacent inner-city locations. They built on pre-existing focal points such as Carlton or Leichhardt and rapidly transformed many almost moribund inner-city shopping centres such as Lygon Street, Carlton; Sydney Road, Brunswick; Smith Street, Collingwood; Parramatta Road, Leichhardt; and King Street, Newtown. These became visibly 'ethnic' and many social customs were developed in inner-city neighbourhoods which were illegal, such as Sunday trading or after-hours drinking. As most Southern Europeans were neither assisted immigrants nor refugees, they had to rely on relatives for financial support and even for employment. Chain migration was very characteristic of this phase, which had not been true of the East European refugee
arrivals. Relatives sponsored immigrants from their own regions, giving rise not only to national concentrations but to regional enclaves. This was close to the American experience, but did not create similar problems.

The areas into which many Southern Europeans settled from the 1950s were near the city centres. Their housing stock was much older than in the outer suburbs, being mainly built between 1880 and 1914. Much of it had been rented, although the new arrivals preferred home ownership. They rapidly paid off homes which, in the 1950s were worth as little as $6,000 but today might fetch more than $200,000. Many areas had been earmarked for slum clearance, some of it on the basis of high rise blocks until growing opposition forced discontinuation in the late 1960s. Public housing was not utilised by Southern European migrants, although it later became tenanted by many Turks, Indochinese, Latin Americans and Aborigines. The inner-suburbs provided a variety of employment, especially for women in clothing, textiles and footwear (in which immigrant women have been concentrated in all industrial societies). There were opportunities for commercial development, as real estate started to boom and previously moribund shopping centres revived. The population of the inner-suburbs continued to fall, as it had done since the 1930s. But the new arrivals were younger and, eventually, more prosperous than the native Australians who were dying off or moving out. While there were many fears of ghetto formation, in fact the new arrivals greatly enhanced the values and facilities of their areas of settlement. Eventually this led to them becoming so attractive that they were 'gentrified' by middle class professionals. Because there were so many opportunities to open small businesses and to transform derelict premises into churches or clubs, the inner-suburbs developed an overtly 'ethnic' public character which was largely absent from the outer suburbs. As they were centrally located they became focal points for those further out, who shopped in them, socialised and got married in them. Whole areas were transformed in a way which was immediately obvious to the majority, in contrast to the 'hidden' character of the remoter western suburbs. They became attractive to the majority as Australian standards of catering and entertainment improved during the affluence of the 1960s and 1970s. Rather than deteriorating into slum ghettos, the inner-suburbs often lost their character as zones of transition. They became increasingly expensive, which was highly profitable for those who had invested in them but created obstacles for new
arrivals who wanted to settle in them. What Australia witnessed was not the 'death of the cities' as in inner urban areas of America or Britain, but the 'rebirth of the cities'.

Local government areas characterised by this development include:

- **Sydney:** Marrickville, Botany, South Sydney, Leichhardt, Canterbury
- **Melbourne:** Brunswick, Richmond, Fitzroy, Collingwood, Port Melbourne, Footscray, parts of Melbourne City
- **Adelaide:** Thebarton, Hindmarsh, Kensington/Norwood, Prospect
- **Perth:** Parts of Perth City (North Perth)

Unincorporated suburbs of other cities include:

- **Brisbane:** West End, Woolloongabba, Fortitude Valley
- **Newcastle:** Hamilton, Mayfield

These areas fulfilled many of the historic functions of the American ghetto. They were social focal points, helped integrate new arrivals, provided a basis for 'ethnic' business success, catered for national tastes and eventually for a more sophisticated majority, and sustained a replica of the 'old country' in the new. But they lacked the problems of American ghettos. They were not major criminal areas, despite the proximity of some historic locations for crime and vice. They did not deteriorate but improved. They became so prosperous that many parts of them rose rapidly up the social and real estate scale. But, as in the American ghettos, many of their inhabitants preferred the suburbs and moved outwards.

Most NESB migrants between the 1940s and the 1970s either settled in or moved through these two major types of settlement. East European and Maltese immigrants preferred to go directly to the outer suburbs, while Southern Europeans preferred the inner for a while. Many who settled near the centre later moved either to older working class areas or, in increasing numbers, to selected middle-class areas. This left room in the cheaper premises or in public housing for newer arrivals from the Middle East and Southeast Asia, and in the more expensive properties for the gentrifying professionals. The overseas born populations began to decline in many inner suburbs from the mid-1970s. There was considerable ethnic succession (the replacement of earlier groups by
later arrivals), the difference from the American situation being that many of those moving in were from the advantaged majority not from disadvantaged minorities. With rare exceptions the inner suburbs cannot accurately be termed 'ghettoes'. They were not normally dominated by a single ethnic group except in a few streets, and they were not outstandingly impoverished or subject to severe and escalating social problems.

Both the outer working class suburbs and the inner zones of transition provide much better living standards and amenities than are found in the ghettos of America or Britain. They are based on single homes rather than tenements and on home ownership rather than rentals. However, they are not free of problems and many more prosperous immigrants have chosen to live elsewhere when they are financially able to do so. Among these problems are: the age and limited size of many properties in the inner suburbs; industrial pollution (especially in the Botany and Auburn areas of Sydney, the Footscray/Altona area of Melbourne, the Cringila area of Wollongong, and the Darra area of Brisbane); road and air transport congestion and pollution (especially along the Western, Hume and Princes highway exits from Sydney, the Sydney Road exit from Melbourne, and around Sydney airport in Botany, Rockdale and South Sydney); dependence on declining or unstable manufacturing industry (especially the car industry, clothing, textiles and footwear and iron and steel); and a lack of educational, employment and recreational opportunities for youth in the outer suburbs. Both the inner and outer suburbs still contain pockets of poverty and disadvantage, especially in public housing estates and in transient accommodation in the inner zones of transition.

Some zones of transition include traditional centres of crime and vice, such as Kings Cross (Sydney), Fitzroy and St Kilda (Melbourne), Hindley Street (Adelaide), Fortitude Valley (Brisbane) or Rose Street (Perth). These were all established before post-War immigration. They influence the reputation of adjoining neighbourhoods and attract visitors, tourists and transients.

Many immigrants have, therefore, chosen to move to less congested intermediate working class areas or to selected middle-class suburbs. Among these are: Ashfield, Burwood, Drummoyne, Strathfield and Randwick in Sydney; Coburg, Preston, Essendon, South Melbourne and Prahran in Melbourne; Payneham, West Torrens and Unley in Adelaide; and New Farm, Lutwyche and Annerley in Brisbane. In Perth and Canberra immigrant populations are very widely spread. Many of these areas of settlement have middle-class enclaves and good quality housing. The more prosperous immigrants (who
include many Italians, Greeks, Indians and Chinese) have been able to choose more freely where they live. But like the Jewish communities, which live mainly in a limited range of middle-class suburbs, NESB groups have chosen their residence selectively rather than spreading at random throughout the suburbs. Many middle-class suburbs remain overwhelmingly Anglo-Australian in their character. Jewish settlement has been mainly in Caulfield, St Kilda, Malvern and Kew in Melbourne, and in Woollahra, Waverley, Lane Cove and Ku-ring-gai in Sydney. Newer groups have shown a strong preference for newer middle-class suburbs, especially Doncaster and Templestowe, Heidelberg and Waverley in Melbourne; Parramatta, Ryde, Willoughby, Lane Cove in Sydney; and Campbelltown in Adelaide.

By the 1970s patterns of settlement had emerged in the major cities based on the two major waves of East European Displaced Persons and of Southern Europeans. Immigrants from outside these two major groups tended towards the far outer suburbs, where they lived in proximity to young British and Anglo-Australian neighbours. German, Dutch and British immigrants made up the numerical bulk of these settlers and only the British were markedly concentrated, although there were some group settlements by fundamentalist Dutch religious groups in parts of Sydney and in Hobart. British concentrations were created by deliberate policy through the use of public housing in South Australia, especially in Elizabeth, Noarlunga and Whyalla. Other concentrations arose in Frankston (Vic), Penrith and Campbelltown (NSW) and in Kwinana and Rockingham (WA). Direct recruitment of British immigrants by industry and the public housing policy of some States were major factors in creating these concentrations, which have remained significant to the present.

Rural and provincial settlement was limited and mainly involved the Southern European nationalities which had settled before 1940 and the more recently arrived Dutch. Southern European concentrations existed in Victoria (around Shepparton, Mildura, Myrtleford, Beechworth and Cobram), in New South Wales (around Griffith), in north Queensland and at Stanthorpe, on the Murray in South Australia and in parts of Western Australia. Communities of NESB miners (many from Yugoslavia) grew in Mt.Isa, the Pilbara and Coober Pedy. However, provincial settlement was very limited and there were virtually no provincial towns in which there was a marked ‘ethnic’ presence other than Darwin (Greeks and Chinese), Queanbeyan (on the outskirts of Canberra) and Hobart (Dutch and Poles). The new city
of Gold Coast only began to attract NESB settlement in the late 1970s and the major 'ethnic' element in other Queensland cities was made up of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders.

The metropolitan patterns created by the 1970s might be summarised as:

- **Utilitarian suburbs** (in new, outer industrial suburbs)
- **Zones of transition** (close to the city centres)
- **Middle-range working class suburbs** (between the first two categories)
- **Selected middle-class suburbs**

Similar patterns existed in all major cities but were least clearly marked in Perth. Substantial NESB settlement on a smaller scale occurred in Wollongong, Geelong, Newcastle, Canberra and Darwin with some replication of the metropolitan pattern in the first three.

Major changes in the sources and character of immigrants began in the late 1960s and early 1970s. These were mainly caused by the abandoning of the White Australia Policy and the consequent universalisation of the intake. Turks and Yugoslavs were encouraged under inter-government agreement. But the greatest changes came after 1975 with an increase in the numbers arriving and the admission of large numbers of refugees from Lebanon and Indochina. Changing world patterns of migration affected Australia, with increasing numbers coming from the Philippines and from Overseas Chinese communities in southeast Asia. Smaller numbers of Pacific Islanders also started to arrive and there was a refugee intake from Latin America. This greatly varied the origins of arrivals.

Many of the new arrivals went into the same areas as earlier Southern Europeans, but there were two major changes, both caused by public policy decisions. One was the clustering of refugees around the reception hostels. This had not been true of the East European Displaced Persons of the early 1950s, as they had been located in remote rural areas and chose to move to the major cities. However, in the 1970s the hostels were located in the suburbs of metropolitan centres and refugees stayed in them long enough to establish local links. This gave rise to **hostel centred concentrations**. These included Cabramatta in Sydney, Springvale in Melbourne, Darra/Wacol in Brisbane and
Woodville in Adelaide. These all became major Vietnamese concentrations, giving rise to publicly expressed concern yet again about the formation of 'ghettoes'. In response, attempts were made to disperse refugees to distant locations such as Hobart, Whyalla, Alice Springs and Albury/Wodonga, though with limited success and with some hardship for those sent to districts so far from their compatriots and from the varied employment of the major cities.

The second area of public policy was the use of public housing under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, for refugees and for the socially disadvantaged. This led to concentrations of Vietnamese, Turks, Aborigines and some Arabs and Latin Americans in areas such as North Richmond, Flemington, Fitzroy and Collingwood in Melbourne; Campbelltown and Blacktown in Sydney; and Inala in Brisbane. The Office of Multicultural Affairs survey of 1989 (Table H 21), found that only 4.4% of its general sample lived in public housing and figures for NESB I (3.7%) and NESB II (1.8%) were even lower. However, for NESB immigrants who had arrived since 1981, the level of public housing tenancies was 16%, or nearly four times the national average. Rented public housing in Australia is now largely treated as a welfare provision. Many new arrivals have been housed together with social problem cases, often with resulting violence which has led, in a few instances, to murder.

These two developments since the mid-1970s have reactivated the salience of the 'ghetto problem' in public controversy. This has been particularly the case because most new concentrations have been of non-Europeans and, in many cases, of non-Christians. Many of these, in fact, settled in outer and inner suburbs previously favoured by Southern Europeans. As will be shown in a later section, 'Asians' as a broad category do not concentrate to any greater degree than do 'Europeans' despite popular myths to the contrary. But the appearance of large new Chinese/Vietnamese shopping centres in such suburban locations as Springvale or Cabramatta, and the rapid expansion of Muslim populations in such areas as Canterbury and Auburn in Sydney or Brunswick and Coburg in Melbourne alarmed many who had become used to Southern European concentrations. Their arguments were canvassed most extensively by Professor Blainey in Chapter Seven of his All for Australia, entitled 'The Front Line is the Neighbourhood' in which he referred to 'the invaded suburbs' (p.123).
Post-1975 immigration mainly added new layers to the settlement patterns established after 1947. Most Vietnamese, Lebanese and Latin American settlement was in the zones of transition and the utilitarian suburbs. Arabic-speakers are concentrated in Canterbury, Bankstown, Marrickville, Auburn, Parramatta and Burwood in Sydney, all areas previously favoured by such disparate groups as Poles, Greeks or Italians. In Melbourne they have chosen Brunswick and Coburg, as did Italians before them. Spanish-speakers have settled in Fairfield in the outer suburbs of Sydney and in Canterbury, Marrickville and Botany in the inner, just as did previous generations of NESB arrivals. In Melbourne they prefer the outer western suburbs and the outer southeastern suburbs around Oakleigh and Dandenong. Vietnamese-speakers, too, have largely moved into areas previously favoured by Southern and eastern Europeans, such as Fairfield, Canterbury, Bankstown, Marrickville and Auburn in Sydney; Richmond, Collingwood, Footscray, Sunshine, Oakleigh and Springvale in Melbourne; Hindmarsh, Woodville, Thebarton, Port Adelaide and Enfield in Adelaide; and Darra, West End and Wacol in Brisbane. Thus Blainey's alleged confrontation between 'invaders' and 'old Australians' is largely imaginary. What has happened, rather, has been ethnic succession from Southern Europeans to Indochinese, Arabic and Latin American newcomers. Community conflict arising from such rapid change frequently involves relationships between a variety of ethnic groups. It cannot be understood only within an intellectual framework based on an 'Anglo-NESB' dichotomy nor on perceptions of 'racism' based on Australia's past experiences. However, such conflict has been remarkably muted.

The three distinctive waves of post-War NESB immigration have been:

- East European refugees (1947 - 1956)
- Southern European chain migration (1951 - 1973)
- Third World migration (since 1975)

At the same time, various other migration patterns have continued, particularly the predominance of English-speaking migrants and a continuing interest from Yugoslavia. The metropolitan settlement of each new distinctive wave tended to overlay that of the previous wave and to be concentrated on industrial and working class suburbs of the metropolitan centres and a handful of lesser cities, especially Wollongong and Geelong. There is little evidence that ethnic groups congregated in concentrated areas by
deliberate preference, except perhaps for middle-class Jews. Large middle-class areas of many cities, and the great bulk of rural and provincial settlements, remained dominated by Anglo-Australians. There were virtually no one-nation 'ghettos' in the Black American sense, nor were most areas of NESB settlement severely disadvantaged slums which deteriorated still further. They were never the most sought after parts of town but some improved markedly. The typical settlement pattern was of the ethnic mix. This has meant that in large areas of metropolitan cities there is not a direct relationship between 'old Australians' and one 'ethnic group', but rather between a multiplicity of ethnic groups. Nor is there a direct link between immigrant settlement and poverty. Many of the poorest in zones of transition or in public housing are Anglo-Australians or Aborigines.

**Measures of Concentration**

The general discussion above is based on a study of Census data over the past century. However, in popular debate such analysis is rarely made. Areas are termed 'ghettos' even when they have only a small minority from an ethnic group other than Anglo-Australian. This was particularly marked before 1940 when any non-Anglo presence was so rare as to provoke a reaction. Thus districts such as St. Kilda have been regarded as 'Jewish' for a century though they have never had anything like a Jewish majority and certainly do not have one today. As suggested above, settlement has usually been mixed. In most areas the native-born are a majority, although this includes the children of immigrants. In only a handful of municipalities did speakers of languages other than English at home come close to or exceed a majority in 1986. These were: Canterbury, Botany, Marrickville, Ashfield, Burwood, Auburn and Fairfield in Sydney; Keilor, Sunshine, Footscray, Whittlesea, Coburg, Brunswick, Northcote, Richmond and Oakleigh in Melbourne; and Thebarton in Adelaide.

There is usually a gap between public perceptions of ethnic concentration and the measurable reality. There is also a long-standing belief that groups seen as culturally most distant from the majority are the most likely to favour segregated ghetto living. Overseas studies have found that public opinion greatly exaggerates the numbers of 'visible minorities' (in this context non-Europeans). To some extent it is true that
barriers of language or religion are likely to increase residential segregation. But, as suggested above, most residential segregation in Australia has had a common sense economic basis related to availability of cheap accommodation and of employment. Thus measurements need to answer such popular questions as: 'Is Springvale (or Cabramatta) a Vietnamese ghetto?' or 'How Italian is Leichhardt (or Carlton)?' or 'Do Asians congregate together more than Europeans?'

The 1986 Census provides four possible bases for measuring ethnicity. These are: birthplace, ancestry, language used and religion. The first and last have been used in censuses for 150 years, allowing generalisations to be made about settlement patterns over time. The other two cannot be compared with other data but tend to overlap with birthplace for most NESB groups. Census data can also be used to measure the numbers of second generation Australians (NESB II).

To answer questions about settlement patterns usefully there are several possible approaches, each having its particular uses. Proportionate concentration within given boundaries shows the extent to which a given category (birthplace group, linguistic group, religious group or Aboriginal group) forms a percentage of the total population within a boundary such as a State, a metropolitan area, a local government area or a collectors census district (the smallest available unit).

Thus it is possible to say that, in Richmond (Vic.) Local Government Area, 42.2% were born overseas, or 7.6% were born in Greece, or 48.7% used a language other than English at home, or 22.1% were Catholics, or 7.3% spoke Vietnamese at home, and so on.

This approach is useful for measuring the likely electoral strength of ethnic minorities, the demand for language services provided in the unit of measurement, the general 'ethnic ambience' of a neighbourhood, the extent to which one or a combination of ethnic groups influences local life and so on. However, because most political units are of varying size it does not usually indicate either how many of any category live within the unit nor what proportion of the total for that category lives within the boundary. The maps used in this study are based on proportions within local government areas. However there are often more of a category living thinly concentrated in a large municipality than strongly concentrated in a small one. This is particularly relevant for the inner suburbs, which usually have smaller populations than the outer, giving
rise to the superficial impression that certain ethnic groups congregate in inner suburbs when, in fact, far more live towards the outskirts.

A second useful measure, for some purposes, is total population within a given area. This can be shown on maps through dots distributed according to location, avoiding the problem of showing large but thinly inhabited areas as though they were uniformly inhabited. This is particularly important for outer suburbs, which often contain large uninhabited areas. The use of total population answers two questions: how many of the category lives at a certain location? and how are they distributed over the area? Some ethnic groups may be strongly concentrated only in a particular part of a local government area or other political unit. Maps on this basis have been prepared by John McKay of Monash University (McKay, 1981).

Using either proportionate or total measures, given areas may be placed in rank order. This helps to distinguish between the questions (for example): 'which is the most Vietnamese area of Sydney?' and 'where do the largest number of Vietnamese live in Sydney?' While answers are sometimes identical they are frequently different. In the example given the answer is Fairfield LGA in both cases. But other examples of ranking give different results. In Melbourne, Preston ranks first in the number of the Italian-born but only third in the proportion of Italian-born, after Coburg and Brunswick; Oakleigh ranks second in the number of Greek-born but only sixth in the proportion. The practical consequences of this discrepancy is that Greeks have had more consistent political influence in areas where they are more concentrated than in Oakleigh. In Sydney the largest number of Spanish-speakers lives in Fairfield but the highest proportion lives in Botany, an entirely different type of suburb.

To determine whether ethnic groups have a propensity to concentrate, a measure of residential concentration is often used by social geographers. This is based on the Gini coefficient of concentration which ranges from 0 (no tendency to concentrate differentially) to 1.0 (absolute concentration in one unit of measurement). Such measures are best used comparatively over differing situations, as ethnic groups do not necessarily behave in the same way in different cities. For example, Greeks are highly concentrated in Brisbane and Sydney, but not in Melbourne.
Another useful measure is of **residential segregation**. This shows the extent to which different ethnic groups live together or apart. It is broadly observable in Australian cities that British, Dutch and German migrants tend towards different suburbs from Southern Europeans. This might suggest degrees of cultural affinity or difference. But as Vietnamese and Poles or Greeks congregate in the same districts in some cities, the answer may more meaningfully be sought in economic factors such as the price of housing or the availability of manufacturing employment. Social analysis should look at various measures of segregation, not simply at ethnicity. In most modern cities there are clearly defined social zones which embrace different classes, types of property, environments and ethnic settlement patterns. While some Australian cities, most notably Canberra, are not very clearly divided, others, such as Sydney, Melbourne or Adelaide, obviously are. But it is not just ethnic groups which are segregated. There is considerable segregation in Australian cities between those employed in manufacturing and those in the professions.

The most fruitful analysis of the character of an area will take into account not just its 'ethnic' but its overall socio-economic character. An example of the kinds of data which can be useful is drawn from two Melbourne suburbs, one in an inner **zone of transition** and with an exceptionally high level of NES settlement, the other a residential outer suburb with limited NES settlement well below the metropolitan norm.
Characteristic | Richmond | Ringwood
--- | --- | ---
Population | 23,275 | 40,289
Overseas-born | 42.2% | 21.4%
Catholic | 22.1% | 21.8%
Born in Greece | 7.6% | 0.3%
Born in Vietnam | 10.7% | 0.5%
Greek-speaking over 5 | 13.4% | 0.7%
Speaking other than English over 5 | 48.7% | 11.4%
Holding a degree or higher | 7.3% | 5.8%
Unemployed | 13.7% | 5.1%
Employed in manufacturing | 24.8% | 16.6%
Managerial, professional, para-prof. | 27.5% | 32.4%
Renting public housing | 15.0% | 1.2%
Private rental | 32.0% | 14.2%
At same address in 1981 | 40.9% | 55.8%

Even without the application of statistical measures of significance, it is very obvious that Ringwood and Richmond are quite different, not only in their 'ethnic' character but also socially. However, in some respects (such as Catholicity) they are very similar. Such a clustering of characteristics is a necessary approach to making meaningful generalisations about a municipality and to gaining insight into the whole picture of its social relationships and the reasons for ethnic and immigrant concentration in some areas rather than others. In the following section all such measures are reduced to indicate their deviation from the norm within the Sydney or Melbourne metropolitan statistical divisions. The norm is set at 100, so that measures below that suggest the relevant category is underrepresented in the LGA, while numbers above suggest the opposite. The higher (or lower) the number the greater the deviation from the metropolitan norm set at 100.
Characteristics of NESB Concentrations in Sydney and Melbourne

Nearly two-thirds of NESB immigrants have settled either in Sydney or in Melbourne and it is in those two cities that the possibility of ghetto development is greatest. While there are significant concentrations of particular ethnic groups in Adelaide and Brisbane, and a more widely-spread NESB population in Perth, the analysis of NESB concentration is most fruitful in the two major metropolises. There are few areas in either city which have not been significantly affected by NESB settlement. To illustrate the different character of settlement, all LGAs in which more than 25% of the population (5 years old and upwards) used a language other than English at home in 1986 have been grouped in geographical/social regions. There were 17 such LGAs in Sydney and 25 in Melbourne. While NESB Australians were widely scattered in many other areas, it is in the contiguous areas occupied by these selected LGAs that they are most heavily concentrated. All public discussion of 'ghetto formation' has centred around districts contained within these LGAs. Selected characteristics have been recalculated to indicate their deviation from the norm of 100 within the appropriate metropolitan statistical division. Comment is based on the situation revealed in the 1986 Census. The characteristics measured are: Born Overseas (O/B); Born in Southern Europe (BSE); Born in Southeast Asia (BSA); using a language other than English (LOTE); Catholics (RC); employed in manufacturing (Manuf.); employed in management, professions and para-professions (Profs.); holding a degree (Degree); Unemployed (Unemp.); living in public rented housing (Public R.); living in private rented housing (Private R.); and living at the same address as in 1981 (Same Add.). Figures are derived from different bases as explained in Volume Two.

SYDNEY WEST
This area contained three LGAs in which more than 25% used a language other than English at home in 1986. These were Fairfield, Holroyd and Liverpool, with a total population of 324,974. It is of predominantly post-1950s development around pre-existing nuclei and on land used previously for market gardening. It is still developing to the west of Fairfield and Liverpool. The great majority of homes are quite modern and on their own land. There is a large area of Army housing in Liverpool which distorts the figures for public housing tenancies. The area forms part of an overwhelmingly working-class suburban tract, which includes less 'ethnic' areas such
as Blacktown, Campbelltown and Penrith. The most settled area is Holroyd, which has built up most of its available space. The whole area has developed as a result of post-War migration, with a large Maltese community in Holroyd, a long-established Italian (mainly Sicilian and Calabrian) community in Liverpool and Fairfield, and a widely distributed Croatian and Serbian population in Fairfield and Liverpool. In recent years the presence of migrant hostels has led to a major settlement by Indochinese refugees (Vietnamese, Chinese, Khmer and Laotians) who have concentrated especially in the Cabramatta area of Fairfield. Fairfield is also the location of the largest Spanish-speaking population in Australia, drawn from several Latin American countries and also including refugees. Relevant statistics are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Fairfield</th>
<th>Holroyd</th>
<th>Liverpool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What stands out from these figures is the exceptionally high concentration from Southeast Asia in Fairfield, the very high proportions in manufacturing in all three, the high level of unemployment especially in Fairfield and the low levels in professional employment or holding degrees. Discounting the Army housing in Liverpool (which had few NESB tenants), it appears that Holroyd has both the lowest levels of rental and the highest levels of residential stability, implying a preponderance of stable home ownership. Neither Liverpool nor Holroyd have a
higher level of overseas-born than the metropolitan norm and they are only included in this category because of their higher than average numbers using a language other than English at home, many of them the Australian-born children of immigrants. The exceptional LGA of the three is Fairfield with its very high Southeast Asian proportions (the highest in Sydney) and of unemployment (the highest for the 17 selected Sydney LGAs). Fairfield also has the highest proportion of its workforce in manufacturing of the 17 'ethnic' LGAs. Many of the community relations problems of this area must be understood against this combination of factors.

SYDNEY INDUSTRIAL SOUTH AND WEST
This area lies between the older core of Sydney, largely built up by the 1920s, and the outer western and southern suburbs which did not become developed until the 1950s. It is spread along the major road exits such as the Western, Hume and Princes highways and Canterbury Road, away from the harbour and the higher ground and including two airports and major railway yards. It is almost as dominated by manufacturing as the West and has also grown as the result of the post-War migration programme. It contains the LGAs of Auburn, Bankstown, Canterbury and Rockdale, with a combined population of 410,169. Like the West this is an area of very mixed ethnicity, with a large Islamic population drawn from Lebanon and Turkey, but with strong representation from Greece, Yugoslavia and Indochina. It is more Islamic and Orthodox and less Catholic than the West but is also predominantly working-class in character. Relevant characteristics include:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Auburn</th>
<th>Bankstown</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>Rockdale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though not as starkly as for Fairfield, these figures suggest the same relationship between heavy reliance on manufacturing, high levels of community language use, high levels from Southeast Asia, limited scope for the well educated and high levels of unemployment. All of these are more marked in Auburn and Canterbury than in Bankstown or Rockdale. However, the population turnover is not remarkably different from that of Sydney as a whole, despite the relatively large role of private rentals in Canterbury.

SYDNEY CENTRAL

The central Sydney area is remarkably complex in its ethnic, occupational and social structure. It includes the City of Sydney, Botany and Marrickville, with a combined population of 202,231. Most of it was developed before 1914 and there are large areas of what elsewhere would be regarded as slum housing, especially in the South Sydney city which was excised from Sydney after the 1986 census. However, because of proximity to the city centre, house prices can be very high and there has been some redevelopment aimed at maximising market return. Most of the original pre-War settlements of Greeks, Italians, Lebanese, Jews and Chinese are in this area, as well as the only major concentration of Aborigines in the inner suburbs. There is a range from
derelicts and transients to millionaires, and representatives of a wider range of ethnic
groups than in most other areas in Australia. This makes it very difficult to sustain the
kind of valid generalisations which might be made of less varied areas. Relevant
characteristics include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Botany</th>
<th>Marrickville</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Botany and Marrickville are similar to other industrial areas in having a heavy
reliance on manufacturing, low levels of professionals and high levels of
unemployment. But unemployment is also high in the City of Sydney despite a much
lower reliance on manufacturing and a substantial proportion of professionals and
graduates. This suggests a combination of social backgrounds characteristic of
'gentrification'. The working class, including many NESB immigrants, lives in different
circumstances from the professionals, but often in close proximity. They have a heavier
dependence on public housing than in other parts of Sydney. At the same time there is a
very high level of private rental and a substantial turnover of tenancies since 1981,
higher in the City of Sydney than in any other LGA under review. In Marrickville,
however, public housing is not particularly important and although its level of
graduates is exactly the same as throughout the metropolitan area, it has more than
twice the normal level of unemployment. It also has a particularly high level of
Southeast Asian (predominantly Indochinese) settlement, being second only
proportionately to Fairfield. Marrickville also has more than three times the normal
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Sydney level of Southern European settlement, being a major centre of Greek life. Thus, as in the outer suburbs, the inner city of Sydney is characterised by a multiplicity of ethnic backgrounds. But it also has a more varied social mix than the outer suburbs, especially in the City itself. The presence of the University of Sydney (located within the city but close to the Marrickville border) is partly responsible for the 'gentrification' process. This has been even more advanced in the neighbouring districts of Glebe and Balmain within the city of Leichhardt.

SYDNEY INNER WEST
The inner west, on higher ground overlooking the inner harbour, is a more favoured residential area than most of the surrounding suburbs. Nevertheless, it is also heavily settled by NESB immigrants. The adjoining municipalities of Ashfield, Burwood, Concord, Drummoyne and Strathfield had a population of 148,623 in 1986. This is a major area of Italian settlement, although the historic focal point lies further east in Leichhardt. Apart from Italians, other settlers include Poles, Chinese and Vietnamese. This is one of the most Catholic areas of Sydney, partly due to Italian settlement. It is also quite pleasantly middle-class in appearance, in contrast to other western suburbs. Despite this it is close to the Sydney average in the proportion employed in manufacturing. Relevant dimensions are:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Ashfield</th>
<th>Burwood</th>
<th>Concord</th>
<th>Drummoyne</th>
<th>Strathfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests a very stable area, with tenancy turnover very similar to the Sydney average, with a limited role for public housing and with no more than an average reliance on manufacturing. Graduates are well represented and professionals are more common than in more industrialised areas. However, unemployment is still quite high in Ashfield and Burwood, and above average in Strathfield. These cities are favoured by Southeast Asians to a greater degree than Concord or Drummoyne which are Southern European (mainly Italian) strongholds. Drummoyne has a Southern European concentration second only to Marrickville, where the settlement is much more Greek. The large Italian population of this area, which contributes to the relatively high proportion using a language other than English, lives in a less industrialised environment than many other NESB settlers.

**SYDNEY EAST**

An even more middle-class environment than in the inner west, but with high levels of NESB settlers, is in the eastern municipalities of Randwick and Waverley, with a combined population of 143 157. There is a large Jewish population here and the University of New South Wales (located within Randwick) is the only one to have a specifically Jewish residential college. It also has a particularly high number of
Chinese students from southeast Asia as well as many Greek Australians from Randwick and neighbouring areas. Waverley has been favoured by New Zealanders, including Maoris, but unlike Randwick has a lower than average proportion who were born in southeast Asia. As elsewhere, both areas are of very mixed ethnicity. Relevant characteristics are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Randwick</th>
<th>Waverley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although being above average in the proportion of professionals and well above in the proportion of graduates, both areas had higher than average unemployment. This was particularly marked in Waverley, which also had a high level of private rentals and a high turnover of residents. This area includes Bondi Junction, well known for its transient young population, many of them likely to be drawing unemployment benefit. There is little reliance on manufacturing and this area differs quite markedly from most other centres of NESB settlement. Waverley has a particularly low proportion of Southern Europeans and southeast Asians, with much of its Jewish population deriving from central and eastern Europe. All ethnic group figures for Randwick must be treated with caution because of the size of the university, the biggest in Australia.
SYDNEY - GENERAL COMMENT

The municipalities surveyed above all have at least an average level of NESB settlement and use of LOTEs and most are well above the average. They cover a wide belt of Sydney extending from the Pacific beaches of Waverley and Randwick to the fringes of urbanisation beyond Liverpool and Fairfield. All are characterised by a variety of settlement patterns. Indeed, it could be argued that the middle-class Anglo-Australians of the North Shore and outer southern suburbs are more insulated from multicultural influences than the residents of this heavily populated central belt. Despite Italian concentration in the inner west and heavy Indochinese settlement in Fairfield, the normal pattern is based on a multiplicity of backgrounds. This varies from city to city and even within different parts of a municipality. While the bulk of populations surveyed may be characterised as working-class, in the sense of being manual workers in industrial locations, their chosen suburbs are also varied, ranging from the very old to the very new and from the congested to the spacious.

There are some aspects of the 'ethnic' suburbs which should cause concern. With exceptions in the east and, to a lesser extent, the inner west, they are more heavily dependent on manufacturing than the Sydney average. With the exceptions only of Concord and Drummoyne, all had higher than average unemployment, while five had twice or more the Sydney-wide level in 1986. Unemployment has declined since then, but it should not be overlooked that juvenile unemployment has been averaging more than twice the adult level. The heavy concentration of unemployment in areas with large Indochinese or Lebanese populations simply underlines the established fact that these populations have exceptionally high unemployment levels on the national scale. Levels in Fairfield, Marrickville, Auburn and the City of Sydney were especially high. The very low proportions of professionals and graduates in many industrial suburbs suggests that many NESB Australians (like many Anglo-Australians in the same areas) are living in districts of limited educational opportunity from which the better educated leave or to which they are very reluctant to move. 'Gentrification' is reversing this process in the inner suburbs, but it is most acute on the outer fringes. These areas run the risk of long-term cultural and intellectual impoverishment.

MELBOURNE WEST

The western suburbs of Melbourne are very similar to their Sydney counterparts in the sense of being heavily reliant on manufacturing and of being built up as a consequence of
post-War NESB immigration. The adjoining LGAs of Altona, Footscray, Keilor, Sunshine and Williamstown had a population of 291,195 in 1986, or just over 10% of the Melbourne metropolitan total. Williamstown is by far the oldest suburb and has recently become 'gentrified' because of its attractive historic inheritance. However, it is surrounded by heavily industrialised areas in Footscray and the northern part of Altona. Footscray also has a nineteenth century core and was well developed by the 1920s. Sunshine was created by the founding of the Sunshine Harvester works, the first major 'green fields' industrial site in Melbourne. The rest of the area is essentially industrial and suburban. These are classic utilitarian suburbs, built for workers in the new industrial plants, many of them recruited from the three migrant hostels located in the area during the 1950s and 1960s. The last of these, Maribyrnong, was used for refugees in the 1970s, many of whom settled in Footscray and Sunshine. In other cities Asian settlement is well below the metropolitan average. Some parts of Sunshine and Keilor contain the highest NESB concentrations in Australia, especially in the large suburb of St Albans which they share between them. These suburbs have elected NESB representatives at the national, State and municipal levels. Relevant characteristics include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Altona</th>
<th>Footscray</th>
<th>Keilor</th>
<th>Sunshine</th>
<th>W'town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This is a relatively stable area with most homes being purchased. It does, however, have a relatively high level of unemployment, except in Keilor, and relies heavily on manufacturing. As in other industrial suburbs there is a low level of professionals and graduates, comparable with the Sydney West but even lower in Sunshine. Other than Williamstown, which has only an average NESB population, there is a high proportion from Southern Europe, especially from Malta and Yugoslavia. The very high concentration in Footscray from southeast Asia is of recent origin and corresponds, as in Sydney's West, with a high rate of unemployment. Indochinese settlers are not generally found in public housing but were attracted to Footscray by its demand for unskilled labour and the proximity of refugee hostels.

MELBOURNE CENTRAL

The central Melbourne area includes the City of Melbourne, Brunswick, Collingwood, Fitzroy, Port Melbourne, Richmond and South Melbourne. Most of this area was already fully developed by the late 1880s. Its population has been declining for many years. The area has undergone more consistent 'gentrification' than is apparent in the city of Sydney. Districts which were regarded as slums thirty years ago (such as Collingwood, Richmond or Fitzroy) are now highly sought after. House prices have escalated well beyond the reach of newly arriving immigrants. However there is still a high level of private rental and a very high level of public housing, into which many new arrivals have moved. The inner city thus has a dual character, with well educated middle class residents in privately owned homes and much less well off new arrivals and refugees in adjoining rentals or in high rise public housing flats. As in Sydney, this zone of transition also attracts transients and still has a residue of its former Anglo-Celtic working class majority, though these are fast disappearing. The central core was the initial settlement area for pre-War communities of Jews, Greeks, Italians and Chinese but few of these communities remain as residents despite the persistence of focal points based on shops and restaurants. The City of Melbourne, to which many immediate post-War Southern European immigrants moved, now has a far lower than average level of Southern European born population. Relevant characteristics include:
These figures bring out the extremely mixed character of inner-city life in Melbourne. Fitzroy and Collingwood, once proletarian strongholds, now have well above the Melbourne level of professionals and graduates. Yet they also have well above the level of unemployment. All but Brunswick have exceptionally high levels of public housing tenancy, indeed the highest in Melbourne with over four times the normal level in Collingwood, Fitzroy, Port Melbourne and Richmond and over five times in the City of Melbourne. It is improbable that many graduates and professionals live in these estates. Instead we must look to the exceptionally high levels of southeast Asians, reaching nearly seven times the norm in Richmond (the highest concentration in Australia within an LGA) and three times the norm in Melbourne, Collingwood and Fitzroy. These figures represent refugees placed in 'hard to let' high rise flats, originally built for slum clearance by the Victorian Housing Commission in its controversial and eventually abandoned programmes of the 1960s. This amounts almost to the deliberate creation of potential 'ghettoes' as an act of public policy. With very high levels of public and private rentals, most of the inner city has a high turnover of residents. The major exception is Port Melbourne where a strongly entrenched Anglo-Australian working class has been less affected by NESB immigration or by 'gentrification' than in other districts. South Melbourne has been very 'gentrified' and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>B'wick</th>
<th>C'wd</th>
<th>Fitzroy</th>
<th>Melb.</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>Richm.</th>
<th>SM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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is now substantially a middle-class area. In other districts the traditional Irish-Catholic working class, immortalised as inhabitants of 'Carringbush' by Frank Hardy, has virtually disappeared. Inner Melbourne now has a much lower level of Catholicity than the metropolis, except in Brunswick where the level of Catholicity is largely explained by the high concentration of Southern Europeans. The small factory based economy with many clothing and footwear firms has also withered, with employment in manufacturing well below the Melbourne level in Collingwood, Fitzroy, Melbourne and South Melbourne. The process of transition in inner Melbourne is not simply from Anglo-Australian workers to Southern European immigrants, as it was in the 1950s. It now involves a complex process which puts middle class graduates together with Indochinese refugees and the well off together with the poor.

MELBOURNE NORTH
The adjoining suburbs of Broadmeadows, Coburg, Essendon, Northcote, Preston and Whittlesea had a population of 416,291 in 1986. They were favoured for settlement by Southern Europeans moving out from the initial residence areas in the inner city. Consequently, the level of Southern European born is well above the metropolitan average, being highest in Whittlesea. While the largest group is Italian, there is considerable mixing from various Southern European origins. In Whittlesea there are many Italians, Greeks, Yugoslavs and Turks. In Broadmeadows there are many Maltese, while in Northcote Greeks and Italians are almost equal in proportions. This mixing is rather unusual as elsewhere there is considerable residential segregation between Italians and Greeks. Preston has the highest number of Italian-born in Melbourne, while Coburg has the highest proportion. There is also an Islamic population of Turkish and Lebanese origin, though this is less noticeable than in Sydney. There is, however, a much lower level of southeast Asian settlement than over Melbourne as a whole. Other than Northcote, this is an area of high Catholicity, reflecting Italian settlement to a major degree. Relevant features include:
Apart from Essendon, which is a middle class enclave, these areas depend on manufacturing to a major extent, especially in the outer areas of Whittlesea and Broadmeadows. The motor industry and its ancillaries are important in providing employment. Unemployment was high in Northcote, Preston and Coburg, but surprisingly low in Whittlesea, otherwise a classic utilitarian suburb. This is a very stable area, based on home ownership (which is exceptionally high amongst Southern Europeans throughout Melbourne). Population stability is at or above the Melbourne average, even in Whittlesea which is the most rapidly expanding suburb.

INNER SOUTHEAST MELBOURNE

While NESB immigrant settlement in Melbourne has been concentrated north of the 'Yarra Line' separating working-class and middle-class regions, there is also a substantial number in the southeast. St. Kilda, with the highest level of private rentals in Melbourne, has always attracted new arrivals, including many from Britain. The Jewish population is strongly concentrated in the southeast, with many of its institutions in St Kilda and Caulfield. Unlike the rest of Melbourne, there is considerable development of private flats in the area, a form of residence favoured by many central and eastern Europeans. There has been less Southern European settlement...
than elsewhere, although there is a large Greek community in Prahran. There were no migrant hostels in this area, which is essentially middle-class and residential, with high population densities. The three adjoining LGAs of Caulfield, Prahran and St Kilda, had a population of 156 658 in 1986 and made up the largest middle-class area in Melbourne with a higher than average NESB population. Characteristics were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Caulfield</th>
<th>Prahran</th>
<th>St Kilda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These were areas with a high turnover of population and of private rental. They were not, however, dependent on manufacturing and had a high level of professionals and graduates. High unemployment in St Kilda (as in Waverley in Sydney) reflects a concentration of unattached youth rather than of NESB immigrants. There was limited Asian refugee settlement except in Prahran. Partly reflecting the high Jewish component, the level of Catholicity was well below the metropolitan average. This area is comparable in many ways to the Sydney East, but has even higher levels of graduates and professionals. It is ethnically mixed but its use of languages other than English is only at the metropolitan norm in Caulfield and Prahran. It contains some of the most affluent and cosmopolitan shopping centres in Australia but also has some pockets of small housing, in Prahran, and many cases of individual, rather than collective, disadvantage.
MELBOURNE OUTER SOUTHEAST

With the industrialisation of Melbourne in the 1950s on the basis of immigrant labour, a belt of new industries grew up around Dandenong in what had previously been a rural area. The motor industry was particularly important, with large plants at Dandenong and Springvale. This development extended along the railway and the Princes Highway and created a new suburban extension which now reaches well beyond Dandenong towards Gippsland. The two older settlements of Oakleigh and Dandenong formed nuclei for these suburbs, which were otherwise typically utilitarian and without previous character. The three cities of Dandenong, Oakleigh and Springvale cover most of this area. Although the southeast is often looked upon as commuter suburbia, the level of manufacturing employment in these three LGAs is comparable to that in the West. Their characteristics were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Dandenong</th>
<th>Oakleigh</th>
<th>Springvale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/B</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profs.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public R.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private R.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Add.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This repeats the pattern for the Sydney and Melbourne West, with heavy dependence on manufacturing, low levels of professionals and graduates and higher than average unemployment. There is also a higher than average southeast Asian settlement in Oakleigh and Springvale. While the Oakleigh total is probably distorted by the presence of Monash University, the Springvale figure reflects Indochinese settlement.
from the Enterprise hostel. Although the totals have probably grown since 1986, the Springvale concentration is not as high as in inner Melbourne or Footscray, or in inner Sydney or Fairfield. Despite the recent addition of many Indochinese, this is not a residentially unstable area by Melbourne standards, nor does it have an exceptionally high level of public or private rentals. Like the other utilitarian suburbs it has been settled by industrial workers who are buying their own homes. It has not been exceptionally favoured by Southern Europeans, except in Oakleigh where there is a very large Greek population.

MELBOURNE OUTER EAST
Until the 1970s there was little NESB settlement in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne. These were white collar commuter suburbs with very low levels of Catholicity and were solidly middle-class in appearance and occupational character. Although there were migrant hostels at Nunawading and Holmesglen, these were mainly used for British arrivals, many of whom settled in the area, as did many Dutch and Germans. In more recent years, however, there has been a steady movement of prosperous Greek and Italian Australians outwards towards the east. This is most marked in the large and growing municipality of Doncaster and Templestowe. Unlike its neighbours, this completely suburban area now approximates very closely to the metropolitan norm for LOTE speakers and for those born in Southern Europe. It is one of the few unmistakably middle-class areas of Melbourne of which this is true and has no real Sydney counterpart. In 1986 it had a population of 99,269 and its characteristics were:
This is so close to the average in terms of immigrant settlement, use of LOTE, settlement from Southern Europe, Catholicity and stability of residence as to suggest that it might be a 'typical' Melbourne LGA. However, it is visibly less dependent on manufacturing, has a higher than average level of professionals and graduates, a much lower level of unemployment and almost negligible levels of rental accommodation, especially in the public sector. What it does show is that there is substantial NESB settlement in middle-class suburbia in Melbourne, much of it based on Southern European upward social mobility. Unlike many other similar areas on the outskirts of Melbourne and Sydney, Doncaster is not an 'Anglo-Australian, Protestant middle-class ghetto'.

THE ETHNIC MIX

The above analysis of Sydney and Melbourne concentrates only on those LGAs which are above average in terms of LOTE speakers or NESB settlers. In all of them at least 25% use a language other than English in the home. However, they are not ghettos in any normal sense of the word. They all embrace a variety of ethnic backgrounds within their borders. Analysis at the smaller Collection District level would undoubtedly show some clustering, as would street-based surveys on the ground. But the typical
residential pattern is based on an ethnic mix rather than a single concentration. The culturally homogeneous districts are those in the suburban periphery inhabited predominantly by Anglo-Australians and British immigrants. These often contain considerable German or Dutch populations who are well assimilated and use English at home. Such areas include Warringah, Ku-ring-gai, Manly, Hornsby and Sutherland in middle-class Sydney and Penrith and Campbelltown in the working-class west. In Melbourne they include the Mornington Peninsula, the Dandenong Hills, the Bayside suburbs, Ringwood and Eltham. There are no substantial districts closer to the city centres which do not have a significant NESB population, whatever their social character.

NESB Australians do not usually live either in slums or ghettos in Sydney or Melbourne. Most live in suburbs which are relatively new and which have a substantial part of their employment in manufacturing. These suburbs are not attractive to middle-class residents and have few graduates or professionals. They are subject to higher than average unemployment, with the Sydney situation being more acute than in Melbourne. Indeed, the inner city dweller in public housing or private rental is much more likely to live in close proximity to a professional neighbour than those in the outer suburbs. Whether that leads to greater socialising is highly unlikely. There is no reason to suppose that the Fitzroy or Collingwood graduate has much to do with the Vietnamese or Turkish high-rise dwellers who live in the same suburb. Field work methods are needed to plot patterns of neighbourhood socialising before anything definitive can be said about the impact of ethnic mixing on general behaviour. An excellent example of such work is the Perth survey, *Diversity is Great, Mate!* That people of varying backgrounds may be mixed together in a statistical sense does not mean that they mix together in any other sense. What this analysis of the two major cities does suggest is that very large numbers of Australians must be aware of multicultural realities in their daily lives. This is true whether they are suburban industrial workers, inner city sophistcates or even solid middle-class residents of respectable suburbs. Social isolation from others within ethnic communities undoubtedly exists in metropolitan Australia. But it is not usually based on geographical segregation. This is true even for the very highly concentrated Indochinese settlements in areas such as western and inner Sydney and Melbourne. They all live in very close proximity to others of very varied backgrounds. Essentially, Australia's two major cities are not divided between 'ethnic ghettos' and 'Australian
suburbs' - but between multicultural and monocultural areas - the latter being mainly middle-class commuter districts in both cities, together with peripheral working-class areas in Sydney. In both cities the majority live in multicultural areas.

'Asian' Concentrations

Much discussion since 1975, especially that aroused by the so-called 'Blainey debate' of 1984, has assumed that ghetto formation is a peculiarly 'Asian' phenomenon, just as much previous discussion had assumed it was peculiar to Southern Europeans. The category 'Asian' is relatively useless for social analysis as it covers too wide a variety of origins. But it must be confronted in public debate because of the frequency with which it is used. It has long been established that 'Asians' as a category (especially if the Middle East is excluded) are more middle class, better educated and better paid than 'Europeans' or 'Australians'. They are, thus, less likely to concentrate in the areas favoured by working class NESB immigrants of rural or skilled origins. This is particularly true of the large numbers who came before the complete abolition of the White Australia Policy in 1973 and were of only partly Asian origin. These included Anglo-Indians, Sri Lanka Burghers, Anglo-Burmese, Eurasians and others permitted to settle after the relaxation of policy in 1966. These were overwhelmingly Christians, English-speaking and well educated, though many had been relatively impoverished by loss of status after the independence of their birthplaces or by rigid restrictions on the export of capital. They had mostly enjoyed a middle-class lifestyle in their homelands and sought to reproduce one in Australia as quickly as possible. They thus tended to settle in middle-class suburbs and to seek white collar and professional jobs, often with great success. Figures for the Indian and Sri Lanka-born (who tend to live in similar suburbs) were still showing these patterns in 1986.

The settlement patterns of Indian and Sri Lankan-born do NOT conform to the notion of 'Asian ghetto formation' at all. On the contrary, they followed the British in seeking a high degree of residential segregation from NESB immigrants. Nor did they establish visible focal points. Indian restaurants and shops, for example, did not develop in most Australian cities until the 1970s, nor were they clustered in any particular commercial centres in contrast to the situation in England. Those coming after 1975 were, if
anything, even more middle-class than those who had preceded them, as only they could meet the high immigration qualifications if they had no kin to nominate them. The great majority used English at home. As late as 1986, only 21 000 used the major South Asian languages as against 84 305 born in the major South Asian countries. The biggest South Asian settlements were in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth, with a large Anglo-Burmese community in the latter city as well. In Melbourne the Indian and Sri Lankan born were found largely in the southeastern suburbs, with their commercial life centred on St Kilda, Oakleigh and Dandenong. The largest numbers were in Springvale, Waverley, Moorabbin, Dandenong and Oakleigh. Only in Broadmeadows was there an appreciable number in the northwestern industrial suburbs. The initial pattern of settlement in St Kilda, which had been marked in the 1970s, had largely disappeared, with only 846 left who had been born in either country. In Sydney (where the number of Sri Lankans was much smaller) there was a narrower spread, with the highest concentrations in Burwood, Ryde and Strathfield, and the adjoining but more working-class suburb of Auburn. In Perth Indians have settled in the northern residential suburbs, especially in the city of Stirling. There are simply NO South Asian ghettos in Australia and those areas most heavily settled are very suburban, essentially middle-class and widely scattered. Nor are there any identifiable focal points which have an obvious 'ethnic' character. South Asians certainly socialise together, but travel considerable distances to do so within a wholly suburban environment. The location of Hindu or Sikh temples in Australia is not strongly related to the location of Indians, and the great majority of these (as of Sri Lankans and Burmese) are Christians.

Filipinos do not form concentrations or have any visible focal points. Like Indians and Sri Lankans, Filipinos are usually much better educated than the majority of Australians. Even more importantly, a majority are women and many settle in the place chosen by their husband rather than by themselves. This is often in a remote location and Filipino organisations exist in such places as Mt Isa or Alice Springs. In the major cities there is an absence of identifiable Filipino settlement points. As Catholics, most Filipinos do not require distinct places of worship. Many are fluent in English. In Sydney in 1986 the only municipalities in which more than 1% had been born in the Philippines were Ashfield, Auburn, Blacktown, Botany and Marrickville. These were all areas of significant NESB settlement and of predominantly working-class character. However, they were also scattered in three distinct clusters - Ashfield/Auburn; Blacktown; and Botany/Marrickville. Such Filipino centres as exist
tend to be found in multicultural areas characterised by a variety of 'ethnic' institutions, like West End, Brisbane. One difficulty faced by Filipino grant-in-aid welfare workers is that in dealing with the problems of Filipina women they have to cover a vast geographical area precisely because there is no concentration and their clients suffer from isolation.

There are, then, NO Indian, Sri Lankan or Filipino residential concentrations in Australia to which the term 'ghetto' might be applied in any of the senses in which it is used anywhere. With a few major exceptions, other 'Asian' groups are either very small or are predominantly middle-class. In the latter category are the Japanese-born, many of whom are only temporary residents or are women married to Australian-born men. The only visible Japanese concentration is in North Sydney and Northbridge, where a number of shops and restaurants cater for a community which also maintains a Japanese-language school with the purpose of educating children who will normally return to Japan with their parents. This Japanese community is located in a prosperous middle-class area which has not been characterised by mass NESB settlement. Also located in and around North Sydney is the largest Armenian community in Australia. The Assyrian community, who are largely refugees from Iraq, are found more strongly in the western working-class suburbs of Fairfield. The Japanese community is linguistically isolated from the Australian majority, while the Armenians and Assyrians (like the Jews) have an ethnicity strongly dependent on access to religious institutions not shared with others. All three are relatively strongly concentrated within Sydney but seem to cause little comment. The Japanese are partly 'invisible' under a tide of Japanese tourists who confuse popular perceptions about their numbers and location.

The four major groups popularly regarded as forming large and problematic 'ghettos' are the Chinese, the Indochinese (mainly Vietnamese), the Lebanese and the Turks. Within the Lebanese population there are major religious differences despite a common cultural base in the Arabic language. It seems unlikely that most critics of 'Muslim ghettos' can distinguish between Turks and Arabs, let alone between Shias and Sunnis. The basic popular picture is of an 'Asian' population (Chinese and Indochinese) and a 'Middle Eastern' or 'Muslim' population (Turks and Muslim Arabs). Chinese and Lebanese have had a historic presence in Australia since the nineteenth century, whereas most Turks and Indochinese have only arrived since the early 1970s. However,
Lebanese and Turks were not excluded under the White Australia Policy in most cases, whereas Chinese and Indochinese were. The central point about all such immigrants is that they are perceived as very 'distant' in all surveys taken since the 1940s, including that recently completed by OMA. Any concentration of them is thus likely to be more readily perceived as problematic than are other concentrations.

Analysis of Chinese locations in the past has been confused by the fact that the majority of ethnic Chinese in Australia were not born in China. Prior to 1966 racial categories were published as part of the Census, but between then and 1986 there was no published material which could usefully be used to measure the concentration of ethnic Chinese. In that period the ethnic Chinese population increased rapidly in consequence of the ending of White Australia and the arrival of many refugees from Indochina, at least half of whom were ethnic Chinese. Census figures remain confusing to some extent because of the considerable number of ethnic Chinese students living in Australia, many of them from Malaysia and Singapore and intending to return home. This gives rise to measurable concentrations around universities, especially in the Sydney municipalities of Sydney (U of Sydney), Randwick (UNSW) and Ryde (Macquarie U), the Melbourne municipalities of Melbourne (U of Melbourne) and Oakleigh (Monash U), the Brisbane census areas of St Lucia (U of Queensland) and Macgregor (Griffith U) and the Perth municipality of Nedlands (UWA). The best measure of Chinese ethnicity is the use at home of a Chinese language, claimed by 139,000 in 1986. Some Australian-born Chinese, who may identify with the Chinese community, are unable to speak or read Chinese. They must be traced through the Ancestry tables of the 1986 Census.

Analysis of the location of Chinese-speakers should dispel the belief that the Chinese are especially likely to form 'ghettos' or to live in Chinatowns. These latter appear more realistically as focal points rather than as centres of mass Chinese residence. Even allowing for Chinese-speaking students, Chinese are very widely spread throughout the major cities, being found in both middle and working class districts. There are differences between those Chinese deriving generally from Southeast Asia and China and those deriving more specifically from Indochina and especially from Vietnam. These latter are more likely to be found concentrated in working class areas and to be residentially intermingled with those who speak Vietnamese. Otherwise, Chinese are residentially segregated from other major NESB settlers, being similar in this respect to South Asians. This reflects the middle class character and high levels of education.
and income of many ethnic Chinese from Southeast Asia as indicated by Census data on those of Malaysian or Singapore birthplace.

The largest number of Chinese-speakers is to be found in Sydney. But within the city they are widely spread with focal points in the Dixon Street Chinatown, in Ashfield and in Cabramatta. They are also, however, quite widely spread in areas not favoured by NESB immigrants such as the North Shore. They do not favour some NESB ethnic concentrations such as Holroyd, Blacktown or Liverpool in the outer western suburbs. The 'most Chinese' suburbs in terms of concentration are (in rank order): Fairfield, Strathfield, Burwood, Auburn, Ashfield, Randwick, Willoughby, Canterbury, Ryde and Sydney City. The most favoured suburbs, in terms of gross numbers, however, are: Fairfield, Randwick, Canterbury, Sydney City, Marrickville, Auburn, Kur-ring-gai, Rockdale, Parramatta and Willoughby. These suburbs taken together represent a cross-section of Sydney society and are not synonymous with suburbs of NESB or other Asian settlement.

In Melbourne the spread of settlement is equally wide. Chinese-speakers, like Indians and Sri Lankans, are found strongly represented in the southeastern suburbs. But, as in Sydney, they are also well represented in suburbs not strongly favoured by NESB immigrants, such as the eastern suburbs along the Maroondah Highway. Chinese in working class suburbs such as Richmond or Footscray are intermingled with Vietnamese, while those in middle class suburbs are segregated from them to a large extent. The 'most Chinese' suburbs in terms of concentration are (in rank order): Richmond, Melbourne City, Oakleigh, Fitzroy, Doncaster & Templestowe, Springvale, Prahran, Footscray, Collingwood and Waverley. The most favoured, in terms of gross numbers, were Melbourne City, Doncaster & Templestowe, Waverley, Oakleigh, Springvale, Nunawading, Richmond, Sunshine, Camberwell and Footscray. This latter listing ranges all the way from such classic NESB working-class areas as Footscray and Richmond to decidedly middle-class areas like Doncaster and Camberwell. These suburbs group loosely into a central core (Melbourne, Richmond, Collingwood, Fitzroy, Prahran): affluent eastern suburbs (Doncaster, Camberwell, Nunawading, Waverley); southeastern semi-industrial suburbs (Oakleigh, Springvale); and western industrial suburbs (Footscray, Sunshine). Chinese focal points are strongest in Melbourne Chinatown, Springvale and Footscray. But as in Sydney, this spread of residences does
not suggest undue concentration by the Chinese, whose residential pattern is largely
determined by their income and social class.

In other cities there are differing patterns but none which could establish a stronger
Chinese tendency to 'ghettoise' than is true for other major ethnic groups. In Adelaide
Chinese settlement is in the central core of the City and its working-class neighbours,
Enfield, Hindmarsh and Thebarton. Adelaide does not have a strong Chinese
historical tradition nor a concentrated Chinatown. In Brisbane, which has both, there
are two basic patterns - a central core around the City in New Farm, West End, South
Brisbane and Newstead, all close to the Chinatown of Fortitude Valley - and an outer
suburban core in Darra, Wacol and Pallara, which is largely coterminous with the
Vietnamese settlement created by refugee placement in the Wacol hostel. In Perth,
Chinese (many from Singapore and Malaysia) are very widely and evenly spread
throughout the inner and middle distance suburbs, though thin in traditional NESB
settlements such as Fremantle and Bassendean or in British-favoured outer suburbs such
as Armadale or Kalamunda. Despite the persistence of a small Chinatown in North
Perth, the Perth Chinese are almost as widely spread as in Canberra where there are
no measurable concentrations other than those related to the Australian National
University, and no Chinese focal points despite a large variety of Chinese and
Vietnamese restaurants.

While there may have been significant changes in Chinese locations since 1986 as a
result of Indochinese or Hong Kong immigration, there is little in the Census figures to
suggest that Chinese are replicating the nineteenth century concentrations which
caused so much alarm in Australia in the past. Most have already lived in mixed
communities in Southeast Asia, many are middle-class and prefer the company of those
who are socially similar. Some are quite affluent and able to live on the Sydney North
Shore or the Melbourne inner-East, areas which most NESB immigrants have yet to
penetrate in large numbers. What gives rise to accusations of 'ghetto formation' is not
the reality of settlement, but the perception of very visible focal points in which
Chinese and Southeast Asians congregate and which they have developed often at
great profit to themselves. It would be naive to overlook the probability that such
focal points also provide convenient resting places for illegal immigrants, for
laundering illegal money and for creating contact points for the Southeast Asia-based
drug trade. This has been the experience of other Chinatowns in San Francisco,
Vancouver, New York and London in recent years. There is a strong case for more effective police and community liaison in such areas for the benefit of their users and residents, as most of these do not welcome the threats to their livelihoods offered by criminal activity. As Chinese immigration increases, as it undoubtedly will, law enforcement agencies will need to improve their links with the Chinese commercial communities in the half-dozen major Chinese/Vietnamese focal points. Good community relations, however, depend on not confusing these issues with the more general fact that Chinese are widely spread and have not formed 'ghettos' or even major concentrations of residence, except where they have settled as Indochinese refugees.

Two quite different patterns are suggested by Chinese settlement. In the first there is considerable ethnic segregation from other NESB settlers, including Vietnamese. In this pattern, which includes student concentrations around the newer universities, the Chinese community is revealed as middle-class with similar choice of suburb to South Asians. In the second there is marked co-mingling with NESB immigrants and especially with Vietnamese. It is this second pattern which has caused publicly expressed concern. Some areas have a particularly high concentration of Chinese and Vietnamese combined. In Melbourne these include Richmond (16% using Chinese and/or Vietnamese at home), Collingwood (8.6%), Fitzroy (7.8%), Footscray (8.2%) and Melbourne City (9.6%). In these five adjoining cities there were 15,086 over the age of five using one or other languages in 1986. This formed a concentration in a classic immigrant zone of transition which had previously housed newly arrived Southern Europeans in the 1950s and 1960s. In Sydney the concentrations of Chinese and Vietnamese combined were mainly in Fairfield (11%), Auburn (7.7%), Canterbury (6.5%) and Marrickville (7.7%). As in Melbourne these were all areas previously favoured by Southern European immigrants. Most were further out in the suburbs and there was not the same contiguity as in central Melbourne where public housing estates were an important location. In Brisbane there were two different concentrations. In the outer suburbs around Wacol hostel there were 23.9% using one or other language in Darra. In the inner suburbs there were 14.2% in West End. Both areas had a significant Vietnamese/Chinese commercial presence in their shopping centres. In Adelaide contiguous settlement was close to the city centre in Hindmarsh (5.7%), Thebarton (4.5%) and Enfield (3.3%).
What these patterns suggest is that Chinese and Vietnamese live together in large numbers when they have had the common experience of escape from Vietnam. Otherwise, Chinese do not live in the same suburbs as Vietnamese, favouring much more middle-class locations. Vietnamese live in the same areas as earlier Southern European immigrants. It is reasonable to suppose that they will also move out of these areas in due course, as did their predecessors. With high levels of unemployment, many Vietnamese are probably more dependent on public housing and less able to purchase than were Italians or Greeks in the fully-employed 1960s. However, the strong commercial orientation of Chinese and Vietnamese from Indochina makes it probable that a middle-class will rapidly emerge and that this will seek to relocate. At present the great majority of Vietnamese-speakers still live either in zones of transition or in utilitarian suburbs previously favoured by earlier waves of NESB immigrants. The numbers of Laotians and Khmer are too small for effective analysis, but many also live in areas such as Fairfield and are involved in the commercial centres dominated by Vietnam Chinese. In 1987 the Khmer Community of New South Wales had its headquarters in Fairfield while the Lao Community Advancement Co-op was located in the adjacent suburb of Cabramatta. In Melbourne, also, these two small communities had their offices in the Springvale/Clayton outer suburban area favoured by many Chinese and Vietnamese.

Vietnamese are currently more strongly concentrated than Chinese or than most other NESB communities of any size. However, like other communities, they are not concentrated only in one area. The normal situation is to have at least two distinct locations, many kilometres apart - one near the city centre and one in the outer suburbs. In rank order of proportion of the total population their favoured LGAs are: (Sydney): Marrickville, Fairfield, Canterbury, Auburn and Bankstown; (Melbourne): Richmond, Collingwood, Footscray, Melbourne City and Fitzroy. In order of numbers their favoured areas are: (Sydney): Fairfield, Canterbury, Marrickville, Bankstown and Auburn; (Melbourne): Footscray, Springvale, Melbourne, Richmond, Sunshine. These are all essentially working-class suburbs of heavy NESB settlement. Vietnamese reasons for living in them are undoubtedly very similar to those of their European predecessors - cheapness of housing and closeness to industry.

Apart from Chinese and Vietnamese, the other ethnic communities arousing some hostility have been those from the Middle East, especially if Muslim. The building of
several large mosques in prominent locations, as at Lakemba in Sydney or Preston in Melbourne, has increased the visibility of the Muslim population. There have been several disputes with local councils about the building of mosques and Islamic schools, most notably in Auburn, which with 13.6% of its people Muslims in 1986, is easily the most Islamic of any metropolitan local government area in Australia. The continuing exposure of the public to news from Lebanon, Iran and the Middle East in general has made the position of Australian Muslims especially difficult. Their organisations are well aware of public prejudice, which they seek to moderate. Yet most Muslims in Australia are not Arabs and most Arabs in Australia are not Muslims. Consequently the residential dispersal of either Muslims or Arabs tends to refute the proposition that Islamic ghettos are being created in Australia. The largest ethnic groups which go to make up the Islamic community are from Turkey, Lebanon and Yugoslavia, societies which have little in common except a now tenuous inheritance from the Ottoman Empire which ceased to exist in 1918. They have tended to develop 'ethnic mosques', despite universalist beliefs in Islamic brotherhood.

Muslims in Sydney and Melbourne are more widely scattered than Jews. Their favoured locations reflect their working-class character and they have a high degree of residential segregation from Jews, who are predominantly middle-class. Conversely, they are found in precisely those locations always favoured by Southern European and other less skilled post-War immigrants, including both inner and outer suburbs. The Muslim focal point is obviously the mosque and their locations may affect settlement as is true of other religious denominations. But because of ethnic variety and, to a lesser extent, the division between Sunnis, Shias and other sects, there are several choices of mosque in the major cities, often at considerable distances from each other. In Perth (the oldest continuing mosque in Australia in North Perth), Adelaide (Marion Road) and Brisbane (Mount Gravatt) there are fewer alternatives. There are also a small number of provincial Muslim centres, notably Shepparton (Albanian), Broome (Malay) and Katanning (Cocos Islanders), with a single place of worship.

In Sydney Muslims of Turkish and Arabic origin are most strongly concentrated in such traditional NESB settlement areas as Auburn, Canterbury, Rockdale, Bankstown, Botany, Strathfield and Ashfield, in order of proportions. For Arabic-speakers the highest proportions are in Canterbury, Auburn, Burwood, Bankstown, Marrickville, Parramatta, Holroyd and Rockdale. Obviously there is considerable overlap. But some
Arabic populations, especially around Parramatta, are predominantly Christian. There is a substantial core of Arabs and Muslims throughout the southern and western suburbs in which NESB immigrants have normally settled. The major focus of most Arabic organisations is in the Lakemba/Punchbowl/Campsie area, falling mainly within the city of Canterbury. But there are also Arabs on the inner-North Shore and in the outer western suburbs and there is a substantial Australian-born middle-class of Arabic origin which is Christian (mainly Catholic), has lost its language and has moved away from the original Lebanese settlement of Redfern into the middle-class suburbs.

Three-quarters of all Arabic-speakers and half of all the Muslims in Australia, live in New South Wales, mainly in Sydney, with their major focal points within the city of Canterbury. However, they share that city and all other residential locations with large numbers from a variety of other ethnic and religious backgrounds. The same is even truer of Melbourne, where the Turkish presence is more marked than in Sydney amongst Muslims. The most Islamic city in Melbourne is Brunswick (6.4% in 1986). But Brunswick is also 13.6% Orthodox, 13% Greek-speaking and 17.8% Italian-speaking. While it might claim (with Fairfield) to be the most multicultural city in Australia, it is certainly not an Islamic or Arabic ghetto. Indeed Melbourne Arabs and Muslims do not have the same single focus which is provided by districts of Canterbury in Sydney. The adjacent cities of Brunswick and Coburg fulfill this function to some extent, but many Muslims in both are Turks and some are Yugoslavs. Islamic organisations are centred as far out as Dandenong (where they are mainly from Yugoslavia) or Broadmeadows (mainly Turks). Arabic, Turkish and Yugoslav Muslims are, however, consistently found in industrial districts and what little there is of an Islamic middle-class is more likely to come from India, Pakistan or Indonesia and to live in different locations from the Islamic majority.

Of the ethnic and religious groups popularly held most likely to form ghettos, the great majority live in multicultural suburbs where they can interact with Australians from a wide variety of backgrounds should they wish. Rarely have they moved directly into overwhelmingly Anglo-Australian areas, as they cannot afford to do so. The notion, spread by Professor Blainey and others, of 'front-line suburbs' where 'Old Australians' confront the 'Asian invasion', is simply false. Most areas into which Asian and Middle Eastern immigrants have settled have already experienced ethnic
succession. Those 'Asians' who have settled amongst Anglo-Australians have been predominantly from middle-class immigrations of Indians, Sri Lankans and Overseas Chinese. Yet little hostility or resentment is expressed against them nor do most feel much prejudice. The 'front-line' concept, like the 'ghetto' concept, is based to a large extent on the creation of very visible focal points, such as shopping centres for Southeast Asians or mosques for those from the Middle East. These act as gathering places for what are often widely scattered populations.

Focal Points and Core Areas

While ethnic groups may be very widely spread throughout the suburbs, they often have focal points or core areas to which they look for ethnic-specific services, entertainment or religious and social interchange. These may be the original centre for settlement, from which the majority have departed but which still retains institutions and services created in the period of initial settlement. Such areas include Norton Street, Leichhardt for Sydney Italians; Lygon Street, Carlton for Melbourne Italians; Russell Street, City, for Melbourne Greeks; or the central Chinatowns of Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. Eventually, if a group has moved completely away, the institutions will follow, as with the total disappearance of Jewish institutions in Carlton, Melbourne. However, such focal points can be very persistent and may, like the Chinatowns, be revived by new waves of immigrants or even by tourists of the same culture.

Focal points or core areas may be created and sustained by several factors:

- the dependence of language and cultural maintenance on regular socialising;
- the preference of particular cultures for their own food and for eating out;
- religious requirements;
- the location of clubs or other meeting places;
- heavy capitalisation of shops, entertainment centres or religious centres;
- the persistence of remnants of the early settlers, especially the elderly;
- facilities which cater for wider publics than the ethnic group alone;
- the international reputation of particular locations amongst compatriots.
A combination of these factors is often present. The greater the number of such relevant factors, the longer the duration of the focal point is likely to be. But in the widely scattered and mobile populations of the metropolitan city a focal point will not last indefinitely once its clientele has dispersed. Properties become converted to other uses - for example, in Carlton the Jewish Kadimah is now the premises of the Italian Eolian Society; the Yiddish school is now an Albanian mosque; a Protestant church has been handed over to the Lebanese Maronites while another now belongs to the Romanian Orthodox. Thus to some extent the focal point depends on the preservation of ethnic core areas. On the other hand, populations are now much more willing to travel long distances for entertainment and shopping. Focal points near city centres have tended to revive in recent years and to become larger and more prosperous as entertainment and shopping has become less localised. Those which provide recognisably 'ethnic' facilities for leisure are, potentially, profitable investments as tastes have become more sophisticated and foreign tourism has increased. This is particularly the case for the central Chinatowns, which have been able to attract overseas capital.

Focal points might be divided in terms of their functions and history:

- Created by and still dependent on locally concentrated compatriot communities;
- Created by earlier settlement but sustained by drawing customers from the metropolitan-wide ethnic group;
- Created by earlier settlement but forming part of the central reserve of shops and entertainment drawing a multicultural and international clientele;
- Based on non-recreational facilities such as clubs or churches;
- Forming part of a 'multicultural' focal point which caters for an ethnically varied clientele in the surrounding neighbourhood.

Such focal points may simply consist of one or two premises or may embrace hundreds of locations within a grid of streets. Size is obviously related to the size of the ethnic group, but may vary considerably between cultures.

The analysis of selected shopping centres in Volume Two, gives some idea of the complexity of focal points. Some, such as Lygon Street, Norton Street, the Chinatowns,
Cabramatta or Springvale are dominated by a single ethnic group or by closely associated groups such as Chinese and Vietnamese. Others include a combination of ethnicities and a core of Anglo-Australians. Only large centres were analysed and thus many East European or smaller nationalities are overlooked. This does not mean that they do not have focal points, only that these are often very small or limited to clubs and churches rather than focussed on shopping centres. Some ethnic groups, particularly those assimilated to majority culture such as Germans, Dutch, Anglo Indians or Ceylon Burghers, do not have recognisable focal points, although they may have a club and church life which remains 'hidden' from the general public. Some ethnic groups, especially Chinese, Vietnamese, Italians, Greeks and Lebanese, have a very 'extrovert' culture based on shops, clubs and street socialising. Others, such as Yugoslavs or Maltese, although numerous, are not nearly as strongly represented in commercial centres.

The commercial centres analysed in depth are:

- **Multicultural**: King Street, Newtown; Sydney Road, Brunswick/Coburg; Footscray; Port Kembla; Acland Street, St Kilda; Lalor; Oakleigh
- **Italian**: Lygon Street, Carlton; Norton Street, Leichhardt;
- **Chinese**: Little Bourke Street, Melbourne; Dixon Street, Sydney; Fortitude Valley, Brisbane;
- **Vietnamese/Chinese**: Cabramatta; Springvale; North Richmond; Darra.

Other multicultural focal points studied include: Ashfield, Bankstown and Bondi Junction in Sydney; High Street, Northcote; Johnston Street, Collingwood; and Swan Street, Richmond in Melbourne; West End, Brisbane; Hamilton, Newcastle; Hindley Street, Adelaide; and Pakington Street, Geelong. The North Perth area has recently been studied in *Diversity is Great, Mate!*, published by the WAMEAC in conjunction with OMA, and this has been drawn on.

While there are many other commercial centres in which there is a marked 'ethnic' or 'multicultural' component, there are very few other than those listed above in which such a component could be described as dominant. What is much more common is a handful of 'ethnic' or NESB-owned businesses within a predominantly Anglo-Australian environment. Such traditionally NESB-owned businesses as cafes, fish
shops or greengrocers, while widespread even in small country towns, operate as 'mainstream' businesses and do not normally constitute anything which might be termed an ethnic focal point. With perhaps a dozen exceptions, there are NO commercial centres in Australia which are dominated by a single ethnic minority group. Much of the public perception of 'ghettoes' is heavily influenced by this handful of very visible locations. Some of these have deliberately sought publicity by organising festivals, which are often extremely popular with the entire population, not just with the ethnic group. These include the Lygon Street Festa and the Johnston Street Spanish Fiesta in Melbourne, the Norton Street Festa in Sydney, the Pakington Street Festival in Geelong and the Chinese New Year celebrations in the Chinatowns of Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. These have all sought and (quite rightly) received some public funding and are an approach to multiculturalism which deserves continued official support.

Apart from commercial centres, the institutions which might form the basis of an ethnic focal point include clubs, churches or even informal gathering places such as pubs or cafes. Any clustering of such institutions, even within a predominantly Anglo-Australian environment or one dominated by a different ethnic group, can legitimately be termed an ethnic focal point. Urban Aborigines have such focal points of a non-commercial character in several locations: in Redfern, Sydney; in Northcote (and previously in Fitzroy), Melbourne; and in Musgrave Park, Brisbane. Most urban Aborigines live in peripheral locations, especially in public housing. These central locations attract them, provide services and also function as meeting places for rural relatives visiting the city. The only major urban ghetto in Australia, by American definitions, is in the Eveleigh and Caroline Streets area, near Redfern Station, Sydney, where blocks of old housing have been made available to Aborigines by a public trust. Otherwise, Aboriginal focal points tend to be around churches, pubs or even, as in Brisbane, in public parks. As a non-urban people they have not created either metropolitan ghettos or commercial focal points, other than in the small and exceptional case of Redfern. The establishment of institutions catering for Aborigines also creates focal points. Examples have included the Aboriginal health and legal services in Redfern and Tranby college in Glebe; the church of Pastor Doug Nicholls in Fitzroy; and the more recent creation of a girls home and other Aboriginal facilities in Northcote. In numerical terms, however, the major centres for Aboriginal settlement have been in outer suburbs, especially in public housing. Such settlements include Inala.
(with over 1,000), and Wacol in Brisbane; Blacktown (with over 3,000, mainly in Mt Druitt), Campbelltown and Penrith in Sydney; Elizabeth and Munno Para in Adelaide; and Cockburn and Swan Shire in Perth. Aboriginal settlement thus has two aspects, very similar to that of less skilled NESB immigrants - peripheral settlement and zone of transition settlement, with those on the periphery treating the central area as a focal point.

Other small or non-commercial ethnic groups tend to be less ‘visible’ than Aborigines. A small Fijian, Polynesian and Fiji Indian focal point is in the St Peters end of King Street, Newtown. This consists of a handful of shops and meeting places. Similar focal points have existed for Maoris in Bondi. These centres are small and limited because their potential public is small and relatively poor. At the other extreme are the Jewish synagogues, reception centres and schools of the southeastern suburbs of Melbourne or the eastern and North Shore suburbs of Sydney. While there are distinctively Jewish shopping centres, such as in Acland Street, St Kilda, the main focus of Jewish life is on family and religion. As a very prosperous community they have been able to create a range of well capitalised and permanent buildings and institutions.

The role of religious institutions as focal points is often very important. Large gatherings can be expected at mosques in Sydney and Melbourne. These are often so large that local councils have used congestion and parking problems as reasons for refusing planning permission for further mosques even in strongly Muslim areas such as Auburn, Sydney. Such objections cannot be proved to be based on religious prejudices, even if they are! As in the rural societies of origin, Sunday church services create a social meeting point for compatriots. These are often widely scattered in the suburbs. Communities like the Macedonians have very little other than churches or meeting halls to form focal points around. This type of community consolidation has been characteristic of Slav settlers in general. The Croatian Catholic centre at Summer Hill, Sydney or the Polish club in Ashfield, provide centres for ethnic groups which have no visible presence in the form of commercial centres. In Canberra, where there are no distinct ‘ethnic’ focal points at all, the more than twenty ethnic community clubs, well endowed through poker machines, share with the churches the major consolidating function for the substantial NESB population. There are few NESB communities which do not have some form of focal point, even if its existence is not apparent to the outside observer. Highly consolidated communities such as the Ukrainians in Melbourne, centre their life...
around a handful of churches and a complex of social centres, club houses and a credit co-operative in Essendon. These, rather than shops or restaurants, make Essendon a Ukrainian focal point - but one very different in appearance from the 'Asian ghettos' of Cabramatta or Springvale. Very small communities may have only one or two institutions on which to centre their social life, such as the Sydney Assyrians with their club and church in Fairfield.

The existence of such institutions raises the question of whether focal points slow down the process of suburbanisation, by keeping people attached to the area in which these points are located. With the universal use of the car by all except the elderly, it seems unlikely that this is normally the case. While orthodox Jews are confined within walking distance of a synagogue on the Sabbath, no other important ethno-religious group has such limitations, nor are most Jews orthodox worshippers on a regular basis. What seems more likely is that the institutions follow their publics after a time-lag. Greek Orthodox communities, for example, are now established in Richmond, Moonee Ponds, Box Hill, Brunswick, Clayton, Coburg, Dandenong, Melbourne City, Mentone, North Altona, Oakleigh, Reservoir, Prahran, St Albans and Lalor in Melbourne; in Mascot, Paddington, St Marys, Belmore, Crows Nest, Kingsford and Darlinghurst in Sydney; and in Norwood, Torrensville, Adelaide City, Port Adelaide, Unley and Noarlunga in Adelaide. Yet all three Greek communities originated in a tightly-knit, small community very close to the city centre.

Conclusions

There are almost NO GHETTOES in metropolitan Australia in the sense that the term is used for urban concentrations in the United States or the United Kingdom - a district of multiple social problems inhabited primarily by a distinct ethnic group or groups generally held in low esteem by the majority population living elsewhere. The only such ghetto which our fieldwork revealed was the small Aboriginal community around Eveleigh Street in Redfern, Sydney. Only in Sydney is there a large concentration of classical nineteenth century slum housing, most of it located in the municipalities of South Sydney, Botany and Marrickville. Apart from small and diminishing pockets in Melbourne and Adelaide, no such housing conditions exist elsewhere in metropolitan
Australia. This reflects the relatively high living standards which Australia attained in the late nineteenth century and the consequently superior levels of housing when compared with North America or Western Europe. Otherwise, the poorest living conditions are invariably in rural and outback areas where Aborigines have settled or been deliberately located by authorities.

There are, however, some POTENTIAL GHETTOES which might require attention in the future if they are not to reproduce social conditions found in other societies.

One such is public housing estates deliberately used to house disadvantaged families, Aborigines and refugees. These include both high rise flats and individual housing and are characterised especially by Vietnamese, Lebanese and Turkish concentration. The use of public housing for welfare purposes has concentrated social problems in many societies with large immigrant populations. These include such developed welfare states as the Netherlands, where the massive estate at Bijlmermeer south of Amsterdam has been used for Surinamese and Moluccan settlement and has reproduced most of the social problems found in the United Kingdom. These problems include unemployment, youth delinquency, drug addiction, single parent families and the public reputation of such estates as 'problem neighbourhoods'. These problems are not confined to immigrants or ethnic minorities, but the presence of large concentrations of such minorities reinforces public perceptions that they constitute a serious problem. The solution involves public policy well beyond the scope of anything embraced by 'immigrant settlement' or 'access and equity'. It may, as in the some cities of the United States, require the complete demolition of high rise estates judged incapable of providing attractive living conditions. But it also involves a reduction in youth unemployment, the provision of income support, drug rehabilitation programs and the attachment of suitably qualified welfare workers to relevant estates. In the context under discussion, this includes welfare workers proficient in appropriate languages and familiar with relevant cultures. This remains primarily an area of State government responsibility, but one in which the Commonwealth should take some interest. It funds in part the Commonwealth-State housing agreements under which some of these 'problem estates' have been created and towards which refugees, in particular, have been directed. Such concentrations of public housing, which may be in inner or far outer suburbs, are problem areas not because of ethnic concentration but because of their use as welfare housing projects. Overseas experience suggests that such projects must have
effective access to the labour market if they are not to reproduce many of the problems they were designed to overcome.

A second potential ghetto situation might arise in areas of rooming houses or transient accommodation being settled by poorer and less well educated immigrants from the Pacific region. These include Maoris (who as New Zealanders have free entry to Australia), Fijians, Tongans, Samoans and other islanders who in recent years have been leaving their small homelands in increasing numbers for New Zealand, Australia and the United States. Because of their proximity to Australia, some have entered as illegal immigrants and are largely unprotected from economic exploitation or are unwilling to take up social service support. Such immigrants present some problems in New Zealand and may well do so in Australia as their numbers increase, not because of their racial origins but because they are poorly educated and unskilled and have a male preponderance. The main locations for the development of such transient ghettos are in Sydney and Brisbane, with focal points in Newtown/St Peters and Bondi Junction in Sydney and Fortitude Valley in Brisbane. Because of the relatively small numbers involved, the Pacific islanders do not form very noticeable or concentrated settlements. However, there is probably a growing need for placement of appropriate grant-in-aid or other publicly funded welfare workers at Islander focal points and for cultural sensitisation of police, welfare and employment officers in such localities. Under current immigration policy, it is unlikely that large and uncontrollable numbers of Islanders will settle in Australia.

It has already been argued that 'Asians' are not likely to form 'ghettos' in the sense of creating concentrations of disadvantage, poverty and crime. There is, however, a third potential ghetto situation in the concentration of refugees from Indochina in particular localities, when combined with high levels of unemployment. The same could be said of high concentrations of Lebanese. While most of these latter are not strictly refugees in the official sense, they came under relaxed conditions taking into account the collapse of civil society in the Lebanon since 1976. They share with the Indochinese many disturbing experiences of warfare and family breakup as well as encountering prejudice and high unemployment in Australia. The Office of Multicultural Affairs survey of 1988 found that Vietnamese, Lebanese and Muslims (who overlap with Lebanese), were regarded as the 'most distant' of ethnic categories by the majority of Australians. Thus
any high concentration of these minorities inevitably gives rise to accusations of ghetto formation, because of their perceived differences.

Whether such concentration is a real problem or simply an assumed problem, depends partly on philosophical and sociological standpoints. Previous generations of refugees either did not concentrate very noticeably (as with post-War Displaced Persons) or were similarly criticised (as with pre-War European Jews). No rational observer today would claim that Jewish concentration (which is overwhelmingly in middle-class suburbs) causes any 'problems' at all. The former Displaced Persons are either very small in numbers within specific ethnic groups (as with Estonians, Lithuanians or Ukrainians) or live distributed through the same working class suburbs as many other different groups (as with Poles or Croatians). There are no metropolitan areas which still have a 'Displaced Persons' ambience, although there are some small East European focal points. Were Indochinese or Lebanese refugees to behave in the same way as their European predecessors, they might be expected to have dispersed widely by the end of the century. Their initial concentration would then be seen as a function of their settlement in refugee hostels (as for Indochinese in Cabramatta, Springvale or Darra) or through chain migration (as for Lebanese in Canterbury).

One difference between current and previous refugee settlement is in the concentration on commercial activity which has created strong focal points - a concentration previously limited to Jews and influencing such shopping areas as Acland Street, St Kilda. Thus the visibility of Indochinese is compounded not just by their concentration in areas of initial settlement, but in the rapid development of Chinese and Vietnamese shopping centres such as Cabramatta, Springvale, North Richmond and Darra. These differ from the traditional 'Chinatowns' (with which most Australians are familiar). They are located in areas not previously characterised by Asian settlement. As Chinese or Vietnamese shops and restaurants spread into adjoining areas (such as Bankstown in Sydney or Footscray in Melbourne), public opinion becomes alarmed by spread as previously it was alarmed by concentration. This is, perhaps, inevitable, given the Southeast Asian practice of prominently decorating commercial premises with appropriate languages and symbols, making them even more noticeable than they might otherwise be. But there is no argument for discouraging such focal points. They represent large and growing investments in districts which were previously not noted for their commercial or
entertainment facilities. Property values have increased dramatically in Cabramatta and there is no economic argument against further Chinese/Vietnamese development. On the contrary, most of the commercial centres developed in the past ten years have appreciated in value very rapidly to the benefit of local council revenues. Any cost-benefit analysis of the few Indochinese focal points which now exist, could only conclude that they are economically and financially very beneficial.

The major problems of such areas (numbering perhaps six or seven of all the hundreds of metropolitan shopping centres in Australia) are:

- that they attract adverse comment from opponents of Asian settlement and concentration;
- that they cater for unemployed youth who create disturbances or threats similar to those found in other working class suburbs (but are dominated by minority ethnic groups and thus more controversial);
- that public and police relationships are often strained by the refusal of local police to adapt their attitudes and behaviour to relatively unique situations;
- that already established citizens and institutions resist and resent the rapid changes which have taken place.

The alleviation of these tensions rests with several authorities. In Cabramatta and Springvale initiatives have been taken by local municipalities to stress the multicultural character of the population. Local schools take similar initiatives in such areas as Richmond. There is a continuing need for police training to stress the problems likely to arise with a culturally distinct clientele. Local political parties and elected officials also need to cater for their constituents in a responsible manner - rather than endorsing such activities as the 'anti-mosque' campaigns which have taken place in Auburn (NSW) over recent years. While the general effectiveness of public awareness campaigns in lessening ethnic tension is often questioned, there remains a strong case for such campaigns in the limited number of areas which have been heavily settled by Indochinese and Arabs. Such campaigns require a great deal of local consultation and participation if they are not to be counterproductive. Ideally they should have the endorsement of local councils and politicians and of the local media. One strength of the new communities is that they are very commercially oriented. They
thus have a strong potential influence on local media, which rely heavily on advertising, and on local election contests, in which local business leaders have always taken an important role.

One obvious focus for organising such public awareness campaigns might be the Migrant Resource Centres. Unfortunately not all areas under discussion have such centres, which are the funding responsibility of the Commonwealth through the Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs. The location of MRCs in the past has sometimes been affected by political factors and there is a mismatch between populations and the provision of MRCs. In 1986 it was found that whereas the average NESB immigrant population served by MRCs through Australia was about 73 000, this varied between less than 20 000 in Tasmania and the Northern Territory and more than 100 000 in Sydney and Melbourne (ROMAMPAS Report, Appendix Four, Table 18). With limited resources available, there has been a tendency to freeze MRC expansion in the major cities and to suggest their limitation to an initial settlement role for new arrivals, as generally urged for all DILGEA services by recommendation 11 of the 1988 FitzGerald Report. This approach has already led to the closing of the Melbourne MRC (despite its relocation at Johnston Street, Collingwood in a traditional zone of transition) and the associated upgrading of the St Albans MRC in an outer suburb. MRCs generally function as referral centres, as meeting places, as 'drop-in centres' and as office locations for a range of services. Some are very successful while some are not. They are managed by committees drawn overwhelmingly or completely from 'ethnic' organisations and would, therefore, be seriously hampered if limited to new arrivals who have not yet formed viable community structures. Their work amongst the elderly would also be rendered very difficult if such a limitation were imposed. An approach to be encouraged would make the MRCs into effective 'multicultural centres', releasing them from their traditional obligation to provide welfare services for immigrants rather than to act as community centres for all NESB Australians and their descendants. Many MRCs feel under threat of withdrawal of funding and have short-term and unpredictable grants-in-aid. They should, rather, be seen as permanent features of those areas with heavy NESB concentrations. This implies a much closer relationship with local government and with State agencies than often exists, including the receipt of regular income support from such agencies. It also suggests wider answerability by MRC management committees than hitherto has been the case.
A role for the Commonwealth, through DILGEA and the OMA, might exist in close co-operation with local government, the school systems and local voluntary, community and religious institutions. In Britain such co-operation exists through the Community Relations Councils, which in some ways replicate the functions of Australian Migrant Resource Centres. However, unlike MRCs, such councils would need to embrace both 'ethnic' and 'mainstream' elements in the community (accepting that in some areas 'ethnic' elements are the numerical 'mainstream'). An important function of the British councils is to facilitate police/minority relationships. Studies of ghetto disturbances in Britain and America stress the often negative role which police have played as a result of a widening gap between them and younger elements of the minority population, many of whom are unemployed. One option open to national, State and local government is to organise and facilitate regular co-operation between communities in the relative handful of areas which are characterised by a strong East Asian or Arab presence of recent arrival. A particularly important role rests with elected representatives, who already exercise major 'community relations' functions in many outer metropolitan areas.

Apart from the three situations outlined above (public welfare housing; transient areas; and refugee concentrations) there are simply NO important situations requiring public intervention of a remedial nature. Thus any 'solutions' to the 'problem' of ghettos must be viewed with great scepticism. That many relatively affluent and modern outer suburbs have heavy NESB concentrations is NOT A PROBLEM any more than that many very affluent and rather older middle range suburbs have heavy Anglo-Australian concentrations or that some outer suburbs of Perth and Adelaide have exceptionally large numbers of British immigrants and their children. Assimilationists may regret that some ethnic groups prefer to live in close proximity to compatriots, or that there is a handful of suburbs in which English is not the language of the majority in the home. Arguably such developments slow down the process of assimilation and of language loss. But public policy no longer favours such processes. All arguments for dispersal 'amongst the wider community' must be very critically inspected and (in most cases) simply rejected not just as unworkable but as inequitable.

Policies of deliberate dispersal, while officially favoured for over a century, have normally only been applicable to those directly under control already, such as
Aborigines or refugees. Aboriginal policy has been just as likely to favour concentration, thus creating a 'ghetto mentality' amongst a people once thinly spread over the continent in well defined traditional homelands. Refugee policy has also been contradictory. Pre-War Jewish refugees were made the specific responsibility of the existing Jewish community, as a way of limiting public expenditure on their settlement. Consequently, they largely settled amongst existing Jewish residents. This process remained true for Jews from the Soviet Union into the 1980s. Post-War Displaced Persons, in contrast, had no existing communities to support them in most cases and were housed in camps in the first instance. As these were usually in areas with no prospect of continuing employment, they failed to become focal points for settlement and were closed after the refugees had dispersed through Australia. Although the East Europeans maintained a very active community life in many cases, they did not concentrate in particular neighbourhoods. They were left free to settle where they wished which was mainly in newer outer working-class suburbs close to developing industries. They had been, however, widely dispersed in practice, and small communities continued to exist in places such as Tasmania or Newcastle which otherwise attracted few NESB immigrants.

Other refugees were also scattered by the settlement process, with no strong concentrations of Hungarians or Czechs being created after 1956 and 1968. All refugees until the 1970s were Europeans and were not regarded as constituting a special problem. But since 1975 the majority of refugee and Special Humanitarian settlers has come from Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. Those who did not go directly into the community were housed in city hostels. The likelihood of them settling in the vicinity was much greater than for their predecessors in the 1940s. Despite official concern about concentration, the use of hostels was the most important single factor in creating such concentrations. Dispersal policies were adopted in the early 1980s, though these seem now to have been abandoned. Such policies were based on the use of non-metropolitan hostels (such as Hobart) and on the adoption of refugees by sponsors under the Community Refugee Settlement Scheme. The Commonwealth no longer exercised the powers which it had in the 1940s to direct labour anywhere it chose.

Nor was it willing to prevent resettlement in the metropolitan centres by those who had initially settled elsewhere. There were no special financial or tax inducements to settle outside the major cities, other than those available for all settlers in the tropics.
Thus while small refugee groups were settled in places such as Whyalla, Alice Springs or Rockhampton, most became permanently established in the handful of major cities in which the majority of Australians live. Within those cities they gravitated towards areas in which compatriots were already settled. In virtually all cases these were already ethnic concentrations created by previous waves of NESB immigrants. There were no important instances of post-1975 refugees concentrating in any strength in predominantly Anglo-Australian suburbs.

Attempts to encourage settlement in 'designated areas' have been adopted by the Commonwealth government since June, 1989. These are based on manipulating the points system for family reunion to favour sponsors who have lived for two years in Tasmania, the Northern Territory, the Pilbara and southwest Western Australia and central and northern Queensland. This approach was welcomed by the Opposition and by the Northern Territory government (Age 23 June 1989). Both the NT government and the Darwin City Council have stated their willingness to take increased numbers of immigrants from Southeast Asia. As Darwin has had an ethnically mixed population since its foundation and is oriented towards Southeast Asia, it is probably the most promising major city for the further devolution of Asian migration. However, the Liberal Party council, which considered the policy of devolution incentives, was advised against requiring settlers to move to remote areas as a condition for admission to Australia (ibid.). It seems unlikely that any Australian government will do more than encourage devolution by offering incentives such as favourable points within the overall settlement qualification. The policy has been adopted too recently to judge what its effects are likely to be, especially in areas such as Tasmania or central Queensland which have failed to attract many NESB immigrants over the past forty years and, therefore, have few potential sponsors for such immigrants.

Refugee dispersal programs in other societies have experienced difficulties in consolidating new communities in devolved locations. In Sweden since 1985 an elaborate program of refugee devolution has been based on the highly developed welfare state and municipal system. Contracts were established between the Swedish government and various municipalities in order to meet criticism that refugees were placing a burden on some major cities by concentrating within them. The state provided accommodation and welfare payments for a three year period. But it was less successful, despite a national unemployment rate of only 2%, in finding job openings for refugees.
There were also social problems in sending predominantly male refugees from the Middle East (such as Kurds or Iranians) to remote Arctic locations where they remained socially isolated and unemployed. The trend was for refugees to return to major metropolitan centres after the three year period of provision expired. The Netherlands has operated a comparable system, using municipalities but with even greater employment problems as the unemployment rate has reached 14% in recent years. In the United Kingdom dispersal programs were launched in connection with the arrival of many Ugandan Asians in 1972. Certain municipalities (such as Leicester) which had attracted large Asian communities were declared 'red areas' and refugees were advised against settling in them. However there were neither sanctions nor incentives which would have made such a policy workable. In more recent years some Vietnamese refugees have been located in provincial cities in Northern England, but because of high unemployment levels this dispersal has not been particularly fruitful.

The lessons of Australian, Swedish, Dutch and British refugee dispersal programs seems to be that they are capable of solving initial accommodation problems but that they are much less successful in creating viable new communities away from traditional areas of immigrant settlement. Unless a variety of suitable employment is available, and unless there are well developed support systems, it is natural for refugees, like other immigrants, to settle where they can gain employment and where they have support mechanisms provided by relatives or compatriots. The overseas programs all depend on a much greater degree of municipal support than has usually been sought in Australia, where local government is not a national but a State responsibility and where the provision of relevant welfare functions is much less developed. The only prototype for such co-operation has been the funding of a grant-in-aid worker by the Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs in Fairfield since 1982 in response to local authority concerns about the large-scale settlement of refugees from hostels within the city. As the Department of Immigration is now also responsible for local government, there may be much more scope to develop such co-operation than hitherto. But refugees respond to economic factors to as great a degree as anyone else. Unless job opportunities are available they will not remain permanently in areas remote from the major cities. Because non-refugee immigrants are free from any obligation to the Commonwealth and have their own resources, there is virtually no possibility of their being encouraged to settle anywhere other than where they personally choose. Indeed, there is no economic or social reason why they should do so.
Non-refugee settlers have not concentrated nearly as strongly in recent years as those who arrived in the 1950s and 1960s. This is partly due to the rundown of employment in major manufacturing plant, as such employment was a central cause of residential concentration in that period. It also reflects the spread of NESB settlement. Those arriving under family reunion programs are less likely to be sponsored by relatives living in central zones of transition and much more likely to move into outer suburbs to which their relatives have moved. The major exception is for the relatively small numbers arriving under orderly departure procedures from Vietnam.

The policy options suggested below do not include a program of dispersal directed towards NESB immigrants, far less one concentrating on 'Asians'. It has been argued that 'Asians' are no more likely than anyone else to settle permanently in concentrated areas. As most Indochinese have only settled since 1975, it is too early to judge their potential for spreading through the suburbs at the same rate as previous large ethnic groups. Lebanese and Muslims are already found in quite scattered metropolitan areas and Chinese are even more widely dispersed. There is almost no discernible pattern of concentration for Indians, Sri Lankans or Filipinos. There is considerable 'residential segregation' between NESB settlers, the British and native born Anglo-Australians. The only 'problem' which this creates is that large sections of the population may have only tenuous social links with each other. However, this is equally true for segregation by class and occupation and as between metropolitan and rural dwellers. Public policy should concentrate on:

- the possibility that unfavourable social conditions might arise or persist in areas of NESB concentration;
- the effective control, with community co-operation, of criminal or illegal activity in some focal points or concentrations;
- making local institutions responsive to the nature of their clientele;
- maintaining good community relations in areas of rapid ethnic change;
- ensuring that areas are not stigmatised because of the ethnic character of their population.

In none of these policy areas does the Commonwealth have the sole responsibility, thus requiring close co-operation between all three levels of government.
Options for consideration by appropriate levels of government might include:

- Regional development programs for the outer industrial suburbs of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide which seek Commonwealth, State and local government co-operation in improving educational, social and employment openings for youth, regardless of ethnic background but with appropriately targeted language services.

- The commissioning of professional social surveys of selected local government areas with high density of NESB settlement, through additional funding for the Office of Local Government within DILGEA and its co-operation with the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

- Encouraging the Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs to assist local authorities with settlement services through the Office of Local Government.

- Emphasis on the positive aspects of ethnic concentration and focal points (such as improved social and entertainment facilities) in public awareness campaigns like that proposed under the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia.

- Further development of the co-ordinating role suggested for local government in the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services (1986) in its recommendations 12 and 27.

- Development through the Police Ministers' conferences and relevant police liaison procedures of the principle that all police permanently stationed in areas of ethnic concentration be expected to participate in appropriate training to equip them to deal with a multicultural clientele and that appropriate police-community liaison committees be established in areas of high NESB concentration.
• Extension of the Migrant Resource Centre program to locate Centres so that a NESB I clientele of about 75,000 falls within the catchment area. Such Centres to establish closer links with State and municipal governments than hitherto and not to be limited to servicing recent arrivals.

• Development through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and through the Housing Ministers’ conference of procedures to ensure that problems associated with the use of public housing for refugees, Aborigines and other ethnic minorities be addressed and that suitable bilingual and multicultural staff be appointed in a welfare role for major public housing projects where appropriate.

• Development through local government, chambers of commerce and relevant State and Commonwealth departments of the tourist and entertainment potential of ethnic focal points, on the model created for the Chinese and Greek complexes in the City of Melbourne.

• Joint Commonwealth-State endeavours, through publicity and tax inducements, for the establishment of employment opportunities in metropolitan areas of high youth unemployment, including the relocation of government offices to such areas.

• Extension of the tertiary education facilities in the western suburbs of Sydney and Melbourne as a major priority in the creation of new universities. Such institutions to be encouraged to develop relevant language, ESL and multicultural education courses.

• Subsidy and support through the National Policy on Languages (or its subsequent equivalent) for multilingual resources in public libraries, schools and cultural centres in regions of high NESB concentration.

• Creation with Commonwealth support of community relations councils in areas of perceived potential ethnic conflict, especially in those undergoing rapid ethnic change. Such councils to include representation of ALL local community, religious, voluntary and official agencies and to have the specific task of monitoring and, where necessary, intervening in situations of potential ethnic conflict on the model of the British Community Relations Councils.
• Encouragement by the Office of Multicultural Affairs of a favourable representation of areas of ethnic concentration in official municipal histories, public relations brochures, tourist guides and other material produced by local or regional authorities.

• Regular reconsideration by DILGEA of the social impact of the refugee program on particular localities. Commonwealth consultation with local authorities in receiving areas with a view to financial, informational and organisational assistance with relevant problems of service provision for new arrivals.

• Acceptance of the principle by State Grants Commissions in their allocation to local government that costs arising from NESB concentrations should be assessed on a regular basis.

• The maintenance in the inter-Censal period of profiles of the ethnic, social and occupational character of local authority areas with high NESB concentrations, by regular surveys conducted by relevant authorities and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Such surveys to include data relating to the employment and training situation of recent arrivals and especially of NESB youth.

• Increased attention by Human Rights agencies to planning and allocation decisions by local authorities which appear to discriminate against ethnic or religious groups and organisations.
The development of areas of ethnic concentration in major cities has been a natural feature of all multicultural societies, whether population increase has derived from internal or international migration. Most analysis of such areas has come from the United States and needs modification in the Australian context. Despite a century of criticism of 'ghettoes', there are almost NO significant ghettos in metropolitan Australia in the sense of areas of multiple deprivation dominated by a single ethnic minority (or by closely associated minorities). The normal Australian situation is of the ethnic mix in neighbourhoods chosen for social and economic reasons as much as for the presence of compatriots or co-religionists. These neighbourhoods have been initially either in:

* zones of transition - in city centres in older housing

OR

* utilitarian suburbs - on the periphery and recently built.

Later settlement spreads outwards from central zones towards suburbs intermediate between the two, once sufficient capital has been accumulated to purchase a family home. Middle-class NESB immigrants and their children tend to settle in different suburbs from working class immigrants, although they may favour certain suburbs rather than spreading evenly throughout the built-up area.

There is no evidence that 'Asians' are more prone to concentration than 'Europeans'. While social and religious institutions may encourage settlement at particular points, they may also move their location to cater for the new locations of their appropriate public. Thus a constant process of suburbanisation characterises immigrant settlement, rather than increasing concentration in older and more congested districts.
'Problems' are not caused by ethnic concentration but arise from particular circumstances, including:

- The creation of highly visible 'focal points' which create an impression of heavy concentration. These are dominated by a small number of ethnic groups, though many other groups have smaller and less 'visible' focal points;
- The social and educational problems of some outer working-class suburbs which no longer provide adequate employment, entertainment or social facilities for their youth;
- The persistence in zones of transition of transient and criminal lifestyles and poor housing;
- The use of public housing for refugees and Aborigines as well as for welfare purposes.

The public perception of 'ghettoes' is not a problem in the same sense as are the others. It is a perceptual problem which needs to be tackled within a community relations and public awareness framework, for example through the Office of Multicultural Affairs community relations strategy.

Other problems are socio-economic and cannot be tackled exclusively within an 'ethnic', 'settlement' or 'multicultural' strategy alone, nor by one level of government only. These problems cannot be solved by policies based on dispersal, which are both unworkable and inequitable. They can only be tackled by co-operation between the national, State and local levels of government, co-operating with appropriate agencies and with effective local consultation. Such co-operation is particularly needed to deal adequately with the settlement of refugees but might also be needed for poorer and less skilled arrivals from areas such as the South Pacific. All local agencies should be encouraged to adopt strategies which recognise the permanent character of their multicultural clientele, as NESB settlement tends towards the same areas despite changes in its sources.
METHODOLOGY

This survey is based on data derived from the 1986 Australian Census, using Local Government Areas as the basis for analysis. These LGAs were analysed in terms of residence patterns for various birthplace, language and religious categories. These raw numbers were reduced to percentages of the appropriate base. For the two metropolitan areas of Sydney and Melbourne these were further reduced to ratios related to the all-metropolitan level for the category (expressed as 100). Data was mapped for inclusion in Volume Two. Historic series were analysed for birthplace data. A complete picture of the ethnic character of major Australian cities was created.

Fieldwork was conducted in selected locations in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Wollongong. The object was particularly to analyse the ethnic character of various commercial centres. Fieldwork previously done for other projects in Geelong, Adelaide, Newcastle, Sydney and Melbourne was also utilised.

The academic literature on ethnic concentration was studied and is included in the bibliography. Particular attention was paid to the relevance or otherwise of models derived from the United States or the United Kingdom. Australian studies were exhaustively analysed. Newspaper and journal sources were checked for references to 'ghettoes' or other relevant contemporary material.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Pages 94-108 survey American literature on spatial distribution between 1925 and the 1950s, while pp. 109 - 126 offer a theoretical discussion of the consequences of spatial distribution patterns.

BONGIORNO, Aldo, GAMBALE, Salvatore, and YORK, Barry, *Canberra: Our Italian Heritage*, Italo-Australian Club, Canberra, 1988

A good example of a locally-based study of an ethnic community, under the auspices of the particular community. *Canberra: Our Italian Heritage* contains useful information on the formation of the local Italian community since the 1920s, and discussion of future problems for the maintenance of Italian identity in the national capital.


Thirty-one articles are organised under groupings such as 'Schools and Education', 'Work and Neighbourhood', 'Women, the Family, and Social Change', and 'Ethnic Action'. The two most relevant papers as far as 'ethnic ghettos' are concerned are those by M. Cooper and Judith Glavin. (See listing by author).


Brody, who was director of the University of Maryland's Psychiatric Institute, adopts an 'intra-psychic and inter-personal' approach. He concludes that 'The ghetto, or 'urban ethnic community', is the terminal point not only of those who are unaccepted in the larger host (or cosmopolitan urban) environment, but of most of the upwardly mobile or would-be mobile migrants who come from the original pool'. He discusses the concept of an 'ethnic ghetto' on pp. 18-21.

BURGESS, Ernest W., and BOGUE, Donald, (eds), *Contributions to Urban Sociology*, University of Chicago Press, USA, 1964

More than forty scholars contributed to Burgess' and Bogue's large volume. The chapters are organised into four sections: 1. Urban Ecology and Demography, 2. Urban Social Organisation and Mass Phenomenon, 3. Ethnic and Racial Groups in Urban Society, and 4. Urban Social Problems. Part three is the most relevant to ethnic groups, but chapter 13, in part two, is also useful as it discusses the function of voluntary associations in an ethnic community (pp. 203-223)

Using 1920 data, Burgess describes the pattern of residential concentration of 'Negroes', Italians, and Poles, in six major United States cities.

BURNLEY, Ian, 'A Comparative Analysis of First and Second Generation Immigrants: Residential and Occupational Mobility in Metropolitan Sydney', in Australian Geographical Studies, v. 23, no. 2, 1985, pp. 269-290

Using 1981 Census data for Metropolitan Sydney, Burnley's article was the first 'large-data set' attempt at intergenerational analysis in Australia. In offering hypotheses concerning the relationship between spatial and social distance, and between first and second generational segregation, Burnley argues that intergenerational convergence (i.e., integration), has occurred in urban Australia. A Table on page 273 provides indices of residential dissimilarity between Australian-born groups, and second-generation of common and mixed parentages.

BURNLEY, Ian, 'Cities of Immigrants: Migration, Growth, and Heterogeneity', in BURNLEY, I., and FORREST, J., (eds), Living in Cities: Urbanism and Society in Metropolitan Australia, pp. 187-198

An excellent overview based on analysis of 1981 Census data by Local Government Area, and looking at how immigration has altered urban social environments. While the emphasis is on the post-War period, there is some useful historical information too.


Essentially covers the same ground as the author's Australian Geographical Studies' article.

BURNLEY, Ian, From Southern Europe to New Zealand: Greeks and Italians in New Zealand, Australian National University and University of New South Wales Press, 1972

Burnley traces the migration to New Zealand of Greeks and Italians and demonstrates how the movement has been characterised by a transition from village and regional folk societies to an urban society. The monograph contains tables on residential movements in the Wellington-Hutt urban area, and on the range of values of improvements to residential properties of Greeks and Italians, plus occupational and residential patterns in 1966.
Burnley found that the majority of Lebanese had settled in metropolitan Sydney as a result of strong village chain migrations, and that many had formed separate religious and village clusters based on kin ties rather than any single Lebanese ethnicity. While a residential concentration was apparent, Burnley noted that there was also evidence of considerable residential mobility and dispersion within the first generation Lebanese in Sydney.

Burnley compares Southern European and Lebanese concentrations in Sydney. He finds more similarities than differences in terms of the importance of kinship, close friendship, and the utilization of ethnic shops and services in local areas, in concentration structure and social interaction. 'Community' tended to be locally defined for both groups. An interesting conclusion poses the idea that, if language regression occurs with ageing, then relatively cohesive concentrations will be a good thing for society.

Burnley is concerned here with resettlement, rather than settlement, patterns. He concludes that, while it is too early to ascertain whether the second generation (the children of immigrant parents) will maintain some degree of occupational or residential distinctiveness, it is nonetheless 'certain that the larger Southern European and Middle Eastern peoples' settlements will survive in some form over more than one generation'.

Burnley analyses the post-war urban settlement pattern of immigrant groups, and concludes that socio-economic factors (including levels of skill and income, and migration patterns) were the most important. He concludes that Australian society needs to consider the consequences of a migration system whereby less fortunate settlers are forced for economic reasons to congregate 'not in ghettos certainly but nevertheless in semi-segregated areas characterised by poorer housing, relative poverty, inadequate school facilities and teaching'.

Statistics and analysis of birthplace groups (and first and second generations) in Melbourne and Sydney, as of 1981, at a glance.


Relevant chapters 10 and 11 are by Burnley and Ware. (See entries under surnames).

BURNLEY, Ian, ENCEL, Sol, and McCALL, Grant, Immigration and Ethnicity in the 1980s, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1985

Parts 3 and 4 (pp. 113-209) contain chapters by Michael Petty, Ian Burnley, and Judith Galvin which deal with ethnic residential patterns, social issues, and problems. (See entries under each author in this Bibliography).


Chapter 6 deals with immigrant populations and multicultural Australia, specifically looking at German, Chinese, and Southern European settlements in rural Australia and refugee and Southern European settlements in metropolitan cities. The author concludes that there is no evidence to suggest that ethnic concentrations, in themselves, inhibit an individual's life chances or create conflict with the wider society.

BURNLEY, Ian, and FORREST, James, (eds), Living in Cities: Urbanism and Society in Metropolitan Australia, Allen & Unwin, in association with the Geographical Society of NSW, Sydney, 1985

Part 4 offers two chapters on migrant and Aboriginal groups in the city (by Burnley and Routh). (See under authors' names).

BURNLEY, Ian, and ROUTH, Nigel, 'Aboriginal Migration to Inner Sydney', in BURNLEY, I., and FORREST, J., (eds), Living in Cities: Urbanism and Society in Metropolitan Australia, pp. 199-211

Burnley and Routh surveyed 150 Aboriginal residents of Sydney suburbs Chippendale, Newtown, Redfern, and Leichhardt, with a view to ascertaining the causes of cityward migration of Aborigines in New South Wales and the impact of such movement on their social situation. Comparing their findings with those of F. Gale in her much earlier study of Aborigines in Adelaide, Burnley and Routh suggest that the 'institutional completeness' being developed in inner Sydney through Aboriginal voluntary organisations and services may augur well for the future in terms of living conditions. Two-thirds of the 150 respondents (only 21 of whom had been born in Sydney) felt they were better off in the city.

92 METROPOLITAN GHETTOES AND ETHNIC CONCENTRATIONS
BURNLEY, Ian, and WALKER, S., Population and Social Change in the Inner City of Sydney, School of Geography, University of New South Wales, 1977

In this 150 page booklet, Burnley and Walker analysed population change in inner Sydney between 1947 and 1976; changes in population density, socio-economic status, child-women ratios, and extent of overseas-born between 1961 and 1971; and policy implications of their analysis.

BURNLEY, Ian, PRYOR, R. J., and ROWLAND, D. T., (eds), Mobility and Community Change in Australia, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane, 1980

Pages 119-208 discuss ethnic minorities in relation to residential and community environments. (See entries under each author: BURNLEY, SINCLAIR, WHITELAW and HUMPHREYS, HUGO and MENZIES, and SMITH).


While not discussing ethnic groups as such, Castells' book is an example of the type of alternative theoretical formulation of the social and political factors forming cities to arise during the 1960s, in contradistinction to the 'urban paradigms' of the 1920s. Castells attempts to apply the Marxian analysis of social class and the notion of the reproduction of labour power via collective consumption. He also analyses the relative ability of different social classes to use power to achieve their ends. In short, he is concerned with how social classes get what they want in terms of urban resources.


A very useful compilation of statistical data by Australia's official Statistician, dealing with overseas-born Australians as of 1988. The 177 pages cover population and families, health, education, working life, income, and housing of the overseas-born population.

CENTRE FOR URBAN RESEARCH AND ACTION, The Displaced: A Study of Housing Conflict in Melbourne's Inner City, Centre for Urban Research and Action, Melbourne, 1977

A study funded by the Australian Housing Research Council in response to concerns over the difficulties encountered by low-income families in purchasing homes in the inner suburbs, the booklet contains some discussion of ethnic residential patterns. Pages 10-11 analyse changes in ethnic composition of inner city areas between 1954 and 1971; pp. 14-15 look at ethnic vendors and purchasers; and pp. 33-35 analyse the ethnic status of individual investors in South Melbourne and Fitzroy.

CHOI, C. Y., Chinese Migration and Settlement in Australia, Sydney University Press, 1975

Choi's history of the Chinese in Australia is divided into three main parts: the period 1861-1901; 1901-1947; and 1947-1966. Pages 51-54 discuss geographical and occupational distributions in the 1901-1947 period. The author finds that the Chinese followed the
broad Australian pattern with urban employment increasingly important and accounting for nearly 40 percent of all Chinese in Australia by 1911. Settlement and suburbanisation are discussed on pp. 67-77.


In Cooper's study, five main problem areas emerged for migrants in urban Australia: communication, perception of societal position, discrimination, urban poverty, and disagreements within and between ethnic groups.


Cressey describes the patterns of succession through the city of the various groups comprising Chicago's population during the 1930s, namely: Poles, Italians, Germans, Irish, Czechs, and 'Negroes').

DE LEUW CATHER of AUSTRALIA and LLEWELYN-DAVIS KINHILL Pty Ltd, Western Sydney Study, Summary of Data Sources, Sydney, 1976

The 1976 Report on the western suburbs of Sydney recommended that a regional approach be adopted to the problems and needs of the rapidly growing, lower socio-economic, area. The report proposed a regional development model based on citizen participation and representative processes; information and analysis, planning and management, and 'influencing public sector control tools'. The report paid little attention to persons of Non-English-Speaking Backgrounds.

DUNCAN, Otis D., and LIEBERSON, Stanley, 'Ethnic Segregation and Assimilation', in American Journal of Sociology, v. 64, no. 4, January 1959, pp. 364-374

Duncan and Lieberson examined the changing residential patterns of ethnic and immigrant groups in Chicago between 1930 and 1950, and found a positive relationship between assimilation and length of residence. However, such changes did not disrupt a pattern of differential segregation and spatial separation of 'ethnic colonies'.

FITZPATRICK, J. P., 'The Importance of "Community" in the Process of Immigrant Assimilation', in International Migration Review, v. 1, no. 1, October 1966, pp. 5-16

A useful discussion of the concepts 'assimilation' and 'community', in which the author argues that the immigrant community is the beachhead into the new society as it provides security, peace, and psycho-social satisfaction in the period of adjustment.
Galvin questions the usefulness of national and birthplace categories in Census data as meaningful social entities, and questions the reliability of the social indices used to measure integration/assimilation.

Using the intercensal period 1961-71, Galvin analyses differences between the settlement pattern of three Southern European groups - Greek, Italian, and Yugoslav - in Newcastle. The author concludes that ethnic concentrations tend to facilitate integration by increasing accessibility to channels of information.

A detailed study of the concentration and dispersion of an Italian village community in Newcastle. Galvin argues that, in contrast to the traditional notions of immigrant settlement and suburbanisation, community consolidation has accompanied the residential integration of the Lettesi community in Australia's sixth city.

Gans' study of West End, an inner Boston neighbourhood, concentrated on Italian-Americans. His book challenged the 'middle class' approach of American town planners, sociologists, etc., of the 1950s who blamed slum-life for the social problems of the inhabitants of such neighbourhoods. Gans took up residence in the West End for nearly a year while completing his research. He concluded that the 'planners' had got it all wrong, and that the alleged 'slum' was in fact a 'way of life (which) constituted a distinct and independent working class subculture that bore little resemblance to the middle class'. Chapter 2 locates the Italian-born and the Italian-Americans of the West End area in terms of their socio-economic and ethnic characteristics, as well as spatial distribution.

The authors attempt to trace the role of ethnicity in the life of New York City. The notion that ethnic and religious diversity would blend into homogeneity, they say, had outlived its usefulness and had not materialized. On the contrary, the ethnic groups in
New York City were maintaining a distinct identity, albeit a changing one, from one generation to the next. Residential issues are discussed on pp. 53-66 ('Negroes') in pp. 122-128 (Puerto Ricans), pp. 159-165 (Jews), and pp. 186-193 (Italians).


The authors studied a sample of 1,500 Jewish families in the metropolitan area of Providence, Rhode Island. The authors received the support of the local Jewish community in compiling their 'census' of the community. The study incorporates three generations of American Jews. Residential patterns are discussed in chapter 3, pp. 36-61.

GOLDSTEIN, Sidney, and MAYER, Kurt, 'The Impact of Migration on the Socio-Economic Structure of Cities and Suburbs', in Sociology and Social Research, v. 50, no. 1, October 1965, pp. 5-23

Using special United States 1960 Census tract tabulations which indicate the migration status of the US population (cross-tabulated by education, occupation, and income), Goldstein and Mayer found that migrants into both the central cities and the suburbs resembled each other more closely than did the non-migrants in the respective areas, but that migration still contributed to increasing socio-economic differentiation of cities from their suburbs. The article is concerned with migration within America, which of course includes overseas-born migrants.


Pages 132-136 provide an early nineteenth century perspective on 'ethnic communality' in America, with particular reference to the Irish and Germans.


At a time when the White Australia Policy was a basis of immigration policy, Hammond sought to investigate attitudes to particular race-nation groups. Hammond concluded that the main subjective component to people's concern about 'White Australia' was the issue of varying 'ways of life' rather than race prejudice and economic motives.

HANDLIN, Oscar, The Uprooted, Little, Brown, and Co., Boston, 1951

Subtitled The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that made the American People, Handlin discusses 'The Ghettoes' on pp. 144-169. 'If immigrants were to achieve the adjustment to their new environment', argues Handlin, 'it had to be within the confines of the ghettos the environment created'.

Hazelhurst's book is valuable for its drawing together of the existing literature and statistics. Data covering the past 30 years compares the court appearances and imprisonment rates of migrants with those for persons born in Australia. Among Hazelhurst's findings is the indication that 'persons from the general migrant population commit fewer offences and are less likely to be in prison than persons from the Australian-born population'.


Heppel and Wigley's study includes an assessment of the initial stage of the Alice Springs Aboriginal town camp development programs funded by the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs up to the formation in the late 1970s of an Aboriginal town campers' association, the Tangatjira Council.


Hiller mainly discusses police efforts to develop crime prevention programs for elderly persons, but includes a section on ethnic liaison.

HUBER, Rina, *From Pasta to Pavlova: A Comparative Study of Italian Settlers in Sydney and Griffith*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1977

A study of the Italians from the Province of Treviso who settled in Griffith and in Sydney, emphasizing the socio-economic factors at work in the patterns of settlement but also stressing the importance of the maintenance, in whatever form, of traditional customs and institutions.

HUGO, Graeme, and MENZIES, B. J., 'Greek Immigrants in the South Australian Upper Murray', in BURNLEY, I., PRYOR, R., and ROWLAND, D., (eds), *Mobility and Community Change in Australia*, University of Queensland Press, 1980, pp. 170-192

Using the hub of Greek settlement in the Upper Murray region (the Renmark Irrigation Area) as a field study, the authors develop an argument concerning the largely overlooked tendency among Southern European migrants to go against the general trend in Australia of movement away from rural areas into the urban centres. The net urban to rural flow of Greeks', they maintain, 'contrasts sharply with migration trends among the British Australian population'. While still constituting only a small proportion of the total rural population, first and second generation immigrants have tended to settle in a relatively narrow range of rural districts so that their impact is magnified through being concentrated in particular rural communities. The authors conclude that the underlying causes of ethnic segregation - the chain migration process, the constraints on interaction imposed by language difficulties, and the influence of distinctive religious,
cultural, and national heritages - have similar results regardless of whether settlement has occurred in rural or urban areas.


Humphrey focuses on the role of religion in organising a Lebanese Muslim community in Sydney, and demonstrates how a conflict over mosque leadership drew a culturally and politically isolated community into mainstream political and legal processes. More broadly, the author attempts to consider the role of immigrant culture and organisation in defining spheres of social and political autonomy outside the workplace, and the way the state seeks to intervene in local community politics to limit that autonomy.

IMMIGRATION, Department of, Survey of Views of Local Government Authorities Relating to Immigrant Settlement and Integration, Survey Section, Department of Immigration, Canberra, 1974

Between 1973 and 1974, the Department of Immigration sent questionnaires to all local government authorities in Australia to obtain their views on settlement and integration of immigrants in their local government areas. The most common problem to be nominated was that of language and communication, plus immigrants' poor knowledge of Australian laws and procedures. On the role of local government in immigration, the report arising from the survey maintained that the utilisation and development of local government authorities' structures and resources were of 'crucial importance'.

IMMIGRATION and ETHNIC AFFAIRS, Department of, Migrant Attitudes Survey, 2 vols., AGPS, Canberra, 1986

Based on a survey of Australian-born and overseas-born residents of Adelaide and Sydney, the survey aimed to find out the extent of neighbourly activity was taking place between Australian-born and migrant family neighbours, and to ascertain the attitudes such neighbours held toward each other generally. Vol. 1, 'Summary of Findings', offers a view of the effect of 'neighbourhood' on levels of prejudice and tolerance. Vol. 2 provides 'Overall Findings'. Basically, the survey paints an optimistic picture for the future, with 'clear signs at the neighbourhood level that much importance (is) given to expected patterns of behaviour amongst neighbours, regardless of status or background' and that 'Asian migrants (are) acquiring the status of good neighbours'.

IMMIGRATION, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, and ETHNIC AFFAIRS, Department of, Australia's Population Trends and Prospects, 1988, DILGEA, AGPS, Canberra, 1988

The booklet emphasises Australia's capital cities. Population growth is discussed on pp 25-45, with immigration being discussed in terms of skill levels, sex ratios, age structures, settler sources, and settlement patterns. Pages 63-85 look at the overseas-born population, as well as the second generation. A final section, 'Population Prospects' (pp 98-106), is concerned with projections to the year 2001.
INGLIS, Amirah, Amirah: An Un-Australian Childhood, Heinemann Australia, Richmond, 1989

'Amirah' is the autobiography of Amirah Gutstadt to 1945. Born in 1926 to Polish Jewish parents in Belgium, Amirah came to Australia with her mother, to join her father at Melbourne, in 1929. While the book focuses on Amirah's family life, education during the War, and political involvement in the communist movement, a binding theme of the text is her Jewish identity. As such, the autobiography is a valuable study of Jewish ethnicity in Australia during the 1930s and '40s.

JOHNSTON, R. J., Urban Residential Patterns: An Introductory Review, Bell and Sons, London, 1971

Johnston draws mainly on urban studies in the USA but also on works from Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The aim of the book is to offer a geographical approach to the patterns and processes of migration and neighbourhood; in a word, the residential pattern of a city. Chapter 6 (pp. 242-292) deals with residential patterns of ethnic minority groups. The author concludes that there are three main influences on the settlement patterns of minority groups within urban areas: (a) the discriminatory attitude of the majority population toward the group; (b) the community ties within the minority group, and (c) the socio-economic status of the group members.

JOHNSTON, R. J., 'Zonal and Sectoral Patterns in Melbourne's Residential Structure', in Land Economics, (University of Wisconsin), v. 45, no. 4, November 1969, pp. 463-466

Johnston analyses the basic zonal and sectoral patterns in the Melbourne metropolitan area in 1961, with emphasis on the interaction between socio-economic status, family status, and the distribution of 'minority groups'.

JONES, F. L., Dimensions of Urban Social Structure: The Social Areas of Melbourne, Australia, ANU, Canberra, 1969

Jones' analysis of the structure of Melbourne was based on the 1961 Census. Chapter 5 (pp. 66-86) discusses the ethnic and religious composition of Melbourne, and contains nine charts, mainly dealing with the period 1947-1961. A map, highlighting the residential distribution of ethnic groups, appears on p. 80.


Jones used 1954 and 1961 Census data for Melbourne to examine differences in the degree of residential concentration among the eight largest overseas-born groups and to assess how far, if at all, these differences reflected systematic differences in group assimilation. Writing in 1967, Jones suggested that 'over time, these ethnic groups will become more dispersed in Melbourne's residential, occupational, and social structure'.

Pages 433-440 deal with residential segregation. The remainder of the text is concerned with occupational segregation by gender.


Jupp argues that there is an identifiable area of Melbourne, in its north-west, which is sufficiently 'non-Anglo' in composition to be described as 'Ethnic Melbourne' and that, despite the area's ethnic transformation since 1950, the politics of the area has not deviated from its traditional ALP loyalty. Further, Jupp contends that the occupational structure of the ethnic population reinforces neighbourhood influences loyal to the ALP, and that there exists a 'reinforcing relationship' between residence and occupation in the case of Mediterranean peoples (Italians, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Cypriots, Maltese, and Turks). Table 3 (pp. 11-12) outlines the ethnic proportions in the Melbourne municipalities.

JUPP, James, 'The Politics of 'ethnic' areas of Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide', in HALLIGAN, John, and PARIS, Chris, (eds), Australian Urban Politics, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1984, pp. 110-128

Jupp discusses the manner in which the changing ethnic character of the inner suburbs of Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide, and the extension of immigrant settlement to the outer suburbs, has affected the closed networks that traditionally prevailed in local politics. The Australian Labor Party, he concludes, has taken the lead in recognizing that ethnic representation is, at least, not harmful and, at best, an asset to electoral objectives.


While not touching directly on ethnic groups, Kilmartin and Thorns' book is useful as a comparative study of Australian and New Zealand cities from an urban sociological point of view.


Kirkland argues that the pattern of Armenian settlement in Sydney was mainly influenced by the residential locations of earlier settlers when the main influx of Armenians occurred in 1963-64. Also important were the location of early Armenian institutions, especially Churches, and the location of government migrant hostels. Armenian settlement and spatial redistribution patterns in metropolitan Sydney have, Kirkland says, been determined by socio-economic differentiation, ethnic consciousness, and the structure of the Sydney housing market.
Includes a useful survey of existing literature on the social geography of Australia and New Zealand since the 1960s. Pages 192-197 deal with the impact of post-War immigration.


Lieberson analyses and compares ten United States cities. Appendix 'F' details selected characteristics of ten ethnic groups in each city between 1910 and 1950, and covers thirteen pages from 206-218. Lieberson's study concludes that there are 'orderly and consistent patterns' in the assimilation of immigrant groups and their children and that the process of assimilation is bound up with the process of residential segregation in American cities. 'Residential segregation' is analysed in chapters 3 to 5, pp. 44-158.


Lieberson examines the residential segregation of specific immigrant groups in ten American cities with a view to ascertaining the impact of segregation on other aspects of ethnic assimilation, such as ability to speak English, citizenship, intermarriage, and occupational composition. Lieberson concluded that 'residential dispersion is a basic prerequisite for ethnic assimilation'.

LIEBERSON, Stanley, 'The Old-New Distinction and Immigrants in Australia', in *American Sociological Review*, v. 28, no. 4, August 1963, pp. 550-564

Lieberson's article tests a popular American sociological hypothesis of the 1950s and 1960s - the Old/New theory - to Australian immigration. The theory maintains that old immigrant groups will have more favorable rates of adaptation and assimilation (judged by 14 main indicators) than newer groups. Lieberson drew on the 1954 Australian census and compiled some interesting charts, including a Table describing spatial distribution in rural and metropolitan areas (p. 559). Overall, he found that notwithstanding some differences between north-west Europeans and Southern and central European migrants) the Old/New theory did not stand up well in an Australian context.


Leisegang, who was Community Services Officer with the Prahran Council, Melbourne, offers an overview of the community-based needs of people from non-English-speaking backgrounds.

Using 1976 Census data, McKay's analysis of birthplace and language groups in Melbourne is expressed in diagrammatic form via 62 maps. Each national and language group is assigned a separate map, with residential concentrations expressed on the basis of one 'dot' per fifty persons. Other maps deal with intra-urban mobility. There are also Tables on levels of concentration in Local Government Areas for 1966, 1971, and 1976, and levels of intra-urban mobility for 1971-1976.

MARTIN, Jean, Community and Identity: Refugee Groups in Adelaide, ANU Press, Canberra, 1972

In this study of Adelaide, Professor Martin analysed the organisational structures of fourteen East European ethnic groups who came to Australia as refugees after the Second World War. Professor Martin demonstrated how some had developed highly cohesive and diverse organisations, while others had become fragmented and split by internal conflicts. She concluded that group organisation was not 'finally a defensive reaction' but stemmed from 'the positive value attached to the opportunities for self-expression, gaining recognition and exercising influence'.

MEDDING, Peter, From Assimilation to Survival: A Political and Sociological Study of an Australian Jewish Community, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1968

Medding's study of Australia's biggest Jewish community - that found in Melbourne - takes organisations and individuals as its starting-point. An interesting feature of the book is its emphasis on the problem of how Jews maintain an identity in a modern democratic society.

MEDDING, Peter, (ed), Jews in Australian Society, MacMillan, Melbourne, 1973

Chapters 2 and 3, 'Melbourne Jewry: A Profile', by Walter Lippmann (pp. 14-29) and 'A Study of Poverty Among Jews in Melbourne' by Lionel Sharpe (pp. 30-40) are the most relevant to ethnic residential patterns.

METGE, Joan, A New Maori Migration: Rural and Urban Relations in Northern New Zealand, Melbourne University Press, 1964

Chapter 1 provides a useful overview of 'Maori Urbanisation: The Problem and its Background' (pp. 1-22). In 1936, 13 percent of the total Maori population was in the urban centres. In 1951, the figure was 23 percent. The author found that length of residence in the city, however, did not correlate consistently with a weakening of the bonds of kinship and Maori culture.

An excellent and original analysis of sources of population growth in the six capital cities between 1901 and 1961.

MULTICULTURAL and ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION of Western Australia, and OFFICE of MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS, Canberra: 'Diversity is Great, Mate!: A Study of Community Relations in an Inner-City Area of Perth, Western Australia, MEAC and OMA, Canberra, 1989

The study of the inner city area of Perth, with its high overseas-born and Asian population, and low socio-economic status, was commissioned in order to ascertain the extent of inter-group tension and community conflict. After six months intensive investigation, the researchers did not find any serious inter-ethnic conflict; though they encountered a number of cases of individual prejudice and discrimination on a personal level.

NEUTZE, Max, Australian Urban Policy, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1978

Neutze analysed the key aspects of urban policy, such as the role of government, welfare and population distribution, housing, transport policy, urban services, planning, land policy, and government policy.

NEUTZE, Max, Urban Development in Australia: A Descriptive Analysis, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1977

Neutze discusses the effects of overseas immigration on urban centres in Chapter 3, especially pp. 51-55. A highlight is his Table (pp. 52-53) accounting for the components of population change in 59 Australian cities between 1947 and 1971.

PARKIN, Andrew, Governing the Cities: The Australian Experience in Perspective, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1982

Parkin notes the ethnic transformation of Melbourne and Sydney inner suburbs in Chapter 2, especially pp. 26-28. He suggests that 'ethnic neighbourhoods' result partly from the antagonism of the surrounding population, and partly as a supportive and preservative measure for the particular group.

PATTERSON, Sheila, Dark Strangers, Tavistock Publications, London, 1963


Petty surveyed the south-west Sydney suburb of Canterbury as the Local Government Area with the largest Lebanese concentration in 1971, with a view to accounting for the high rate of unemployment among Lebanese youth at that time. His conclusions stressed the importance of improved services, especially the teaching of English, because he found that those Lebanese youths with good English were no more disadvantaged in employment than Australian youth with the same education.


Focussing on the period 1951-81, Rabbi Porush’s narrative includes the influence of Jewish education, women, the Israeli Embassy, and the Jewish National Community Centre and synagogue in the formation and development of a Jewish community in Canberra.


An illustrated analysis of the Sydney population, based largely on the 1971 Census. Pages 96-110 analyse birthplaces, while pp. 112-120 deal with religion. Changes in population for Greeks, Cypriots, and Italians are described on pp. 152-155.


Part 1, pp. 7-22, provides an overview of the patterns of historical development of local government, while Part 6 discusses policy problems and options.

PRICE, Charles, German Settlers in South Australia, Melbourne University Press, 1945

Price’s 1945 study of Germans in South Australia was concerned with the extent to which the national self-consciousness of the German settlers had hindered their assimilation into South Australian society. In 1939, there were 26,000 people of German origin in South Australia. Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 discuss German organisations and the Lutheran Church in South Australia.

PRICE, Charles, Southern Europeans in Australia, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1963

Price discusses the geographical, social, and political backgrounds to the various Southern European groups (Portuguese, Spanish, French, Italian, Yugoslav, Bulgarian, Albanian, Greek, Maltese, and Cypriots) and analyses the features of their migration
to, and settlement in, Australia. Chapter 6 (pp. 200-274) discusses ethnic groups and assimilation.


Chapter 3 (pp. 70-97) is particularly relevant to the 'ghetto' question as it analyses a particular multi-racial (West Indian, Asian, British) area in Birmingham, England, known as Handsworth. The authors regard Handsworth's problems as a dramatic representation of the conflict in the wider society which, they say, is creating an 'immigrant underclass'.


Three chapters - 'Growth and Change in the Population of the Urban Illawarra' (by M. Wilson, pp. 238-253), 'Social Differentiation of Urban Space' (by Ross Robinson, pp. 254-266), and 'Ethnic Residence: Aspects of Spatial Adjustment and Residential Choice of Greeks in Urban Illawarra' (by Robinson and Akrivula Kambesis, pp. 267-282) - discuss ethnic settlement within the region.


While not concerned directly with ethnic groups, Saha's article is valuable for its methodology. The author documents the primary support structure of new Australian suburbs, with emphasis on the geographical proximity to kin in varying crisis situations.


Part 5 deals with the changing racial composition of metropolitan areas in America. Pages 281-293 deal specifically with the decade 1950-1960, and identify 'Negro suburbs' in all parts of the United States as a result of the move away from the southern cities by non-white Americans.


Schnore and Evenson analysed residential segregation based on race in southern cities of the United States and found a negative association between age of city and levels of segregation; i.e., the older the city, the less residential segregation by colour.
SCOTT, Peter, (ed), Australian Cities and Public Policy, Georgian House, Melbourne, 1978

In this edited collection, the impact of immigration on urban centres is discussed by W.D. Borrie (pp. 12-15) and Peter Scott (pp. 52-57).


Shevky and Bell's book focuses on the San Francisco Bay area of the United States, and includes discussion of a theoretical nature concerning 'construct formation', 'conceptual procedures', and methodology.

SINCLAIR, D. A., 'The Resettlement of Greek Immigrants in Sydney: A Kinship Study', in BURNLEY, PRYOR, and ROWLANDS, (eds), Mobility and Community Change in Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1980

Sinclair maintains that kinship networks play an important and continuing role in providing financial and emotional support in times of crisis, as well as helping the individual maintain a sense of identity in a new society.

SMITH, L. R., 'New Black Town or Black New Town: The Urbanization of Aborigines', in BURNLEY, PRYOR< and ROWLANDS, (eds), Mobility and Community Change in Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1980, pp. 193-208

The author provides a convenient overview of the urbanization of Aborigines since European settlement, with particular reference to the evolution of, and changes in, official policy.


Subtitled Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City, the book is a study of the Addams area on the Near West Side of Chicago, where the author lived for three years while conducting his research. Suttles demonstrates how the moral order existing in the Addams slum area was rooted in a set of very personalistic relations that the residents had with members of their own groups. 'Ethnic Solidarity' is the theme for Chapters 6-8 (pp. 99-156) which mainly deal with 'Negroes', Mexicans, Italians, and Puerto Ricans.


Pages 26-30 offer an analysis of Greek Orthodox community, and Greek settlement, patterns by suburb. Maps indicate suburbs where Greek-born immigrants outnumbered those from other non-British ethnic groups in 1981.
THOMSON, K. W., and TRLIN, A. D., (eds), Immigrants in New Zealand, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 1970

The book involved seven different authors, and aimed to highlight the significance of non-British migration to New Zealand through a detailed analysis of particular ethnic and racial minorities (i.e., Asians, Yugoslavs, Greeks, Poles, Dutch, and Cook Islanders). Issues of segregation, dispersion, chain migration, and assimilation are discussed, and some indices of residential and occupational concentration are supplied on pp. 207-208

TROY, P. N., (ed), Urban Redevelopment in Australia, Urban Research Unit, ANU, Canberra, 1967

A collection of 20 papers presented at the Joint Urban Seminar, at the Australian National University, in October-December 1966. None deal directly with ethnic residential patterns but are useful studies of the growth and decay of urban centres in an Australian context.


Ware argued that ethnic residential segregation (along with low levels of out-marriage) were a major factor reinforcing the division between Southern European immigrants and the remainder of Australian society in terms of status, attitudes, and behaviour.


Whitelaw and Humphrey are concerned with the role of the location of migrant hostels in determining the eventual place of settlement. Not surprisingly, their study found that the location of hostels is influential and that the longer the migrant remained in a hostel the greater becomes the knowledge of the choices available. The authors examine two 'ethnic groups', broadly categorized as 'British' and 'Southern European'. Ethnicity is important in the relocation process, they argue, because of the 'spatially concentrated social patterns attached to a minority group'. Thus, Southern Europeans are more likely to leave the hostel quickly and to follow the movement patterns of their countrymen already established here.

WIRTH, Louis, The Ghetto, University of Chicago Press, USA, 1956

Wirth's book is both sociological and historical, and focuses on the Jewish 'ghetto' experience since medieval European times. He attempts to portray key features of the 'Jewish mind and personality' in the United States, and to demonstrate how such qualities have been influenced by the social isolation of the ghetto. Wirth's study first appeared in 1928.
An examination of the factors influencing the formation of a Maltese community in the Canberra/Queanbeyan region from the mid-1920s to the 1950s.


Zubrzycki's paper, presented to the 1959 International Population Conference, argued that the characteristic feature of the settlement of immigrants in Australia was the extent to which they were concentrated in capital cities. He analysed this tendency with the aid of two measures - the Index of Metropolitan Concentration and the Index of Metropolitan Segregation - and found that 'clustering' was most pronounced in Southern Europeans and least pronounced in persons of 'British birth'.

ZUBRZYCKI, Jerzy, Immigrants in Australia: A Demographic Survey based upon the 1954 Census, Melbourne University Press, 1960

Zubrzycki's analysis of the 1954 Australian Census aimed to reveal the characteristic distributions of Australia's ethnic groups. It is a purely quantitative analysis, examining the effect of immigration on age and sex structure; the ethnic and religious composition of immigrants, and their geographical, industrial, and occupational distribution. Pages 68-85 discuss residential and settlement patterns.

ZUBRZYCKI, Jerzy, Settlers of the La Trobe Valley, Australian National University, Canberra, 1964

Zubrzycki's sociological study of immigrants in the brown coal region of Victoria's La Trobe valley discusses the pattern of social and cultural participation of ethnic groups (Chapters 8-9). Demographic characteristics and duration of residence are discussed on pp. 67-69.

Theses

CHIU, R., CHINESE-VIETNAMESE REFUGEE SETTLERS IN SYDNEY, BA Hons., Geography, University of New South Wales, 1980

GIBSON, J., THE RESIDENTIAL PATTERN AND MOBILITY OF DUTCH AND GREEK MIGRANTS IN THE ADELAIDE METROPOLITAN AREA, BA Hons., Geography, University of Adelaide, 1965

GRIMES, J., THE SPATIAL ASPECTS OF IRISH IMMIGRANT FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS IN SYDNEY, Ph.D., Geography, University of New South Wales, 1980

JONES, F. L., THE ITALIAN IMMIGRANT POPULATION OF CARLTON, Ph.D., Australian National University, 1962
KIRKLAND, R., ARMENIAN MIGRATION, SETTLEMENT AND ADJUSTMENT IN AUSTRALIA, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE ARMENIANS IN SYDNEY, Ph.D., Australian National University, 1980


YOO, Byung Hee, MALTESE SETTLEMENT IN METROPOLITAN SYDNEY, MA Hons., Geography, University of New South Wales, 1978
Measures used throughout this analysis are based on the 1986 Census.

Proportions for birthplace, religion, housing tenure and housing location are based on TOTAL population within the area being analysed.

Proportions for language use are based on population who have passed their fifth birthday.

Proportions for employment and occupation are based on those in the labour force who have passed their fifteenth birthday.

Units used are incorporated Local Government Authorities, except for Brisbane where they are Census Local Government Areas. Comparisons for Sydney and Melbourne are made with the relevant Statistical Division, which includes the entire metropolitan area and some of its periphery. Boundaries are as in 1986.

References to country of birth, language used or religion followed are those used in the Census.

Proportions for qualifications are for those who have passed their fifteenth birthday.

The definition of Aboriginality is that used in the 1986 Census, which relies on self-identification and acceptance by other Aborigines. As used here it includes Torres Strait Islanders.

The determination of ethnic background in the section on commercial centres is based on assessment by the researchers in the field, supplemented where practical by personal enquiry.
1. Metropolitan Ghettoes and Ethnic Concentrations
James Jupp, Andrea McRobbie and Barry York

2. The Global Milkbar and the Local Sweatshop:
Ethnic Small Business and the Economic Restructuring of Sydney
Stephen Castles, Jock Collins, Katherine Gibson, David Tait and
Caroline Alcorso

3. Ancestry Groups in Australia: A Descriptive Overview
Frank L. Jones

4. Non-English Speaking Background Immigrant Women in the Workforce
Caroline Alcorso

5. Government Service Delivery to People of Non-English Speaking Background in Remote and Rural Areas
Allbrook Catalini Research

6. The Pathfinders: Women of Non-English Speaking Background in White Collar Occupations in the Public Sector
Kate Barnett

7. Ethnic Business in South Australia: A Sociological Profile of the Italian Business Community
Rosario Lampugnani and Robert Holton

8. Different Agenda: Economic and Social Aspect of the Ethnic Press in Australia
Phillip Bell, Sandra Heilpern, M. McKenzie and J. Vipond

9. Immigrant Access to Small Business Support Services
Ken W. Strahan and Karen E. Luscombe

10. Immigrants and Occupational Welfare: Industry Restructuring and Its Effects on the Occupational Welfare of Immigrants from Non-English Speaking Communities
Adam Jamrozik, Cathy Boland and Donald Stewart

11. Cultural Differences and Conflict in the Australian Community
Linda Fisher and Jeremy Long

12. Sadness is Losing Our Country, Happiness is Knowing Peace: Vietnamese Social Mobility in Australia, 1975-1990
Tran My Van and Robert Holton

13. Focused Study of Non-English Speaking Background Immigrants in Remote and Rural Areas of Australia
Nicholas Conner and Sandra Heilpern

14. Immigrant Women Entrepreneurs in Australia
C.L. Kermond, K.F. Luscombe, K.W. Strahan, A.J. Williams

15. Australian Aborigines and Cultural Tourism:
Case Studies of Aboriginal Involvement in the Tourist Industry
Julie Finlayson

16. Ethnic Minorities and Equity Strategies in Tertiary Education
Helen Meekosha, Andrew Jakubowicz and Esther Rice

17. Public Disorder in Australia 1985-1989
Robert Holton

18. The Parent-School Partnership: Issues of Parent Participation in Culturally Diverse Schools
Mary Kalantzis, Robyn Gurney and Bill Cope

19. The Challenge of Multiculturalism: Global Changes and Australian Experiences
Stephen Castles

20. Policy into Practice: Essays on Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity in Australian Society
Edited by Bill Cope

21. The Labour Market Experience of Vietnamese, Maltese and Lebanese Immigrants: An Analysis of the OMA Supplementary Survey of Selected Birthplace Groups
Thorsten Stromback, Bruce Chapman, Peter Dawkins and Shane Bushe-Jones

22. Immigrant Social Mobility: The Determinants of Economic Success Among Lebanese, Maltese, and Vietnamese in Australia
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