The Finnish Migrant Community in Post-war Melbourne[1]

"The only thing that spoke English was the radio"

Senja Baron

Introduction

With the exception of a handful of historical and demographic studies, Finnish and Australian scholars have written little about Finnish immigrants in Australia.[2] All previous works have generally focussed on uncovering facts and figures but have not addressed the question of Finnish ethnicity in Australia. This article is an attempt to explore some of the questions studies of Finnish migration and typical writings on large ethnic groups have left unanswered. How did Finnish ethnic community develop in Melbourne despite Finns' apparent absorption into Australian society? Why did they choose to maintain their cultural heritage after moving, from their perspective, to the end of the earth? How did they define their Finnishness? Or, put in more general terms, how does a person or a group become ethnic if not by their visible difference?

As the existence of the Finnish Church and Society indicates, Finnish immigrants in Melbourne have formed an 'ethnic group'; i.e. a social group defined by its members' shared descent, history, culture and experience.[3] Their 'ethnicity', or sense of common origins and history, has been unlike most others', however, as it has not been manifested through conspicuous cultural or physical difference. Finns have had little impact on Australian culture, cuisine or politics, and as an ethnic group they have been virtually invisible to the rest of Australian society.

Because of this, typical studies ethnicity focussed on large and conspicuous migrants groups contribute little towards understanding the development of Finnish-Australian migrant ethnicity.[4] To explore Melbourne's Finnish immigrants personal experiences of ethnicity, ten oral histories involving six men and eight women were collected for this study. The majority had migrated to Melbourne in the late-fifties, some in the early-seventies, and all were active participants in the Finnish ethnic organisations. It is important to note that as this study is based on the stories of this limited group, it refers only to a small minority of all Finns living in Melbourne. It is not concerned with immigrants that arrived at other times, or with second-generation Finns. Most importantly, the experiences discussed in the thesis are indicative only of the 10–15% of Finns in Melbourne that participate in the Finnish ethnic organisations, not of the hundreds that never or seldom attend them.[5]

On the basis of the immigrants' memories and the supporting evidence from written sources such as the Finnish-language newspaper *Suomi*, the defining factors of their Finnish ethnicity become clearer. To an extent these factors emerged in sequence as the immigrants settled into the new country. The following three sections of this article will explore the boundaries based on linguistic and social exclusion from the Australian society, Finnish ethnic organisations, and on perceived personality attributes that distinguished the immigrants' from Finnish people in Finland. Overall, the Finnish post-war immigrants' story indicates that ethnicity is not only about shared national origins, but also about shared experiences of migration, exclusion and difference.

Model immigrants?

We certainly are very popular (at least so far); it can be seen and heard everywhere. […] The over twenty neatly dressed and restrainedly behaving Finns were an obvious contrast to the loud migrant

rabble dressed in shiny pointed shoes and red scarves that some Southern European countries seem to be able to produce without limit. […] The customs officer had let his gaze rest on the group of Finns standing in front of him and said: "These… are the ones that we are hoping for!"[6]

This Finnish priest's observation of a newly arrived group of Finns at Brisbane airport in 1958 illustrate the prejudiced ideas Finns, along with the Australian immigration officials, held of the superiority of northern European immigrants. The Government assumed British and Nordic settlers to be culturally similar to the Australian host population. Consequently, it was thought that they would assimilate quickly, i.e. to discard the cultural traits of their country of origin and acquire the Australian way of life.[7] The Finns were eager to meet Australians' expectations of their ability to blend in. But as many soon realised, succeeding in English-speaking workplaces, learning the new language, and making friends with Australians was easier said than done.

Protecting Australia's 'whiteness' against all non-white and most non-British peoples had been a key feature of the Australian Government's migration policy since the 19th century. After the Second World War the racist terminology lingered in public arguments promoting immigration from northern Europe.[8] One policy maker found migrants of 'Nordic stock' most agreeable on the grounds that they were 'akin to us in outlook and background', and because they shared Protestant beliefs and 'a common fatherhood of centuries ago' with the British.[9] Similarly, the renowned historian W. D. Borrie suggested that because Scandinavians did not have 'strong national traits' they assimilated easily, unlike Greek migrants whom he thought formed residential concentrations because they had 'a strong attachment to their country of origin'.[10]

So when post-war Australia needed loyal settlers to fill its empty spaces as a defence against feared Asian invasion and hard workers to man the developing industries, northern Europe in addition to Britain was the most preferred source of immigrants.[11] In order to attract more Scandinavians, Germans and Dutch, the Australian Government introduced assistance schemes to cover the costs of their journeys. While most southern Europeans had to finance their own voyage, from 1954 migrants from the north had 25–30% of the cost of their passage covered by the government's General Assisted Passage Scheme (GAPS).[12] From 1966 the Special Passage Assistance Programme (SPAP) offered entirely free passages to migrants from these countries. In return the migrants had to stay in Australia for two years and agree to take English lessons on arrival.

The assistance schemes were of course not the only reason why individual Finns decided to leave their homeland. Although the relatively high income levels in Scandinavia made fewer Finns than southern Europeans immigrate to Australia, the Finns who did migrate were still driven by economic reasons.[13] Most interviewees involved in this study identified unemployment, high taxation, difficulty getting a home loan and finding housing as the main motivators for seeking better conditions overseas.[14] While the vast majority of Finns settled for nearby Sweden as a land of their hopes, those venturing to faraway Australia were after a greater adventure.[15] They were encouraged by expectations of warmer climate and desire to escape the political instability resulting from Finland's position between the Communist East and Capitalist West. A significant proportion of them originated from Karelia, the easternmost part of Finland surrendered to Soviet Union during the Second World War.[16] Karelian refugees seem to have been more prepared to seek their fortune far away from Finland when economic reasons compelled them to do so.[17]

But despite these reasons to migrate and the Australian Government's eagerness to attract Nordic immigrants, the size of the Australian Finnish community remained minuscule compared to most other migrant groups. During the first peak of Finnish arrivals in Australia in 1958–60 mere 4404 Finns arrived, and despite a second peak of 5433 Finnish immigrants in 1968–71, the number of Australia's Finnish-born residents never rose much above 10 000.[18] Finns formed 0.4% of the overall immigrant intake of over 4 million between 1945 and 1985, and their numbers were ten to twenty times smaller than those of the largest non-English speaking migrants groups from Italy, Greek,

Yugoslavia and the Netherlands.[19]

Because of their small numbers and similar complexions to white Australians, Finnish immigrants became invisible to the mainstream society and thus appeared to meet the Government's expectations. The interviewees involved in this study maintained the image of their superior ability to blend into Australian society. One interviewee considered Finns different from other migrants because 'we try to, more than many others, be like these [Australian] people.'[20] Finns despised Southern European migrants' distinctive attires and judged themselves superior on the basis of their "more Australian" looks.[21] The Finns thought of themselves as good immigrants also because of what they perceived to be their typically Finnish industriousness. Several interviewees emphasised how hard-working and peppy Finns were, and asserted that they had a very good reputation with employers.

While the Finns recalled their working lives with pride, it was clear that work was also a cause of frustration. Because of their poor English skills, many Finns could not get their trade skills recognised by Australian employers. Most Finnish immigrants found work in unskilled and semiskilled jobs in manufacturing and construction industries through introductions and recommendations by other Finns. Consequently, groups of Finnish workers emerged in the building industry, a Melbourne shirt factory and a carpet factory in Tottenham.[22] While most interviewees had advanced into skilled trades or positions as leading hands over the years, only two had moved onto higher status clerical work away from heavy industry. In 1981, when most post-war immigrants were still in the workforce, 49% of Finns and 50% of Greeks were employed as tradesmen or labourers, in comparison to only 25% of Australians and 34% of Dutch.[23] In terms of their concentration into low-status industrial jobs, then, Finns were in fact more similar to the supposedly less-assimilable southern Europeans than the Dutch, whose occupational statistics resembled those of Australians.[24]

The greatest obstacle to Finns becoming assimilated into the Australian society was their poor command of English. Surprisingly, scholars of migration and ethnicity have rarely addressed the importance of language as the key factor preventing assimilation, but have instead focussed on notions of cultural difference.[25] The case of the Finnish immigrants demonstrates that without the ability to communicate, migrants sharing similar culture and appearance with the host society can remain excluded from it. Although the interviewees tended to downplay the impact their lack of language skills had had on their lives, most admitted their English was limited to essential work language and dealing with everyday situations. Most interviewees continued to be most comfortable with speaking Finnish, even after 40 years of living in the country.

Only two of the interviewees knew English before their arrival, in contrast to many Dutch migrants who could speak English before they came and often learned it well enough to discard Dutch within a few years from arrival.[26] The Government acknowledged that most immigrants did not know English beforehand and made taking English lessons in Australia a condition for receiving travel assistance. The rule was rarely enforced, however, and none of the interviewees recalled being pressed to attend lessons.[27] The Finnish language newspaper *Suomi* tried to encourage Finns to learn English, but also recognised the fact that because Finnish was linguistically completely different from English, Finns found it more difficult to learn than those from Dutch or German background did.[28]

While most of the interviewees had taken some English lessons after their arrival, family and work commitments prevented many from continuing them for long. This interviewee's experience was typical:

I tried to learn by correspondence, but I didn't have the time in the end because I had to work and I had the children and the whole family, had to carry all the groceries from the shops, to do the washing… How on earth was I supposed to have time?

Discouraged by the difficulty and time-consuming nature of formal language study, many interviewees gave it up hoping that English would soon 'stick to their clothes'. Learning through immersion was often infeasible, however, as the environment in factories where most worked was too noisy for conversation. In any

case, once the migrant had learned the object names and commands relevant to his or her job on the machine or conveyor belt no one was interested in their linguistic abilities. Thus their poor occupational status contributed to many Finns' poor English skills and the two combined caused most of the interviewees to stay socially excluded from Australian society.

While many assimilation theorists implied that immigrants' disassociation with the host population was intentional,[29] the Finns, though willing to interact with Australians, were unable to do so because of their poor English. Most interviewees had become acquainted with other Australians through work, but none had become friendly enough to socialise with workmates outside work. Most of the men had belonged to trade unions, but rarely attended meetings, most likely because they could not follow the English proceedings. None had belonged to other Australian associations or clubs. In most cases neighbourly relations remained distant, and relationships with Australians did not develop through marriage either, because all but one of the interviewees were already married when they arrived. Thus the Finns that were unable to assimilate as expected because of their poor language skills and class became economically, linguistically and socially separated from the mainstream society.

Institutional boundaries of ethnicity

In this situation of unintended social exclusion, the Finnish Society of Melbourne and the Finnish Lutheran Church were established as formal settings for social interaction with fellow Finns. These ethnic institutions were the overt manifestation of Finnish ethnicity in Melbourne. While individual migrants could perceive their Finnishness on a private, subjective level, it was through interaction within the organisations that individuals identifying themselves as Finns came to develop and define a shared ethnic identity.[30] The Church and Society provided a Finnish cultural reference point even for those who seldom participated in ethnic activities. Each came to represent a distinctive model of being Finnish in Melbourne.[31]

Because ethnic organisations are the most obvious and easily examined demonstration of ethnicity, much sociological and historical research has concentrated on exploring their origins and function. While American research emphasises political motivations behind ethnic group formation,[32] many Australian scholars have tended to focus on social interests as the mobilising force.[33] The two most prominent Finnish ethnic organisations in Melbourne, the Finnish Church and the Finnish Society, share the general nature and pattern of development suggested by Australian scholars.

First, as suggested by Martin among others, ethnic organisations offered migrants practical assistance and social support with adjusting to the new environment.[34] Melbourne's Finnish organisations had their origins in the late-fifties immigrants' informal friendships based on mutual assistance with settling, and finding work and accommodation. Regular meetings in the Estonian church offered the newly arrived 'greenhorns' an opportunity to ask help with language and adjustment problems from the 'the elders', as the Finns who had lived in Melbourne for some time were commonly referred to.[35] Within a few months these helpful gatherings led to the establishment of the Finnish Society of Melbourne in May 1958. Its nature as a social club was ensured by the appointment of subcommittees responsible for organising entertainment, picnics, sports and a 'do-it-yourself' club for socialising and craftwork.[36] The rules printed in the official membership booklet asserted that 'the purpose of the Society is to gather Finns living in and around Melbourne to shared activities'. It was to 'assist Finns living and arriving in Australia by furthering their social and economic interests and by maintaining a happy, perky mood amongst them'.[37] The Society and later the Church provided migrants 'something of an extended family or tribe' in the absence of actual familial relationships.[38]

The Finnish Lutheran Congregation was also established along the lines of social support, and catered especially for those who disliked the vodka-fuelled 'perky' atmosphere of many Society functions.[39] Furthermore, by the late-fifties the pastoral care and ceremonial needs of the over 1000 Finns in Melbourne could no longer be adequately serviced by the single travelling Finnish Seamen's missionary. The Finnish

Mikael Agricola Church and its manse and chapel was established in 1960.[40] In addition to servicing the ceremonial needs of the community, the new Church provided an active social environment through a sewing club, a choir, and a youth club, and by organising annual camping trips to the countryside.[41]

As suggested by Australian scholars, the Church and Finnish Society provided vital assistance for non-English-speaking Finns with settling into their new environment. They served as the first point of contact to new comers in need of practical help with language and other immediate needs, and became the arena for constructing close friendships and support networks. One of the interviewees, for instance, had been unhappy in Melbourne until she began to go to the Finnish Society's evening dances and became the folk dancing clubs' dance instructor. Another recognised the organisations' continuing importance in providing social services. He asserted that 'there is still a need for Finnish social and spiritual work because there are many elderly folks who haven't assimilated with the local community in any way but stay in their own circles'.

Since both organisations provided this social support through organising cultural activities, they also fulfilled the second function identified by Australian scholars, that of preserving and representing Finnish language and heritage. Indeed, a theatrical society and a choir, preserving classical forms of Finnish language and culture through plays and music, were among the first to be established within the Society. The folk dancing group and the craft club maintained more tangible expressions of and skills relating to Finnish traditions. The creative talent of the immigrants had a regular airing in the social evenings organised by the Society. In one such night at the Temperance Hall in October 1962 the audience of over 100 people heard songs, poem recitals, accordion music and other instrumental pieces, and saw a play and a somewhat un-Finnish hula-dance presentation.[42] Dances were organised every month with the highlight being the biannual formal dinner dance at the lower hall of the Melbourne City Town Hall.[43] The Church ensured the continuance of Finnish religious traditions through its Finnish Lutheran sermons and children's Sunday school. Both organisations celebrated annual festivals such as Christmas, Finnish Independence Day, May Day, Midsummer and Mother's Day with speeches and Finnish foods and music. The Society also established a team to play Finnish baseball. Skills in baseball, volleyball and in selected cultural activities such as reciting were annually measured against teams of other Finnish organisations in the country in the Easter Games held by each club in turn. It was through these kinds of activities that the organisations provided an important avenue for preserving Finnish folk and sporting culture.

The second function many scholars have attributed to ethnic organisations, that of representing migrant cultures to other Australians, has been only of peripheral importance to the Finnish community in Melbourne. Despite the Society's folk dancing club's occasional involvement in ethnic entertainment, the Finns never developed as prominent a cultural profile as the Italian, Greek, Vietnamese, and other larger migrant communities did. There are three reasons for this. First, because of their small numbers, residential dispersal, and lack of exotic appeal, the Finns like most other Northern European immigrants were not of interest to the mainstream society. Second, thanks to their invisibility and consequent lack of negative labelling by other Australians, Finns did not have to purposely assert a positive image through culture like many southern European immigrants did. Third, unlike many of the post-war refugee associations, the Finnish Church and Society were decidedly apolitical and therefore not aimed at influencing public opinion in Finland or in Australia.[44] The fact that Finns saw no reason to promote their culture to the wider public enforced their invisibility and apparent lack of ethnicity compared to many other immigrant groups.

The third role of ethnic institutions, as identified by scholars of ethnicity, is to serve as mediums for positive identity construction. Several scholars have pointed out that ethnic institutions are important particularly for those people who are unable to develop a positive sense of self and to receive respect through other means. For example, migrants who have lost status and self-esteem because of difficulties with language and getting their qualifications and

Market at the Finnish Lutheran Church in Melbourne in August. – *Senja Baron.*

skills recognised are more likely to seek support and positive identification within their ethnic group.[45] Indeed, most of the interviewees, all of whom were members of either the Finnish Church or the Society, had struggled with these problems. More importantly, none had made friends with Australians or gained social standing in associations within the wider community. Thus it could be argued that the 10–15% of Finns in Melbourne that participate in the community do so because they have not found other sources of positive identification.[46] This idea could also help to explain why Finns have developed more tight-knit communities than other Northern European migrants such as the Dutch. The fact that only 1% of Dutch immigrants belong to ethnic associations suggests that they have not had as strong a need to identify with their compatriots as Finns have. This is most probably consequent to the Dutch good command of English and ability to find work and social standing in the mainstream society.[47]

The interviewees' accounts certainly indicated that membership in the ethnic community was an important aspect of their self-identities at present. They clearly derived a positive sense of identity from the solidarity within the organisations. As all of them had left their extended families behind, the Church or the Society offered them a sorely missed opportunity to interact in a community involving their whole personalities in informal and intimate interaction. Frequent references to the organisations as 'family' and 'home' reflected their importance as a primary group, and in providing an environment where these migrants could feel understood and comfortable within a shared system of values and norms.[48] Thus immigrants that never gained proficiency in English, adjusted to the mainstream culture or became part of its social networks found solace in the familiarity offered by ethnic organisations.

Although the Church and the Society had these three roles of social support, cultural maintenance and identity construction in common, they represented two different types of Finnish ethnic identity in Melbourne. In fact, the Finnish community continues to be divided between the members of the two organisations. The pertinence of this division was revealed by the fact that only two of the households involved in this study actively participated in both organisations. While the division between the Church and the Society may be presently enforced by personality conflicts, it is likely that the rift originally emerged because of fundamental disagreements about the nature of Finnish ethnicity and the purpose of the organisations. By its very nature as a Christian organisation, the Church focussed on expressing and maintaining Finnishness in a respectable family environment of Sunday services, youth camps, the choir, and the more recent children's Finnish language classes. The Society on the other hand tended towards more bois-

terous evening entertainment and dances, which some thought indicated a dearth of 'real' and 'constructive' cultural content.[49] The Church and Society came to represent two different cultural frameworks of being Finnish in Melbourne, one being informal and folksy and the other more solemn and religious.

A third model of Finnishness, significantly different from both the Church and the Society, emerged after a split of the Finnish Society in 1962.[50] A section of the Society grew impatient with what it saw as the organisation's lack of commitment to sport and established Sisu –62, a club devoted to baseball, volleyball and other sports. This dispute over funding allocation and importance of sport over cultural activities developed into a deeper division within the community. Because Sisu's aim was simply 'to encourage Melbourne's youth in sports and physical recreation', it did not consider Finnish origins as a prerequisite for joining the club.[51] This was as odds with the rules and principles of all the other Finnish organisations and prevented Sisu from joining the Australasian Federation of Finnish Clubs and Societies and therefore from participating in the annual Easter Games.[52]

Although the clash seemed to be primarily due to personal strife between the Society's and Sisu's leaders, later attempts at uniting the two fell though on the grounds of this membership question. The former insisted on the importance of 'keeping the Society Finnish',[53] and thus emphasised its role in preserving Finnish language and culture. It continued to maintain Finnish sporting culture through its baseball and volleyball teams and competed only with other Finnish ethnic teams. Sisu, on the other hand, developed into one of the top volleyball teams in the state with several of its members representing Victoria in state competitions until its quiet dissolution in the early 1980s.[54] Its involvement in Australian sporting associations and inclusion of players of any nationality reflected Sisu's radically different interpretation of migrant ethnicity and the purpose of ethnic organisations. While it organised Finnish-style dinner dances and continued to report to the Finnish-language *Suomi,* Sisu's members were obviously able and willing to interact with the English-speaking mainstream society. The organisation functioned as a vehicle of integration into Australian society, not as a secure mini-Finland providing social support and positive identification within a Finnish cultural framework.

Regardless of the conflicts and differences between the still existing Finnish Church and Society, these organisations together formed the tangible boundary enclosing the Finnish community, and provided the frameworks within which to explore and define what it means to be Finnish in Australia.

Covert boundaries of ethnicity

Despite all the theorising about ethnicity, assimilation and ethnic group formation, people continue to understand their identities in primordial terms. To the interviewees Finnishness seemed to be a natural and inherent a quality of their hearts, or a mindset acquired in birth and from mothers' milk. Ethnic identity is clearly experienced and defined on a level more profound than tangible exclusion from host society or membership in an ethnic organisation.[55] To better understand how ethnic identity is constructed and experienced, it is useful to recognise that identity is always constructed across difference, i.e. in comparison to others that are unlike the person in question.[56] Several anthropologists have suggested that because shared identities such as ethnicity are about a relation to something, examination should focus on the boundary distinguishing 'us' from 'them'.[57] For Finnish immigrants, the most significant boundary exists between their ethnic group and the host society, but other levels of boundaries become apparent when listening to Finnish immigrants' oral histories.

The interviews revealed that another significant boundary defining Finnish migrant identity was constructed in opposition to their old homeland, Finland. The Finnish immigrants did not consider themselves as simply Finns living in Australia, but as sort of hybrids, not entirely Australian but not quite Finnish either. Just as maintaining Finnish identity was determined by the impossibility of being Australian, being a migrant Finn was marked by not being like Finns living in Finland. The boundary distinguishing the immigrants from Finns in Finland

consisted of three separate factors. The first was based on distinctive form of Finnish language, the second on cultural comparisons between Finland and immigrant Finns, and the third on disinterest in present day Finland.

Finnish language was not only a barrier separating the immigrants from Australians, but also produced a distinct Finnish-Australian culture.[58] Surrounded by English but maintaining a Finnish base of communication, the interviewees had adopted expressions and words from the dominant language creating slang commonly referred to as *finglish*. Several interviewees also adopted and modified some English words to be more easily pronounced by Finns. The migrants' Finnish had changed also as a result of interacting with people from different parts of Finland. Most of the interviewees had lost their original dialects and had merged their various vernaculars into a new way of speech incorporating elements of their distinct Karelian, Southern and Western dialects. One had become painfully aware of the 'mixed up and confused' nature of his Australian-Finnish when visiting Finland after seventeen years in Australia. He had 'felt that bus drivers and everyone stared at me and wondered what language I spoke'. In effect then, language formed a two-way barrier distinguishing Finnish immigrants not only from English-speaking Australians but also from the Finns in Finland. Within that boundary a particular Finnish-Australian language emerged enforcing the shared identity of immigrant Finns.

The second factor of Finnish-Australian identity, based on cultural comparisons, became also evident though the interviewees' recollections of their visits back to Finland. Most had visited for the first time in the 1980s and found that after decades abroad they no longer fitted into the Finnish cultural and social environment and felt like strangers in their original home country. While all acknowledged that they had enjoyed seeing friends and relatives again, their reminiscences were characterised by comments negatively contrasting Finland to their current home in Australia. Two main points of cultural distinction between the Finns and the immigrants emerged. First, the interviewees noted that Finns were 'stiff and reserved' and 'not easy-going', and considered themselves as (new) Australians to be more 'relaxed', 'free', and 'open'. Several had been frustrated with having to always take coffee or flowers when visiting friends, and some considered Finns to be pretentious, as they were 'quick to mention titles'. Second, several interviewees considered themselves to be more cultured and worldly than ordinary Finns. One had found that her family was 'not interested in other countries' but 'only [thought] of what's right in front of their noses'. Another had noticed that Finnish 'people live in such small circles', and thought that immigrants 'look at life from a few more angles than Finns do'. Immigrants' interaction with Finns in Finland, then, enforced the cultural boundary between the two.

The third factor distinguishing the immigrants from Finns in Finland was based on their weak connection to the present of their homeland. This was in blatant contrast to scholars' finding that, despite certain cultural boundaries, connections to the migrants' hometown and the present of their country of origin continued to influence their ethnicity.[59] None of the interviewees were particularly interested in Finnish news or politics, and while a few mentioned their pride in the success of the Finnish Formula I driver Mika Häkkinen and Nokia mobile phones, these did not seem central to their ethnic identity or the activities of the ethnic organisations. The comment 'what happens in Finland now doesn't really move me at all… I think of Finnishness here rather than in Finland' expressed a common sentiment.

Although the Finnish immigrants have clung to certain cultural practices and the language of their past, a solid boundary existed between the migrant community and present day Finland. This may be attributed to a number of factors. Firstly, loyalty to one's hometown and family does not seem to be as central to Finnish culture as it is to many Southern European cultures.[60] Moreover, a significant proportion of Finnish post-war migrants lost their homes in the Karelia region after the Second World War and therefore did not have a strong emotional connection to existing parts of Finland to begin with. In addition, Finns did not migrate for political reasons, as Poles and other Eastern Europeans did, and therefore had little reason to be concerned with the political situation in present day Finland. Finally, none of the interviewees had been in the financial position to maintain a

close connection to their families and homeland by regular visits and lengthy phone calls. Overall then, Finnish immigrants did not base their identities on a relationship with present-day Finland, but seemed to perceive their Finnishness in reference to the homeland as it was before they left.

But ethnic boundaries seldom enclose a uniform and unanimous whole. Instead of being static or homogenous, ethnic identity is in fact a boundary-forming device within which divisions exist.[61] While most interviewees recognised the boundaries demarkating them from Australians and Finns in Finland, there were significant differences in their understanding of Finnish-Australian ethnicity in Melbourne. The distinctions between the various Finnish associations discussed earlier were a clear example of this. The oral histories of the immigrants also revealed other, more covert, boundaries based on class, gender and age.

Perhaps the most fundamental but also the most covert formative factor of the Finnish migrant ethnicity was based on class. In fact, it did not operate so much as a dividing boundary within the community but existed alongside the linguistic and cultural boundaries. This was because the ethnic organisations that embodied the Finnish community drew their members largely from the late-fifties and late-sixties immigrants who were characterised by their working-class background. An interviewee recognised the importance of the class bond:

Those people that left Finland in the same decade… came from similar circumstances, they were all working-class families. So everyone was on sort of equal level then… and we were able to talk about our experiences.

Market at the Finnish Lutheran Church in Melbourne in August. – *Senja Baron.*

As many migrants also shared similar occupations in the manufacturing and construction industries in Melbourne, the feeling of common experience and group solidarity was further strengthened.[62] It is possible that Finns who were more socially mobile and financially established never felt the need to seek positive identification within ethnic organisations. The culture and customs practised within the Finnish Church and Society have certainly always been distinctively working-class. They emphasise sport, dancing, folk music, crafts and humorous plays instead of the concert music, art and literature associated with the middle and upper classes.

There were also several differences between men's and women's experiences of ethnicity, mostly due to the differences in their occupations. Because many women did not attend the workforce, they were more excluded from the Australian society. Consequently, their Finnish was less influenced by English than men's was. Homebound women were also able to maintain more informal ethnic networks based on home visits and mutual advice. Men tied to full-time jobs, by contrast, had to limit their socialising to the weekend events and the institutional networks of the Church and the Society. They held all the leading positions within the organisations with the exception of leadership of the subcommittees responsible for the more feminine craft, theatre and dance associations.[63] In communal efforts women demonstrated their ethnic loy-

alties in the kitchen while men engaged in constructing and administering the more visible side of the projects. One woman expressed her frustration with going unnoticed while her husband received praise for his contributions to the community. 'Although they say now that [he] has done all this and that, he couldn't have done any of it on his own. I've always been there behind him, baking pastries [for sale] and doing all sorts of things.' In summary it seems that Finnish women's ethnicity, just like their lives in general, was based more on domestic and informal associations than the men's, who focussed more on its institutional manifestations.

Although dissolved in the recent times, another boundary existed between the late-fifties and the late-sixties immigrant cohorts on the basis of their different experiences of immigration.[64] The older group that arrived in Australia with empty pockets after having spent all their money on the passage, were forced to take on low-skilled manufacturing jobs, and few managed to improve their financial situation as much as they had hoped even after decades of toil. Those who arrived in the late-1960s, however, received a virtually free passage and were able to invest their savings in starting businesses or buying homes in Australia. Many were also able to return to Finland once they had enough of the adventure or had cashed up over a few years hard work. Prior to the late-sixties, the Finnish community had been strongly shaped by the immigrants' uniform experiences of leaving, settling and living in Australia; the arrival of the new immigrants was seen as an encroachment of its boundaries.[65]

One couple had experienced the difference within their family. They recalled, 'we didn't have anything, we had to start from scratch. When [his] brother came ten years later it didn't cost them anything… they could get set up so easily.'[66] Judging the new comers by the governmental travel and settling assistance they received, some fifties migrants deemed the 'freshmen' too weak, demanding and unprepared for facing the difficulties of migrant life.[67] Indeed, some new arrivals were surprised at the backwardness of the industries, the general dirtiness, and the poor social welfare in Australia compared to Finland.[68] The homeland had changed a lot since the late-fifties migrants had departed, and some were eager to point that out.

We intend to absorb into the Australian society as migration officials have promised, and it is from this basis that we hope to begin, not with a hoe in hand. … We'd rather work with our brain, not with our hands. …All the respect for the pioneers, but we are living in 1967 now.[69]

Suggestions that the new comers were somehow better or of higher class enraged some of the older migrants. In response to the above, one fifties migrant suggested, 'Go and try working in your high-class occupation, but you will end up becoming what all [Finns] have become – a builder.'[70]

The friction between the two migrant cohorts was mostly due to the fact that during the ten years before the new migrant wave arrived, the fifties migrants had formed close friendships crystallised by their shared experiences. As many of them fondly reminisced, the acquaintances made already on the voyage over and during the first months in the new country had become like family to them. It was understandable then, that the established community felt threatened by a wave of new immigrants who did not share their experiences and held different expectations of what migrant life was going to be like. By the last decade, the real and perceived differences between the two waves waned and became largely inconsequential. Both the Society and Church councils are now manned predominantly by the younger migrants since many of the late-fifties migrants have become ill with age or passed away. At least for an outsider, the fifties and the sixties cohorts seem united behind the more prevalent language, class and cultural boundaries, and today share the stakes of maintaining and defining Finnish-Australian ethnicity.

Conclusion

The Finnish post-war migrant experience demonstrates the specificity of ethnicity. The Finns' oral histories confirm that the boundaries defining identity emerge through interaction with 'the other', and that ethnicity is always established on the premise of the specific sociocultural circumstances within which this interaction occurs.[71] Ethnicity is also a phenomenon more profound than

its structural, political and social implications. It cannot be fully explained by theoretical generalisations or dissected into components applicable to all ethnic groups, but is best studied through oral histories that expose the experiential and subjective forces underlying its construction and maintenance.[72]

The boundaries that demarcate Finnish ethnicity in Melbourne are particular to their post-war migration experience. The Finns never arrived in as large numbers as other post-war immigrants, and were considered model immigrants because of their northern European looks and culture. Because they appeared similar to Australians they were not purposely excluded or negatively labelled as ethnics. The boundary forcing them to remain in the fringes of Australian society was founded upon their inability to communicate in English. Regardless of others' expectation and their own intention to blend in, this real and tangible barrier curbed their career opportunities and ability to become part of Australian social networks.

In response, the Finns established the Finnish Lutheran Church and the Finnish Society. These ethnic organisations formed another conceivable boundary enclosing Finns that needed support and interaction within a familiar cultural environment. The boundary was enforced by the exclusion of non-Finnish people and of Finns that were willing to integrate into the host society. The Finnish community then, was separated from other Australians by boundaries based on its members' poor English, concentration into industrial occupations, and inability or reluctance to socialise with English-speaking Australians.

The migrants were also distinguished from Finns living in Finland by a set of more intangible boundaries. By adopting expressions from the language of the surrounding society and merging their various vernaculars, they created a dialect distinct to the migrant group. They also adopted new behavioural codes and attitudes distinguishing them from other Finns whom they considered to be uptight and narrow-minded. The migrants grew apart from their country of origin so that it was a reference point only in their memories, not in present-day interests or orientations. The Finnish post-war migrant community in Melbourne then, was demarcated not only from its Australian host society but also from the Finns' old homeland.

Within these boundaries, a number of understandings of Finnish ethnicity emerged. The most obvious internal boundaries were established by the ethnic organisations and based on their emphasis of particular aspects of Finnishness. Another level of boundaries intersected the institutional distinctions. The community was defined by the working-class status of its members and cultural practices. Also, men and women experienced and understood their ethnicity differently, with the former focussing on its formal expression through the institutions and the latter on domesticity and informal networks. The late-fifties and late-sixties immigrant cohorts were distinguished by their different experience and understanding of migration. Overall, the Finns' experience confirms Harney's assertion that 'ethnic identity does not emerge from a monolithic, shared culture but through a complex, diverse social field'.[73]

These tangible and intangible, and external and internal boundaries have encapsulated a distinctive Finnish-Australian ethnic identity based on shared experience of migration, exclusion and difference.[74] Max Weber recognised that 'subjective belief in common descent because of … memories of migration' can be just as potent a basis for shared ethnic identity as 'similarities of physical type or customs'.[75] Sharing memories and experience also means sharing core values, conduct, and understanding of the world that make communication more effective within the group than it is with those outside it.[76] In other words, the boundaries of the Finnish-Australian ethnic community have been enforced by their shared understanding of Finnish language and customs as well as of the social code of Australia. Having created their unique blend of these two cultures, the post-war immigrants are truly 'tied to two places and at home in neither',[77] and are therefore most at home with those with similar experience.

In sum, belonging to the Finnish ethnic community in Melbourne is not only about being from Finland. Because the community is so strongly defined by its members' experience of their particular circumstances, it effectively excludes Finns with differ-

ent backgrounds and understandings. Consequently, the Finnish community has struggled to attract recent immigrants and second generation Finns to ensure its continuity. To do so, a more flexible model of Finnish ethnicity not bound to concrete and lived experience of exclusion due to Finnishness should be constructed. This has happened in America, where second and third generation Finns have continued to maintain their ethnicity as a source of pride and nostalgia but have not incorporated Finnishness into their daily lives.[78] Whether Finnish ethnicity in Melbourne will evolve beyond its current experiential boundaries remains to be seen.

Notes

1 This is an abstracted version of **Senja Baron**'s study submitted as a *Forth Year Honours Thesis* for the Department of History, University of Melbourne in May 2000.

2 **M. Bass**, *'Scandinavians on the Sydney waterfront'*, in Oral History Association of Australia Journal, no. 6, 1984: 41–44; **A. Griffiths**, *'Australian Immigration'*, and *'The Finns in Bunyip'*, in **O. Koivukangas** (ed.*), Scandinavian Emigration to Australia and New Zealand Project: Proceedings of a Symposium February 17–19, 1982, Turku, Finland.* Turku: Institute of Migration, 1983, pp. 24–29, and pp. 110–116; **H. Throssell**, *'Migrants in Industry'*, in *Ethnic Minorities in Australia: The Welfare of Aborigines and Migrants.* Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968; **J. Korkiasaari**, *Suomalaiset maailmalla: Suomen siirtolaisuus ja ulkosuomalaiset entisajoista tähän Päivään*. Turku: Institute of Migration, 1989. Also **J. Lompolo**, *Maa johon mahtuu: Australia suomalaisten silmin.* Jyväskylä, 1975; **E. Kansanaho**, *Etelän Ristin alla*. Helsinki, 1975.

3 **G. A. De Vos**, *'Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation'*, in **L. Romanucci-Ross & G. A. De Vos** (ed.), *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict and Accommodation*, third edition. Walnut Creek / London / New Delhi: Altamira Press, 1995, pp. 18; **J. R. Feagin & C. B. Feagin**, *Racial and Ethnic Relations*, sixth edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1999, pp. 11–12.

4 **R. D. Alba**, *'Ethnicity'*, in **E. F. & M. L. Borgatta** (ed*), Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Volume 2. New York: Macmillan, 1992, pp. 580–1; See for example **W. D. Borrie**, *Italians and Germans in Australia: a Study of Assimilation*. Melbourne: F. W. Chesire, 1954; **G. Bottomley**, *After the Odyssey: A Study of Greek Australians.* University of Queensland Press, 1979; **G. Bottomley**, *From Another Place: Migration and the Politics of Culture*. Cambridge University Press, 1992; **J. Collins**, *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Post-War Immigration.* Leichhardt: Pluto Press, 1988; **J. R. Feagin & C. B. Feagin**, *Racial and Ethnic Relations*, 1999, pp. 36–8; **J. Martin**, *Community and Identity: Refugee Groups in Adelaide*. Canberra: ANU Press, 1972; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours: Migrant Organisations in Melbourne*. Canberra: ANU Press, 1978; **J. Wilton & R. Bosworth**, *Old Worlds and New Australia: The Post-War migrant experience.* Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1985.

5 Accurate figures are not available, but knowing that in 1996 there were 991 Finns in Melbourne and that in 1999 the average attendance at the weekly meetings at the Society was 60 and at the Church 40, an educated guess can be drawn. Both organisations have many more members though, but in this context the proportion of active participants is of more relevance. **O. Koivukangas**, *'Finns in the Southern Hemisphere'*, 1998, pp. 190–91; Attendance figures from the organizer of the Society's Wednesday Club and the 1999–2000 president of the Church council.

6 *Suomi*, 6/1958, pp. 3.

7 **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 158.

8 **J. Collins**, *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land*, 1991, pp. 9.

9 **David Hunter**, a NSW politician as quoted in **J. Wilton & R. Bosworth**, *Old Worlds and New Australia*, 1985, pp. 6. See also **J. Jupp**, *'Seeking Whiteness; the recruitment of Nordic Immigrants to Oceania'*, in **O. Koivukangas & C. Westin**

(ed), *Scandinavian and European Migration to Australia and New Zealand: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Stockholm, Sweden and Turku, Finland, June 9–11, 1998*. Turku: Institute of Migration / Stockholm: CEIFO, 1998, pp. 37–38.

10 **W. D. Borrie**, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, 1954, pp. 44.

11 **J. Korkiasaari**, *Suomalaiset maailmalla*, 1989, 128; **J. Jupp**, *Immigration*, 1991, pp. 70–71; **M. L. Kovacs & A. J. Cropley**, *Immigrants and Society: Alienation and Assimilation*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975, pp. 71–72.

12 **J. Jupp**, *Immigration*, 1991, pp. 77; **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 12, 18–20; **O. Koivukangas & J. S. Martin**, *The Scandinavians in Australia*. Melbourne: Australasian Educa Press, 1986, pp. 178.

13 **J. Jupp**, *Immigration*. Sydney University Press, 1991, pp. 78; **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 61–63; **J. Korkiasaari**, *Suomalaiset maailmalla*, 1989, pp. 73–77.

14 **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 66–70.

15 **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 58–63.

16 Koivukangas found that nearly 20% of the migrants he surveyed originated from Karelia. Five out of the nine households involved in this study had either a husband or wife who'd been born there.

17 **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 38–50, 66–70.

18 **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 12–13, 17–18; **J. Korkiasaari**, *Suomalaiset maailmalla*, 1989, pp. 127.

19 **J. Collins**, *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land*, 1991 [2nd edition], pp. 29; **A. Parr**, *'Globalisation, nationalism and Finnish-Australian ethnicity'*, in **O. Koivukangas & C. Westin** (ed), *Scandinavian and European Migration to Australia and New Zealand: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Stockholm, Sweden and Turku, Finland, June 9–11, 1998*. Turku: Institute of Migration / Stockholm: CEIFO, 1998, pp. 266.

20 Despite frequent references to interviews, no references will be provided in this article in order to protect the identity of the interviewees. Details of all of the interviews withheld by author.

21 *Suomi*, 22/1998, pp. 26.

22 *Suomi*, 7/1962 pp. 7 and 19/1970 pp. 1; **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 86–88, 94.

23 Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, *Profile 81: 1981. Census Data on Persons Born in Finland. Profile 81: 1981. Census Data on Persons Born in Greece*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1984; **J. Wilton & R. Bosworth**, *Old Worlds and New Australia*, 1985, pp. 93–94.

24 **G. Bottomley**, *After the Odyssey*, 1979; **J. Jupp**, *Arrivals and Departures*, 1966, pp. 45–57.

25 **L. Jayasuriya**, *'Multiculturalism and Pluralism in Australia'*, in **R. Nile** (ed.) *Immigration and the Politics of Ethnicity and Race in Australia and Britain*. Carlton: Bureau of Immigration Research / London: Sir Robert Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, 1991, pp. 84. Classics such as **H. J. Gans**, *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York: Free Press, 1962 and **M. Gordon**, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964 as well as more recently published **N. Hutnik**, *Ethnic Minority Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective*. Oxford University Press, 1991, for example, bypass the language issue completely.

26 **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 161–63.

27 **A. Jordens**, *Alien to Citizen*, 1997, pp. 95–96.

28 For example *Suomi* 6/1958, pp. 4; 9/1958, pp. 5; 10/1958, pp. 4–5; 16/1967, pp. 3. **O. Koivukangas**, *Suomalainen siirtolaisuus*, 1975, pp. 108–13, 198–99.

29 **L. Jayasuriya**, *'Multiculturalism and Pluralism in Australia'*, 1991, pp. 84.

30 **F. Barth**, *'Introduction'* in F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Culture of Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 29–30; **J. A. Fishman**, *'Language and Ethnicity'*, in **H. Giles** (ed.)

Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations. London: Academic Press, 1977, pp. 16; **J. Western & M. Lynch-Blosse**, *Self-Identities and Ethnicity*. Canberra: Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989.

31 **R. Unikoski,** *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 288, 290–91.

32 For example **N. D. Harvey**, *Eh, Paesan! Being Italian in Toronto*. University of Toronto Press, 1998, pp. 54, 94; and **J. Nagel**, *'Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture'*, in Social Problems, 41, 1, February, 1994:156–60; **G. E. Pozzetta** (ed.), *Ethnic Communities: Formation and Transformation*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1991.

33 For example **G. Bottomley**, *After the Odyssey*, 1979; **J. Martin**, *Community and Identity*, 1972; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978.

34 **J. Martin**, *Community and Identity*, 1972, pp. 28–29.

35 *Suomi*, 6/1958, pp. 4, 6; 8/1958, pp. 4–5.

36 *Finnish Society of Melbourne 25 Years* [Special celebratory leaflet]. Finnish Society of Melbourne, 1983.

37 *Melbournen Suomi Seura – Jäsenkirja* [Melbourne Finnish Society – Membership book], pp. 5.

38 **G. Bottomley**, *After the Odyssey*, 1979, pp. 72–73; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 273; **M. Gordon**, *Assimilation in American Life*, 1964, pp. 31.

39 *Suomi*, 3/1961, pp. 2; 8/1962, pp. 8; 15/1969, pp. 11; 17/1969, pp. 6–7; 22/1970, pp. 9.

40 *Suomi*, 8/1960, pp. 2; **H. Eilert & J. S. Martin**, *Northern Light in the Southern Skies: Scandinavian Church Life in Victoria 1883–1983*. Melbourne: Swedish Church, 1983, pp. 158–61; **O. Koivukangas**, *Kaukomaiden kaipuu*, 1998, pp. 143.

41 *Suomi*, 1/1962, pp. 2.

42 *Suomi*, 11/1962, pp. 14.

43 *Finnish Society of Melbourne 25 Years* [Special celebratory leaflet]. Finnish Society of Melbourne, 1983.

44 **J. Martin**, *Community and Identity*, 1972, pp. 29–34; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 61–71.

45 **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985, pp. 107; **A. Hodge**, *Determinants of Ethnic Group Vitality in Australia*. Richmond: Clearing House on Migration Issues, 1984, pp. 4; **G. A. De Vos**, *'Ethnic Pluralism'*, 1995, pp. 32.

46 Both organisations have many more members but in this context the proportion of active participants is of more relevance.

47 **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 137–38; *Profile 81: 1981 Census Data on Persons Born in Finland*, 1984; *Profile 81: 1981 Census Data on Persons Born in the Netherlands*, 1984; **J. Wilton & R. Bosworth**, *Old Worlds and New Australia*, 1985, pp. 93–94.

48 **G. Bottomley**, *After the Odyssey*, 1979, pp. 73–76; **M. Gordon**, *Assimilation in American Life*, 1964, pp. 31; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 285–87.

49 *Suomi*, 6/1962, pp. 3; 8/1962, pp. 8; 8–9/1965, pp.5.

50 **O. Koivukangas**, *Kaukomaiden kaipuu*, 1998, pp. 131. I was also able to examine some of the Finnish Society's correspondence and committee meeting minutes relating to the dispute with Sisu -62 for years 1962–67. The papers are held in the Finnish Hall at Altona, courtesy of Jori Tossavainen, President of the Finnish Society of Melbourne.

51 *Suomi*, 1969, Juhlanumero [Special edition], pp. 42.

52 *Suomi*, 24/1967, pp. 10.

53 *Suomi*, 9/1966, pp. 6.

54 **O. Koivukangas**, *Kaukomaiden kaipuu*, 1998, pp. 131.

55 **C. Calhoun**, *'Social Theory and the Politics of Identity'*, 1994, pp. 14–18; **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985, pp. 12, 20; **J. A. Fishman**, *'Language and Ethnicity'*, 1977, pp. 17–19.

56 **J. Armstrong**, *'Nations before Nationalism'*, in **J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith** (ed.), *Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 141; **G. Bottomley**, *From Another Place*, 1992, pp. 131–32.

57 **F. Barth**, *'Introduction'*, 1969, pp. 9–38; **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985, pp. 12.

58 **I. Chambers**, *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London/New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 12.

59 **L. Baldassar**, *'Home and Away: Migration, the Return Visit and 'Transnational' Identity'*, in **Ien Ang & Michael Symonds** (ed.), *Communal/Plural 5/1997: Home, Displacement, Belonging*. Sydney: Research Centre in Inter-

communal Studies/University of Western Sydney, 1997; **N. D. Harney**, *Eh, Paesan!*, 1998, pp. 7–8, 80–101, *passim.*; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 287.

60 **L. Baldassar**, *'Home and Away'*, 1997, pp. 69–94.

61 *Ibid.*, pp. 90–91; **G. Bottomley**, *From Another Place*, 1992, pp. 36, 57; **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985, pp. 20–21; **J. A. Fishman**, *'Language and Ethnicity'*, 1977, pp. 27; **N. D. Harney**, *Eh, Paesan!*, 1998, pp. 3–4.

62 **M. Hechter & M. Levi**, *'Ethno-Regional Movements in the West'*, in **J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith** (ed.), *Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 186

63 Finnish Society of Melbourne 25 Years [Special celebratory leaflet]. Melbourne, 1983; *Finnish Society of Melbourne 40 Years* [Special celebratory leaflet]. Melbourne, 1998.

64 Similar divisions have also been found between different waves of Polish migrants to Melbourne and Italians in Toronto. **N. D. Harney**, *Eh, Paesan!*, 1998, pp. 32–33; **R. Unikoski**, *Communal Endeavours*, 1978, pp. 13–14.

65 **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985, pp. 109.

66 *Suomi*, 8/1967, pp. 11.

67 *Suomi*, 15/1969, pp. 11.

68 *Suomi*, 6/1970, pp. 11.

69 *Suomi*, 7/1967, pp. 5.

70 *Suomi*, 8/1967, pp. 10.

71 **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985, pp. 13.

72 **L. Romanucci-Ross & G. A. De Vos**, (ed.), *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict and Accommodation*, 1995, pp. 11–12; **M. R. Somers & G. D. Gibson**, *'Reclaiming the Epistemological "Other": Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity'*, in **C. Calhoun** (ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford UK/Cambridge USA: Blackwell, 1994, pp. 38–59.

73 **N. D. Harney**, *Eh, Paesan!*, 1998, pp. 3–4.

74 **R. D. Alba**, *'Ethnicity'*, 1992, pp. 575; **F. Barth**, *'Introduction'*, 1969, pp. 9–38; **A. P. Cohen**, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, 1985.

75 **M. Weber**, *Economy and Society*, 1978, pp. 388–89.

76 **K. W. Deutch**, *'Nationalism and Social Communication'*, in **J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith** (ed.), *Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 26; **M. Weber**, *Economy and Society*, 1978, pp. 390.

77 **Judith Brett** as quoted in **G. Bottomley**, *From Another Place*, 1992, pp. 70.

78 **Y. Hiipakka Lockwood**, *'Immigrant to Ethnic: Symbols of Identity among Finnish-Americans'*, Folklife Annual 1986, Washington: American Folklife Center at the library of Congress, 1986; **P. Kivisto**, *'The Attenuated Ethnicity of Contemporary Finnish-Americans'*, in P. Kivisto (ed.) *The Ethnic Enigma: the Salience of Ethnicity for European-origin Groups*. London & Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989, pp. 67–88.

Primary Sources

Details of the **ten interviews** on which the study was based are held with the author.

Finnish Hall in Altona:

- Finnish Society of Melbourne 25 Years [Special celebratory leaflet]. Melbourne, 1983.
- Finnish Society of Melbourne 40 Years [Special celebratory leaflet]. Melbourne, 1998.
- Finnish Society's correspondence and committee meeting minutes for years 1962–67.
- Melbournen Suomi Seura – Jäsenkirja [Melbourne Finnish Society – Membership book]. (Not dated but possibly printed in 1960).
- Study of Social Service Needs of Elderly Finns in Melbourne. The Finnish Society of Melbourne Inc., May 1996.

The Lutheran Archives, North Adelaide:

- Suomi, most issues for years 1951–1971.