

**Ethnic Community Capital  
In Sydney**

**Walter Lalich  
September 2003**

**ACCORD Report No. 11**

ACCORD

# **Ethnic Community Capital In Sydney**

**Walter Lalich**

**September 2003**

**ACCORD Report**

ISBN 0-646-42709-1  
Copyright 2003, University of Technology, Sydney

## **Disclaimer**

This report contains general information only and is not intended to provide accounting or legal advice or information. The authors, the Australian Centre for Co-operative Research and Development and its servants and agents, and University of Technology, Sydney and its servants and agents, expressly disclaim all and any liability and responsibility to any person or reader of this report in respect of anything, and the consequences of anything, done or omitted to be done by any person in reliance, whether wholly or partially upon the whole or part of this report. Information contained in this document should not be acted upon without first obtaining professional and/or legal advice.

## About ACCORD

The *Australian Centre for Co-operative Research and Development (ACCORD)* is an independent centre dedicated to research and development of co-operatives, mutuals, and the broader social economy.

ACCORD is a joint venture between University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) and Charles Sturt University (CSU). It receives financial support from the New South Wales Office of Fair Trading and the two universities. The views in this publication should not be taken as those of the New South Wales Government or of the universities.

ACCORD papers report research likely to interest members of co-operatives and other social economy organisations, government policy makers and other researchers. ACCORD staff and associates write the reports based on information collected and/or research undertaken by them. The research is published in this form to enable its wide and timely distribution. In some cases, reworked versions of these papers will receive refereed publication. Comment and feedback are welcomed.

For information about ACCORD contact us on (02) 9514 5121, or e-mail [accord@uts.edu.au](mailto:accord@uts.edu.au) or visit our web site at [www.accord.org.au](http://www.accord.org.au).

## About the Author

*Walter Lalich*, ACCORD Research Associate

Walter recently completed his PhD thesis on *Ethnic Community Capital: The Development of Ethnic Social Infrastructure in Sydney*, at the University of Technology, Sydney. The study examines the development of various religious and secular buildings by ethnic communities in Sydney since 1948. His current interests are in various aspects of migrant and ethnic social economy, in particular, the production and consumption of collective goods in urban environment; non-profit organisations; ethnic collective social entrepreneurship and trans-national linkages.

Walter was educated in Croatia and Australia. He has Bachelor of Economics degree from the University of Zagreb, and acquired a Master of Economics degree from the University of Western Australia (Perth). His thesis examined the integration of less developed countries, using Latin America as a case study.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The author wishes to thank supervisors Professor Jock Collins and Associate Professor Steven Wearing for their help and guidance during the work on my PhD thesis: *Ethnic Community Capital: The development of ethnic social infrastructure in Sydney*, submitted to the University of Technology, Sydney in 2003. Thanks also go to staff and postgraduate students at the School of Finance and Economics, for their support. This work was facilitated by a two and half year scholarship granted by UTS. Financial support for local travel and presentations at international conferences was provided from the Vice Chancellors Conference Fund, Faculty of Business and School of Finance and Economics. The Australian Centre for Co-operative Research and Development (ACCORD) financially assisted in the preparation and publication of this report.

This work would have not have been possible without the active support and assistance of many representatives of various ethnic organisations – the office bearers, community leaders and members - who willingly provided important information about the development and life of their organisations, while extending on many occasions, valuable moral support as well. I am most grateful for expressions of solidarity, support, and shared information.

## CONTENTS

About Accord	iii
About the Author	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
List of Tables	vii
Abstract	ix
Introduction	1
Migration to Australia	3
Ethnicity as a Mobilising Factor	7
The Development of Ethnic Community Capital in Sydney	13
Ethnic Collective Resources	19
Sustainability	27
Concluding Comment	31
Endnotes	33
Sources	35



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Australian Population born in Non-English Speaking Countries by regions, 1954-2001	4
Table 2.	Religion in Australia: Changes in Denominational Affiliation, 1947-2001	5
Table 3.	The Development of Ethnic Community Capital: Incidence of Development, by type and periods, Sydney, 1950-2000	14
Table 4.	Developed Physical and User Capacities, by type and periods, Sydney, 1950-2000	16
Table 5.	Developed Capacities, Sydney, 2000	17
Table 6.	Management Patterns of Ethnic Community Capital, by type, Sydney, 2000	18
Table 7.	Investment in Ethnic Community Capital, by periods, Sydney, 1950-2000	22
Table 8.	Sources of Investment in Ethnic Community Capital, Sydney, 1950-2000	25
Table 9.	The Incidence of Activities at Ethnic Communal Places, Sydney, 2000	28
Table 10.	Ethnic Community Organisations: Expected Organisational Longevity, Sydney, 2000	29



# ETHNIC COMMUNITY CAPITAL IN SYDNEY

## Abstract

This paper identifies a wide array of religious and secular facilities in Sydney that have been developed by ethnic communities as a consequence of post-1945 demographic and cultural changes. During this period many thousands of non-English speaking immigrants voluntarily engaged in the development of a diverse range of facilities to satisfy various social needs, which were arising in their new social environment. They collectively invested scarce material resources to build places of worship, social and sport clubs, childcare, schools, welfare centres and aged care facilities.

The social infrastructure developed by ethnic communities in Sydney is called *ethnic community capital* in this paper. The development of ethnic communal facilities in Australia can be traced back to the very early days of colonisation. In Sydney today, over 410 ethnic non-profit organisations manage such facilities. This is a consequence of demand pressures and settlement constraints, and migrants had to find means to satisfy their social, cultural, religious, and recreational needs. They had to rely on their own resources, and they transferred human, cultural, and social capital to find their own solutions at times, when they had a limited recourse to commercial and public funding.

After the major social reforms during the 1970s, ethnic communities also developed education and aged care organisations. The main conclusion of this research report is that ethnic communities have improved the physical and social landscape of Sydney by contributing many millions of dollars and hours to help build a better Sydney and improve its physical and social environment.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Sydney is one of the most multicultural cities in the world today. More than half its population are first or second generation immigrant-settlers, who came from all corners of the globe. During the process of settlement many of these immigrants or new settlers encountered social constraints, the burden of which many individuals eased through collaborative acts. The research suggests that various forms of mutual aid were a key part of the migration process; migrants frequently acted collectively to solve critical problems faced by their ethnic community. They joined scarce resources with the intention to develop places of worship, or facilities to meet leisure, education and welfare needs. Such collective migrant action was a variable of the time, place, and situation in a new social environment, and consequently varied in regard to issues, form and intensity.

This paper reports some key findings of recent research on ethnic community capital in Sydney<sup>1</sup>. It reflects on aspects of collective action by non-English speaking settlers in Sydney in the post-World War II period and is constructed around four segments that provide a well-rounded picture of this important social development. In the introductory segment, some key aspects of Australian post-war demographic and cultural changes are presented, to provide insight into the local social context, constraints and cultural differences that stimulated migrant collective action. The next segment is organised around critical theoretical issues and introduces recent findings about collective practice by migrants in the development of communal places in Sydney.

Data presented in the third segment provide information about the major patterns and forms of development, investment and human engagement by 386 ethnic, religious and secular organisations. These findings illustrate the extent of, and diversity in, the collaborative efforts by Sydney's new immigrant communities to satisfy diverse and fragmented needs during the settlement. The final segment discusses some aspects of the sustainability of ethnic community capital in Sydney.

### **Settlement process**

Settlement, as a part of the migration process, is a very intense and complex process and highlights migrants' decisions to stay permanently, or at least for a considerable period in a new social environment. The settlement issues reflect everyday experience and problems that immigrants encounter in a new cultural, social, economic and political environment. Immigrant settlement is more than arrival and the subsequent solution of immediate personal problems, such as finding lodging, work, school and similar. To settle implies a striving for the "normal"

(Miszta 1996: 62); it is a yearning for the establishment of conditions of normal life in circumstances where change, not normalcy, rules. Decisions to stay, to find employment and lodging, and to raise a family imply settlement or establishment of roots (Weil [1949] 1978: 41) in a new social space. Private solutions of, or responses to, settlement issues vary from collective ones; collective approaches could be undertaken either by government or by migrants through their own collectives. Some such solutions required the appropriation of buildings that could satisfy a particular need.

Roots, as a signifier of settlement, were not only established through individual or family acts, but also through collective agency. A migrant is “on the margin of two cultures and two societies”, a marginal *man* (Park [1928] 1967: 205) that belongs to one culture and is not fully accepted in the new social environment. Consequently, migrants congregated, communicated, and established networks in an attempt to collaborate and fulfil a certain collectively perceived need. Resulting problems were usually the consequence of inadequate material resources or an insufficient quantity of places, where migrants could congregate and satisfy their spiritual, leisure, educational and welfare needs. To satisfy a perceived need, migrants undertook collective action.

This paper is based on such collective migrant settlement experience. Some migrant needs were only solved through a joint supply of a collective good, like of a place of worship, place of gathering, language education, or aged care. Migrants undertook intentional collective actions, because institutions of the host society (public, market and third sector) were either not capable or would not even attempt to satisfy pertinent migrant needs that surfaced from cultural, religious, and linguistic differences. Therefore, this paper deals with the settlement experience that is broadly understood as being the satisfaction of “the needs of the soul” (Weil [1949] 1978: 3), and not just formal solutions of physical and initial settlement issues. To satisfy diverse, and often fragmented, collectively perceived spiritual, cultural and welfare needs, immigrant-settlers established necessary organisational forms, and in many instances, communal facilities as well. The settlement experience thus generated the development of public infrastructure by migrants.

## **MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA**

The post-war economic and social development of many countries, new world countries in particular, depended on large-scale immigration. Migration to Australia during this period differed from previous migration by the heterogeneity of immigrants' origins, as well as economic background and social composition of migrants. Unlike Australia's earlier migration experience with a large share of return or sojourn migration, the post-war migration was characterised by permanent settlement and changes in the ethnic and social composition of the migrant intake. The structure of post-war migration is very complex and includes several waves of refugees or coerced migration, brief renewal of chain migration, appearance of skilled, professional and business migrants and of various forms of transnational migration (Collins 1991).

Within a period of thirty years, Australian immigration policy changed from the initially heavily subsidised British migration, and the gradual acceptance of a large number of continental European migrants, to the breakdown of the White Australia policy that had effectively excluded non-white immigrants for the first sixty years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These changes were reflected in the composition of Sydney's population (Spearritt 2000). Many settlers came from countries that had not had any major prior migration experience to Sydney, and could not rely on help from established co-ethnic communities during the settlement period. Consequently, many new ethnic collectives had to depend on their own resourcefulness to meet their social needs.

Table 1 indicates major patterns of demographic change in Australia during the post-war period. The first major change occurred in the 1950s with the large arrival of continental European migrants, including 170,000 refugees between 1948 and 1953. Many arrived from countries that had hardly any prior settlers among the 1.8 percent of non-English speaking inhabitants. As a consequence of intensive migration, this share rose to 13.5 percent in 2001 (Price 1980; ABS 2001). However, due to post-war political and immigration policy changes migrants from Asia started to arrive in larger numbers, even before the White Australia Policy was finally abandoned in 1972.

The arrival of over three million new settlers of diverse non-English speaking background after 1948 has impacted on cultural and social changes in Australia. Demographic data indicate not only cultural differences between the new settlers and the established society, but also the

intensification of cultural diversity. This is evident in those capital cities, to which most migrants gravitated, and in particular in Sydney, which has remained Australia's most popular migrant destination. The proportion of non-English speakers in Sydney increased from 2.02 percent out of 1.484 million inhabitants in 1947, to 23.4 percent or 936,743 out of 3,997,305 inhabitants in 1996 (Clib 2001; Spearritt 2000). It is estimated that people of non-English speaking background, and first and second generation immigrants together account for 54 percent of Sydney's city dwellers (Burnley, Murphy and Fagan 1997: 33).

Table1 Australian Population<sup>1</sup> Born in Non-English Speaking Countries by regions,1954-2001

<b>Regions</b>	<b>1954</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1978</b>	<b>2001</b>
Western Europe	147,118	281,874	279,133	272,997
Eastern Europe	148,493	166,047	160,261	140,612
Southern Europe <sup>2</sup>	197,427	669,450	696,570	633,587
Middle East <sup>3</sup>	7,871	70,348	115,150	213,942
Southern Asia <sup>4</sup>	n.a <sup>7</sup>	35,028	57,737	186,612
South East Asia	n.a <sup>7</sup>	35,940	63,913	497,076
China, Hong Kong <sup>5</sup>	11,831	23,184	43,672	234,404
Korea, Japan	966	4,929	10,363	64,427
Latin America	1,719	12,879	38,131	75,691
Pacific Islands	4,426	17,461	21,563	99,361
Africa <sup>6</sup>	n.a <sup>7</sup>	21,054	26,066	141,696
<b>Total</b>	<b>519,851</b>	<b>1,338,194</b>	<b>1,512,499</b>	<b>2,560,405</b>
Share of NESB (%)	5.79	10.49	10.61	13.50
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>8,986,530</b>	<b>12,755,638</b>	<b>14,263,078</b>	<b>18,972,350</b>

Notes: 1.Excluding British Isles, Canada, USA, New Zealand, Caribbean and South Africa. 2. Includes countries of former Yugoslavia. 3. Includes North Africa, Middle East. 4. Also, Central Asia from 2001. 5. Singapore in 1978. 6. Does not include South Africa. 7. Data for 1954 not included: assumed non-Indigenous emigration.

Source: Price, Ch. (1980). Australian Immigration, A Bibliography and Digest, No.4. A 92-5; Price, Ch., Martin, J.I. (1976). Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, No.3 ABS (2002). Census of Population and Housing. Cat. No. 2015.0. p. 92

Immigration brought new religions to Sydney. Data in Table 2 show changes in the religious structure in Australia since 1945, and introduces one of the key aspects of cultural differences that evolved as a result of migration. Originally identifying itself as a predominantly Christian society, contemporary Australia is now home of many religions and denominations. Linguistic diversity is an equally significant identifier of cultural diversity: 734,198 speakers over five years of age were using one of twenty major languages every day in 1996, while other languages were spoken by an additional 175,182 inhabitants (EAC NSW 1998: 50-51).

Table 2 Religion in Australia: Changes in Denominational Affiliation, 1947-2001 (%)

	<b>Australia 1947</b>	<b>Australia 1971</b>	<b>Australia 2000</b>	<b>Sydney 2001</b>
Anglican	39.0	31.0	20.7	19.8
Catholic	20.9	27.0	26.3	28.8
Presbyterian & Reformed	9.8	8.1	3.3	2.9
Methodist	11.5	8.6	6.7 <sup>1</sup>	3.7 <sup>1</sup>
Lutheran	0.9	1.5	1.4	0.5
Orthodox		2.7	2.9	4.2
Other Christian	2.4	2.2	6.2	5.5
Oriental Christian			0.4	1.5
Judaism	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.8
Islam		0.2	1.5	3.4
Buddhism			1.9	3.4
Hinduism & Sikh			0.4	1.4
Other Non-Christian			0.4	0.3
Other	3.8	5.4	1.2	1.7
No Religion	0.3	6.7	15.3	11.7
Not Stated	10.8	6.1	10.3	9.0
Inhabitants	7,579,358	12,755,286	18,972,350 <sup>2</sup>	3,997,322 <sup>2</sup>

Notes: 1. Uniting Church. 2. Includes visitors (1.1% and 1.2% respectively).

Sources: Mol Hans, 1985, *The faith of Australians*, Sydney; George Allen & Unwin; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002 Year Book, No 84, Cat. No 1301.0, Canberra; ABS (2001) *Clib 2001 Census Statistics*, Canberra; Ethnic Affairs Commission of NSW (1998). *The People of New South Wales*, Sydney.

The changes in religious structures in Australia and Sydney, as presented in Table 2, show a significant increase of denominations other than the established Western Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish religions. Although immigrants of Orthodox, Muslim and Buddhist faith had arrived in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, their arrival was barely recorded in 1947, due to the entry restrictions. The large-scale initial arrival of continental Europeans, and later of Asian and Latin American settlers in the post-war period greatly increased the number of Roman Catholics, who discovered existing religious and educational structures.

Furthermore, a language other than English is spoken at home by over one million people over five years of age, or 26.4 percent of Sydney's inhabitants, representing an 11.2 percent increase from the previous census (EAC NSW 1998). The census data are representative of the established cultural heterogeneity, but also point to potential social problems facing settlers in a continuously changing urban social environment. One of these perceived problems is the age structure of Sydney's immigrant communities. There are 12.1 percent of people of non-English-

speaking ethnic origin over 65 years of age in Sydney, and an additional 11.8 percent in the age group of 55-64. Around 50 percent of Italian and Greek settlers, and over 24 percent of Chinese settlers, living in Sydney today, are in these age groups.

Many academic, literary and media sources identify and analyse aspects of cultural differences generated by dramatic demographic changes. Cultural diversity is expressed in the multitude of languages spoken, the ability to use English, religious practices, leisure habits, sports, media, art performances, food, building styles and gardening. Still, migrants are not readily accepted into the host society and are considered to be “Others” (Archer 1997: 27,124; Murphy, Watson 1997:19; Hage 1998). In many instances, settlement conditions have led to spatial concentration of co-ethnic settlers, particularly in South Western Sydney, albeit never to the extent of exclusion through “ghetto” forming (Jupp 1990).

Common settlement difficulties were not only a consequence of cultural differences. Various other issues appeared during the post-war settlement, such as type of work available to migrants, higher unemployment ratios, disadvantaged migrant women, access to quality housing and welfare facilities, and attitudes towards migrant children in schools. The deprivation of large numbers of non-English speaking migrants, due to lower economic status and various forms of social disadvantage, is documented in a wide range of sources (Henderson 1970; Martin 1981, 1978; ABS 1994:159; Collins 1991:175; Jupp 2002: 30). However, the issues facing migrants have differed throughout the whole post-war period, reflecting changes in immigration policies, in particular, the recent emphasis on self-supporting business and skilled IT professionals.

## **ETHNICITY AS A MOBILISING FACTOR**

Ethnicity is considered to be a key personal and group identifier that could be further enhanced by settlement experience. In the Australian context, the term ethnicity is generally only applied to first and second generation immigrants of non-English speaking origin (Martin 1981: 141). Weber (1968: 389) views an ethnic group as those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent, have physical similarities and also similarities of customs, irrespective of any blood relationship. In delineating belonging, ethnic boundaries identify membership to a particular ethnic group as a product of both inclusion in the group and exclusion from the social structures of the host society (Breton et al 1977:197).

The contemporary view of ethnicity defines it as a dynamic category, a key factor influencing the development of diverse forms of social relationships and social organisations (Coleman 1990: 43-44,300). Ethnicity facilitates group formation; it is a source of initiatives, and a resource that enables the development of community facilities. It generates mobilisation of available resources and defines group engagement in the development of community infrastructure during settlement in a new environment. As such, ethnicity appropriates a dimension of a social resource.

Ethnicity, as a dynamic and resilient category within the context of settlement process, defines key features of social capital as well. The settlement context enhances ethnic networks, solidarity and mutual trust, within established and transferred norms, and therefore reinforces the essential components of (ethnic) social capital (Bourdieu [1980] 1990, Coleman 1990, Putnam 1993). The ethnic group membership and settlement experience, generating necessary collective action, create new social capital. Parsons (1975: 53) indicates the significance of ethnicity for creating a feeling of solidarity and loyalty of individual members towards an ethnic group. As a category of ascription and identification, ethnicity establishes a field of communication and interaction (Barth 1969: 10-16). The established trust among the people experiencing similar settlement difficulties facilitates various forms of mutual aid. This enables the development of networks, comprehension of exigencies, and action deemed necessary to solve a perceived problem. The end result of such collective action is a new form of social capital, and established communal facilities are often its tangible expression.

Various sources on ethnic histories provide information on migrant needs and indicate how dynamic migrant collectives often mobilised resources to satisfy those needs. Hence, ethnicity can be also conceived as an organisational “vessel” appearing in different forms and amounts

reflecting prevailing social circumstances (Barth (1969:14). Existing ethnic boundaries were the stepping stone for the self-organisation of migrants. Ethnicity was not only a transfer of culture, but also of a response to reality, therefore providing the essential grounds for community action. Migrants did not come simply to be a labour force (Collins 1991), and the development of spiritual, leisure, education and welfare facilities in Australian cities, like Sydney, is the historical outcome of migrant settlement from the earliest days of colonisation.

## **Culture**

Culture is the outward representation of a particular ethnic group that has formed outside its original social environment. It is often called “cultural baggage”, and describes aspects of a certain way of life in a new social environment that is culturally different. It is a state of mind, and a way of life (Novak [1972] 1996: 426), and provides a very important symbolic dimension (Eisenstadt (1992: 64, 83). Culture is a constitutive segment of human activity generating and providing new symbolic features to the urban map, and appears as a new symbolic resource, or form of capital.

Ethnic groups endeavour to maintain their transferred culture and, as Sowell (1981: 287-288) argues, cultures are a focus for loyalties and emotions. This provides the grounds for understanding ethnic collective action. However, within a dynamic social system that develops through social changes, including migration, various sub-cultures or subsystems appear and co-exist. Hence, “cultural pluralism” appears along religious, ideological, and linguistic lines; not only in society as a whole (Smelser 1992: 9) but also within a particular ethnic group.

Nevertheless, Anderson’s (1991:4) notion of “imagined” communities defining the limits of all but primordial communities, sets the parameters of ethnicity. Ethnic groups and organisational forms are determined by migration patterns, time of arrival, place of origin, regional and dialectal background, political and ideological differences, and religious affiliations. Differences experienced at the place of settlement compound further the heterogeneity of the developed organisational forms and the ensuing social action. As a result various forms of collective actions appear.

Besides the importance of language as the medium of culture transfer and communication, the most visible aspect of culture transfer is in religious practice. The transfer of religion has a deep cultural and psychological meaning, and often indicates the establishment of new roots or “being at home” (Bell 1981;Fenton 1988: 170, 173;Yang 1999: 82,91). However, it is often the most

contentious issue in the host society and is reflected in various forms of discrimination. A place of worship is for many a focus for the total life experience of their community outside work, as it integrates social and cultural life of settlers. There is a high propensity for the development of religious facilities by migrants during settlement (Wade 1959; Pozzetta 1991; Rutland 1997; Warner and Wittner 1998). This disposition towards the establishment of places of worship reflects the structural dimension of settlement. In a predominantly Christian country, like Australia, even the already established Christian churches do not often meet the needs of newly arrived co-believers because of differences in language, religious practices and customs.

Religion is an important mode of symbolic expression, but also a key to cultural reproduction (Warner 1998:16; Fenton 1988:117). Religion enables ethnic mobilisation for other purposes, like education and welfare. Herberg (1974: 77-8) claims that family religion is the focal point of ethnic affiliation, establishing a heritage, through which self-identification of the third generation is manifested, while other aspects of ethnicity gradually vanish. Many languages and cultural traditions are transmitted through religious use. Public places in many Sydney suburbs are symbolically defined by places of worship built in a specific building style.

### **Collective goods**

Ethnic communities undertake collective action for the acquisition of social resources, the intended outcome of which may be the development of a communal facility. Buchanan and Tullock ([1962] 1965: 13) comprehend collective action as "... the action of individuals when they choose to accomplish purposes collectively rather than individually". Collective action develops among individuals, who attempt to make the best use of available resources, over which they have control, to solve a particular problem of scarcity (Coleman (1990: 300). However, Luhmann ([1984] 1995: 199) argues that not every social system is capable of collective action, as it depends not only on outside social constraints, ("environment provokes the system to unified action"), but also on adequate preconditions for that action. Consequently, outcomes differ as groups of people with specific common interests enter into a process leading towards various collective arrangements.

Various ethnic communities use their own private resources, to produce social infrastructure that is considered as a collective good, because of the nature of supply and consumption patterns. Goods of significance to a community are provided through collective communal effort. Such goods are neither purely private nor public goods, and can be comprehended as "impure", *quasi* public or collective goods (Buchanan [1967] 1987: 18-21; Harvey 1973: 59-60, 89-91; Stiglitz

2000:14). These privately produced collective goods are used by members of a particular collective and have different forms of exclusion of non-members. Actors form groups “in order to consume various *excludable jointly produced goods*, goods, whose attainment involves the co-operation of at least two individual producers”, while levels of exclusion could vary (Hechter 1987: 10,36;Frank 1997: 620, 624-625).

The basis for exclusion is established, according to Olson ([1965] 1971: 51), through the existence of selective incentives that are excludable, and hence collective goods could be offered only to those, who contribute. Newly formed social capital, established networks, levels of solidarity, and trust, provide grounds for development and exclusion. Although people, who are not part of the collective are excluded from use of the collective good, exclusion may often be just a temporary feature of such systems.

Migrant-developed, collective goods reflect various forms of scarcity in the migrant- receiving societies. Decisions to satisfy a community-perceived need is often collectively made on the basis of shared material or social interests, and such incentives are usually endogenous to a group (Hechter 1987: 9,35). In this report we define *ethnic community capital* as collectively appropriated buildings and other physical property of non-English speaking communities in Sydney that satisfy their communal needs. Groups of settlers developed collective goods or resources for the provision of diverse services for the purpose of social reproduction. Such resources have a symbolic meaning as well as material and measurable qualities, as they represent property acquired and developed for joint or common use by a group of people. A statement by Heilbroner (1968: 441) could be applied to emphasise that ethnic community capital rates as an economic factor, and is valued as a capitalised asset and for the services it provides.

### **Ethnic resources**

Migrants experience a dual form of scarcity, not only of a mode to satisfy their needs, but also of resources that could be applied for the development of collective goods. It is claimed by Breton (1989: 52; 1977: 207) that ethnic communities in general control a relatively small amount of resources and hence have to rely on internal and external sources of support for their development. Still, individuals join a group or collective, if the benefits to be gained are greater than the shared production costs of a collective good (Buchanan and Tullock *ibid*: 44;Hechter 1987: 42), or if economies of scale can be achieved through sharing of the development and maintenance costs (Brown, Jackson 1978: 5).

For migrants, the rationale of collective action lies in the intrinsic “jointness” of production, and in minimising external and social cost. Economic incentives are not the only incentives according to Olson ([1965] 1971: 60); often various social incentives arising out of membership or even `social pressures` can play a major role. The major resource is located in migrants themselves, their social and cultural capital (Bourdieu [1997] 2000: 240-2), perceived needs and the motivation to find solutions. Migrant creation of collective goods is qualified by communal homogeneity (that differs, being a vector of various cultural, regional, spatial, and settlement constraints factors), the level of demand, and the degree of commitment and compliance. Simmel`s ([1950] 1964: 92) argument, that small homogeneous groups can more easily apply available resources, is supported by Olson`s ([1965] 1971: 35,50,54) understanding of a more likely success of small group endeavours in comparison to large or latent groups that have no incentives to act to obtain collective goods.

Besides the more intangible aspects of social and cultural capital, voluntary labour and material contributions are the most often utilised resources for the development of collective goods. This applies not only because of individuals` self-interest, but also because the satisfaction of having contributed to a common good is an end in itself. Frank (1997: 624) states that motives for donations are as varied as the projects they support, and vary from social rewards to social penalties. People exchange their private resources for access to collective ones, and the greater the average proportion of each members` private resources contributed to collective ends, the greater the solidarity of the group. The other reason for the willingness to pay a higher contribution for a collective good is the level of dependency, the availability of close substitutes, lack of information about alternatives, the cost of moving or leaving a group, and the strength of personal ties (Hechter 1987: 46-47). Due to a cultural gap, this situation is found in many migrant communities contributing to the creation of necessary critical resources.

In true entrepreneurial spirit, new settlers channelled their modest resources, including organisational, construction and management skills, to secure conditions that could satisfy community-perceived needs. This happened often a very short time after arrival, although building developments often occurred many years after arrival and reflected permanency of settlement and increased living standards. Property of ethnic communities, now valued at millions of dollars, often started with as little as forty dollars in a bank account.

Migrants collaborate and collectively establish (in)formal organisations to pursue such needs, although many do not necessarily develop their own facilities, and continue to use various other premises, such as homes. They may rent or share facilities. In many instances business premises served as a logistical support for various activities of collective concern. However, changes in post-war migration patterns, and the subsequent evolution of government policy from assimilation to multiculturalism (Jupp 2002; Lopez 2000; Galbally 1978), created a more conducive social environment for voluntary ethnic engagement, in particular towards the development of educational and aged care facilities. The following segment presents some key aspects and outcomes of this form of migrant collaboration.

## **THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY CAPITAL IN SYDNEY**

The development of community buildings is the outcome of ethnic collective engagement. The material effects of such action are expressed through approximate market or replacement value of developed buildings, and social and symbolic value. Furthermore, such objects provide the basis for various additional indicators of social significance: developed space, the numbers of users of the facilities or clients benefiting from them. Also, data on human engagement can be gathered, such as numbers of volunteers at various stages of development and job creation, but also on their financial involvement and their organisation's annual budgets. These buildings generate important social value for people attempting to establish roots in a new environment. They are symbolic expression of arrival, culture transfer, resilience and accommodation.

Selected key indicators of the outcomes of collective migrant commitment over a fifty-year period in Sydney are presented on the following pages. The data<sup>2</sup> was collected via a survey in 1999-2001 among ethnic communities in Sydney, which had developed a building for the purpose of religion, leisure, education and welfare. The response rate was high, 344 or eighty-six per cent of 385 contacted organisations responded. The data covers most of the post-war ethnic communal development, representing an estimated 85 percent of the identified ethnic organisations with their own facilities in Sydney. The research data is organised around two key identifiers of this development, namely the physical aspects and the mobilisation of resources. The first section discusses major patterns of the development over this long period and its outcome. The second section discusses resources applied and sources of funding.

### **Development process**

The aggregated data presented below provide some key aspects of the period when facilities were initially established: the development of physical assets, spatial and user capacities in square metres, and the number of persons-users. Data are organised in decades that are divided into two sub-periods. The years from 1950 to 1980 roughly cover the assimilation period that terminated with the landmark recognition of ethnic organisations by the Galbally Commission in 1978. The second period (1980–2000) parallels the development of multicultural policies, and government financial support of some ethnic organisations (mostly welfare and education).

Data in Table 3 provide an insight into the patterns of development by type, and indicate that within the first three decades of development, education and welfare facilities amounted to only 19 percent of all developed facilities. The cultural differences experienced during the initial decades of post-war settlement were reflected in the development of urgently needed religious and leisure facilities. This explains the large number of settler-established religious and leisure facilities; 208 religious and 94 leisure organisations with their own facilities provided data.

Table 3 The Development of Ethnic Community Capital<sup>1</sup>: Incidence of Development, by type and periods, Sydney, 1950-2000, Estimate (% , n=units)

Periods	Religions <sup>2</sup>		Leisure <sup>3</sup>		Education <sup>4</sup>		Welfare <sup>5</sup>		Total	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
1950-1970	59.6	28	25.5	12	4.3	2	10.6	6	100.0	48
1961-1970	58.5	31	28.3	15	3.8	5	9.4	6	100.0	57
1971-1980	43.9	31	31.8	21	16.7	11	7.6	4	100.0	67
Total 1950-1980	53.0	90	29.0	48	9.0	18	9.0	16	100.0	172
1981-1990	44.0	51	26.7	31	13.8	18	15.5	17	100.0	117
1991-2000	64.4	67	14.4	15	7.7	8	13.5	14	100.0	104
Total 1981-2000	53.6	118	20.9	46	10.9	26	14.6	31	100.0	221
Total 1950-2000	53.4	208	24.4	94	10.1	44	12.1	47	100.0	393

Source: Lalich, W.F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (PhD thesis, UTS, unpublished)

Notes: 1. Data relate only to respondent organisations representing about 85 per cent of the total field or of all organisations that developed (bought or constructed) their own facilities. 2. Any religious building, including halls. 3. Social and sports clubs, community halls and centres. 4. Includes child-care facilities. 5. Includes retirement and nursing homes; and welfare organisations

Table 3 shows that ethnic communities in Sydney established at least 208 buildings for religious purposes, 94 for leisure purposes, 44 for education and childcare and 47 for welfare and aged-care over the period 1950-2000. The dynamics of the development during this period can also be seen: 12.2 percent of all ethnic facilities were established in the 1950s, and 30 percent in the 1980s. This pattern reflects the large number of arriving settlers, intensity of cultural diversity, and the capability to support communal investment. Within each decade religious facilities represented the most significant developments. Religious organisations often subsequently developed other facilities, such as childcare centres, schools and aged care institutions.

The stagnation in the establishment of leisure facilities in the 1990s indicates structural changes in society and ethnic communities. For decades, there was little, if any, competition from the commercial sector, as there were inadequate recreational or entertainment facilities in many Sydney suburbs where migrants settled, not only in the western suburbs (Powell 1993, Sandercock 1977). More recently, developments within the hospitality industry, ageing of migrants and change in migration structures has impacted on this trend.

The development of childcare, schools and aged care (welfare) institutions since 1980 indicates changes in community priorities, but also in Australian society itself (Brennan 1998; Hartley 1995; Marginson 1997; McMahon, Thompson, Williams 2000). The development of ethnic educational and welfare facilities is supported by access to public funding by ethnic community groups for their construction and maintenance. These differences in the development ratios indicate changes in perceived social needs and the intensity of social changes in the host society.

### **The dynamics of development**

The involvement of ethnic communities in the acquisition of property, land and buildings, made the establishment of facilities by over four hundred ethnic organisations possible. Throughout the whole 50-year period, over 150 different buildings were purchased for ethnic communal purposes, including at least 85 churches developed by earlier established religious organisations, thereby preserving many historic heritage objects for future public use. The *religious succession* in Sydney, to be seen in conjunction with *ethnic succession* (Waldinger et al 1990), is an indicator of the changing ideological or religious map of the Sydney metropolitan area.

The acquisition of land was not a “one-off” event; at least 115 organisations continued to acquire land after the first acquisition. The land was purchased through various sources, while some religious organisations also acquired land and other property through donations. Government agencies also provided long-term leases on land to some organisations, and determined development locations through favourable sale of land to others. Such acquisitions provided an opportunity for additional development to satisfy communal needs, upgrade and develop new facilities, and diversify services.

The dynamics of the development of facilities, that is, the physical size and the location, varies. Many organisations initially developed smaller facilities, but some redeveloped their facilities to suit larger congregations, new functions, and increased and diversified demand. This process is ongoing, because new settlement needs, the dynamics of physical and social mobility, generational changes, and ageing, impacts on further development and the sustainability of developed facilities. During the last five decades at least 106 religious and 70 leisure organisations continued their substantial development investment. Similarly, most aged-care centres and schools continued their development during this period as well.

Table 4 Developed Physical<sup>1</sup> and User Capacities, by type and period, Sydney, 1950-2000, Estimates, (sqm, n<sup>2</sup>, %)

Periods	Religions <sup>3</sup> (%)		Leisure <sup>4</sup> (%)		Education <sup>5</sup> (%)		Welfare <sup>6</sup> (%)	
	Sqm	n	Sqm	n	Sqm	n	Sqm	n
1950-1960	12.0	11.9	23.2	17.9	0.3	0.4	13.6	17.5
1961-1970	19.5	21.1	22.0	26.7	0.8	0.6	19.5	23.4
1971-1980	14.8	18.7	18.1	15.8	22.2	22.3	4.9	10.0
Total 1950-1980	46.3	51.7	63.3	60.4	23.3	23.3	38.0	50.9
1981-1990	31.0	24.3	26.2	30.0	41.3	48.5	40.3	27.6
1991-2000	22.7	24.0	10.5	9.6	35.4	28.2	21.7	21.5
Total 1981-2000	53.7	48.3	36.7	39.6	76.7	76.7	62.0	49.1
Total 1950-2000 (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Lalich, W. F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (PhD thesis, UTS, unpublished)

Notes: 1. Includes purchased physical objects. 2. Persons. 3. Any religious building, including halls. 4. Social and sports clubs, community halls and centres. 5. Includes child-care facilities. 6. Includes retirement and nursing homes.

The data in Table 4 provide an insight into the development of physical capacities. The largest leisure capacities were developed by the earlier established organisations, unlike educational and aged-care facilities, which tend to be of more recent origin. In comparison to the 63 per cent of all leisure capacities built between 1950-1980, 62 per cent of all aged care facilities were built after 1980. Older religious organisations established somewhat smaller facilities than the new ones established since 1980.

This development was not uniform and corresponds to perceived needs and available resources, the changing nature of immigration and settlement, and concurrent social changes. It also reflects the level of community support for the development and the availability of the necessary entrepreneurial skills. Consequently, collectives produced outcomes that make any comparison very difficult. For example, it is difficult to compare leisure clubs, which have installed gaming machines that derive significant income, with the many small regional clubs that do not have gaming machines, although various traditional games are played for recreation in these facilities.

A summary of this development is presented in Table 5, indicating that close to half a million square metres of space was developed over the period 1950-2000 for specific uses by 386 ethnic collectives from over sixty different ethnic groups<sup>3</sup>. This space can accommodate approximately two hundred thousand people at any time, and over 320,000 regularly use these facilities, not including spectators at sport events. Over 200,000 sqm were developed for religious purposes, 100,000 sqm for leisure, 56,000 sqm for education and childcare, and 104,000 sqm for welfare purposes (mostly aged-care). User capacities differ, and could include seating or standing space in places of worship and leisure, student capacity, and beds in welfare (aged-care) organisations.

Such development represents an immeasurable social value to their members and users, but also to the broader community.

Table 5. Developed Capacities, Sydney, 2000, Estimates (persons, sqm)

<b>Capacities</b>	<b>Religions<sup>1</sup> (n206)</b>	<b>Leisure<sup>2</sup> (n94)</b>	<b>Education<sup>3</sup> (n39)</b>	<b>Welfare<sup>4</sup> (n47)</b>	<b>Total (n386)</b>
Developed space <sup>5</sup>	209,656	103,117	56,345	104,373	473,491
User place <sup>6</sup>	119,819	48,081	10,751	2,270 <sup>4</sup>	180,962
Regular users	191,983	117,412	9,820 <sup>7</sup>	2,197 <sup>7</sup>	321,412 <sup>7</sup>

Source: Lalich, W.F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (PhD thesis, UTS, unpublished)

Notes: 1. Any religious building, including halls and attached classrooms. 2. Social and sports clubs, community halls and centres. 3. Includes child-care facilities; new schools not filled to capacity. 4. Retirement and nursing homes (40 units). 5. Square metres. 6. Persons. 7. Adjusted for volunteers and employees would be 11,568 and 6,002 persons or total of 326,965 regular users.

Social value lies in the ability to satisfy ethnic community needs through generated social capital, capability and independence within social constraints. Throughout this process, concerned communities experienced intensification of social capital either during production, or consumption of developed facilities, such as the expansion of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 2000). To many migrant-settlers the developed community facilities are the centre of their communal life in Sydney. Such tangible collective ethnic goods or tangible social capital (Thompson, Alvy, Lee 2000: 329) that were developed for collective ethnic consumption, are often consumed by other segments of society as well.

This development allows for the active involvement of people in diverse key activities: the commitment of finance, material, labour and time throughout the life cycle of the facilities, participation in activities organised around or in the facilities, and participation in various organisational bodies. The means of human participation can differ between organisations, and appear in different forms and quantity during the construction of facilities, and in service or goods consumption, or representation.

Summary data related to the participation of people in the active life of established organisations are presented in Table 6. Nearly 5,000 people with different skills are employed in these organisations in Sydney now. Over sixty per cent of all employees are women, mostly working in female dominated industries, like education and welfare, but also in religious and leisure organisations. Many employees, even in religious organisations, are not from the same ethnic background, as it is frequently difficult to find workers within the ethnic group, who have adequate language skills.

Table 6 Management patterns of Ethnic Community Capital, by type, Sydney, 1950-2000, Estimate

<b>Participation</b>	<b>Religions (n206)</b>	<b>Leisure (n94)</b>	<b>Education (n44)</b>	<b>Welfare (n47)</b>	<b>Total (n391)</b>
Employed <sup>1</sup>	595	1,196	1,208	1,832	4,831
Management <sup>2</sup>	2,235	1,150	190	445	4,110
Volunteers	8,967	2,286	350	1,528	13,671
Total (persons)	11,887	5,172	1,748	3,805	22,612
Total (%)	52.6	22.9	7.7	16.8	100.0

Source: Lalich, W. F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (PhD thesis, UTS, unpublished)

Notes: 1. 53.0% are full-time employees. 2. Boards and committee members, volunteers only.

More specifically, *ethnic community capital* in Sydney has provided employment for at least 600 people in religious organisations. Most are religious personnel, and there are over 2,200 volunteers in various management capacities, and 9,000 other volunteers. In the leisure category only 1,196 people or 23 percent are paid employees. This means that clubs are very much dependent on volunteers. There are fewer volunteers in education and aged-care, because of the structure of management and employment. Over 1,200 jobs are in education, and over 1,800 in aged-care. This amounts to 63 percent of all employment opportunities in these ethnic facilities.

More than 4,000 people work as volunteers in various management functions, on boards and committees. It is estimated that nearly six percent of the users of all facilities are engaged as volunteers. This provides opportunities for many to contribute to the development of their community and satisfy their creative aspirations. Our data suggest, that by activating under-utilised human resources, social problems may be alleviated.

## **ETHNIC COLLECTIVE RESOURCES**

Migrants have faced a two-fold problem of scarcity: of facilities capable of satisfying their social needs, and of resources needed to develop such facilities. They have mobilised available resources in their quest to overcome scarcity and develop communal infrastructure. Light and Rosenstein (1995) argue that ethnic difference and social marginality are converted into an economic resource. The nature of ethnic resources could be reinterpreted to emphasise not only social capital, reactive solidarity, and social networks, but also (entrepreneurial) heritage, values and attitudes, relative satisfaction arising from non-acculturation, finances, and members willing to offer their time and labour. Furthermore, following Parsons and Smelser (1956), a particularly significant resource is embedded in individual motivation and the subsequent collective commitment to develop community facilities.

Joint use of scarce resources leads to the consumption of a new social product in newly created spaces, although fragmented, due to origin and purpose. The creation of new social resources is defined through acquisition, construction, improvements and continuous maintenance. It requires human and material resources. Therefore human and material resources, including financial, could be considered as critical resources in the development of communal facilities.

Community supported development processes often materialised, despite various hindrances (Schumpeter 1954;Dunn 2001;Lyal 1990). In Australia, government support for ethnic community welfare started to appear sporadically in the 1970`s, but became an integral feature of social policy after the recognition of the important role of ethnic organisations in Australian society by the Galbally Commission in 1978. Together with changes in post-war migration patterns, the evolution of government settlement policy from assimilation to multiculturalism, created a conducive socio-political atmosphere for the voluntary development of diverse community organisations. It became possible for ethnic organisations to solicit public financing to develop various educational and welfare facilities. In other words, a fraction of taxes paid by the new settlers was returned through the publicly-supported development of ethnic social infrastructure.

The following section is structured around two key development inputs: human and material (or financial) resources. The financial contributions are further analysed by their origin, which is classified as the community`s own or private, commercial, public, and overseas. This provides a

new perspective on the development and economic life of this critical ethnic social infrastructure in Sydney.

### **Human engagement**

The key resource in this development process are the individuals, who form a particular collective, and combine not only material - mostly defined through contributions of money and other material input - but also human, cultural and social capital with intent to develop a new resource that has critical value for a defined group of people. It is purposeful human action that uses available resources to produce a desired outcome: a necessary collective good. The outcome of collective action lies in the development of a particular communal building, defined by Thompson and colleagues (2000) as “the creation of community-based tangible and intangible assets which would otherwise not exist.” Accordingly, tangible assets include buildings, services and support networks, while intangibles include identity, reputation and respect for achievement. These actions form the basis for community development and survival, and as a new resource, facilitate further social actions, which sometimes transcend ethnic and geographic boundaries.

Human capital is a key ethnic resource (Light and Gold 2000), and of particular significance at all stages of ethnic collective social enterprise. The interaction between transferred human and cultural capital with local social capital, establishes grounds for creative action. Migration and the settlement experience create a habitat (Bourdieu 1990; 2000) for community development. Migrants develop organisations and facilities voluntarily to facilitate “everyday life”, to counterbalance disadvantages during the process of settlement. These organisations are seen as non-profit organisations that provide a benefit to the members of a particular collective.

Buildings for community use are the result of various collective entrepreneurial acts through voluntary commitment. Voluntary work is defined by Lyons (2001) as that in which a person or an organisation is involved without seeking profit, although benefits could accrue to members, to other people, who may join the organisation, and even to the broader community. Volunteers are considered to be a critical constraint in community organisations (Drucker 1985; Light 1972).

The available information indicates that voluntary labour was more important in the early development of religious and leisure facilities, than later for the construction of schools and aged care facilities. Up to 40 percent of the value of many facilities developed in the first post-war decades, depended on voluntary labour, in particular in construction work; otherwise such development would not have been possible. However, the ensuing changes reflected a need to

abide by more stringent planning and building regulations for the construction of new facilities. Still, even today many professionals provide free labour for the construction of ethnic community buildings.

The volume of voluntary participation in ethnic communal organisations is difficult to estimate, as it is influenced by urgency and commitment. The degree of voluntary participation is also determined by demographic structure, available skills, and ageing of the community. Very few organisations have information on the number of volunteers or hours volunteered during construction. The data on participation in various management bodies and organisational activities is often the best available information. However, the acquisition of material assets by such a large number of fragmented ethnic collectives, and their ability to develop nearly half a million square acres of public space, signifies migrants willingness and commitment towards the development of important social facilities. Human resources were the major input into the development of this critical infrastructure in the new Australian social environment.

### **Investment**

The full extent, to which material resources have been provided, is difficult to assess. During construction, people not only contributed financial resources, but also construction materials and various artefacts, artistic and sacral works. Such contributions were frequently provided free of charge, at discounted prices or were purchased and subsequently donated. Other donations often had an emotional value for the donors, such as religious objects or photographs. The value of this form of investment was often not commensurate with the market value, as it represented a major financial sacrifice during the time of settlement.

Funding was a major constraint in the early stages of communal development, when the settlers' need for access to friendly services was most urgent. Ethnic collectives initially experienced limited access to financial markets and were dependent, for most of the development period, on their own, and community members' financial resources. Funding problems were further exacerbated because unlike ethnic small business, the development of ethnic community capital had higher entry costs.

Table 7 Investment in Ethnic Community Capital, by periods, Sydney, 1950-2000,  
Estimate (‘000; \$A2000; %)

Investment patterns	Religious (n190)	Leisure (n88)	Education (n33)	Welfare (n39)	Total (\$) (n350)
<b>Initial Investment<sup>1</sup></b>					
Total 1950-1980	31.7	41.7	10.8	14.4	27.9
Total 1981-2000	68.3	58.3	89.2	85.6	72.1
Total 1950-2000 (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total 1950-2000 (\$)	77,187	46,079	25,470	36,772	185,518
Ratio	41.6	24.9	13.7	19.8	100.0
<b>Development Investment<sup>2</sup></b>					
Total 1950-1980	63.6	78.3	23.9	51.9	57.4
Total 1981-2000	36.4	21.7	76.1	48.1	42.6
Total 1950-2000 (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total 1950-2000 (\$)	261,739	169,387	121,924	187,338	740,388
Ratio	35.3	22.9	16.5	25.3	100.0

Source: Lalich, W.F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (UTS, PhD thesis, unpublished)

Note: 1. Refers primarily to purchases of a building or a block of land. 2. Indicates all forms of investment: initial adaptation, construction and the additional purchase of land.

The data on financial investment relates primarily to two important phases of an organisation’s life. It identifies investment at the time of acquisition of facilities or land, and, during the development, adaptation and construction work. Data in Table 7 indicate that the most intensive initial investment before 1980 was in the religious and leisure categories. The education and welfare facilities have been predominantly developed over the last two decades, when over 85 percent of initial investment in these two categories occurred. The initial investment in religious facilities and clubs also increased over this period and was mostly due to continuous changes in demographic and cultural patterns, price, and local social and physical mobility.

Ethnic collectives initially invested more than \$77 million in religious buildings in Sydney, with a further amount, over \$260 million, invested in construction and maintenance, over the period 1950-2000. Over \$46 million was raised to purchase leisure facilities or a suitable block of land, and at least \$169 million to construct, maintain and expand those facilities. In addition to this investment, various ethnic collectives raised over \$25 million to establish schools and childcare facilities, and a further \$121 million to construct, maintain and expand these types of facilities. More than \$37 million went towards the development of various aged-care and welfare facilities and over \$187 million towards their further development and maintenance. Overall, Sydney’s ethnic communities have invested more than \$930 million in places of worship, schools, childcare, aged-care and leisure facilities over a fifty-year period.

The initial acquisition was not the end of the process for many organisations. Development finance was generally used for the construction of new, or expansion and improvement of established facilities. The available data show that investment in religious facilities represents over one-third of the total recorded development investment. Nearly eighty percent of the investment in leisure facilities was made during the first three decades, indicating a crisis in urban leisure in Sydney and pointing towards subsequent cultural changes. The relatively large share of development investment in educational and aged care facilities reflected technological and regulatory requirements and the availability of public support.

### **Financial resources**

The estimated value of total financial investment of at least \$930 million, or over one billion dollars, if non-respondent organisations were included, accentuated the importance of access to financial resources in the development of ethnic community capital. The pattern of financial investment altered over time. Historically, the development of ethnic community facilities resulted from community resourcefulness, including individual philanthropy, and various forms of outside private and public support, either local or overseas. The collected data make it possible to differentiate the sources of investment at both the inception of the life cycle and at later development stages.

The development in the earlier decades started from positions of extreme scarcity and the “uncertain” status of new collectives, being “outsiders” to the receiving society. Consequently, the initial development depended on limited collective financial resources, as other financial sources were not readily available. The initial development was made possible only through the mobilisation of local internal sources. Access to outside sources of capital indicates successful settlement and social changes.

Communal financial input is classified separately as individual and community contribution, although in the final analysis these are derived from one source only: community members. The dual classification is an attempt to distinguish between the direct contributions by individuals and previous contributions that materialised through accumulated capital or through the sale of a property. In particular, it is difficult to segregate commercial revenues from contributions, because the final source is ultimately a member of the collective. The repayment process actually enhances individual commitment and, therefore, augments social capital. Many sources indicated

that the financial burden undertaken by their communities was often repaid within a short time through intensive commitment. Therefore, the full comprehension of individual and community contributions requires understanding of its inclusiveness, apart from being the most important sources of investment.

A very specific source of financial resources have been “mother” or “umbrella’ organisations. These generally provided loans or non-refundable funds to offshoot organisations or even to independently established co-ethnic organisations. This was a significant source of funds for the purchase of churches.

Internal loans, although valuable and critically important, were not the major source of financing. However, many individuals never insisted on repayments, even after many years, thus converting loans or shareholdings into gifts.

Table 8 indicates that the development of most places of worship, and leisure facilities relied on self-financing of more than 50 percent of initial and developmental investment. The government or various public authorities became the major sources of investment in the development of the technologically more demanding educational and aged care (welfare) facilities. The leisure organisations relied the least on overseas support for acquisitions, a fact that points to their grass roots within the conditions of settlement. Religious organisations continue to rely on community support, while in leisure organisations the value of commercial loans was equal to the community contribution. Education institutions also used commercial loans, often as bridging finance. Overseas support went primarily to religious, education and aged care facilities, which benefited also from philanthropy. It is estimated that around three percent of the total investment came from overseas sources.

Table 8 Sources of Investment in Ethnic Community Capital, Sydney, 1950-2000,  
Estimate (%)

Sources	Religions (n200)		Leisure (n88)		Education (n37)		Welfare <sup>1</sup> (n46)		Total (n371)	
	I	D	I	D	I	D	I	D	I	D
Own resources	14.8	13.3	37.7	23.9	15.6	11.9	34.2	28.3	23.6	19.4
Community contributions	38.4	58.4	17.9	20.5	18.4	19.3	11.0	25.1	25.1	35.3
Internal loans	1.4	2.3	6.0	5.9	0.9	0.5	....	1.1	4.9	2.6
Head bodies	8.5	1.2	....	1.7	....	...	6.7	0.5	2.0	1.1
Financial institutions	26.1	20.9	36.7	44.6	27.3	52.5	21.8	9.1	26.8	28.4
Gifts	2.5	0.3	1.6	1.0	3.8	0.2	1.5	0.9	2.3	1.6
State	2.6	0.8	0.5	2.4	21.3	15.6	22.5	32.6	5.6	11.1
Overseas	5.7	2.8	1.7	...	12.7	...	4.3	2.4	9.7	0.6
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Lalich, W.F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (UTS, PhD thesis, unpublished)

Notes: I=Initial Investment; D= Development Investment

1.Data relate only to aged care institutions, not to the nine general welfare organisations that provide various day services and have been supported by the Grants-In-Aid scheme since 1969.

Many developments were limited by the availability of funding. Consequently, the availability of financial resources influenced the patterns and intensity of organisational development, and some communities postponed the realisation of initiatives until living standards could support any collective financial involvement. Many religious organisations and social clubs were established several years prior to the development of their own facilities, and leased, rented or shared facilities, while accumulating the necessary capital. Several organisations had bought property previously, and sold it to acquire new premises deemed more suitable to their needs. Some were induced to surrender their former property to the state authorities for some other use (roads, housing, airport) and were compensated or provided with the opportunity to purchase their current locations. Finally, various government bodies provided land, either on long lease, or for acceptable prices, to several religious and leisure organisations.

The major change in financing the development of ethnic community capital, and its further diversification, appeared with the change in official attitudes towards ethnic organisations, following the Galbally Commission Report in 1978. After that, public authorities became a

significant regular source of finance for the development of educational and aged care facilities. The development of these facilities was an outcome of social reforms and paralleled the development of these institutions in Australia from early 1972, when most of the far-reaching policy changes were made. These reforms provided financial support for the development of ethnic educational and welfare facilities. This encouraged some ethnic collectives to initiate and intensify the development of such facilities. Government financial assistance facilitated acquisition of facilities, but also required the acceptance of local planning and building development standards. The authorities were also involved in covering the operating costs of educational and aged care organisations.

The intensive commitment from community members, either through financial participation or voluntary work, made these diverse, but fragmented outcomes possible. This confirms the argument by Thompson and colleagues (2000) of the importance of a building as a medium for attracting support, because it provides assurance that other useful services could also be provided on the premises.

## SUSTAINABILITY

Many factors impact on the sustainability of ethnic facilities. The following analysis of selected findings provides some insights into social potential of ethnic organisations. The median age of a sample of 28 out of 85 religious buildings, at the time of religious succession, was 72 years. Some were over a century old at the time of purchase. This marker established an indicator of an approximate life span for the analysed properties. It, however, does not take into account, that many of these buildings symbolise century old struggles for survival, and re-territorialised (Deleuze-Guattari 1995), century old traditions developed their genuine potential beyond expectations in a new social environment. Migrant communities developed buildings to satisfy their needs, and the urgency of their problems changed, following social changes in society. Only the development of religious buildings indicated continuous need over the fifty-year period. However, it came as no surprise that the largest ratio of anticipated investment for the forthcoming period was for the development of aged-care organisations, as ageing is a major social issue for the whole of society.

Important factors of a new field of social interaction are functions and activities in ethnic places. Many organisations indicated more than one function, and approximately half of the religious and leisure organisations had developed three additional functions per unit. The educational function and the role of a community centre are the most common. The ability to create additional organisational functions provides the prerequisite for the evolution of (ethnic) social space.

An even more dynamic aspect of this development and its sustainability lies in the activities conducted on or from the research facilities. Table 9 categorises diverse activities. From a total of 5,551 registered activities, 3,011 activities are conducted by religious bodies, and 1,770 by leisure organisations. The education and aged care units registered approximately nine diverse activities each, totalling 770 registered activities. Generic or obligatory activities range from 44.9 percent in the education category to 47 percent in the religious category, the rest are additional activities. They range from commercial, cultural, education, entertainment, sports, to specific youth activities. The extensive field of activities is an important indicator of the significance of *ethnic community capital* for communal life in Sydney.

Table 9 The Incidence of Activities at Ethnic Communal Places, Sydney, 2000 (%)

Generic activities	Places of Worship (n 206)	Places of Leisure (n 94)	Education & childcare (n33)	Aged care and welfare (n 47)
Communal	20.3	20.5	23.9	21.1
Functional/Religious	12.3	8.1 <sup>1</sup>	10.8 <sup>3</sup>	14.6 <sup>4</sup>
Social	14.4	17.6	10.2	10.1
Sub-total	47.0	46.2	44.9	45.8
Generated activities				
Commercial	4.0	6.2	4.6	8.6
Culture	7.4	8.4	7.2	8.0
Education	12.2	6.2	6.6 <sup>2</sup>	9.2
Entertainment	8.4	18.1	8.5	13.1
Recreation/sports	6.0	2.1 <sup>2</sup>	10.2	5.6
Welfare	8.3	6.1	12.1	7.3 <sup>2</sup>
Youth	6.7	6.7	5.9	2.4
Total	53.0	53.8	55.1	54.2
Total (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	3011	1770	305	465

Source: Lalich, W.F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (UTS, PhD thesis, unpublished)

Note: 1. Sports and recreation. 2. Religious. 3. Education. 4. Welfare and aged-care.

The depth of engagement in the development process, tangible effects of mobilised scarce resources, and the breadth of functions and activities, highlight a deep sense of achievement. The richness of functions and activities has turned these facilities into a real source of life; *fabrics of life*<sup>4</sup>, for many ethnic communities, by establishing deep feelings of attachment and a multitude of external links. For example, over 64 percent of leisure and over 44 percent of religious organisations indicated a year ahead of the Sydney Olympics<sup>5</sup> that they anticipated to play an active role during the Games.

Discontent exists in many organisations about their neighbourhood relationships. Among the sample of 107 religious organisations, 42 percent indicated bad relationships with their neighbours; only 8 percent indicated good contacts. The ratios for a sample of 39 leisure organisations are 18 and 4 percent respectively. The same samples indicated better relations with the authorities, as 16 percent of both religious and leisure organisations indicated good, while 10 and 26 percent complained about bad relationships. These responses show that despite co-existence, sometimes over several decades, there is place for improvement in community relationships. The above data do not cover responses on parking problems; one of the key issues for many ethnic, religious organisations, and their neighbours. From this sample, consisting of half of all respondents in these two categories, approximately 30 percent are not happy with local relationships

Table 10 Ethnic Community Organisations: Expected Organisational Longevity, Sydney, 2000 (%)

Expected longevity	Positive (%)	Positive-Qualified (%)	Negative (%)
Religious (n164)	82.9	10.4	6.7
Leisure (n 86)	77.9		22.1

Source: Lalich, W.F. (2003). *Ethnic Community Capital*. (UTS, PhD thesis, unpublished)

Many religious, and over a third of leisure organisations encounter internal problems and find solutions within the organisational framework. The major problem is ageing, and subsequent generational issues, and the lack of motivation because the project is completed. For many organisations the major issue is gradually evolving around the role and participation of a new generation in management and activities. While 70 percent of religious organisations are satisfied with the role of the young people in their congregation; in contrast the ratio is only 39 percent in leisure organisations. These responses are reflected in Table 10 that gauges the outlook on the organisational future. A majority of religious organisations indicated a high degree of optimism in the future, probably not only because of their key role in the transferred culture, but also because of their ability to relate to the second generation, while most of the leisure organisations had been established as a direct response to severe scarcities during the time of settlement. The successful transfer of religious patterns and culture has also positively affected the future of educational facilities. Childcare facilities showed a high degree of adaptability to the mobility and ageing of the population, even though many do not provide services for children of their peer communities.

Some early post-war ethnic communal buildings have already acquired dual heritage status, being representative of the local social development and of transferred cultures. Some are deeply embedded in the local social structure, and others in the evolving transnational societies. Though it is impossible to visualise the future, it can be assumed that many of the established elements of *ethnic community capital* are here to stay in a continuously changing local and global environment.



## CONCLUDING COMMENT

Ethnic community capital is an important part of the ethnic economy (Light and Gold 2000) and of a wider social environment exercising also exceptional potential in transnational linkages (Faist 2000; Burnley 2001). This development of communal facilities was made possible through mobilisation of ethnic resources, through the joint action of many groups of people, the application of human and social capital and of material resources during settlement.

The available data provided an insight into the ability of migrant collectives to meet their social needs. It showed how various migrant collectives successfully overcame the problem of scarcity. These communal facilities were developed to satisfy local community needs, and were in nearly all cases financed from local resources, and a few from public resources. Altogether, well over \$900 million was generated for this development in the last 50 years. It enabled the employment of over 5,000 people by diverse ethnic organisations and provided the capacity for diverse use by more than 200,000 people. Ethnic community capital or social capital, produced in a time of deprivation, can be defined through its economic and financial dimension and its incomparable social value.

The driving force behind this human achievement lies in migrant voluntary participation. The importance of this voluntary contribution was exemplified through the development of critical infrastructure, here defined as ethnic community capital. It was a historical phenomenon, dating back to the earliest decades of modern colonisation, and a part of the Australian third sector experience. However, these data provide only a limited insight into the development of ethnic community capital, as the value of developed collective goods, represented as social capital, is much more than its tangible features.

Nevertheless, it is clear that ethnic communities from a non-English speaking background have contributed substantially towards the transformation of Sydney. In the buildings that they have established for religious, leisure, education, welfare and aged-care activities and in the social functions these buildings play, it can be truly said that ethnic communities in Sydney have helped create a better city.



## ENDNOTES

- 1 The term, *ethnic community capital*, is used instead of more familiar terms like public places, civil architecture (Dattner 1995), built environment, social and physical infrastructure or urban infrastructure (Harvey 2000: 59; 1999: 69,233; Burnley, Murphy and Fagan 1997: 59) with the intention of distinguishing such ethnic collective involvement in the development of buildings for community use. It corresponds very much to *pattern-maintenance "capital"*, indicating schools, churches, recreational facilities, as the term is applied by Parsons and Smelser (1956: 57), in a sense of "impure" localised public goods defined by partial excludability (Harvey 1973). It is felt that this distinction in relation to classical terminology is needed to emphasise the development of collective goods, i.e., public places with limited access, as they are particularly important resources for ethnic communities. Beside material value, ethnic community capital implies existence of intangible social values and usage value. Although it could be interchangeable in many instances with the classical terminology, it is ascertained that it could help in the comprehension of this particular development within the specific constraints of migration and settlement. In this case public utility, a public good, is not produced by governments (Baumol, Blinder 1985) but by diverse ethnic non-profit organisations. It differs from the interpretation of "ethnic capital" as used by Borjas (1999) to define the totality of the ethnic environment, but primarily relates to ethnic human and not to developed material resources.
- 2 The data were collected by the author from 1999 to 2001 throughout Sydney and involved 386 diverse ethnic organisations that developed their own facilities through voluntary engagement of their members. The aim of this data collection was to secure necessary empirical data for the author's PhD project on *Ethnic Community Capital*. The 344 respondents (out of a total of 385) also provided information on an additional 42 affiliated organisations. The sample survey provided only a limited insight into this important human engagement during the process of settlement in a new social environment.
- 3 The respondents were not large entities, such as ethnic groups or their umbrella organisations, but in nearly all cases were separate organisations that had developed a particular facility, their own building or sports grounds. However, some development was probably not recognised and not recorded during this research. Ethnic organisations that lease, rent or share facilities with some other entity, like places of worship, were not contacted, except for one small club that leases facilities. This research only covers those ethnic organisations, whose members developed their own facilities, and invested energy, money and time.
- 4 Ellis Island Museum Exhibition, New York.
- 5 Collins, J. and Lalich, W. (2000). Cultural Diversity and Event Management: The Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. The Australian Event Evaluation Research and Education Conference. NSW Trade and Investment Centre. Sydney, 13-14. June 2000.



## SOURCES

- Anderson, B. ([1983]1991). Imagined Communities. London, Verso.
- Archer, J. (1997). Situating Australian national identity in Theory and Practice. The Politics of Identity in Australia. G.Stokes, (Ed.). Melbourne, Cambridge University Press: 23-36.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002). Census of Population and Housing. Cat. No.20150.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001). Clib Census Statistics.
- Australian Population and Immigration Council (1977). Immigration Policy and Australia's Population, A Green Paper. Canberra: AGPS
- Barth, F. (Ed.). (1969). Ethnic Groups and Boundaries, The Social Organisation of Culture Differences. Oslo/London, University Forlaget/George Allen & Unwin.
- Baumol, W.J. and A.S.Blinder ([1979] 1985). Economics: Principles and Policy.3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
- Bell, J. (1981). The Dutch: Making Australian Society. Melbourne, Nelson.
- Borjas, G., J. (1999). Heaven` Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. ([1980] 1990). The Logic of Practice. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. ([1997] 2000). Pascalian Meditations. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Brennan, D. (1998). The Politics of Australian Childcare: Philanthropy to Feminism and Beyond. Rev. Ed. Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
- Breton, R., J. Burnet, et al (1977). The Impact of Ethnic Groups on Canadian Society: Research Issues. Identities: The Impact of Ethnicity on Canadian Society. W. Isajiw, Ed. Toronto, Peter Martin Associates Ltd: 191-213.
- Breton, R. (1964). Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants. American Journal of Sociology, **70**(2):193-205
- Brown, C.V., and P.M. Jackson (1978). Public Sector Finance. Oxford, Martin Robertson.
- Buchanan, J.M. (1987). Public Finance in Democratic Process: Fiscal Institutions and Individual Choice. Chapel Hill, The University of North Caroline Press.
- Buchanan, J. M., and G. Tullock ([1962] 1965). The Calculus of Consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy. Ann Arbor Paperbacks.
- Burnley, I., H. (2001). The Impact of Immigration on Australia: A Demographic Approach. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.
- Burnley, I.H. (2000). Diversity and difference: Immigration and the multicultural city. Sydney. Connell, J. (Ed.). Melbourne, Oxford University Press.
- Burnley, I., Murphy, P., Fagan, R. (1997). Immigration and Australian Cities. Sydney, Federation Press.
- Coleman, J., S. (1990). Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press.
- Collins, J. (1991). Migrant Hands in Distant Land: Australia's post-war immigration. Sydney, Pluto Press Australia.
- Collins, J., K. Gibson, et al. (1995). A Shop Full of Dreams: Ethnic Small Business in Australia. Sydney, Pluto Press Australia.
- Collins, J., and Lalich, W.F. (2000). Cultural Diversity and Event Management: The Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. The Australian Event Evaluation Research and Education Conference. NSW Trade and Investment Centre, Sydney, 13-14. June 2000.
- Connell, J. (Ed.). (2000). Sydney: The Emergence of a World City. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.
- Cox, D.(1987). Migration and Welfare: An Australian Perspective. Sydney, Prentice Hall.
- Dattner, R. (1995). Civil Architecture: The New Public Infrastructure. New York, McGrawHill
- Deleuze, G., and F.Guattari ([1994] 1991). What's Philosophy? London, Verso.
- Drucker, P.F. (1985). Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practices and Principles. New York, Harper & Row Publishers.
- Dunn, K. (2001). Representations of Islam in the Politics of Mosque Development in Sydney. Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie **92**(3): 291-308.

- Eisenstadt, S.N. (1992). The Order-maintaining and order-transforming Dimensions of Culture. Theory of Culture. R.Munch and N.J.Smelser, (Eds.). Berkeley, University of California Press: 64-87.
- Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales (1998). The People of NSW: Statistics from the 1996 Census. Sydney.
- Faist, T. (2000). The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Fenton, J., Y. (1988). Transplanting Religious Traditions: Asian Indians in America. New York, Praeger.
- Fernandez Kelly, M. P. (1995). Social and Cultural Capital in the Urban Ghetto: Implications for the Economic Sociology of Immigration. The Economic Sociology of Immigration. A. Portes, (Ed.). New York, Russell Sage Foundation: 213-247.
- Foster, L., and .D. Stockley (1988). Australian Multiculturalism: A Documentary History and Critique. Clevedon/Philadelphia, Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Frank, R.H. ([1991] 1997). Microeconomic and Behaviour. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Boston, IrwinMcGrawHill.
- Freestone, R. (2000). Planing Sydney: Historical Trajectories and contemporary debates. Sydney: The Emergence of a World City. J. Connell. (Ed.). Melbourne, Oxford University Press: 119-143.
- Galbally, F. (1978). Migrant Services and programs: Report of the Review of Post-Arrival programs and Services for Migrants. Canberra: AGPS.
- Hage, G. (1998). White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a multicultural society. Sydney, Pluto Press Australia.
- Hartley, R. (Ed.). (1995). Families and Cultural Diversity in Australia. Sydney, Allen & Unwin/ Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Harvey, D. (2000). Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Harvey, D. ([1982]1999). The Limits of Growth. London, Verso.
- Harvey, D. (1989). The Urban Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1973). Social Justice and the City. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hechter, M. (1987). Principles of Group Solidarity. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Hechter, M., Friedman, D., and Appelbaum, M. (1982). A Theory of Ethnic Collective Action. International Migration Review, 16(2): 412-434.
- Heilbroner, R. L. (1968). The Economic Problem. Eaglewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Henderson, R.F., A.Harcourt, et al (1970). People in Poverty; A Melbourne Survey. Melbourne, Chesire.
- Hon, H.C. and J. E.Coughlan (1997). The Chinese in Australia: Immigrants from the People's Republic of China, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao. Asians in Australia: Patterns of Migration and Settlement. J. E. Coughlan and D. McNamara, (Eds.). Melbourne, Macmillan Education Australia: 120-170.
- Jamrozik, A., Boland, B.,Urquhart, R. (1995). Social Changes and Social Transformation in Australia. Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
- Jakubowicz, A. (1989). `Normalising aliens`: The Australian Welfare State and the Control of Immigrant Settlement, in Kennedy, R. (Ed.). Australian Welfare-Historical Sociology. Melbourne, The Macmillan.
- Jakubowicz, A. (1984). Ethnicity, multiculturalism and neo-conservatism, in Bottomley, G. and de Lepervanche, M. (Eds.). Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Jones, M. A. (1996). The Australian Welfare State: Evaluating Social Policy, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Jupp, J. (1991). Immigration, Australian Retrospectives. Sydney: Sydney University Press
- Jupp, J. (1990). Ghettoes, Tribes and Prophets. Canberra: OMA.
- Jupp, J. (2002). From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration. Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
- Kunz, E.F. (1988). Displaced Persons: Calwell's New Australians, Sydney, ANU Press.
- Lalich, W.F. (2003). Ethnic Community Capital; The development of ethnic social infrastructure in Sydney. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Sydney, University of Technology Sydney.

- Light, I. (1972). Ethnic Enterprise in America. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Light, I. and S. Gold, J. (2000). Ethnic Economies. London, Academic Press.
- Light, I. and C.Rosenstein (1995). Race, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship in Urban America. New York, Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lopez, M. (2000). The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics 1945-1975. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.
- Luchmann, N. ([1984] 1995). Social Systems. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Lyall, G. (1990). Ethnic Buddhists in NSW. Religion and Ethnic Identity: An Australian Study. Vol 3. A.W.Ata,(Ed.). Sydney, Spectrum: 6-30.
- Lyons, M. (2001). Third Sector: The contribution of nonprofit and cooperative enterprises in Australia. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Lyons, M. and S. Hocking (2000). Australia's Highly Committed Volunteers. Volunteers and Volunteering. J. Warburton and M. Oppenheimer, (Eds.). Sydney, The Federation Press: 44-55.
- Marginson, S. (Ed.). (1997). Educating Australia: Government, Economy and Citizen Since 1960. Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, J. (1981). Ethnic Pluralism and Identity, in Encel, S. (Ed.). The Ethnic Dimension, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Martin, J. (1978). The Migrant Presence. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Martin, J. (1975). The Economic Condition of Migrants. Welfare of Migrants. Canberra, Commission of Inquiry into Poverty/AGPS: 155-163.
- McMahon, A., J. Thomson, et al, (Eds.). ([1996] 2000). Understanding the Australian Welfare State: Key documents and themes, Melbourne, Macmillan.
- Misztal, B. (1996). Trust in Modern Societies: The Search for the bases of Social Order. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Mol, H. (1985). The Faith of Australians. Sydney, George Allen and Unwin.
- Murphy, P.A., Burnley, I.H., Harding, H.R., Wiesner, and Young, D. V. (1990). Impact of Immigration on Urban Infrastructure. Canberra, BIR/AGPS.
- Murphy, P., Watson, S. (1997). Surface City: Sydney at the Millennium. Sydney, Pluto Press
- Novak, M. (1972). The Rise of Unmeltable Ethnics. New York. Macmillan.
- Olson, M. (1965). The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Park, R.E. ([1928] 1967). On Social Control and Collective Behaviour, Selected Papers. Turner, R.H. (Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Park, R.E., Burgess, E. W., McKenzie, R. D., Janowitz, M. ([1925] 1967). The City. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Parsons, T., Shils, E. (Eds.).(1962). Towards a General Theory of Action, Theoretical Foundations for Social Sciences. New York, Harper and Row.
- Parsons, T. (1975). Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change in Ethnicity. Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. N. Glazer and D. Moynihan. (Eds.). Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press.
- Parsons, T., and N.J.Smelser (1956). Economy and Society: A Study in the Integration of Economic and Social Theory. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Pe-Pua, R., R.C.Mitchell, et al (1993). Astronaut Families and Parachute Children: The Cycle of Migration between Hong Kong and Australia. Canberra, Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong/ BIMPR.
- Portes, A., (Ed.). (1995). The Economic Sociology of Immigration. New York, Russell Sage Publications.
- Powell, D. (1993). Out West: Perceptions of Sydney's Western Suburbs. Sydney, Allen&Unwin.
- Pozzetta, G.,Ed (1991). The Immigrant Religious Experience. American Immigration and Ethnicity, Vol 19. New York, Garland Press.
- Prebish, C.S., and K.K.Tanaka, (Eds.). (1998). The Faces of Buddhism in America. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Price, Ch. (Ed.). (1980). Australian Immigration: A bibliography and digest, No.4. Canberra, The ANU, Department of Demography
- Price, Ch, Martin, J.I. (1976). Australian Immigration: A bibliography and digest, No.3. Canberra,

- The ANU, Department of Demography
- Putnam, R., D. (1993). Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Rutland, S. (1997). Edge of the Diaspora: Two centuries of Jewish Settlement in Australia. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Sydney, Brandl & Schlesinger.
- Sandercock, L. (1977). Cities for Sale. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1954). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. London, Allen & Unwin.
- Simmel, G. ([1950]1964). The Sociology of Georg Simmel, Translated by K.H. Wolff, New York, The Free Press
- Smelser, N.J.(1992). Culture: Coherent or Incoherent. Theory of Culture. R. Munch and N.J.Smelser, (Eds.). Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Sowell, T. (1981). Ethnic America: A History. New York, Basic Books Publishers.
- Spearritt, P. (2000). Sydney`s Century: A History. Sydney, UNSW Press.
- Thompson, J., G. Alvy, et al. (2000). "Social entrepreneurship-a new look at the people and their potential." Management Decision **38**(5): 328-338.
- Viviani, N. (1984). The Long Journey: Vietnamese Migration and Settlement in Australia. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.
- Wade, R.C. (1959). The Urban Frontier. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Waldinger, R., H. Aldrich, E., et al., (Eds.). (1990). Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies. Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations. Newbury Park, Sage Publications.
- Waldinger, R., H. Aldrich, E., et al. (1990). Opportunities, Group Characteristics, and Strategies. Ethnic Entrepreneurs. R. Waldinger, H. Aldrich, E. and R. Ward. Newbury Park, Sage Publications: 13-48.
- Warburton, J. and M. Oppenheimer, (Eds.). (2000). Volunteers and Volunteering. Sydney, The Federation Press.
- Warner, S., R and J. Wittner, (Eds.). (1998). Gatherings in Diaspora: Religious Communities and the New Immigration. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). Economy and Society, Ed. Roth, G., Wittich, C. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Weil, S. ([1952, 1949] 1996). The Need for Roots. London, Routledge.
- Yang, F. (1999). Chinese Christians in America: Conversion, Assimilation, and Adhesive Identities. University Park, Penn. The Pennsylvania University Press.

---

## ENDNOTE

- <sup>1</sup> The term, *ethnic community capital*, is used instead of more familiar terms like public places, civil architecture (Dattner 1995), built environment, social and physical infrastructure or urban infrastructure (Harvey 2000: 59; 1999: 69,233; Burnley, Murphy and Fagan 1997: 59) with the intention of distinguishing such ethnic collective involvement in the development of buildings for community use. It corresponds very much to *pattern-maintenance "capital"*, indicating schools, churches, recreational facilities, as the term is applied by Parsons and Smelser (1956: 57), in a sense of "impure" localised public goods defined by partial excludability (Harvey 1973). It is felt that this distinction in relation to classical terminology is needed to emphasise the development of collective goods, i.e., public places with limited access, as they are particularly important resources for ethnic communities. Beside material value, ethnic community capital implies existence of intangible social values and usage value. Although it could be interchangeable in many instances with the classical terminology, it is ascertained that it could help in the comprehension of this particular development within the specific constraints of migration and settlement. In this case public utility, a public good, is not produced by governments (Baumol, Blinder 1985) but by diverse ethnic non-profit organisations. It differs from the interpretation of "ethnic capital" as used by Borjas (1999) to define the totality of the ethnic environment, but primarily relates to ethnic human and not to developed material resources.
- <sup>2</sup> The data were collected by the author from 1999 to 2001 throughout Sydney and involved 386 diverse ethnic organisations that developed their own facilities through voluntary engagement of their members. The aim of this data collection was to secure necessary empirical data for the author's PhD project on *Ethnic Community Capital*. The 344 respondents (out of a total of 385) also provided information on an additional 42 affiliated organisations. The sample survey provided only a limited insight into this important human engagement during the process of settlement in a new social environment.
- <sup>3</sup> The respondents were not large entities, such as ethnic groups or their umbrella organisations, but in nearly all cases were separate organisations that had developed a particular facility, their own building or sports grounds. However, some development was probably not recognised and not recorded during this research. Ethnic organisations that lease, rent or share facilities with some other entity, like places of worship, were not contacted, except for one small club that leases facilities. This research only covers those ethnic organisations, whose members developed their own facilities, and invested energy, money and time.
- <sup>4</sup> Ellis Island Museum Exhibition, New York.
- <sup>5</sup> Collins, J. and Lulich, W. (2000). Cultural Diversity and Event Management: The Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. The Australian Event Evaluation Research and Education Conference. NSW Trade and Investment Centre. Sydney, 13-14. June 2000.

## SOURCES

---