

THE STRUCTURING OF THE MEDITERRANEAN SPACE WITHIN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM IN AUSTRALIA

YIANNIS DIMITREAS

Abstract – *This paper considers the fortunes of Southern European, Mediterranean migrants in Australia throughout this century, from the 'White Australia' regime to the gains made thanks to the Ethnic Rights Movement in the sixties, and to the present economically-inspired focus on catering for migrants from the Asia and South Pacific Rim. It is argued that the neo-corporatist concerns of the Australian government, when global capital dictates privileged relations with supra-national entities beyond the traditional nation-state configuration, have led to reduced budgets for educational programmes that had been set up from the mid-60s onwards to cater for the language and cultural rights of ethnic groups of Mediterranean origin.*

Introduction

This paper examines how Southern European migrants attempted to contribute to the making of an education system which would cater for their real or imagined cultural ecology and educational curriculum in the context of the modern Australian social space. It argues that the model of multiculturalism adopted by Australia since the mid 1970s and the impact on education of subsequent economic rationale based on increasing privatisation and corporatisation of government property and services, and the general kinds of marketing which characterises modern societies is not exceptional in Australia. This economic rationale, which increasingly leads to the economic integration with the countries of Asia and South Pacific, and the continuing transnational migrations from these countries, are challenges to government and scholarly thinking because they raise serious questions concerning the role and ability of the people of the modern Australian nation state in defining their own national identity and their relations with 'otherness', while the polity finds it increasingly difficult to implement social, educational and citizenship policies of current regional as well as global geopolitical context.

This new economic order has forced Australia to shift from its initial pro-British education based on the European enlightenment model, because the emerging social, and economic reality, needs to be reflected on the state's educational curriculum to enable regional economic integration to occur more

successfully. In light of these challenges, the cultural and language education interests of non-British Europeans and more so of Southern Europeans, are being increasingly marginalised because the marketing mechanisms of the new economic rationale have created new zones of exclusion of 'otherness', forcing many outside the contours of policy making to face the new social and economic reality with scepticism or fear, while trying to accommodate themselves to the developments of Australia's European education. This anxiety has presently been intensified for those who remember the days of monoculturalism under the coalition government which is presently in power once again after thirteen years in opposition.

Historical background

Although from the beginning of the European settlement of Australia over two hundred years ago the population was multicultural because the nation's settlers came from various parts of Europe, with the increasing migration from the British isles, this country became better recognised as an outpost of the British Empire in the Southern Hemisphere (Borrie, 1954), namely, a monocultural society. This recognition became apparent in terms of the size of British settlement, the ethnic blending that followed through intermarriage between English, Scots, Welsh and Irish, the establishment of a dominant cultural ecology as well as control and exercise of power since the previous century. This picture remained intact until 1947 by which time Australia had managed to operate as a 'melting pot' of cultures, by having largely homogenised its population, with approximately 90 per cent of its population identifying with some kind of British-Australian ancestry (Borrie, 1954; Price, 1963). As a result, Australian cultural hegemony remained strong until about the mid-1960s when the nation's industrial expansion, the European migrations under way *en masse* upset the demographic and cultural balance amongst national groups and generated obvious related differences in the home front.

Until the early 1970s all non-British migrants were expected to enculturate and assimilate in Australia, socially and linguistically. The onus of migrant accommodation and integration within the mainstream Australian society was left on the newcomers themselves with minimal if any government assistance, and with no one to blame if assimilation failed other than the migrants themselves. The notion of assimilation rested on the White Australia policy implemented by the Commonwealth Government in 1901. The same policy empowered the States to apply the so called Dictation Test if they wanted to expel any undesirable or unwanted migrant from the country. This test included the dictation of 50 words

in any language the Commonwealth Immigration authorities regarded as appropriate at the time – albeit, no migrant was by law allowed to speak or teach their language and culture to other people, including their own offspring (Price 1963; Dimitreas, 1995).

Because Australia had a rather small population inhabiting a whole continent with a fairly long coast line which was difficult to guard or defend in case of invasion from Asia, this feeling of insecurity had created fears of foreigners, a xenophobic spirit with lasting effects upon the settlement of immigrants and their space location in Australia whether in literal geographic or educational context. One of the best examples that highlights the Australian xenophobia towards non-British immigrants is better illustrated not by a Southern European example, but by the fate of the German schools during WWI. The German schools, otherwise known as the Lutheran schools, were closed down as a result of the War Precautions Act when Britain declared a war against Germany. Furthermore, during this time, ‘Germans were denied the right to vote in the referenda and the right to claim actions of libel and slander’ (Harmstorf and Cigler 1985: 122, 127). The xenophobic spirit against non-British however lingered high and British-Australians often did not differentiate against friends and enemies or anyone who did not speak English in public. An example of this has been provided to me in an interview with Stathis Raftopoulos. Raftopoulos, a veteran Greek-Australian businessman and a poet who together with many other Hellenes was serving the Australian armed forces during WWII, on reflection of his experience, recalls an episode with British-Australians connected with the use of the Hellenic language in Melbourne:

‘I remember an instance outside Yiannopoulos’ bookshop in Lonsdale Street in the city of Melbourne. We were a group of Hellene-Australian soldiers and had formed a circle and were speaking in Hellenic. We all were of Hellenic origin serving in the Australian Army. As we were speaking in Hellenic and also making certain physical communication gestures, another group of British-Australian soldiers was passing by, dressed in khaki similar to ours with the same crown on the uniform ... but because we spoke in Hellenic, they attacked us and we were caught by the arms, although we were all the same kind’ of soldier, and all of us were struggling for the same cause, the same purpose (Raftopoulos, *Interview* 10 October, 1988).

Often too, documented in popular media were outlines whose content was highly misleading and provocative. Such media accounts exert even greater concern about foreign languages, whether spoken or written, with the exception of Latin and Ancient Greek. Argus, a Melbourne English language newspaper in

expressing the views of a local body, namely of the 'Australian natives Association' in 1950 wrote:

'Our Association believes that the publication of foreign newspapers is one of the most potent factors increasing and maintaining minority groups. We feel, too, that the teaching in primary schools of any other languages than English, classical Latin and Greek should be absolutely prohibited' (28 January, 1950).

In fact, until 1958, migrant groups faced all kinds of racism and discrimination against their own schools or if they spoke their language in public. Existing non-British schools operated as underground schools or at best were justified by the authorities as Sunday schools which were supposed to be teaching religious catechism (Tamis, 1988).

The social scenery of the Australian landscape changed suddenly in a period of just over twenty years as a result of the post-war mass migration. Hundreds of thousands of new immigrants arrived in the country year after year for over forty years after the war. In the context of these large migrations, Australia received large populations from non-British countries of Europe. For example, approximately 41 per cent of the Australian population in 1981 was associated with immigration (Hugo 1986: 232). Over 3 million migrants arrived in Australia between 1947-1981 and of them only about 85,000 of the second generation were of Asian descent. There was no substantial migration from the Asian region until the 1980s. Furthermore, although the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland were the largest contributors of migrants with over one million people or approximately 37 per cent of all migrants, only 44.7 per cent of the second generation Australians are of British ancestry, the rest are mainly from other parts of Europe with approximately 324,074 of Hellenic origin (figures inclusive of two generations), 534,705 Italians, 107,546 Maltese, and so on. To quote Hugo:

'The impact of Southern European immigration is striking, with over one million Australian being first or second generation Italian or Greek or from what is now [sic] Yugoslavia. Southern Europe accounts for a quarter of all the first and second generation of immigrant population. The next large group comprises people from the continental Western European countries' (Hugo 1986: 231).

As a consequence, by the late 1981, 4 in every 10 Australians were immigrants or children with one or both parent being immigrants.¹

The creation of Mediterranean social space

Attempts to create a Mediterranean space in Australian education from the early 1970s to the present time, as we will show further on, continue to enter new and challenging phases. While many argue that non-British children should have the right to learn and maintain their parents' language, government education strategies and schools system and not least the political forum within which this service has been promoted and provided remains a challenge in itself for non-British ethnic population groups.

Historically, the volume of different migrations and settlement along with their residential patterns and cultural activities had an unprecedented social and demographic impact on the Australian landscape. Non-British immigration from Southern Europe became largely evident within the urban industrial centres of the larger cities of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, with the creation of a fairly specific cultural ecology, suitable to their socio-economic and cultural needs at the time, were highly concentrated settlements in residential neighbourhoods, with their conspicuous features, collective life style and diverse cultural activities, made themselves easy targets for discrimination. These migrations in conjunction with the nation's industrialisation and consumerism which practically conquered Australian life, the myth propagating material affluence for all, the politics of the cold war enhanced by a systematic government and media propaganda spreading anticommunist hysteria and fears of invasion from nearby communist Asia, in conjunction with the increasing private and suburban life style at the same time, forced Australian society to experience an unprecedented social change. According to Alomes *et al.*:

'The reaction against alien 'foreign immigrants' was similar to fears about communism and invasion. Images of deace, or at least dirt and smell, of race and of evil were common in popular perceptions of immigrants' (Alomes, Dober and Hellier 1984: 13).

In light of the changes that followed in the subsequent decade or two, several government reviews addressed questions dealing with immigrant education. Central in the official debate on education remained questions of integrating or Anglicising immigrants and their children through institutional training. Australia remained unwilling to reach any form of compromise by accepting that these different immigrant settlers may have had specific language and cultural needs and aspirations and if denied such rights, they could be forced to return home, something which Australian authorities had not foreseen would occur in large numbers.

Apart from the increasing remigration rate, there were the high levels of failure of immigrant children at all school levels, the disinterest or apathy for schooling for many others, the failure of society to tolerate the cultural and linguistic differences along with the failure of assimilation as expressed by the White Australia policy, the residential 'ghettoisation' of most immigrants residing in the so called 'slums' of the inner or industrial suburbs. Immigrant employment was concentrated in sectors dominated by unhealthy and high-risk jobs. This, together with other factors, created the need for organised community mobilisation to confront the rather indifferent state administration which failed to address the issues affecting the new comers to Australia.

Mobilisation for Mediterranean space in Australian education

Most of the community mass and organised mobilisation which occurred during the 1970s came from churches, some local professionals, from the Left, the labour unions, and, above all, from representatives from the migrant communities themselves. This mobilisation became known in Australia as the Ethnic Right Movement (ERM). It involved the different migrant communities, with the participation of people from the different organisations, and through their mobilisation for 'rights' they attempted to bring to the negotiating table the representatives from the Australian government. The views of the ERM found expression through a document formally launched in 1973, which became better known as the Ethnic Rights manifesto (Storer, 1975; Papadopoulos, *Interview*, 18 November 1993). This manifesto, addressed a multiplicity of labour, educational and cultural rights issues (Storer 1975).

In an unprecedented campaign in the Australian political history, the ethnic communities' leadership struggle for rights found a fairly receptive listener at the time. That was the newly elected Labour Government in 1972 under Prime Minister Gough Whitlam. Labour, in its efforts to win the elections after 23 years in opposition, sensitised itself to demands of Ethnic Rights. Whitlam, himself a popular statesman amongst ethnic communities, responded to the already mobilised ethnic communities for rights because his administration recognised the obvious need for cultural change in Australia through the introduction of fairly radical public policy. He succeeded to show this in practice when he firstly dismantled the White Australia policy in 1972, thus opening the way for consultations with the various ethnic communities. This strategy was to continue until the mid 1970s, in some cases during the 1980s, and in somewhat different form until the 1990s.

Claims for rights by ethnic leadership was a mission of continued struggle involving a strong challenge to the otherwise closed 'gate', so to speak, and at best a bureaucratic attitude to migrant viewpoint. The aim was to open up the bureaucracy to respond to the special migrant needs and thus put an end to their exclusion from the contours of policy making. Furthermore, there were a multiplicity of claims for equal rights which British Australians enjoyed but of which migrants were deprived. For example, there were citizenship rights previously denied to many, language and cultural maintenance rights, welfare and pension rights, and their rights to create and develop a Hellenic or Italian and other forms of Mediterranean space in the Australian education system so far denied to those who were non-British.

In fact, the early 1970s marked the beginning of a whole new era for Australia in addressing questions of the immigrant experience such as identity of 'otherness'. Government administrations found themselves under constant community and professional pressure to define migrant identity appropriately, that is, not as transient images in search of a new identity but as integral identities in their own right according to their own ethnic origin. Consequently, concepts such as 'others' or 'otherness', like the concepts 'migrant' or 'immigrant' were terms which were often used in a derogatory manner aimed at playing down the image of non-British-Australians, those who exercise power and controlled or administered the Australian polity.

Some scholars and ethnic communities' representatives argued that it was unacceptable to lump largely all new settlers from different countries as 'migrants', 'immigrants' or 'New Australians'. The last term was for official use by the government assimilationist policy bureaucrats and politicians for public consumption and often used as a metaphor for discrimination against newcomers. Instead, different national groups of migrants identified as they did in accordance with their ethnicity of origin - because migrants were migrants but never anonymous identities (Dimitreas, 1995). Finally, the terms migrant and immigrant were redefined and given their rather specific connotations as a result of the introduction of the word 'ethnos' (nationhood) in the Australian social science dictionary. Thus, each migrant or national group was defined as ethnic group, with the term ethnicity used interchangeably. The Hellenic term 'ethnos' was imported from the United States and officially coined in Australia by the Labor government's charismatic Minister for Immigration Al Grasby in his inaugural lecture titled 'Family of Nations' in 1973, were a commitment was made to terminate discrimination cause the use of the such words as 'migrant' (Grasby, 1977).

The ERM campaigns for the introduction of Mediterranean space within the Australian education system, was, as I described previously, an issue of recognition of the difference within that space. Its campaigns for the attainment

of migrant education rights maintained a prominent position in debates amongst different ethnic communities throughout the 1970s.

The year 1974 was the highlight for migrant education because, for the first time in national history, the ERM, along with the workers' unions, dealt with migrant education by organising a national conference (Martin, 1978). The conference addressed migrant education, the introduction of ethnic languages² and cultures within the curriculum of government schools, both as an issue of right and as an issue of pedagogy. It was argued that such schools provided trained teachers and also students could attend classes during normal day hours, instead of having to spend their evenings or Saturdays studying their parents language when at the same time British-Australian children could do other things, including having time off from school.

General confusion prevailed since the 1970s as to whether the teaching of different ethnic languages and cultures should or should not be part of government schools' curriculum. There was the position of the Right and the position of the Left expressed both within and outside the Ethnic Right Movement. The Left insisted largely in favour of the introduction of migrant (ethnic) languages into government schools, its reasoning based on the view that government schools provided an all embracing inclusiveness for Australian children and, as indicated, could also ensure better quality of professional teaching school environment, all funded by public money. Many – especially from within the Right – argued that non-British children or anyone for that matter, should be able to learn or maintain a language and culture as part of their training in afternoon, after hours and Saturday or Sunday schools (run by immigrants themselves). It was maintained that such schools provided pedagogically more natural social and cultural space for the learning of languages (Southern European or Mediterranean), thus enhancing the development of identity of otherness by strengthening their self image in the context of Australia's cultural diversity.

In fact, from the mid 1970s an increasing number of state schools introduced Greek, Italian and many other languages according to demand (in the early days, there were problems with shortages), staffing and resource availability, attitudinal problems with members of school councils towards the introduction of Mediterranean space in government schools. In addition to teaching in afternoon and after hours schools in general by ethnically owned schools, some state governments introduced and funded the teaching of languages other than English at Saturday schools. In the absence of qualified language teachers, government provision remained such that staffing sufficiency was completed through the employment of University language students.

By the late 1970s, there was a mixed system in operation. Some ethnic population groups, including the Hellenic community, kept teaching Modern

Greek in state or government schools, in private day or bilingual schools and in ethnic schools run by private individuals, lay community organisations, and the Greek Orthodox Church. The tripartite model reflects the nature of the Mediterranean language school education space in Australia. For all its pitfalls, the model provided a rather complex and interesting combination of school choices than any one single school system dominated by the state bureaucracy and cultural hegemony. This system provided greater space for diversity to develop in the nation although such systems may infringe on the quality of education provided or even lead to a rise in school fee costs, unless otherwise careful control mechanisms existed. Such school models are not necessarily existent for all ethnic minority population groups. The reason for this is that some language and ethnic population groups either have minimum cultural and linguistic maintenance or are on the way of almost total assimilation. This is the case for the Germans, Dutch, and the Maltese, for instance.

The views of supporters and critics of one or another school system for the teaching of courses in the best way to maintain ethnic languages and cultures of any given Mediterranean ethnic population group; have largely reflected in the local ethnically owned and controlled newspapers, especially from the 1970s to the present time. Evident in the content of articles and debates is information about the 'great conflict' between ethnic community leaders and the government sector.

The ethnic community leadership had been expressing their preference for or against the establishment of day time bilingual schools run privately by diverse ethnic communities or such individuals, while many, especially the Left favoured the incorporation of L.O.T.E. (Languages Other Than English) in government schools. The implementation of L.O.T.E. policy is a matter of careful planning and the co-ordination between the various L.O.T.E. providers - government mainstream schools, the Victorian School of Languages (VSL) and after hours ethnic schools (Languages Other Than English in Government Schools, 1995). According to a Victorian government report released in 1995, for example,

'Eighteen languages were taught in primary schools in 1995, 17 in secondary colleges and 41 through the Victorian School of Languages (former Saturday Schools of Languages). In addition, the Distance Education Section of the Victorian School of Languages provided 7 languages. Fifty-two languages were provided through after hours ethnic schools. Italian, Japanese, Indonesian, German, French, Chinese (Mandarin), Modern Greek and Vietnamese continued to be the languages in the greatest demand in 1995. However, the Directorate of School Education hopes to maintain a breadth of high quality programs and languages and after hours ethnic schools ... After hours ethnic schools were not covered by the survey, but

some idea of their role can be gauged from enrolments. There were 25,550 students attending the 196 ethnic schools funded for 1995' (Victorian Directorate of Education, 1995).

This excerpt indicates that there are at least four Asian-Pacific languages currently taught in Australian schools following the increasing migration to Australia from these countries over the last two decades. As a result of this migration intake from the countries of the Asian Pacific rim, there has been an increase in the emphasis of L.O.T.E in the public school sector on Asian languages, particularly Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian, and Vietnamese.

In addition, as Australia's economic rationale changed by the early 1980s through deregulation, privatisation and corporatisation of the government and non-government sectors, with transactions increasing the Asian-Pacific dependency, so has the shift of L.O.T.E. teaching at government schools. This shift for example is evident in the amount of funds allocated by the Commonwealth Department of Employment Education and Training (DEET) to these four Asian languages in contrast to other European or other Mediterranean languages.

DEET expresses Commonwealth Government's policy on languages through the allocation of funds to different states. Evidence also suggests that over the last decade there has been an obvious funding departure from L.O.T.E. (European), in favour of government interest for Asian languages. This funding is allocated through NALSAS (National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools). NALSAS is a strategy which involves the collaboration of states and the Commonwealth. For example, the government allocated approximately \$8-10 million dollars for the priority language programme in contrast to approximately \$13 million dollars for NALSAS for the two financial years of 1994-1995. Ironically, while the teaching of priority languages programme includes the teaching of ten European languages, their funding has only been \$4 million dollars per year combined. In contrast, the NALSAS includes the teaching of four Asian languages only, namely: Japanese, Korean, Indonesian and Chinese. The last four were separated from priority languages programme and were contextualised as NALSAS, receiving separate and additional funds and treatment with at least four times above the amount of funds provided for any European language other than English.

At the same time, because there is a lack of adequately qualified educators to teach Asian languages, DEET allocates special funds for the retraining of existing teachers attended during evening classes in order to upgrade their qualifications and introduce teaching of a given Asian language at the schools. Teachers have to attend classes once a week, doing something like a crash course for two

semesters. Following completion of the course students receive their certificate, they are then regarded as qualified to teach an Asian language such as Japanese, Korean, Indonesian and Chinese. Subsequently, such teachers could go to their schools and introduce courses on one of the Asian languages in which they have been trained. Although according to a Japanese trained tertiary educator of Japanese language in Victoria,

'the teaching by such staff takes place despite the fact that Asian languages are probably up to three times harder than European languages to learn. DEET has given for example large sums of money for many universities to this purpose, including: Swinburne, Monash, and Melbourne universities in the state of Victoria' (Japanese Lecturer, *Interview*, 13 August 1996).

There are beyond doubt immediate economic and cultural forces in operation encouraging governments to focus on Asia and the Pacific Rim. In the area of education, for example, 80-90 percent of all full fee-paying students are from Asia and these constituted 81,000 foreign students studying in Australian institutions, most of whom were from the nearby countries of the Asian-Pacific region. During 1995 these students imported into the country approximately \$2 billion dollars in export revenue to cover their expenses for courses fees, rent and so on. In addition, 60 percent of all Australian manufactured goods goes to Asia. Likewise, in the services sector too, 60 percent of in-bound international tourism is from Asia (ABS, 1995).

An increasing number of Australian universities establish university schools or such departments and run off shore courses in university centres in countries of South East Asia such as Singapore, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Hong Kong. Among such universities as RMIT, Monash, Victoria University of Technology, University of Western Sydney-Hawkesbury, and La Trobe. Similarly, an increasing number of courses and Asian Studies Centres are established throughout Australia. Again, an Asian studies review published in 1991 (Asian Studies Association of Victoria, 1991:133), shows the recent proliferation of Asian studies centres in Australian Universities in the last three years, rising from scarcity in 1987 to at least 20 by 1990. The Japanese language alone, according to the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies (ANU, 1996) is served in at least 30 out of 38 Australian universities, while 33 offer some sort of Japan-related units.

In line with the foregoing, before the beginning of the decline of the number of enrolments to study one or more of the South European languages began in the early 1990s, there was an increase in the number of tertiary institutions teaching

such languages. For example, the number of tertiary institutions providing teaching in Modern Greek was 1 in 1968 increasing to 14 by the 1980s, either in departments per se or as courses run within such departments. Since the early 1990s however, the number of these departments or Modern Greek and related courses taught within Australian universities are being challenged by a rapid decline in different universities. For example, in the State of Victoria three departments teaching Modern Greek courses are under threat of being closed down over the next few years. These include Deakin University, the University of Melbourne, and also Monash University. Similar trends have been observed in other Australian States.

The increasing shift towards the teaching of Asian languages and Cultures within Australian universities is gaining a corporatist status rather than one which is based on rights of inhabitants of this country who have a European heritage. Everything seems to be calculated in terms of dollars, neo-political rhetoric of regional and international context than purely academically recognised and defined contexts based on Australia's past European cultural or ethnically and scholarly defined heritage, and above all on the grounds of living sizeable communities already established in Australia for many decades.

Australia has obviously made a radical shift in its post-war language policy for two reasons. Firstly, because the nation's economic and geopolitical interest have been increasingly defined in global and more so in regional context. Secondly, because increasing migrations from the nearby countries of the Asia-Pacific countries have inevitably brought this nation, for the first time since white European settlement into very close, cultural proximity with the country's real neighbours.

Placing the debate in broader context, unlike the Asian experience, until today there is not even a single Mediterranean studies course centre in Australia. While there have been an increasing proliferation of Asian research and studies centres operating in the country over the last few years as a result of trade and business links with Asia, there is no evidence to suggest that something related is occurring in connection to countries or Australia's ethnic population groups from the Mediterranean region. Thus, questions arising from the experiences are many, especially in connection with the cultural and historic origin of Australia's Southern European settlers all of whom have without any serious consultation been forced to accept Australia's new economic order as the only way out for their survival.

This means that until the present period of the 1990s, the experiences of Southern Europeans in Australia was the experience of a Southern European microcosm with different national origins in the context of one single nation state, namely Australia. Their efforts towards the creation of Mediterranean space has

been both a real and imaginary reflection of the social tensions, political conflict and economic antagonism found within single nation states of their European homeland prior to and after their migration and settlement in Australia. These tensions were transmitted both consciously and unconsciously across the other end of the world (but without the luxury of the protection provided to them within their own nation state) by individual social actors, with analogous if not more difficulties associated with the efforts of single nation states of the South struggling for rights over the rather materially or industrially wealthier and dominant North within the European Union. The tensions of the debate about North and South or about Centre and Periphery in the EU with its economic and political ramifications, whether real or imaginary, has been central in Australian social sciences. It has remained a great divide in the debate amongst Australian academics and other sceptics throughout this century about the 'quality' difference between the Northern European over the Southern European and other Mediterranean migrants, as that quality is being defined by its critics! In other words, Southern European migrants, whether Hellenes or Italians, Maltese, or Yugoslavs, faced the direct racial, cultural, economic, political and legal hurdles, and the implications which have been evident in European history of colonisation with contemporary implications of the nation-state, with lasting effects for migrants and their children in the future.

Likewise, contemporary developments occurring in regional as well as in global trade and politics, with its regionalising ramifications as zones of trade such as EU or APEC (Asian Pacific Economic Co-Operation), have created new possibilities for nation-states as agents of civil society, especially in the area of labour economics and citizenship. That is, current economic and political developments coinciding as they have with the blurring of the boundaries of the nation-state. These factors are forcing the nation-state to search for new economic markets within and beyond their immediate boundaries within their regional zones, seeking co-operation more fiercely than ever before, with marketing competition increasingly eliminating (in principle) trade restrictions within given regional territories. This leads to increasing economic inter-dependency together with technological advancement which greatly facilitated communication, leading to new types of trans-national labour and business migrations. These otherwise new specialist migrations lead increasingly to new forms of dominance and control over the previous generation of labourers and their skilled or unskilled children, many of whom are of ethnic minority population groups of non-British origin in the case of Australia (who often are not offered employment even if they are well qualified, because first preference is usually given to British-Australians as in the era of White Australia (1901-1972). Today, immigrants and their children are being retrenched or cannot find employment in the era of post-

industrialisation. These developments in conjunction with the new age of labour and forms of monitored migration between nation-states have never been experienced before. They raise questions about the capacity or ability of the nation-state to function as the rational representative of civil society, responsible for providing national education and training for children of diverse ethnic languages and cultures, whether from the countries of the European periphery of the Mediterranean or from any other part of the world for that matter, outside the British Isles.

Notes

* This paper was presented at the 17th CESE Conference, held in Athens October 13-18, 1996. The conference theme was 'Education and Restructuring of the European space: Centre-Periphery, North-South, Identity-Otherness'.

¹ To calculate the number of Southern Europeans in Australia or the population of any ethnic group, one needs to take into account the numbers of each ethnic group who came to Australia from different nation states. For example, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) figures of 1981 show 324,000 of first and second generation Greeks. Such calculations, unless added, do not include approximately 35-60,000 Cypriots, 14-20,000 from Egypt, and many others from Turkey, the ex-Soviet Union, Romania, the Middle East and other parts of Europe and the World. In addition, if the third and subsequent generations are taken into account, the number of Australia's Hellenism may well exceed the 500,000 figure. In contrast to such approximate estimates, demographer Charles Price in an article on ethnic strength titled 'The Ethnic Character of the Australian Population' (1988), shows only 360,000 Greeks based on 1986 Census. This figure is justified according to the author (in a telephone communication I had with him in 1993), in the light of the number of Greeks who have returned to Greece since the initiation of post-war migration which is approximately 70,000 people. If however, Hugo's figures above are taken as a base for a pilot calculation, then the number of Greeks in Australia is much higher than the figures provided by Price based on ethnic origin. This may well mean that Southern Europeans and their descendants now living in Australia may in fact be a fairly substantial part of the Australian population above that of the ordinary ABS calculation for one country of origin. Similarly, the figures for Italians and other ethnic origins may be substantially higher.

² At this rather early stage of change, as in the case of this conference, the participants did not use the term 'ethnic languages' but 'community languages', that is, actually spoken languages within the Australian social space by immigrants and their offspring. Additionally, as argued earlier, different population communities, were called migrant communities. The term ethnic communities became prevalent after the term ethnic groups became well known in Australia sometime after this conference was held.

Yiannis Dimitreas can be contacted at the Victoria University of Technology, Department of Social and Cultural Studies, McKecnie Street, St Albans Campus, PO Box 14428, M.C.M.C. Melbourne, Victoria 8001, Australia. Tel. 03 9365 2136; Fax: 03 9365 2242.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1995) International Division of Statistics, Balance of Payments, Canberra, Australia.
- Alomes, S. Dober, M. and Hellier, D. (1984) The social context of postwar conservatism. In A. Curthoys and J. Menitt (eds) *Australia's First Cold War*, Vol. 1, *Society, Communism and Culture*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Argus, English Language Newspaper, 28 January, 1950, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, in *Koinoniké Historia tis Paroikiakes Ekpaideuses* ('Social History of Greek Community Education'), Monograph Series No. 2, unpublished, Modern Greek Studies, Department of Intercultural and Language Studies, RMIT, Victoria, Australia.
- Borrie, W.D. (1954) *Italians and Germans in Australia: A Study of Assimilation*. Melbourne: F.W. Chesire.
- Dimitreas, Y. E. (1995) *Social Mobility of Greeks in Australia*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Victoria University of Technology, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
- Grasby, A. J. (Hon.) (1977) Community relations means us all. In M. Bowen (ed.) *Australia 2000: The Ethnic Impact*. Proceedings of the first national conference on cultural pluralism and ethnic groups in Australia. pp. 6-15, U.N.E. Publishing Unit.
- Harmstorff, I. and Cigler, M. (1985) *The Germans in Australia*. Australian Ethnic Heritage Series, Melbourne: AE Press.
- Hugo, G. (1986) *Australia's Changing Population: Trends and Implications*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Directorate of School Education (1995) *Languages other than English in Government Schools*. Schools of the Future, State of Victoria, Australia.
- Martin, J. (1978) *Migrant Practice*. Canberra: ANU.
- Price, C. (1963) *Southern Europeans in Australia*. Canberra: ANU.
- Price, C. (1988) The ethnic character of the Australian population. In J. Jupp (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Australian People* (Bicentennial Edition). Australia: Angus and Robinson.
- ANU (Australian National University)(1996) Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies: Australian-Japan Research Centre, Canberra, Australia.
- Sofocleous, A.M. (1996) *Koinoniké Historia tis Paroikiakés Ekpaideuses* (Social History of Hellenic Community Education), Monograph Series No. 2, unpublished, August, 1996, Modern Greek Studies, Department of Intercultural and Language Studies, RMIT, Victoria, Australia.
- Storer, D. (1975) Ethnic rights, power and participation: towards a multi-cultural Australia, Monograph No. 2, Clearing House of Migration Issues, Ecumenical Migration Centre and C.U.R.A., Melbourne.
- Tamis, A. (1988) Greeks. In J. Jupp (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Australian People* (Bicentennial Edition). Australia: Angus and Robinson.