The Migratory Process: A Comparison of Australia and Germany

The following text appeared in earlier versions of The Age of Migration. It was Chapter 9 in the Third Edition (published in 2003). For reasons of space it could not be included in the Fourth and Fifth Editions. However, it is provided here as a resource for teaching and study. It has been updated by Derya Ozkul and Stephen Castles in 2013, and should be read in conjunction with Chapters, 11, 12 and 13 of the Fifth edition of The Age of Migration, which present broader dimensions of the process of immigrant settlement and incorporation into receiving societies.

This text presents comparative case studies of the migratory process in two countries with very different traditions and institutional frameworks. Despite these differences, there are significant parallels in the development of migration and ethnic diversity, as will become apparent. This leads to the conjecture that the dynamics of the migratory process (as discussed theoretically in Chapters 2 and 3) can be powerful enough to override political structures, government policies and the intentions of the migrants. It does not mean, however, that these factors are unimportant: although settlement and ethnic group formation have taken place in both cases, they have done so under very different conditions. There have also been differing outcomes, which can be characterized as the formation of ethnic communities in the Australian case, as against ethnic minorities in Germany. The examples gain additional interest through the major changes in attitudes and policies towards migration in both countries since the mid-1990s.

Australia and Germany: two opposing cases?

Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) have both experienced mass population movements since 1945. In both cases, foreign immigration started through the official recruitment of migrant workers. Early on, the areas of origin of migrants were partly the same. However, there the similarities seem to end, and the two countries are often seen as opposite poles on the migration spectrum.

Australia is considered one of the classical countries of immigration: a new nation, which has been built through colonization and immigration over the last two centuries. Like the USA and Canada, it is a sparsely populated country, which has

been open to settlement from Europe and also, more recently, from other continents. Since 1947, there has been a continuous policy of planned immigration, designed both to build population and to bring about economic growth. Immigration has been mainly a permanent family movement of future citizens and has made Australia into a country of great ethnic diversity, with policies of multiculturalism. After 1996, this model was challenged and important changes have occurred. Today Australia's migration policy is shifting from the old principle of permanent family settlement to an economically driven and often temporary migration.

Germany, by contrast, is generally seen as an 'historical nation', with roots that go back many centuries, even though unification as a state was not achieved until 1871. Post-1945 policies emphasized the recruitment of temporary 'guestworkers', although there have also been large influxes of refugees and 'ethnic Germans' from Eastern Europe. Despite the zero immigration policy pursued after 1973, the end of the Cold War led to massive new population movements. Until the late 1990s, leaders claimed that Germany was 'not a country of immigration'. Since then, however, there have been important changes in policies on immigration and integration. These were partly connected with the effects of a period of economic stagnation in the early twenty-first century, which has led to a decline of immigration and the re-emergence of emigration of Germans for the first time for 40 years. Awareness of demographic trends has made German policy-makers realise that immigration will remain important for the economy in the long run, while better integration of minorities arising through past immigration has become a high priority.

In comparing the two countries, we shall look at the way the migratory process is shaped by a number of factors: the origins and developments of migratory flows; labour market incorporation; the development of immigrant communities; the evolution of legal frameworks and government policies; and the immigrants' various forms of interaction with the society of the receiving country. In the German case, the increasing significance of European Union policies on immigration, asylum and equal opportunities has also played a part, while for Australia the growth of economic and cultural links with Asia has been important.

The tables below give figures for the immigrant populations in the two countries. The data for Australia are birthplace figures, as many overseas-born people have become citizens. The 2011 Census showed that there were 5.3 million overseas-born

persons (or 'first generation Australians') living in Australia – 27 per cent of the population. A further 4.1 million persons (or 20 per cent of the population) were Australian-born persons with at least one overseas-born parent ('second generation Australians') (ABS, 2012). Thus nearly half the population were immigrants or their children. The 2011 Census also counted 548,000 Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders (2.5 per cent of the total population) who are the only true 'non-immigrants' in Australia (ABS, 2013).

Germany has 7.2 million foreign residents (8.8 per cent of the total population). The proportion of foreigners in the total population has remained constant at about 9 per cent since 1995 (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 30). 19 per cent of foreigners living in Germany were born in Germany (1.3 million persons). Rather than referring to foreigners, there is an increasing tendency in Germany to refer to 'persons with a migration background', who often have been born in Germany. Moreover, focusing on foreigners excludes those immigrants who have become naturalized during their stay or who have entered the country as Germans (*Spätaussiedler*). This new concept has been introduced because differentiation of data by citizenship has proved to be inadequate and misleading. In addition, since 2005, the German Government has provided data on 'foreign-born persons' by country of birth. This is more directly comparable with the Australian birthplace figures. We therefore provide two tables on Germany: Table 2 on foreign residents and Table 3 on foreign-born persons.

Origins and development of the migratory movements
Migratory movements to Australia and Germany are described in Chapters 5 and 7 of *The Age of Migration*. Here, we will discuss differences and similarities in the post-1945 immigration experiences.

In 1947, the Australian government started a large-scale immigration programme, designed to increase the population for both strategic and economic reasons. The original aim was to attract British settlers, but areas of origin quickly became more diverse. In the late 1940s, many immigrants came from Eastern and Central Europe, while in the 1950s and 1960s Southern Europeans predominated. Many Eastern Europeans were selected for settlement from displaced persons camps, while Southern Europeans were recruited through bilateral agreements with the Italian, Greek,

Maltese, and later Turkish governments. Since the Australian government wanted both workers and settlers, initial recruitment led to processes of chain migration, through which early migrants helped relatives, friends and fellow villagers to come and join them.

Table 1 *Australia: Immigrant population by birthplace region (thousands)*

Country of birth	**1971**	**1981**	**1991**	**2001**	**2006**	**2011**
New Zealand	81	177	276	356	471	483
Europe Of which:	2197	2234	2299	2133	2078	
UK and Ireland	*1088*	*1133*	*1175*	*1086*	-	1101
Italy	*290*	*276*	*255*	*219*	-	185
(Former) Yugoslavia	*130*	*149*	*161*	-	-	-
Greece	*160*	*147*	*136*	*127*	-	
Germany	*111*	*111*	*115*	*108*	-	108
Other Europe	*418*	*418*	*457*	*604*	-	
Asia (incl. Middle East)	167	372	822	1155	-	
North Africa and Middle East	-	-	-	-	251	
South-East Asia	-	-	-	-	553	
North-East Asia	-	-	-	-	389	
Southern and Central Asia	-	-	-	-	267	
Americas	56	96	147	161	180	
Africa	62	90	132	183	-	
Sub-Saharan Africa	-	-	-	-	192	
Total immigrant population	**2563**	**2969**	**3676**	**3988**	**4381**	**5294**

Notes: The symbol – indicates not an absence of migrants, but that these are aggregated elsewhere. At the time of writing we were unable to obtain regional origin data for 2011 that would be comparable with earlier years. Table 2 therefore presents 2011 data by country (rather than region) of origin.
Sources: Australian Census reports.

Table 2 *Australia: immigrant population by Top 10 countries of birth 2011*

Country of birth	Persons (000s)	Proportion of all Overseas-born
United Kingdom	1101	20.8
New Zealand	483	9.1
China	319	6.0
India	295	5.6
Italy	185	3.5
Vietnam	185	3.5
Philippines	171	3.2
South Africa	146	2.8
Malaysia	116	2.2
Germany	108	2.0
Born elsewhere	2184	41
Total overseas-born	**5294**	**100**

Source: (ABS, 2012: 4).

Most recent migration from 2007 to 2011 has been from Asian countries, with India being the leading birthplace group for this period with 13 per cent of all arrivals. The UK came second with 12 per cent of arrivals from 2007 to 2011. Seven of the remaining Top 10 origin countries of recent arrivals were Asian (ABS, 2012: 4).

Table 3 *Foreign residents in Germany (thousands)*

Country	**1980**	**1990**	**1995**	**2000**	**2005**	**2010**
Turkey	1462	1695	2014	1999	1764	1629
Italy	618	552	586	616	541	518
Yugoslavia	632	662	-	-	-	-
Serbia and Montenegro	-	-	798	663	297	232
Croatia	-	-	185	217	229	220
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	-	316	156	157	152
Poland	-	242	277	301	327	419
Russian Federation	-	-	-	116	186	191
Ukraine	-	-	-	89	131	124
Greece	298	320	360	365	310	277
Spain	180	136	132	129	108	105
Portugal	112	85	125	134	116	113
Netherlands	-	111	113	111	119	136
Austria	173	183	185	188	175	175
Other countries	978	1347	2083	2213	2296	2463
Total	**4453**	**5343**	**7174**	**7297**	**6756**	**6754**

Notes: Official data for Germany have been presented differently over the years due to political changes as well as shifts in migration patterns. The figures are for 31 December and apply to the old *Länder* of the pre-reunification Federal Republic of Germany up to 1990 and to the whole of Germany for 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2010. Yugoslavia included Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia in 1980 and 1990, but these new states are shown separately in later years. EC/EU refers to the composition of the European Community or the European Union at the time of the data. Some countries (especially in Eastern Europe) were not listed separately in earlier years due to relatively low migration flows. The symbol – therefore indicates not an absence of migrants, but that these are aggregated elsewhere. Serbia and Montenegro for 2005 and 2010 includes only Serbia,
Sources: (OECD, 1992: Table 10; 2001: Table B.1.5; 2007: Table B.1.5; 2012: Table B.5).

Table 4 *Stock of foreign-born population in Germany (thousands)*

Country	2005	2010
Turkey	1472	1497
Italy	437	420
Serbia	-	204
Croatia	268	226
Bosnia and Herzegovina	237	154
Poland	719	1112
Russian Federation	1005	977
Ukraine	-	227
Greece	233	231
Netherlands	107	133
Austria	191	197
Other countries	**5730**	**5213**
Total	**10,399**	**10,591**

Source: (OECD, 2012: Table B.4)

Germany has had several major migratory movements since 1945. The first and largest was that of over 8 million expellees (*Heimatvertriebene*) from the lost eastern parts of the *Reich* and 3 million refugees (*Flüchtlinge*) who came to the FRG from the German Democratic Republic (GDR) up to 1961. These people were regarded as being of German ethnic origins, and immediately became citizens of the FRG. Despite initial strains, they were absorbed into the population, providing a willing source of labour for Germany's 'economic miracle' (Kindleberger, 1967).

The next major movement - that of 'guestworkers' from the Mediterranean area - was to be the one that did most to turn Germany into a multi-ethnic society. As in Australia, government labour recruitment was the driving force, but there was a major difference: 'guestworkers' were not meant to settle permanently (see Box 5.1 in *The Age of Migration*). The 'guestworker' system was designed to recruit manual workers (both male and female) to work in factories and other low-skilled jobs in Germany. Foreign workers had a special legal status, which restricted family reunion, limited labour market and social rights, and gave little chance of becoming citizens. But the ending of labour recruitment in 1973 led to trends towards family reunion and permanent settlement. Many Southern Europeans did leave, but those who stayed were mainly from the more distant and culturally different sending countries, especially Turkey and Yugoslavia.

The Turkish case illustrates how temporary migration became transformed into settlement and community formation. Turkey had no tradition of international labour migration: the initial movement was a result of German recruitment policies. The Turkish government hoped to relieve domestic unemployment and to obtain foreign exchange through worker remittances. The migrants themselves sought an escape from poverty, unemployment and dependence on semi-feudal landowners. It was hoped that money earned and skills gained abroad would encourage economic development at home. Thus the migrants from Turkey initially shared the German expectation of temporary migration. However, when Germany stopped recruitment in 1973, many workers stayed on, and family reunion continued. Migrants realized that economic conditions at home were bad, and that there would be no opportunity to re-migrate to Germany later. In 1974, there were just over 1 million migrant residents from Turkey out of a total foreign population of 4.1 million. Their number grew to 1.6 million by 1982, and to 2 million by 1995. Family reunion was not the only form of

continued migration: political unrest and ethnic conflict in Turkey generated waves of asylum seekers, who found shelter in Turkish and Kurdish communities abroad. German government policies were ineffective in preventing further immigration and settlement. Mass deportation, though debated, was never a real option for a democratic state, committed to a wide range of international agreements.

By the mid-1970s, both Australia and Germany had large permanent settler populations. Australian authorities accepted settlement and were beginning to seek ways of managing cultural diversity. Germany, by contrast, officially denied the reality of settlement. From the late 1970s, both countries experienced new forms of immigration, leading to even greater diversity.

Australia's immigration intakes became global in scope. The White Australia Policy was formally abandoned in 1973, and large-scale Asian immigration began in the late 1970s with the arrival of Indo-Chinese refugees. By the mid-1980s, Asia was the source of 40-50 per cent of entries. Australia also attracted Latin Americans (both workers and refugees) and Africans (in small numbers at first). Immigration of New Zealanders (who can enter freely) also grew. In the 1990s, economic and political crises brought about new inflows from the former Soviet Union, former Yugoslavia, the Middle East and South Africa, while in the early twenty-first century many Africans (especially from Sudan) were admitted as refugees. Both skilled migration and refugee entry led to entry of dependants.

The changing composition of immigrant intakes reflects these changes. The 1947 Census counted 7.6 million people, of whom 90 per cent had been born in Australia, while most of the overseas-born came from the United Kingdom and Ireland. In 1971, 85 per cent of the immigrant population were from Europe, and of these half were from the UK. From the 1970s, European immigration declined, while entries from Asia, Oceania and Latin America increased. In the early twenty-first century these trends continued, while entries from Africa grew. The proportion of migrants from the UK has been declining steadily from 22.5 per cent in 2005-06 to just 14.2 per cent in 2010-11 (DIAC, 2011: 4). Fast growing origin groups include Oceania (mainly New Zealanders, who enjoy free movement to Australia) and Africa, due to refugee intakes (mainly from Sudan) and migration from South Africa. In 2010-11 North Asia provided 24.8 per cent of the migration program, largely due to the increase in migrants from China (29,547) (DIAC, 2011: 4).

Australia maintains a regular Migration Program planned by the government on the basis of economic, social and humanitarian considerations. Permanent non-humanitarian arrivals averaged 110,000 per year in the 1980s and 90,000 per year in the 1990s. This does not include entrants from New Zealand, who can enter freely. The Centre-Right Coalition Government elected in 1996 set out to re-orient immigration to focus on economic benefits for Australia – mainly by giving precedence to skilled and temporary migration. By 2009-10, permanent non-humanitarian inflows totalled 168,623. Of these, 107,868 were in the skilled migrant category. In 2010-11, the total migration program outcome reached 168,685. Of these 113,725 places were allocated in the skill stream, while the family stream had 54,543 places (DIAC, 2011: 3).

Australia's integration into global and regional economic networks has also led to increased temporary migration – a departure from Australia's traditional focus on permanent settlers. In 2000-01 long-term temporary migrants (overseas visitors allowed to stay for 12 months or more but not permanently) outnumbered permanent arrivals for the first time. The two main streams of temporary migrants in recent years have been skilled temporary migrants entering under the 457 Temporary Business (long-stay) Visa, and overseas students (DIAC, 2010). The numbers of 457 Visa holders have grown rapidly and now are nearly equal to the numbers of permanent skilled migrants. The number of overseas students has grown even faster than the 457 Visa holders. In 2008-09, 421,648 temporary resident visas were issued: 101,280 of them were for 457 visas, while the number of visas granted to overseas students reached a peak of 320,368 (Phillips *et al.*, 2010).

Emigration has also increased in recent years from around 88,000 in 1981-82 to roughly 326,000 in 2008-09 (Productivity Commission, 2010: 36). Working abroad has become an important part of professional and personal experience, and it is believed that as many as 800,000 Australian citizens currently live overseas. This trend is likely to continue as a result of the increasing internationalization of labour markets. On the other hand, due to the global economic crisis and Australia's relatively stronger economy, many Australians have decided to return to their homeland.

Australia's Humanitarian Program has averaged 12,000 entrants per year since the early 1990s. Since the release of the *Report of the Expert Panel on Asylum Seekers*

in August 2012, significant changes have been made: the size of the program has been increased from 13,750 - as it was in 2010-11- to 20,000 places (DIAC, 2012). The majority of visas are granted under the *offshore* component, i.e. applications for asylum before arrival in Australia (Karlsen *et al.*, 2010: 12). Australia remains one of only about ten countries in the world that have programmes to resettle refugees from countries of first asylum in collaboration with the UNHCR. The statistics show that asylum applications increased to 8250 claims in 2010, up 33 per cent from 2009 (UNHCR, 2011: 6). Numbers increased significantly again in 2012-13. This growth is politically controversial because it is seen as undermining the tradition of strict government control of entries (see Box: Australia's immigration panic and the *'Tampa* Affair').

Australian immigration also has regional dimensions. Since 1947, most migrants have tended to go to areas of rapid industrial development, especially the State of New South Wales (NSW) and its capital city Sydney, and the State of Victoria and its capital Melbourne. Although migrants have always also gone to other states, the numbers have been smaller, and ethnic communities make up a smaller share in the total populations. In recent years, the State Government of NSW has become concerned about rapid population growth and possible environmental strains, and has called for policies to encourage migrants to go to country areas or to other states. At the same time, states like Western Australia and South Australia have become worried about lack of labour market entrants and loss of population to other states. The mineral boom of the early 2000s led to intensified efforts by such state governments to attract migrants – both permanent and temporary. Similarly, country areas throughout Australia have welcomed measures to encourage migrants to settle there. For instance, medical personnel willing to work for a certain period in country areas are given preferential immigration treatment, while refugees have been encouraged to take up work in regional towns.

Box: Australia's immigration panic and the *'Tampa* Affair'

Due to its inaccessibility, Australia has had little irregular immigration in the past. Immigration has always been a political issue, but the level of conflict has been limited. This situation changed dramatically after 1996 due to the anti-immigrant rhetoric, the One Nation Party, security fears following 9/11 and the Bali bombing of

2002, as well as the increase in arrivals of boat people. Matters came to a head in 2001 with the *'Tampa* Affair' and a Federal Election fought largely on immigration.

In the late 1990s, the One Nation Party enjoyed a brief period of popularity based on anti-immigrant sentiments. In her inaugural speech in the Federal Parliament, the One Nation leader Pauline Hanson attacked Aboriginal people, called for the stopping of immigration and the abolition of multiculturalism, and warned of 'the Asianization' of Australia. Both the ruling Liberal-National Coalition and the Australian Labor Party (ALP) were slow to condemn Hanson's politics. The trend towards racialization of politics had immediate effects. The tightening of immigration policy was targeted at categories which were claimed to be hurting national interests: family reunion and asylum seekers. The result was a much more hostile climate towards immigration and multiculturalism.

The situation was exacerbated by the increase in boat-people arrivals in northern Australia. These were mainly asylum seekers from Iraq, Afghanistan and other countries brought in from Indonesia, usually on fishing boats chartered by people smugglers. Numbers were not high by international standards, never going much above 4000 in a year, but they provoked hostile media campaigns and popular outrage. The then Immigration Minister Ruddock attacked the asylum seekers as 'queue jumpers', claiming that they took places from 'genuine' refugees allocated by UNHCR. He declared that boat people were a threat to Australian sovereignty. In 1999 the government introduced the three-year Temporary Protection Visa (TPV), which conferred no right to permanent settlement or family reunion. Another deterrent was to stop boat people from landing on Australian shores, and to try to send them back to Indonesia. Those who did land were detained in isolated and remote camps, where they were isolated from lawyers, the media and supporters. As a result, they might languish in mandatory detention for up to three years. Hunger strikes, riots, self-inflicted injuries and even suicide became commonplace. The government also introduced legal measures to limit the power of the courts in asylum matters (Crock *et al.*, 2006: Chapter 5-8).

Matters got even worse in August 2001, when the Norwegian freighter MV *Tampa* picked up over 400 asylum seekers (mainly from Afghanistan and Iraq) from a sinking boat off Northern Australia. The government refused the captain permission to land, and the *Tampa* anchored near the Australian territory of Christmas Island.

This was the start of a saga involving international diplomacy, heated public debates in Australia, and feverish political activity. The 'Tampa Affair' led to the introduction of the 'Pacific Solution': exporting the asylum seekers to Offshore Processing Centres in Nauru and Manus island in Papua New Guinea. Asylum became the central issue in the November Election, giving victory to Liberal-National Prime Minister Howard. Before the *Tampa* affair, a Labour victory had been predicted. The 2002-3 Federal Budget included A$2.8 billion for border control measures - an increase of A$1.2 billion over the previous year. Even stricter border control legislation was introduced in 2002 (Castles *et al.*, 2013).

The Rudd Labor Government which came to power in 2007 introduced changes to asylum policy including abolishing TPVs and ending the Pacific Solution. However, it also retained some key elements, namely mandatory detention, the excision of certain Australian territories from the migration zone, and offshore processing on Christmas Island of asylum seekers arriving by boat. A significant increase in the number of unauthorized boat arrivals from 2008 to 2010 ensured that 'border protection' was a central issue in the 2010 Federal Election. Both major parties treated boat arrivals as a threat to national sovereignty and security, and promised to strengthen border protection and anti-people smuggling measures.

In early 2011, Labor Prime Minister Gillard tried to persuade the government of East Timor to set up a detention and determination facility, to which Australia could send asylum seekers. When East Timor refused, Gillard started negotiating with Malaysia to send asylum seekers for processing there, even though Malaysia is not a signatory to the UN Refugee Convention. This 'solution' was prohibited by the High Court of Australia, which ruled that it contravened Australia's international obligations under the 1951 UN Refugee Convention.

The ALP Government then set up a committee, led by former Air Force chief Angus Houston to find a new policy that might gain support from all main parties. The Houston Committee reported in June 2012, proposing off-shore processing in Nauru and Papua New Guinea. Since 2012, hundreds of refugees have been sent to Nauru and PNG, but boats full of asylum seekers continue to arrive on Australian shores. The Australian Government's hope of deterring boat arrivals by sending asylum-seekers off-shore, detaining them under very basic conditions and taking years to determine whether they would be granted refugee status, has clearly proved

illusory. People fleeing persecution will come whatever the conditions they are exposed to, and the asylum debate remains very much alive. However, the public obsession with asylum had diverted attention from other major changes taking place at present, notably the growth of temporary migration (Castles *et al.*, 2013).

 [END OF BOX]

Germany has had three main types of immigration in recent years: first, entries of asylum seekers from Eastern Europe and from non-European countries; second, entries of economic migrants (both skilled and unskilled, documented and undocumented) from Europe and outside; and, third, immigration of *Aussiedler* or 'ethnic Germans' from the former Soviet Union, Poland, Romania and other Eastern European countries.

Article 16 of Germany's 1948 Basic Law laid down a right for victims of persecution to seek asylum. Until 1993, anybody who claimed to be an asylum seeker was permitted to stay pending an official decision on refugee status, which often took several years. Asylum-seeker movement became significant in the late 1970s, and grew fast as the Soviet Bloc imploded, reaching 100,000 in 1986, 193,000 in 1990, and 438,000 in 1992 (OECD, 1995: 195). In 1992, there was an upsurge in asylum seekers from former Yugoslavia. At first, many were gypsies, as were the majority of asylum seekers from Romania. This ethnic group became the main target of racist violence in mid-1992. Asylum-seeker flows grew sharply during the war in Bosnia-Herzogovina, and by 1995 Germany was host to 345,000 displaced persons from former Yugoslavia (UNHCR, 2000: 239).

Fears of mass East-West and South-North migrations of desperate and impoverished people were seized on by the extreme right, and there was an upsurge in racist incidents. After a lengthy and emotional debate, Paragraph 16 of the Basic Law was amended in 1993, allowing German frontier police to reject asylum seekers for a variety of reasons. Measures were also taken to speed up the processing of applications. After 1995, Germany made agreements with the Bosnian and Serbian governments to facilitate repatriation. People fleeing from Kosovo in 1999 received temporary protection, but most were repatriated quickly after the crisis. In 1999, refugees and asylum seekers made up 1.2 million of Germany's 7.3 million foreign residents. Over 400,000 of these were 'de facto refugees' - persons denied refugee

status, but unable or unwilling to leave for political reasons or fear of persecution (OECD, 2001: 173). Since 1993, the number of asylum seekers has shrunk more or less steadily with about 19,200 applications in 2007 –about the same level as in 1983. Since 2007 more asylum seekers have again been coming to Germany, in 2010 the number was about 41,300.

Germany ended recruitment of migrant labour in 1973, but reintroduced temporary labour schemes for workers from Poland and other Central and Eastern European countries in the 1990s. Some 22,000 contract workers were admitted in 2005. Seasonal workers are also admitted for work in agriculture, hotels and catering. Foreign seasonal workers may be admitted only if no German or foreign workers of equal legal status can be found for these jobs, and if the terms of employment are not less favourable than those for comparable German workers. From 1995 to 2004, the number of seasonal workers grew steadily from about 177,000 to about 334,000 (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 29). Such temporary migration has declined in recent years: in view of relatively high unemployment in Germany, the labour market authorities have encouraged local workers to take short-term posts in agriculture, catering and construction. The number of seasonal foreign workers dropped to about 29,000 in 2009.

Under the 'Green Card' system set up in 2000 to attract highly-skilled workers (especially for the information technology sector), about 5000 persons had been admitted by February 2001. This was far less than the planned 20,000 recruits (OECD, 2001: 174-75). The shortfall appears to have been due to the limited duration of the work permits, and restrictions on family reunion. There is also some undocumented labour migration to Germany, although no official figures are available. In addition, many EU citizens live and work in Germany. Since they do not require work permits, their numbers are not known.

Prior to the global economic crisis, in light of the favourable economic development and the demographic changes, which were beginning to have an impact on the labour market, Germany had gradually opened up its labour market for permanent-type labour migration, although this opening was essentially only for the highly-skilled. Maintaining this policy of gradual opening in spite of the crisis, on 1 January 2009, a number of measures were implemented to promote skilled migration to Germany (OECD, 2010: 206). As of April 2012, the Professional Qualifications

Assessment Act entered into force, improving possibilities for recognizing occupational qualifications acquired abroad, thereby supporting the integration of skilled immigrants in the German labour market (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 68). In parallel, the income threshold for highly-skilled migrants to get residence permits has been lowered. Migrants need to have an employment contract with a gross salary of at least €46,400. Highly qualified people in shortage occupations may be eligible with a gross salary of €36,192. The minimum salary is even lower for jobs where there is a so-called 'special interest of non-EU citizens'. Those who obtain the EU blue card can apply for permanent residency after 33 months (21 months for those who have adequate German language skills).

On the other hand, in recent years German authorities have been encouraging skilled job seekers to take jobs in countries like Austria, Norway, Switzerland and the UK. The German Labour Office now even provides preparation courses for work abroad.

The *Aussiedler* were people of German ancestry whose ancestors have lived in Russia and Eastern Europe for centuries. Like the post-1945 expellees, they had the right to enter Germany and to claim citizenship. *Aussiedler* were generally of rural origin, and often had considerable problems of social adaptation and labour market entry. They were provided with a range of services and benefits to facilitate settlement, which acted as a powerful attracting factor. *Aussiedler* arrivals rose from 86,000 in 1987 to a peak of 397,000 in 1990. In the latter year, 148,000 were from the Soviet Union, 134,000 from Poland and 111,000 from Romania. At a time of social stress and growing unemployment, the influx of *Aussiedler* became unpopular. Despite the principle of free admission, the German government introduced an annual quota. Entries of *Aussiedler* declined to an average of around 220,000 per year from 1991 to 1995. Then quotas were cut further, with just 105,000 entries in 1999 (OECD, 2001: 170). The decline was also due to the introduction of an obligation to prove fluency in German before entering the country. Since 2005, accompanying family members have also been required to prove fluency in German (Ozcan, 2007). By 2010 this type of entry had fallen to 2350 (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 23) – which may be because there are few people of German ancestry left in the areas concerned.

On the other hand, the number of foreigners awarded university places before

arriving in Germany has been rising for years: In 1993-94, this number was 87,000, but by 2000-01 it had risen to 126,000, and in 2009-10 181,000 foreigners were studying at German universities (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 30). Foreign students also have a good chance of staying in Germany: After completing their studies, graduates may take up employment commensurate to their university degree. They may be granted a one-year residence permit in order to look for appropriate employment. Such graduates are not subject to checks before hiring as to whether German or EU citizens are available to fill the position (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 124). In 2008, almost 6000 international graduates obtained a work permit, more than twice the 2006 figure (OECD, 2010: 206).

The debt-stricken Euro Zone countries also affect Germany. The number of foreigners in Germany rose at the fastest pace in 15 years in 2011 with thousands from the Southern European countries moving to Europe's largest economy in search of employment. The number of Greek, Portuguese, Spanish and Italian nationals in Germany jumped by around 16,700 people in 2011, after stagnating in 2010 (Reuters, 2012). This led to the idea of reintroducing border controls inside the European Union.

As this section has shown, both Australia and Germany have been major immigration countries. Australia has received approximately 7 million immigrants since 1947. Although settlement was always planned, it has had unforeseen consequences: the ethnic composition of the population has changed in a way that was never intended by the architects of the migration programme. This has been partly because the need for labour during expansionary phases has dictated changes in recruitment policies. It has also been due to the way in which chain migration has led to self-sustaining migratory processes. Much of Germany's foreign population is the legacy of guestworker recruitment in the 1960s and 1970s, but the asylum seeker entries of the 1990s, the growth of migration from Eastern and Central Europe and new flows from outside Europe have all led to increased population diversity. Altogether over 20 million people have migrated into Germany since 1945. The majority of foreign residents have lived in Germany over ten years, and are likely to stay permanently. Today about one in five persons living in Germany (about 16 million persons) is assumed to have 'a migration background', including 8.5 million German citizens. About three million people are of Turkish background, and about 1.5

17

million have roots in the former Yugoslavia (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 21). Current movements are complex and unpredictable. Germany is once again becoming an emigration country, but immigration also continues.

Labour market incorporation

Up to about 1973, both Australian and German immigration policies were concerned with the recruitment of a manual labour force. Non-British migrants who received assisted passages to Australia were directed into jobs on construction sites such as the Snowy Mountains Hydroelectric Scheme, in heavy industry, or in factories (Collins, 1991). Similarly, the German Federal Labour Office channelled foreign workers into unskilled and semi-skilled jobs on building sites and in factories, and used restrictionary labour permit rules to keep them there as long as possible.

The pre-1973 movements were mainly rural to urban migration: Mediterranean farmers and rural workers emigrated because of poverty, breakdown of social structures through war, and decline of local industries. Many intended to work temporarily in industrial economies, in order to use their earnings to improve their farms or set up small businesses upon return. Even in Australia, many Southern European workers expected to return home, and indeed did so in the 1960s and 1970s, as conditions improved in their countries of origin. However, in time, many migrant workers' intentions changed when it became clear that it would not be possible to achieve their objectives in the home country as quickly as originally expected. The result was an increasing orientation towards long-term stay and occupational mobility in the immigration country (a trend which went hand in hand with family reunion: Piore, 1980: 50).

Workers found that, having entered the labour market at the bottom; it was hard to gain promotion. Migrants' qualifications were often not recognized, forcing skilled workers into dead-end jobs. Typical workplaces for men were car assembly lines, construction sites and foundry work; and, for women, clothing, textiles and food processing. Service occupations such as catering, refuse collection, office cleaning and unskilled jobs in public utilities also became known as 'migrant work' (see Castles *et al.*, 1984; Collins, 1991). The structural factors and discriminatory rules, which led to initial low status, caused enduring patterns of labour market segmentation (social scientists call this phenomenon 'path dependence'). This applied

particularly to migrant women, whose situation was affected both by patriarchal structures in the countries of origin and gender discrimination in the country of immigration. Their occupational status, wages and conditions were generally the worst of all groups in the labour market (Phizacklea, 1983: 1990).

Economic restructuring since the 1970s has brought significant changes, which are analysed in detail in Chapter 11 of *The Age of Migration.* The pre-1973 entrants bore the brunt of restructuring, as low-skilled jobs in manufacturing declined. OECD research has found that once older unskilled foreign workers are laid off in recessions, they have little chance of being re-employed (OECD, 1995: 37). As unskilled manufacturing jobs disappear, many immigrants lack the language skills and basic education needed for retraining (Baker and Wooden, 1992). In Australia unemployment during the recessions of 1974-5, 1982-3 and 1990-2 was significantly higher for non-English-speaking background (NESB) immigrants than for other workers (Ackland and Williams, 1992). Workers from English-speaking-background (ESB) countries fare better. Australians with ancestry linked to Lebanon, Vietnam, the Pacific Islands and African nations, for instance, had much higher unemployment rates than immigrants of other ancestry, and high unemployment rates for Vietnamese and Lebanese have persisted for decades, suggesting structural rather than cyclical barriers to their employability (Collins, 2010: 10).

In Germany the unemployment rate among both men and women of immigrant background is about twice as high as that among the non-immigrant population. The unemployment rate for foreign-born men in 2010 was 12.5 per cent, substantially more than the rate of 6.3 per cent for native-born men. Foreign-born women had an unemployment rate of 10.7 per cent, compared with 5.7 per cent for native-born women (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 64).

Many of the new migrants no longer fit the old stereotype of the low-skilled migrant worker. In Australia, many immigrants from countries such as Taiwan, Korea, China, Hong Kong and Malaysia find work in skilled, professional and managerial occupations. New migrants are needed to make up for skill deficits, and are seen as vital for linking the Australian economy to the fast-growing 'tiger economies' of the region. Germany, like other EU countries, experiences increasing international interchange of managers and experts.

At the same time, the past segmentation of migrant workers into specific forms of

work means that they cannot easily be replaced by local labour, even at times of high unemployment. Newcomers who enter as dependants, asylum seekers or refugees often provide labour for insecure and poorly-paid casual jobs in the growing informal sector. Recent recognition of the decline in fertility in Western countries is changing attitudes towards immigration, with some economists and policy-makers arguing that low-skilled 'replacement migration' will be needed to maintain future demographic balances and economic growth (UN, 2000).

Children of migrants who have obtained education and vocational training in the immigration country often secure better jobs than their parents. Australian research indicates substantial intergenerational mobility. For example, the 1991 Census showed that 18.8 per cent of male Australians of Greek parentage had university degrees, compared with only 2.5 per cent of their fathers. Several European immigrant groups appeared to share this pattern, although usually to a lesser extent (Birrell and Khoo, 1995). However, second-generation immigrants with poor educational qualifications have little chance of steady employment.

Up to the 1980s many foreign children were failing in German schools, while few employers were willing to give them training places (Castles *et al.*, 1984: Chapter 6). More recently school achievement rates improved slightly between 2000 and 2009. The number of foreign students enrolled in *Hauptschulen* (the lowest tier in Germany's multi-track school system) fell, while the number enrolled in the two higher tiers, *Realschule* and *Gymnasium*, rose. But the same trend was seen among German students too, therefore the gap between them hardly narrowed (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 56).

When the original immigrants arrived in the 1950s and 1960s, it was easy to find entry-level jobs in industry. Such jobs are now few and far between, so that many young ethnic minority members face a future of casual work and frequent joblessness. Some groups and individuals break out of this situation, but many are caught in a vicious circle: initial incorporation in low-skilled work and residential areas with poor educational opportunities is reinforced by processes of racialization. Young job-seekers may be rejected because the combination of poor educational credentials, ethnic appearance and living in certain neighbourhoods has become a stigma, denoting marginality and unreliability (Häussermann and Kazapov, 1996: 361).

One route out of factory work is self-employment: 'ethnic small business' has

become significant in virtually all industrial countries (Waldinger *et al.*, 1990). In Australia, 26.7 per cent of self-employed people were foreign-born in 2005 – fairly consistent with the overall foreign-born share of the labour force. In Germany the percentage of self-employed from the non-German labour force reached 12.1 per cent in 2009, surpassing the figure for Germans, which was 10.8 per cent (Fritsch *et al.*, 2012: 22). However, many small businesses fail, and the rate of self-exploitation (long working hours, poor conditions, use of family labour power, insecurity) is high. Many ethnic entrepreneurs are concentrated in 'ethnic niches' such as retail trade, catering, construction and transport (Collins *et al.*, 1995; Waldinger *et al.*, 1990).

Community formation

In Germany, many foreign workers were at first housed by employers in hostels or camps near the work site. In Australia, the Department of Immigration provided hostels for new arrivals, and they often sought work and longer-term housing nearby. As the need for family accommodation grew, migrants had to enter the general housing market. Several factors put them at a disadvantage. Most had low incomes and few savings. Early arrivals lacked local knowledge and informal networks. Some landlords refused to rent to migrants, while others made a business out of it, taking high rents for substandard and overcrowded accommodation. In some cases there was discrimination in the allocation of public housing, with rules that effectively excluded migrants, or put them at the end of long waiting lists (see Castles and Kosack, 1973: Chapter 7). Migrants therefore tended to become concentrated in the inner city or industrial areas where relatively low-cost housing was available. The quality of the accommodation and of the local social amenities (such as schools, health care facilities and recreational facilities) was often poor.

In Germany, such concentration persisted long after initial settlement. In Australia, where there is a strong tradition of owner-occupation, many migrants were able to improve their situation. By 1986, most Southern Europeans had bought their own homes by means of frugal living and working long hours, and their rate of owner-occupation was actually higher than for the Australian-born population (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 1989). Many still remained in the original areas of settlement, though some had moved to outer suburbs. Newer groups, such as Indo-Chinese immigrants, were also following a similar trajectory.

There has been much debate in both countries about the formation of 'ethnic ghettos'. In fact, unlike the USA, there are very few areas with predominantly minority populations in either country. Rather we find class-based segregation, with migrants sharing certain areas with disadvantaged groups of the local population: low-income workers, the unemployed, social security recipients and pensioners. However, there are neighbourhoods where a specific ethnic group is large enough to have a decisive effect on its appearance, culture and social structure. The Turkish community of Kreuzberg in West Berlin is a well-known example. In Australia, a marked Italian atmosphere can be found in the Carlton area of Melbourne, or in the Leichhardt and Fairfield areas of Sydney. There are Chinatowns in the centre of Melbourne and Sydney, and Indo-Chinese neighbourhoods have developed in Richmond (Melbourne) and Cabramatta (Sydney).

Residential segregation of migrants has a double character: on the one hand, it can mean poor housing and social amenities, as well as relative isolation from the majority population; on the other hand, it offers the opportunity for community formation and the development of ethnic infrastructure and institutions. The most visible sign of this development is the establishment of shops, cafés, and agencies that cater for migrants' special needs. 'Ethnic professionals' - health practitioners, lawyers, accountants - also find opportunities in such areas. Small business owners and professionals form the core of ethnic middle classes, and take on leadership roles in associations. Welfare organizations cater for special needs of immigrants, sometimes compensating for gaps in existing social services. Social associations establish meeting places. Cultural associations aim to preserve homeland languages, folklore and tradition, and set up mother-tongue or religious classes. Political associations of all complexions struggle for influence within the community. Often their starting point is the politics of the country of origin, but with increasing length of stay their aims become more oriented to the country of immigration.

Religion plays a major part in community formation. Sometimes migrants can join existing structures: for instance, many Southern Europeans in Germany and Australia became attached to Catholic Churches. However, they sometimes found that religion was practised in ways not sensitive to their needs (Alcorso *et al.*, 1992: 110-12). Often priests or religious orders (such as the Scalabrinians from Italy) accompanied the migrants, giving churches in areas of migrant settlement a new

character. Orthodox Christians from Greece, Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe had to establish their own churches and religious communities. In recent years, the most significant religious development has been connected with migrations of Muslims: Turks and North Africans to Germany; Lebanese, Turks and Malaysians to Australia. The establishment of mosques and religious associations has had a high priority. Buddhist, Hindu and Bahá'í temples can also be found in what were formerly almost exclusively Christian countries.

Such developments can be found in all countries of immigration. They are at the nexus of the migratory process, where transitory migrant groups metamorphose into ethnic communities. Establishing community networks and institutions means an at least partially conscious decision to start 'placemaking' and building a new identity (Pascoe, 1992). Community formation is linked to awareness of long-term or permanent stay, to the birth and schooling of children in the country of immigration, to the role of women as 'cultural custodians' and above all to the coming of age of the second generation (Vasta, 1992). In Germany, growing awareness of the long-term nature of stay led to the formation of Turkish associations (Kastoryano, 1996). Though many had an Islamic character, they were increasingly aimed at obtaining social and political rights in Germany. Moreover, they were linked to a new collective identity that found expression in the demand for dual citizenship: that is, the recognition of being both Turkish and German.

The concept of the ethnic community plays a central part in debates on assimilation and multiculturalism. Community formation is not a mechanistic or predetermined process, and not all migrants form communities: for instance, one cannot speak of an English community in Australia, or an Austrian community in Germany. Community formation is not just concerned with cultural maintenance, but is also a strategy to cope with social disadvantage and to provide protection from racism. The relationships and institutions, which make up the community, are initially based on individual and group needs. However, as economic enterprises, cultural and social associations, and religious and political groups develop, a consciousness of the community emerges. This process is in no way homogeneous; rather it is based on struggles for power, prestige and control. The ethnic community can best be conceived as a changing, complex and contradictory network. It is most intense and easily identifiable at the neighbourhood level, but is in turn linked to wider networks

23

at the national level and beyond. Ethnic communities may take on a transnational character, and provide the basis for communicative networks, which unite people across borders and generations (see Chapters 2 and 3).

Legal frameworks and government policies

There are important parallels in the migratory process in Australia and Germany, but the laws and policies shaping the position of immigrants in society were very different until recently. The differences were linked to varying historical experiences of nation-state formation. The Australian model embodies a territorial concept of the nation appropriate to a former settler colony: if immigration rules allow a person to become a permanent resident, then citizenship policy allows him or her to become a member of the political community and of the nation. By contrast, when the German Reich emerged as the first modern German state in 1871, nationality was defined not through territoriality, but through ethnicity as shown by language and culture. A person could only obtain German nationality by being born into the German community, so that 'blood' became a label for ethnicity. Until 2000, German citizenship was based on *ius sanguinis* (law of the blood, or nationality through descent). Millions of foreigners became part of society, but were excluded from the state and nation. This was the rationale behind the seemingly absurd slogan 'the Federal Republic of Germany is not a country of immigration' (see Hoffmann, 1990).

In Australia, family reunion was accepted from the outset, and newcomers were encouraged to become Australian citizens. The initial five-year waiting period for naturalization was reduced to three and then two years. Today, two-thirds of immigrants who have been in Australia over two years are Australian citizens. Citizenship is based primarily on *ius soli* (law of the soil, or nationality based on birth in a territory), so that children born to legal permanent immigrants in Australia are automatically citizens. Immigrants who become Australian citizens may retain their former nationality, so that dual citizenship is common. However, in 2007, the Liberal-National Coalition Government increased the waiting period for naturalization to four years, and introduced a Citizenship Test – a reversal of Australia's historical trend towards easy access to citizenship.

For Germany there are two separate legal frameworks. The first applies to people of German ethnic descent such as post-1945 expellees and refugees and current

Aussiedler. They have a right to citizenship, and are not considered foreigners. The second framework applies to foreigners. A long residence requirement, restrictive conditions and complicated procedures kept naturalizations low. Foreigners seeking naturalization had to renounce their previous nationality. By the mid-1980s over 3 million foreigners fulfilled the ten-year residence qualification, but only about 14,000 per year actually obtained citizenship (Funcke, 1991). Children born to foreign parents had no automatic right to German citizenship, and the great majority of immigrants and their descendants remained non-citizens.

In the period following German reunification in 1990, restrictive citizenship rules were identified as a major obstacle to social and political integration, especially for youths of immigrant background. Immigrants and anti-racist organizations campaigned for easier naturalization. A key demand was for the right to dual citizenship. Some immigrant groups, especially Turks, were not permitted by the government of origin to give up the previous nationality. In any case, renouncing the previous affiliation could involve both material loss (with regard to land ownership) and psychological difficulties.

The Social Democrat-Green Coalition that came to power in 1998 announced that it would reform naturalization law, and permit dual citizenship. This met with strong opposition from conservative groups. The 1999 citizenship law (which took effect in 2000) represented a major shift towards *ius soli,* but stopped short of allowing dual citizenship. Foreign immigrants have a right to naturalization after eight years residence, providing they renounce their previous nationality, have not been convicted of a serious offence, are able to support themselves and their families, acquire basic proficiency in German and declare allegiance to the Basic Law. Children born to foreign parents in Germany acquire citizenship at birth if at least one parent has lived legally in Germany for at least eight years. They can hold dual citizenship until they reach maturity, but have to decide between their German and other citizenship by the age of 23. By the end of 2009 approximately 365,000 children of non-German parents had acquired German citizenship in addition to that of their parents in this way. Despite the prohibition of dual citizenship, many exceptions are allowed - there were estimated to be 1.2 million dual citizens in the early 1990s (Çinar, 1994: 54), and the number has certainly grown since then.

The number of naturalizations more than tripled between 1994 and 2000.

Following the changes in the law on nationality, the number of naturalizations peaked in 2000 at nearly 187,000 persons. The number of naturalizations then subsided until 2008, after which it rose slightly again, to 101,570 in 2010. This may indicate that a backlog of people seeking German citizenship had been cleared. In any case, birthright citizenship for children born to immigrant parents may reduce future demand for naturalization. In this area, one can observe some convergence between the Australian and the German approaches to immigration and citizenship.

However, the fundamental differences in views on immigration and incorporation into society prevailing until recently helped shape many aspects of public policy. The Australian model for managing diversity had two main stages. In the 1950s, the government introduced a policy of *assimilationism,* based on the doctrine that non-British immigrants could be culturally and socially absorbed, and become indistinguishable from the existing population. The central principle of assimilationism was the treatment of migrants as 'New Australians', who would live and work with Anglo-Australians and rapidly become citizens. There was no special educational provision for migrant children, who were to be brought up as Australians. Cultural pluralism and the formation of 'ethnic ghettos' were to be avoided at all costs.

By the 1960s, it became clear that assimilationism was not working, due to labour market segmentation, residential segregation and community formation. By the 1970s, political parties were also beginning to discover the political potential of the 'ethnic vote'. Assimilationism was replaced by *multiculturalism*: the idea that ethnic communities, which maintain the languages and cultures of the areas of origin, were legitimate and consistent with Australian citizenship, as long as certain principles (such as respect for basic institutions and democratic values) were adhered to. In addition, multiculturalism meant recognition of the need for special laws, institutions and social policies to overcome barriers to full participation of various ethnic groups in society (OMA, 1989).

In Germany there was no question of assimilation. The Federal Labour Office granted work permits and 'guestworkers' were controlled by a network of bureaucracies. The *Ausländerpolizei* (foreigners' police) issued residence permits, kept foreign workers under surveillance and deported those who offended against the rules. The personnel departments of the employers provided basic social services and

managed company hostels. To deal with personal or family problems of foreign workers, the government provided funding to church and private welfare bodies. By the 1970s, foreign children were entering German schools in large numbers. The educational authorities introduced a 'dual strategy' designed both to integrate foreign children temporarily during their stay in Germany, and to prepare them for return to their country of origin. The result was a system of 'national classes', 'preparatory classes' and 'mother-tongue classes' which separated foreign from German students, and prevented many foreign children from achieving educational success (see Castles *et al.*, 1984: Chapter 6). Family reunion also meant that workers were leaving company accommodation and seeking housing in the inner cities. The result was a debate on a 'foreigners' policy' which was to continue until the beginning of the twenty-first century, after which it was largely replaced by new debates on immigration and integration policies.

Following German reunification in 1990, the myth of not being 'a country of immigration' became unsustainable (see Bade, 1994). After the murder of several Turkish immigrants in arson attacks in Mölln in 1992 and Solingen in 1993, there were large anti-racist demonstrations all over Germany. The demands for political and social integration of immigrants led to the reform of citizenship law mentioned above. However, the left remained ambivalent about multiculturalism. Some see it negatively as a model for cementing the identity of ethnic groups, and for maintaining cultures perceived as anti-modern and repressive, especially towards women, although others on the left support multiculturalism as a way of enriching German cultural life (Cohn-Bendit and Schmid, 1993). Conservatives now generally favour models designed to achieve economic and social integration, in the hope that this will lead to cultural assimilation in the long run.

In 2000, the German government appointed a commission to advise on immigration, chaired by a leading Christian Democratic Union (CDU) politician, Rita Süssmuth. The Commission's report declared that Germany had, in fact, been a country of immigration for many years, and that Germany needed immigrants for both demographic and economic reasons. The Commission proposed a planned immigration system to encourage recruitment of skilled personnel. It also advocated a comprehensive integration policy to overcome social disadvantages suffered by immigrants. The goal was to achieve full participation in society, while respecting cultural

diversity. This policy required reforms and special measures in education, social welfare, the labour market, and other areas (Süssmuth, 2001).

Germany's first Immigration Law was passed in 2004. This was designed to establish a modern system of migration management. It also paved the way for integration courses providing German language teaching as well as an introduction to the country's laws, history and culture. From the time the Immigration Act entered into force in 2005 until the end of 2010, 917,503 certificates allowing participation in the courses were issued (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 55). Such courses are compulsory for certain categories of new entrants and existing foreign residents.

Together with the 1999 Citizenship Law, the 2004 Immigration Law can be seen as a major shift in German approaches to immigration and settlement. In addition, European Union regulations have led to the introduction of equal opportunities rules and measures to combat discrimination and racism. In this context, the Federal Government has also established an office against discrimination (Heckmann, 2010: 9).

Since 2006, National Integration Summits have been organised to initiate a dialogue among all levels of government and representatives of civil society and immigrants. At the fourth National Integration Summit in 2010, increasing the share of Federal administration staff with an immigrant background was also the subject of dialogue for the first time (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 82-84). In 2009 the Act to Manage Labour Migration went into effect to facilitate the immigration of highly-skilled workers. In 2011 the Act to Combat Forced Marriages and Better Protect the Victims of Forced Marriages and Amend Further Provisions Governing Residence and Asylum Law introduced improvements for victims of forced marriages and created a right of residence for 'well-integrated young people' (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 208-09). Such steps still fall far short of the comprehensive reforms advocated by the Süssmuth Commission. In the current negative climate of economic problems and concern about security issues, fundamental reforms seem unlikely.

Interaction with the society of the receiving country
The attitudes and actions of the population and state of the country of immigration

have crucial effects on the migratory process. In turn, community formation may modify or reinforce these effects. In both countries the control of migrant labour by the state and its incorporation by employers set the initial conditions for settlement processes. Discrimination in hiring and promotion, non-recognition of skills, and regulations explicitly designed to limit migrant workers' right to equal treatment in the labour market can be seen as forms of institutional racism. Local workers and their unions generally supported such discrimination, at least initially. Australian unions only agreed to recruitment of Eastern and Southern Europeans in the 1940s after being given official guarantees that they would not compete with local workers for jobs and housing (Collins, 1991: 22-23). German unions demanded that foreign workers should get the same pay and conditions as Germans doing the same jobs, but also supported discriminatory 'guestworker' regulations, which ensured that most foreigners got inferior positions (Castles and Kosack, 1973: 129).

Attitudes of local workers towards migrants were part of a wider picture. Many Australians were highly suspicious of foreigners. In everyday terms this meant reluctance to rent housing to migrants or to have them as neighbours, hostility towards anyone speaking a foreign language in public, mistrust of visible foreign groups and resentment towards foreign children at school. However, the 1960s and the 1970s were years of growing acceptance of difference, due to the recognized contribution of immigration to economic growth and prosperity. This permitted such dramatic changes as the abolition of the White Australia Policy, the first large-scale Asian entries into the country and the introduction of multicultural policies.

In the 1980s, there were attacks by public figures and sections of the media against Asian immigration and multiculturalism. These corresponded with increases in racist violence against Aboriginal people and Asians (HREOC, 1991). However, the ALP government took a strong anti-racist line, and there was considerable public support for multiculturalism. After the 1996 Federal Election, however, anti-minority politics gained new prominence through the rise of the One Nation Party, and the Liberal-National government did little to combat racism or to support multi-culturalism. Indeed, cuts in services for Aborigines and immigrants were a part of its policy, and the onslaught on multiculturalism seemed to reflect a desire to return to a more traditional monocultural identity.

In Germany, most social groups supported the 'guestworker' system at first,

although there was informal discrimination, such as refusal to rent to foreigners, or exclusion from bars and dance halls. An escalation of racism came in the 1970s, when unemployment of Germans became a problem for the first time since the 'economic miracle'. The Turks had become the largest and most visible group, and attitudes towards them were shaped by fear of Islam, which remains a powerful historical force in European cultures. Reunification in 1990 was accompanied by vast population movements and by growing economic and social uncertainty, particularly in the area of the former GDR. The result was widespread hostility towards immigrants and an upsurge of organized racist violence. After the events of 11 September 2001 in the USA, Muslim minorities were increasingly perceived as threats to German security and culture, and Islamophobia became a major theme in public discourse.

In 2006 the Federal Ministry of the Interior launched a German Islam Conference in an attempt to define and improve relations between the state and Muslims – who now number some 4 millions – in Germany. The Conference drafted recommendations on the building of mosques and on school-related issues, drafted guidelines on language, regional and cultural training for imams at local level, and worked for establishing Islamic theology courses at German universities, representing Muslims in the media in a more nuanced way, and intensifying cooperation on security issues (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 84-85). The conference so far has not achieved very concrete results but is an expression of the recognition of Islam as part of Germany (Heckmann, 2010: 9).

The visible emergence of ethnic communities influenced public attitudes, as well as state policies. For people who fear the competition of migrants or who feel threatened by difference, the existence of communities may confirm the idea that 'they are taking over'. Ethnic areas can become the target for organized racist attacks, and ethnic minorities can become the focus for extreme right mobilization. On the other hand, contact with new cultures and some of their more accessible symbols, such as food and entertainment, may break down prejudices. Where ethnic small business and community efforts rehabilitate inner-city neighbourhoods, good inter-group relationships may develop.

Complex links emerged between ethnic communities and the wider society. Local branches of political parties in ethnic community areas needed foreign members, and had to take account of their needs in order to attract votes. For instance, the Australian

Labor Party (ALP) set up Greek branches in Melbourne in the 1970s. Unions needed to attract immigrant members; they hired immigrant organizers and published multilingual information material. Churches found that they had to overcome barriers, and work with mosques and Islamic associations if they were to maintain their traditional social role. Artists and cultural workers among minorities and the majority found they could enrich their creativity by learning from each other. Multifaceted new social networks developed in the ethnic community areas of the cities. These gave members of the majority population greater understanding of the social situation and culture of the minorities, and formed the basis for movements opposed to exploitation and racism.

Similar tendencies prevailed in the public sector. Both the German and the Australian state experimented with using ethnic associations as instruments for the delivery of social services, such as counselling, family welfare and youth work. Aims and methods differed so the relationship was often an uneasy one. Government agencies sometimes saw traditionalist ethnic organizations as effective instruments of social control of workers, young people or women. On the other hand, ethnic leaders might use their new role to preserve traditional authority, and slow down cultural and political change. The state could choose which ethnic leaders to work with and which to ignore, and reward desired behaviour through patronage and funding (Castles *et al.*, 1992a; Jakubowicz, 1989: 65-71). But cooption was a two-way process: state agencies tried to use ethnic community structures and associations, but had to make concessions in return. Cooption took place earlier in Australia than in Germany. In Australia, ethnic leaderships had an important power base and the 'ethnic vote' was thought to affect the outcome of elections (Castles *et al.*, 1992b: 131-33). In Germany, members of ethnic communities lacked political clout and were perceived as not really belonging to society.

The main expression of the Australian approach was to be found in the policy of multiculturalism, with its network of consultative bodies, special agencies and equal opportunities legislation, which developed between 1973 and 1996. The 1996-2007 Liberal-National coalition government had strong reservations about multiculturalism, and dismantled many of the special institutions and services. However, in 1999, the government launched *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia* (DIMA, 1999), which largely endorsed the principles of the ALP's 1989 multicultural policy

statement (OMA, 1989). Simultaneously the widespread backlash against multiculturalism, especially since the events of 9/11 in the USA, brought concerns about security. Today the government must negotiate between the desire for security and employers' worries about shortages of labour and skills. Currently the resources sector (especially mining) is booming in Australia, and employers want more immigrant labour. Public debates on immigration, population and multiculturalism are never far from the headlines, and some observers speak of an 'immigration revolution' (Markus *et al.*, 2009).

In Germany, a Federal Office for Migration and Refugees has existed (in various guises) since the late 1970s. This agency had mainly provided public information, and appears to have had limited influence on policy. But there are trends towards recognizing ethnic associations and incorporating them into policy initiatives. In Berlin, Frankfurt and elsewhere 'commissions for foreigners' or 'offices for multicultural affairs' have been set up. These are seeking to build structures to work with ethnic community groups and to propagate legal and administrative reforms. A sort of 'de facto multiculturalism' has been emerging since the 1970s, especially in local educational and social work initiatives. This is not surprising, in view of the fact that foreigners make up a substantial proportion of the population in major cities, ranging from 31 per cent in Offenbach, to 25 per cent in Frankfurt, 23 per cent in Munich, 21 per cent in Stuttgart and 13.7 per cent in Berlin (German Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2011: 34). It is hard to see how social integration can be improved, without some form of policy designed to recognize cultural diversity.

Conclusions

The validity of a comparison between Australia and Germany can be questioned by arguing that Australia is a 'classical country of immigration', while Germany is a 'historical nation' and not a 'country of immigration'. This argument does not stand up to analysis. Both countries have experienced mass immigration. Germany has had over 20 million immigrants since 1945, one of the biggest population movements to any country ever. Australia - with immigration of approximately 7 million people since 1945 - has had a very high inflow relative to its small population. Both countries initially recruited migrant workers in roughly the same areas at the same time. Whatever the intentions of policy-makers, both movements led to similar patterns of

labour market segmentation, residential segregation and ethnic group formation. In both cases, racist attitudes and behaviour on the part of some sections of the receiving population have been problems for immigrants. Thus there are great similarities in the migratory process, despite the differences in policies and attitudes. These parallels are important because, if these apparently opposing examples show corresponding patterns, it should be possible also to find them for other countries, which are somewhere between these cases on the migration spectrum.

But the differences are also significant and require analysis. They go back to the different historical concepts of the nation and to the intentions of the post-war migration programmes. The Australian authorities wanted permanent settlement, and went to considerable lengths to persuade the public of the need for this. Chain migration and family reunion were therefore seen as legitimate, and the model for settlement was based on citizenship, full rights and assimilation. Assimilationism eventually failed in its declared goal of cultural homogenization, but it did provide the conditions for successful settlement and the later shift to multiculturalism.

The German government planned temporary labour recruitment without settlement, and passed this expectation on to the public. Official policies were unable to prevent settlement and community formation. But these policies (and the persistent failure to adapt them to changing conditions) did lead to marginalization and exclusion of immigrants. The results can be summed up by saying that the Australian model led to the formation of ethnic communities which were seen by many as an integral part of a changing nation, while the German model led to ethnic minorities, which were generally not seen as a legitimate part of a nation unwilling to accept a change in its identity. This is an oversimplification, for there are ethnic minorities in Australia too: Aboriginal people and some non-European groups. All the same, the distinction does capture an essential difference in the outcomes of the two models.

Such comparisons show the usefulness of the concept of the migratory process. It means looking at all the dimensions of migration and settlement, in relation to political, economic, and social and cultural practices and structures in the societies concerned. If the architects of the post-war European 'guestworker systems' had studied the migratory process in their own histories or elsewhere, they would not have held the naive belief that they could turn flows of migrant labour on and off as with a tap. They would have understood that movement of workers almost always leads to

33

family reunion and permanent settlement. The very fears of permanent ethnic minorities held by some governments turned into self-fulfilling prophecies: by denying legitimacy to family reunion and settlement, governments ensured that these processes would take place under unfavourable circumstances, leading to deep divisions in society.

Since the mid-1990s, attitudes and policies in both Australia and Germany have changed dramatically. Australia has abandoned its traditional open attitude to refugees, family reunion and permanent settlement. The government has taken a much narrower view of 'national interests' with regard to immigration, and has mobilized considerable public support for this change. Multicultural policies have been watered down, although not altogether abandoned. Ultimately Australia has re-oriented its immigration by giving precedence to skilled and temporary migration. Germany has at last abandoned the ideology of not being a country of immigration, and seems to be moving towards a more open immigration policy and a more inclusive approach to integration. However the recent flows from Southern and Eastern European countries led to a widespread protectionist demand for reintroducing border controls inside the European Union. It would be misleading to see these changes in terms of convergence. Instead, they appear as specific political strategies, linked to complex domestic and international factors. Nonetheless, the changes reflect the breakdown of traditional national models of immigration and citizenship in the context of the globalization of migration.

Guide to further reading

Jupp (2001) is an encyclopaedia of the migrant experience in Australia, while Castles, Vasta and Ozkul (2013) provides a much briefer overview. The history of migration and ethnic group formation is discussed in Collins (1991) Reynolds (1987)gives a good account of the colonial treatment of indigenous people. Overviews of social and economic issues around migration are in Wooden *et al.* (1994) and Castles *et al.* (1998), while Vasta and Castles (1996) deals with racism; Wise and Velayutham (2009) explores everyday multiculturalism . Davidson (1991) discusses citizenship and nationalism in Australia . Two important documents of changing government policies on multiculturalism are OMA (1989) and NMAC (1999). Changes in refugee policy are examined in Mares (2001) and Crock *et al.* (2002). Markus *et al.* (2009)

gives an account of recent developments of national importance. The Australian Parliamentary Library also produces useful research papers on particular aspects of migration to Australia.

For Germany see Castles and Kosack , Castles *et al.* (1984) and Martin (1991; 2004). German readers will also find Hoffmann (1990), Nirumand (1992), Cohn-Bendit and Schmid (1993) and Bade (1994) useful. The report of the Süssmuth Commission (2001) contains a great deal of information and analysis, and is available in German and English. The Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) has comprehensive publications on recent trends available on its homepage.

Up to date data and policy information can be found for Australia on the website of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship: http://www.immi.gov.au/. The Australian Bureau of Statistics is also a valuable source: http://www.abs.gov.au/.

The website for the German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees is at http://www.bamf.de/. Valuable information on German migration can also be found on the Federal Ministry of the Interior website: http://www.zuwanderung.de/

As always, useful comparative material can be found in the publications of the OECD and the IOM, and on the website of the Migration Information Source: http://www.migrationinformation.org/index.cfm/

References

ABS (2012) *Cultural Diversity in Australia Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census.* (Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics) http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012 -2013, accessed 28 May, 2013

ABS (2013) *ABS Census Quickstats 2013.* http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2011/qu ickstat/0#cultural, accessed

Ackland, R. and Williams, L. (1992) *Immigrants and the Australian Labour Market: The Experience of Three Recessions* (Canberra: Bureau of Immigration Research).

Alcorso, C., Giulio Popoli, C. and Rando, G. (1992) 'Community Networks and Institutions' in Castles, S., Alcorso, C., Rando, G. and Vasta, E. (eds.) *Australia's Italians - culture and community in a changing society,* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin)

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1989) *Overseas Born Australians: A Statistical Profile* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service).

Bade, K.J. (ed.) (1994) *Das Manifest der 60: Deutschland und die Einwanderung,*

(Munich: Beck).

Baker, M. and Wooden, M. (1992) *Immigrant Workers in the Communication Industry* (Bureau of Immigration Research, Canberra: AGPS).

Birrell, R. and Khoo, S.-E. (1995) *The Second Generation in Australia: Educational and Occupational Characteristics, Statistical Report No. 14* (Canberra: AGPS).

Castles, S., Booth, H. and Wallace, T. (1984) *Here for Good: Western Europe's New Ethnic Minorities* (London: Pluto Press).

Castles, S., Cope, B., Kalantzis, M. and Morrissey, M. (1992a) *Mistaken Identity - Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia* 3, (Sydney: Pluto Press).

Castles, S., Foster, W., Iredale, R. and Withers, G. (1998) *Immigration and Australia: Myths and Realities* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin).

Castles, S. and Kosack, G. (1973) *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe* (London: Oxford University Press).

Castles, S., Rando, G. and Vasta, E. (1992b) 'Italo-Australians and politics' in Castles, S., Alcorso, C., Rando, G. and Vasta, E. (eds.) *Australia's Italians - Culture and Community in a Changing society,* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin)

Castles, S., Vasta, E. and Ozkul, D. (2013) 'Australia: a classical immigration country in transition' in Hollifield, J., Martin, P. and Orrenius, P. (eds.) *Controlling Immigration: a Global Perspective,* (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press)

Çinar, D. (1994) 'From aliens to citizens: a comparative analysis of the rules of transition' in Bauböck, R. (ed.) *From Aliens to Citizens,* (Aldershot: Avebury) 49-72.

Cohn-Bendit, D. and Schmid, T. (1993) *Heimat Babylon: Das Wagnis der multikulturellen Demokratie* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe).

Collins, J. (1991) *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Post-war Immigration* second edition, (Sydney: Pluto Press).

Collins, J. (2010) 'Immigrants, unemployment, social disadvantage and the global financial crisis in Australia' *Immigration in Harder Times: The United States and Australia Workshop*. (Prato, Italy:May 2010.

Collins, J., Gibson, K., Alcorso, C., Castles, S. and Tait, D. (1995) *A Shop Full of Dreams: Ethnic Small Business in Australia* (Sydney: Pluto Press).

Crock, M. and Saul, B. (2002) *Future Seekers: Refugees and the Law in Australia* (Sydney: Federation Press).

Crock, M., Saul, B. and Dastyari, A. (2006) *Future Seekers II: Refugees and Irregular Migration in Australia* (NSW: Federation Press).

Davidson, A. (1991) *The Invisible State: The Formation of the Australian State 1788–1901* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

DIAC (2010) 'Fact Sheet No 47: Temporary Residence in Australia'. (Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship)

DIAC (2011) *Migration Program Report: Program Year to 30 June 2011* (Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship). http://www.immi.gov.au/media/statistics/pdf/report-on-migration-program-2010-11.pdf.

DIAC (2012) *Australia's Humanitarian Program 2013-14 and beyond* (Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship).

DIMA (1999) *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia* (Canberra: Department of

Immigration and Multicultural Affairs).

Fritsch, M., Kritikos, M. and Rusakova, A. (2012) *Self-Employment in Germany: The Trend Has Been Increasing for Some Time* (Berlin: DIW Berlin—Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung e. V).

Funcke, L. (1991) *Bericht der Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für die Integration der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer familienangehörigen* (Bonn: German Government).

German Federal Ministry of the Interior (2011) *Migration and Integration* (Berlin: German Federal Ministry of the Interior). www.bmi.bund.de.

Häussermann, H. and Kazapov, Y. (1996) 'Urban poverty in Germany' in Mingione, E. (ed.) *Urban Poverty and the Underclass,* (Oxford: Blackwell) pp. 343-69.

Heckmann, F. (2010) 'Recent Developments of Integration Policy in Germany and Europe' *TEAMS Workshop No 4: Population, Economics, Integration and Law: Implications for Immigrant Policy*. (San Diego, USA:March 28-30.

Hoffmann, L. (1990) *Die unvollendete Republik* (Cologne: Pappy Rossa Verlag).

HREOC (1991) *Racist Violence: Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia* (Canberra: AGPS).

Jakubowicz, A. (1989) 'The state and the welfare of immigrants in Australia'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* vol. 12: no. 1.

Jupp, J. (ed.) (2001) *The Australian People: an Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Karlsen, E., Phillips, J. and Koleth, E. (2010) 'Seeking asylum: Australia's humanitarian program': Australian Parliamentary Library)

Kastoryano, R. (1996) *La France, l'Allemagne et leurs immigrés: négocier l'identité* (Paris: Armand Colin).

Kindleberger, C.P. (1967) *Europe's Postwar Growth - the Role of Labor Supply* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press).

Mares, P. (2001) *Borderline: Australia's treatment of refugees and asylum seekers* (Sydney: UNSW Press).

Markus, A., Jupp, J. and McDonald, P. (2009) *Australia's Immigration Revolution* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin).

Martin, P.L. (1991) *The Unfinished Story: Turkish Labour Migration to Western Europe* (Geneva: International Labour Office).

Martin, P.L. (2004) 'Germany: managing migration in the twenty-first century' in Cornelius, W., Tsuda, T., Martin, P.L. and Hollifield, J.F. (eds.) *Controlling Migration: a Global Perspective*.Second, (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press) 221-253.

Nirumand, B. (1992) 'Vorwort' in Nirumand, B. (ed.) *Angst vor den Deutschen: Terror gegen Ausländer und der Zerfall des Rechtstaates,* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowolt)

NMAC (1999) *Australian Multiculturalism for a New Century: Towards Inclusiveness* (Canberra: National Multicultural Advisory Council, Commonwealth of Australia).

OECD (1992) *Trends in International Migration* (Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development).

OECD (1995) *Trends in International Migration: Annual Report 1994* (Paris: OECD).

OECD (2001) *Trends in International Migration: Annual Report 2001* (Paris: OECD).

OECD (2007) *International Migration Outlook: Annual Report 2007* (Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development). http://www.oecdbookshop.org/oecd/display.asp?K=5L4RW7MZQN46&lang= EN&sf1=RegularIdentifier&st1=REG-81011P1&sort=sort_date/d&ds=International%20Migration%20Outlook&m= 4&dc=5&plang=en.

OECD (2010) *International Migration Outlook: SOPEMI 2010* (Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development).

OECD (2012) *International Migration Outlook: 2012* Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development).

OMA (1989) *Issues in Multicultural Australia 1988* (Canberra: Office of Multicultural Affairs).

Ozcan, V. (2007) *Germany* Focus Migration country profiles (Hamburg: Hamburg Institute of International Economics). http://focus-migration.hwwi.de/Germany.1509.0.html?&L=1.

Pascoe, R. (1992) 'Place and community: the construction of an Italo-Australian space' in Castles, S., Alcorso, C., Rando, G. and Vasta, E. (eds.) *Australia's Italians - culture and community in a changing society,* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin)

Phillips, J., Klapdor, M. and Simon-Davies, J. (2010) *Migration to Australia since federation: a guide to the statistics, Background Note* (Canberra: Australian Parliamentary Library).

Phizacklea, A. (1983) 'One Way Ticket? Migration and Female Labour'. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Piore, M. (1980) *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Productivity Commission (2010) *Population and Migration: Understanding the Numbers* Commission Research Paper (Melbourne: Productivity Commission).

Reuters (2012) *Germany attracted more southern Europeans in 2011.* (London http://uk.reuters.com/article/2012/04/04/uk-germany-population-idUKBRE8330UF20120404, accessed 19 May, 2013

Reynolds, H. (1987) *Frontier* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin).

Süssmuth, R. (2001) *Zuwanderung gestalten, Integration fördern: Bericht der unabhängigen Kommission 'Zuwanderung'* German Government Report (Berlin: Bundesminister des Innern).

UN (2000) *Replacement Migration: is it a Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations?* (New York: United Nations Population Division).

UNHCR (2000) *Reconciling Migration Control and Refugee Protection in the European Union: A UNHCR Perspective* Discussion Paper (Geneva: UNHCR).

UNHCR (2011) *Asylum Levels and Trends in Industrialized Countries 2010* (Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

Vasta, E. (1992) 'The second generation Italo-Australians' in Castles, S., Alcorso, C., Rando, G. and Vasta, E. (eds.) *Australia's Italians,* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin)

Vasta, E. and Castles, S. (eds.) (1996) *The Teeth are Smiling: The Persistence of Racism in Multicultural Australia,* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin).

Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. and Ward, R. (1990) *Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Immigrant*

Business in Industrial Societies (Newbury Park, CA, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications).

Wise, A. and Velayutham, S. (2009) *Everyday Multiculturalism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Wooden, M., Holton, R., Hugo, G. and Sloan, J. (1994) *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues* (Canberra: AGPS).