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ABSTRACT

The fundamental aim of this dissertation will be to outline and critique the factors which have delayed the establishment of the first independent ethnic/multicultural radio station in Perth. The Multicultural Radio and Television Association of Western Australia are due to commence broadcasting on 6EBA FM on 1 December, 1990.

While the Association has been broadcasting through 6NR Community Access Radio for the past fourteen years, the increasing demand for air-time led them to apply for a Special Purpose, Category 'S' licence through the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal. The application was made in 1987, and the licence was granted after a hearing in 1988. Since then, the inauguration of broadcasting has been delayed by several factors, namely: finances for the establishment of studio facilities, the search for an antenna site, and the construction of the antenna. Nonetheless, other factors attributed to the delay need to be investigated.

Independent ethnic/multicultural radio stations have been operating in Sydney, Melbourne, their regional areas, Adelaide and Brisbane for over ten years. This disjunction in establishment, must, then, be examined on an official level. Chapter One outlines and identifies national ethnic policy and philosophy in the context of
broadcast radio. The history of ethnic radio broadcasting is detailed to establish how philosophy and official policy are not always aligned.

Chapter Two contextualises national policy and philosophy in the locality of Perth. The history of ethnic broadcasting in Perth is critiqued to determine why there was a need for an independent ethnic radio station. The needs of migrant/ethnic participants are also identified through a theoretical framework and interviews conducted with program co-ordinators.

These two themes are brought together in Chapter Three, where the contradictions between official policy and philosophy, and, policy and migrant/ethnic needs are examined. The contradictions identified ascertain how the lack of appropriate provision, through official policy structure, has contributed to the delay in formation of 6EBA.

This lack is characterised by the contentions within the structure of policy formation, and the lack of acknowledgement of migrant/ethnic needs in the ethnic broadcasting sphere. The disparity between the language of official policy and the voice of migrant/ethnic groups denies the application of access and equality in the ethnic/multicultural broadcasting sphere, and consequently begs the question - “Who’s Speaking to Whom?”
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PREFACE

As a second generation migrant, the topic I have chosen to research is of personal interest to me. In remembering the kinds of discrimination my parents were set against, in the earlier years of their arrival in the 'Lucky Country', it seemed appropriate to learn more about the political structures which contributed to the settlement hardships of newly arrived, non-English speaking migrants. At the same time, I am presented with a worthwhile avenue to dispel some of the anger I felt as a child, when my Anglo-Australian primary school teacher insisted on calling me 'Natalie'.

The dynamics of immigration, ethnicity and multiculturalism are complex and intertwining, but those issues and debates are far removed from the focus of this paper. This paper does not seek to support 'cultural' preservation of migrant/ethnic minorities – some members of migrant/ethnic minorities display the same sorts of racist, chauvinist tendencies as members of the broader community. Whether the immigration policy of the day is right or wrong, once Australia has accepted a migrant it should give him/her the opportunity to benefit from all it has to offer.

I thank Mr Alex Lutero, president of the Multicultural Radio and Television Association of Western
Australia, for his time and help. The co-ordinators of the Chung-Wha, Rhein-Donau, and Macedonian radio programs: Raymond Tan, Ingre Trittler, and Chris Angelkov. Mr Bernard Doyle from the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal, and Marc Landsdorp, the Station Manager of 6EBA.

A special thanks to Barry Perich for heeding my distressed calls when the computer played up; Peter Stafford for editing Chapters One and Two; and the biggest thankyou goes to my supervisor, Dr. Brian Shoesmith, who has had to deal with the difficult task of keeping me on top of my deadlines.
INTRODUCTION

In Western Australia, 1990 marks the year introducing the first multicultural radio station in Perth; 6EBA FM, operated by the Multicultural Radio and Television Association of Western Australia (hereafter MRTA). Whilst, for the past fourteen years the MRTA has been operating through 6NR Community Access Radio, in 1988 they were granted a category 'S' - Special Purpose 'Ethnic' licence. Inauguration of broadcasting has been delayed for almost two years. Financial assistance was sought for studio establishment costs, an antenna site was required and, more recently the construction of the antenna, contributed to this interference. Broadcasting is due to commence on 1 December, 1990, but the question that arises is; why has the introduction of such a service taken so long to reach Perth, when ethnic radio services have been in place in Sydney, Melbourne, their regional areas, Adelaide, and Brisbane for well over ten years?

To establish the disparity between 6EBA's inauguration and that of its interstate counterparts, it is necessary to: outline the national policies and philosophies of ethnic radio broadcasting; identify the perceived needs of migrant/ethnic communities in W.A.; and to correlate these two constituents, with theoretical application, in analysing the contradictions between
official policy and philosophy with perceived needs.

Whilst Australia follows an official policy of multiculturalism, the philosophies of multiculturalism are often contradicted in the formation of policy. By examining policy and philosophy and identifying the needs of migrant/ethnic groups in the broadcasting sphere, the theme of 'access and equality' will be applied with the theory of core/periphery, to determine why ethnic groups in Perth have been disadvantaged in the ethnic radio broadcasting sphere.

To evaluate how the concept of 'access and equality' is not reinforced by policy provisions the core/periphery model underpins the inequality of capitalist society with the theory of dependency economics. Harold Innis' dependency theory explains the disparity between a resource economy with underdeveloped industry and industrial consumption with up-to-date goods and information through the dynamics of the core/periphery dichotomy (Angus, 1988, p. xiii). This dependency creates a society in polarity between modern, technological, international, communication and entertainment imperatives and the archaic, unhistorical world of the margin.

The majority of non-English speaking immigrants in Australia, because of their lack of education and/or
knowledge of the English language, exist at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchial pyramid. In this position they are absent of a political voice. This extends itself to Marx's accounts of industrial capitalism, where he roots inequality and exploitation in the capitalist structures of industrial organisation and the market (Angus, 1988, p. xiii). This division of labour, in the new technocratic world, is part of the universal process by which the old world has been providing labour for the development of the new. New immigrants, in this case, take their turn at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy, and in time become distributed throughout the higher levels, making way for the immigrants after them to repeat the process. Official policy in Australia makes an allowance for this dynamic by promoting a 'self-help' clause in its principles for the provision of programs and services for migrants.

The core/periphery model also lends itself to the issue of power and control. Without a political voice, the migrant cannot define him/herself within the broader community. Through the power of discourse production, the economic-political elite can render their ideology through their institutions and the mass media. Michael Morrissey terms the philosophy of multiculturalism as "migrantness-as-ideology" (Bottomly, Lepervanche, 1984, pp. 72-81). He states two important points in reference to the dissemination of political ideology: one, that ideological production is more a matter of selection and
emphasis from what is true rather than a matter of concocting lies; two, that in the process of ideological production somebody gains and somebody loses (p. 73). In this case definitions of migrant/ethnic/multicultural are constructed by the economic-political elite. While ethnicity has become a much used term in the formulation of multicultural policy and philosophy, its meaning remains unclear.

Jean Martin (1978) was one of the first social scientists in Australia to explore the response of Australian institutions to the migrant presence. Her conclusion deduced that the response was characterised by 'denial and non-confrontation'. The transformation of migrant - ethnic was filtered through to public thinking at a time when migrants began to present themselves as a legitimate (political) interest group (1978, p. 55). Her empirical investigation showed how meaning was socially constructed and how the dissemination of knowledge was related to the distribution of resources and power in relation to the experiences of groups divided by the socio-economic hierarchical pyramid (1978, p. 11).

Defining the term ethnicity was one of the focal points in her investigation. Martin examined the patterns of power and domination of white-Anglo-Australian society, in the key institutions of the government, law, civil service, education etc, since the post-war immigration period. The term 'ethnic' surfaced
in the seventies as a legitimate replacement for the identification of migrants. Given the political climate of the time, detailed in Chapter One, Martin's research supports the claim that ethnicity has only recently been commended as a cultural identity worthy of acknowledgement in the sphere of public policy-making.

The philosophy of multiculturalism aspires to the notion of ethnic diversity, which in turn becomes a constituent in the creation of Australia's national identity. Castles, Cope, Kalantzis and Morrissey, (1987), claim the creation of a national ideology is part of the political process of establishing a nation. Those who have the power to create and rule a nation-state, have the most influence in defining the 'national character'. This, they say, affirms the 'need to belong', but is conveniently linked to the economic and political interests of the definers (1987, p. 4). They examine the historical process of creating the Australian character, and speculate Australia's problematic self-image lies in the ambiguities of the Australian condition, dating back to 1788 when the first white-invaders seized control of Australian shores (1987, p. 5). They add, unlike the USA or India, Australia never managed an independence movement or liberation struggle, but in fact was made a nation by an Act of British parliament in 1901. The creation of a nation in a struggle for independence, they hypothesise, is usually
a pre-determinant for the definition of national
cracter, language, culture and myth, (1987, p. 5).
Australia, lacking an historical struggle, has been
placed in a position where it has had to invent its
identity. The geographical isolation of Australia has
accentuated this problem.

They outline the dynamics of the Australian national
cracter and speculate it might have been maintained, if
not for the post-war immigration programme. In the mid­
forties, immigration was seen as a strategic necessity to
make the country economically and militarily strong. No
ethnic diversity was intended: British migrants were
wanted, and when adequate numbers could not be obtained,
the call was for 'assimilable types' who would rapidly
become indistinguishable from other Australians (1987, p.
7).

By the mid-sixties, it had become clear that
cultural assimilation was not taking place. With at
least eighty different ethnic groups, Australia was faced
with the problem of constructing a national character to
secure social cohesion. This character, however, had to
be defined in non-racist and non-monocultural terms

In the interests of national unity, the ethnic
cracter was born. This character, in turn, was slotted
into the national ideology of, what has become known as,
multiculturalism. The ideology of multiculturalism, however, claims participation of 'all' Australians, while ethnicity implies an isolated group. This disparity lends itself to the continued segregation of those who consider themselves ethnic, and in turn supports the hierarchial structure of Australian capitalism where the socio-economic-political core encourage ethnic marginality.

Ethnic marginality is, in-itself, divided. Through the core's power of discourse production the voice of the political ideology segregates old migrants, or ethnics, from new migrants. Morrissey's theory of "migrantness-as-ideology", labels multiculturalism as a guise, a celebration of trivialised forms of culture, a facade of the the old assimilationist point-of-view (Morrissey, 1984, p. 75). For the ethnic, acceptance in Australian culture means shedding aspects of the old culture. This process articulates itself through the language of official policy and determines acceptance or rejection. (This theme will be expanded on in Chapter Three, with specific application to content restrictions). Once the migrant accepts the values of the majority, he/she is granted the opportunity to make progress up the socio-economic pyramid (Morrissey, 1984, p. 76), which sets the ethnic in opposition to the non-English speaking migrant, who remains at the bottom of the pyramid. The pattern of opposition often occurs between the first and second
generation of migrants, whereby the children of non-English speaking migrants accept the values and language of the broader culture thereby harmonising with the strategy of 'assimilation'.

National ethnic broadcasting is predominantly a service granted by the government. In rural areas, where there is a sizable ethnic population, ethnic broadcasters are allocated time on commercial or public stations (see Appendix One). In Chapter One, details of the history of the ethnic movement, which led to the subsequent development of ethnic radio through the provisions granted by government authorities, is explored. It outlines the political climate of the time, when migrant/ethnic groups were exerting their 'voice' for 'need' on mainstream government and social institutions of Australia. In the seventies, when ethnic radio broadcasting became a prominent issue in Australian politics, the Special Broadcasting Service (hereafter SBS) ran a three month experiment of ethnic radio programming. This experiment led to the permanent establishment of the SBS Radio stations 2EA in Sydney and 3EA in Melbourne.

Once the calls of ethnic broadcasters in Sydney and Melbourne were heeded, ethnic broadcasters in other capital cities expressed their need for ethnic broadcasting services. This, then, highlighted the problem of ethnic radio extension to centres where these
services were warranted. The most widely used facility amongst ethnic broadcasters was the Public Broadcasting Sector. Whilst government funding through this sector was minimal, the stature of SBS, because of its, comparative, high level of funding and its concentrated control over other ethnic broadcasters, became the focal point of contentions arising from the issue of extension.

Chapter One concludes by suggesting the disunity between national ethnic broadcasters is a deterring factor in the progressive establishment of an independent ethnic radio channel in Perth. The absence of a unified national policy for ethnic broadcasting ensures that the problems will persist, if not accentuate, with the succession of immigration.

Chapter Two, specifically outlines the actions of ethnic broadcasters in W.A. in view of the need to establish an independent radio station. It incorporates a critique of the MRTA's history, with an evaluation of migrant/ethnic needs in W.A., in the context of ethnic radio broadcasting. It will identify how the needs of migrant/ethnic groups were not being met by the provisions granted through 8NR, and why an independent ethnic station was needed to take responsibility for ethnic radio broadcasting in Perth. To understand this lack it is necessary to define the juxtaposition between the perceived needs of migrants/ethnics to those of the
majority culture. A theoretical framework provided by Angus (1988) and Morrissey (1984) has been employed to analyse this condition. Morrissey's 'ethnicity model', based on the premise of "migrantness-as-ideology" examines the relationship of the migrant to the majority culture as one where the migrant's, often disadvantaged, position is taken as 'given' rather than a product of Australian Capitalism (Morrissey, 1984, pp. 74/75). Angus' theory of the exotic 'other' supports the claim that ethnic needs are subordinated to consumer society's 'choices', in the sphere of consumption (Angus, 1988, p. 130). The distinction between 'need' and 'choice' illustrates the marginalisation of migrant/ethnic groups in the sphere of radio broadcasting.

Chapter Three examines: the formation of policy; the language of official multicultural ideology; the needs of migrants/ethnics in the radio broadcasting sphere; and theories of power and control and core/periphery, in application to the central issue, that is, access and equality, in the ethnic broadcasting sphere, as applied to Perth. The critique of these factors will reveal a set of contradictions at work in the area of ethnic broadcasting, which have contributed to the delay in establishing an independent ethnic radio station in Perth.
This delay has been caused by the contradictions existing between the philosophy of ethnic broadcasting, and the formation of policy. The disharmony created by these divisions has, as yet, not been resolved, hence the central problem of ethnic/multicultural broadcasting in Australia: "Who's Speaking to Whom?"
CHAPTER ONE

Official Policy and Philosophy

Before we can examine ethnic radio and its history in Perth, it is necessary to outline national multicultural broadcast policy and philosophy which focusses on both television and radio. It is the government's intention to foster the notion of multiculturalism through multilingual radio and multicultural television services. The SBS is the only body corporate in Australia which offers multicultural TV and radio services to the public. While SBS television services are transmitted to all capitals in Australia, except Darwin where SBS TV is soon to be transmitted, SBS radio is only transmitted to metropolitan centres in and around Sydney and Melbourne (Office of Multicultural Affairs [hereafter OMA], 1988, p. 66). The function and significance of SBS TV has consistently been an issue of contention, and although its services cannot be detailed within the realms of this paper, it is necessary to discuss its position within the multicultural broadcasting sphere. This dissertation, however, will focus on ethnic radio broadcasting and specifically ethnic radio in Perth.

Although all states in Australia encourage multiculturalism through ethnic radio, none of the states has a definite policy specifically concerning the future
of ethnic radio broadcasting. The Commonwealth, however, supports ethnic radio as part of its policy of providing programs and services to meet the particular needs of migrants, and to encourage the development of multiculturalism in Australia. It has adopted a set of principles for ethnic radio, known as the Criteria for Ethnic Broadcasting, which state that ethnic radio should:

(i) provide a medium for presenting to non-English speaking residents of Australia, entertainment, news and other information in their own languages;

(ii) assist those from other cultures to maintain those cultures and pass them on to their descendants and to other Australians;

(iii) provide information and advice on the rights and obligations of residence in Australia and on other matters to assist the non-English speaking migrant to settle speedily, happily and successfully;

(iv) encourage and facilitate the learning of English;

(v) provide as adequately and equitably as possible for all ethnic groups including those which are numerically small;

(vi) assist in promoting mutual understanding and harmony between and within ethnic groups, and between ethnic groups and the English speaking community;

(vii) avoid political partisanship

(Department of Communications [hereafter DOC], 1982, p. 3)

In addition, the Report of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants, (1978), (hereafter the Galbally Report), laid down four guiding principles for the provision of programs and
services for migrants and the encouragement of multiculturalism in Australia. In 1982 the Government reaffirmed its commitment to these principles. They were:

(i) all members of our society must have equal opportunity to realise their full potential and must have equal access to programmes and services;

(ii) every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage and should be encouraged to understand and embrace other cultures;

(iii) needs of migrants should, in general, be met by programs and services available to the whole community but special services and programs are necessary at present to ensure equality of access and provision;

(iv) services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients, and self-help should be encouraged as much as possible with a view to helping migrants to become self-reliant quickly.

(DOC, 1982, p. 2)

Access and equality are the main points within the criteria considering 'provisions' for migrant needs. The issue of access and equality and its application to ethnic broadcasting brings to light various contradictions between the philosophy of ethnic broadcasting and its official policy. These contradictions will be outlined in a later chapter. To conceptualise official policy and its application in a local context, that is, ethnic broadcasting services in Perth, this chapter will outline:
1. The history of ethnic radio policy formation;

2. the various models of ethnic radio stations in Australia;

3. the subsequent problems which have arisen in the ethnic radio broadcasting sphere.

Ethnic radio services are provided through:

(i) a Commonwealth funded, independent statutory authority, the SBS, which operates stations 2EA in Sydney, Newcastle and Woolongong and 3EA in Melbourne, including Geelong;

(ii) a number of independent, non-profit public broadcasting stations, licensed by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal (ABT), most of which receive Commonwealth subsidies for the production and transmission of ethnic radio programs;

(iii) a number of profit-making commercial radio stations, licensed by the ABT.

(Bear, 1980, p. 25)

While most people place the commencement of ethnic radio in the mid seventies, ethnic radio had its initiation in the fifties, in Sydney and Melbourne. Ethnic radio then was sponsored by ethnic organisations and programmed through commercial radio stations. In Sydney it began in 1952 on 2GB with a program of Italian music sponsored by the Italian Chamber of Commerce and in Melbourne a Mr Armando Trucchi was the main organiser of Italian sponsored radio programs through commercial radio (Bosi, 1986, p. 65). Later country towns with large populations of immigrants had also begun to air foreign language programs, and soon, other capital and regional areas followed suit. While the run of these programs didn’t last long in many states, all but one of the radio
stations in Sydney, including the ABC, implemented ethnic radio programs. Although foreign language programs of this sort were popular, they were never quite satisfactory for their audiences because, as a result of broadcasting on commercial radio, programs were constantly interrupted by commercials. What made matters worse was that the Federation of Australian Radio Broadcasters (FARB) demanded that commercials be presented bilingually. These obstructions left little time for program content.

Later, in the early seventies, various debates emerged over the nature of radio broadcasting. Contentions about AM frequency expansion, FM broadcasting, Public radio and ethnic radio all came to be foregrounded in regards to potential policy adjustment (Bosi, 1986, p. 67).

Underpinning these debates was the growing recognition of migrant needs which began to exert their influence on an official and social level. Previously ethnic communities were perceived as being marginal and a partial threat to national unity. The post-war migration period (1947 onwards) was governed by the ethos of 'assimilation' (Kress, 1988, p. 50). Assimilation meant that if you were not from a British background you were to, as soon as possible, develop British beliefs, customs and habits. The shared belief was that those from non-British backgrounds had little difficulty in adopting
these British traditions. By the late sixties schools, hospitals and welfare services were forced to recognise that non-English speakers required more specific help. Subsequently the perception of 'assimilation' was thrown into question. However many Australians of British descent maintained that their 'Britishness' was a core aspect of Australia's national identity (Kress, 1988, pp. 51/52).

In 1975 the Immigration Department expressed the view that one could have ethnic (cultural) diversity whilst sustaining national (political) unity (Kress, 1988, p. 52). Jean Martin, (1978), points out, this ideal meant that diversity could be welcomed and encouraged only in areas of life that could be viewed as non-political (p. 55).

By this time, most states had formed Ethnic Community Councils to represent ethnic interests in political debates (Castles, 1987, p. 3), which meant that more and more people from non-English speaking backgrounds were becoming directly involved in the political process as members of state and federal parliaments. They had, thus, become a legitimate interest group. The political parties recognised the substantial political component ethnic groups had come to represent. This recognition contributed to the decisions that were to be made in the evolution of ethnic broadcasting.
In that same year, (1975), Al Grassby, the Minister for Immigration in the first Whitlam administration, was appointed Special Consultant on Community Relations. He proposed a three month ethnic radio experiment in Sydney and Melbourne. The initial purpose of this experiment was to inform the ethnic communities of the government’s plans to establish the Medibank Scheme. After many negotiations with the Minister for Media, the Postmaster General, the Australian Broadcasting Control Board and other Governmental departments, Al Grassby was authorised to proceed with the ethnic radio experiment. The sum of $49,000 was made available by the Department of the Media for the project. Australian ethnic radio broadcasting was officially born in June 1975 (SBS, 1979, p. 25).

The services of volunteers were secured for the planned three months of broadcasting. Seven language groups were included on the Sydney station 2EA, while eight language groups were included on the Melbourne station 3EA. Total broadcasting time in each city was forty-two hours a week (SBS, 1979, p. 13).

The content of the programs varied amongst the different language groups although the general format was essentially the same. Programs were divided into nine minute segments and included modern and traditional music, interviews with personalities, health and social
welfare messages, letters and children’s items (SBS, 1979, p. 15). Controversial political and community matters were specifically excluded, and although a small number of individuals and groups criticised the service for being politically biased, Mr. Bayutti, Chairman of the Experimental Ethnic Radio Committee announced on 30 June, 1975, that ethnic radio was and would continue to be totally non-political and non-controversial (SBS, 1979, p. 16). A professional survey conducted by the McNair Anderson audience research company (with $12,000 included in the budget) found, overall, the majority of the ethnic group members represented in the broadcasts reacted favourably to the service (SBS, 1979, p. 17).

The resulting success of the ethnic radio experiment came at a crucial time in the life of the Whitlam Government, thereby making it unlikely that the government would abandon the project. More money was sought and found whilst more broadcasters were asked to participate. During the constitutional crisis of 1975, caused by the sacking of the Whitlam Government, both political parties not only pledged the survival of ethnic radio, but committed themselves to an upgrading of the service. When the Fraser Government was instated it honoured half its promise. Ethnic radio continued its broadcasts without greater funds for extension (Boisi, 1986, p. 68.) In September 1976, however, the government invited the ABC to establish a permanent ethnic broadcasting service. When the Commission estimated the
cost of such a service as being approximately $2.7 million the government withdraw its proposal in favour of establishing an independent statutory authority to take responsibility for all ethnic broadcasting in Australia (Bosi, 1986, p. 69). The establishment of the SBS occurred in December 1977 under the amended Broadcasting and Television Act of 1942.

Currently, SBS Radio is the recipient of a substantial amount of government funding compared to other ethnic radio stations in Australia. While Sydney and Melbourne boast the highest percentages of migrants in Australia, the SBS is often considered ineffective as a service, and extravagant in its use of public funds because of its concentration in these centres. Although SBS had allocated subsidies to ethnic broadcasters in other states, operating through public radio stations, these subsidies were minimal compared with those funds granted to the SBS radio stations (see Table One).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 $'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS: 2EA/3EA administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDY: public stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDY: training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DOC, 1982, p. 5)
The uneven balance of funding was indicative of the control SBS's bureaucracy had over other national ethnic broadcasters. Without a national policy on ethnic radio broadcasting, the government positioned SBS's bureaucratic arm adjudicator to all ethnic broadcasters. Conditions of operation on public radio stations had to be met by the standards required by the ABT and, until 1986, when the Public Broadcasting Foundation took over the responsibility of public ethnic radio funding, the SBS code of principles. If public ethnic broadcasters did not abide by these principles, they ran the risk of losing access and/or subsidy. This identifies the power of the core, in relation to the hierarchical structure of the ethnic radio broadcasting sector.

Proposals for the development and extension of national ethnic radio services outside of Sydney and Melbourne were initially proposed in the 1978 Galbally Report, which recommended the extension of ethnic radio to all capital cities and some provincial areas with large migrant populations. The 2EA and 3EA stations were to be upgraded and extended to Wollongong, Newcastle and Canberra from Sydney, Geelong from Melbourne, and Whyalla to be linked through a translator to the proposed EA station in Adelaide. Wollongong, Newcastle and Geelong were linked to the existing EA stations, but the further implementation of the EA extension did not proceed. In the meantime ethnic radio broadcasters in other centres utilised the provisions granted by public broadcasting.
(Australian Committee of Revue of the SBS [hereafter ACRS], Report Two, 1985, pp. 216/17). However, the extension of SBS TV services has not been an area of great concern, although within two to three years of its inception, SBS TV had been extended to all capital cities in Australia. This is another site where the core has power over the periphery. Television services in Australia, and particularly in the ethnic broadcasting sector, have far greater prominence than the services of radio. SBS TV is granted priority over its radio service.

Inevitably the SBS and the public broadcasters were drawn into competition over which system should prevail in those centres not served by 2EA and 3EA. This caused disharmony between the two institutions, with each stressing the merit of its own system. The conditions attached to obtaining Government subsidies by following the requirements set out by the Criteria for Ethnic Broadcasting contributed to the confusion (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 208).

It is interesting to note that the SBS Radio stations were established on the basis of a public broadcasting model rather than as professionally administered and programmed stations such as the ABC or commercial stations. Initially all the broadcasters engaged by the stations were unpaid volunteers from the ethnic communities. The stations' licences were issued
under the Wireless Telegraphy Act 1906 and were held by members of the ethnic communities assisted by appointed committees who acted as representatives for and of the ethnic groups involved. The principle difference between the EA stations and public broadcasters (a difference which progressively broadened) was, the EA stations were granted financial and administrative support by the Commonwealth public service. This led to increased governmental control over program content and payment to broadcasters to cover their expenses, and later fees for their services. Once these changes evolved it was inevitable SBS Radio would head towards a professional broadcasting format (ACRS, 1985, p. 208).

The Public Broadcasting Association of Australia (hereafter PBAA) has argued strongly against the extension of ethnic radio through the SBS. They state:

- they are managed by a hierarchical bureaucracy which requires consultative/advisory machinery to provide for community inputs; such provisions (which the ABC also has) never work well because the committees come to identify with the bodies they are advising rather than the public whose interests they are supposed to have been set up;

- by comparison with the democratic structures of public radio, the SBS management has manifestly, and rather publicly, demonstrated difficulty in dealing smoothly and without harmful publicity with complaints and problems arising within its own structure;

- the SBS services are extremely costly to operate, needing five times as much government money for each broadcast hour (AIMA Evaluation of Post-arrival Programs and Services, p.292, para 35) as ethnic radio programs;
- the services operate to standards claimed to be professional but which do not equate with the expectations of a statutory broadcaster, with no provision whatsoever for staff training.

(ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 222)

In contrast to the above, the tenets of public broadcasting are:

(i) to explore the 'local' and reflect the local community - its major concern is to provide an avenue to those local groups who can't get access to the media in any other way. The sense of the local is at the heart of the public radio charter.

(ii) to pursue the 'particular' - while commercial and national broadcasters concern themselves with the need to be immediate and contemporary, public radio explores particular interests in a way that is constant.

(iii) to provide 'access' on the airwaves - not only to encourage listener allegiance, but also to encourage listener participation and control. There is a sense in which the control of the operations reside in the people who are committed to the community.

(iv) to promote 'difference' - a distinctiveness that is based on true commitment to things that are not necessarily conventional and a commitment to always finding the other edge. Public radio does not wish to steer in the direction, or follow models of national or commercial radio programming.

(WAPBA [Inc], Aug 88, p.4) (see Appendix One)

In line with these beliefs, public radio concerns itself with the needs and interests of minority groups. Initially these identified groups included music enthusiasts, educational institutions, ethnic communities, religious groups, and those who wanted access to and for the public, through direct community involvement in the media. The merger of public broadcast philosophy and the needs of ethnic broadcasters resulted
in the rapid growth of ethnic broadcasting through the public broadcasting sector.

Public broadcasting began in Adelaide on radio 5UV in March 1975. The ABC’s 3ZZ went to air in May 75 followed by 2EA and 3EA in June of the same year. Between 1975 and 1980 the public broadcasting sector increased from an initial twelve stations offered licences (educational institutions) under the Wireless Telegraphy Act 1905, in 1975 to twenty-six stations on air as of 30 June 1980. As at 31 December, 1989, there were ninety-one public radio stations operating throughout Australia. Of these, only three are 'fully' ethnic stations (Australian Broadcasting Tribunal [hereafter ABT], 1990, pp. 157-165). During the latter half of the seventies, many public radio stations made provisions in their charters for ethnic broadcasting. Five of the twelve stations licenced in 1976 introduced ethnic programs in that year. One of these stations was 6NR, Community Access Radio, located at the (then) Western Australian Institute of Technology, Kent Street, Bentley.

In 1978, when the Government agreed to subsidise the production and transmission of ethnic programs on a temporary basis, pending the extention of SBS Radio, ethnic broadcasting organisations in Adelaide and Brisbane were granted 'S' category licences. This enabled them to operate 'fully' ethnic radio stations.
By the time 4EB in Brisbane and 5EBI in Adelaide were established and operating the procedure for subsidising public stations through the SBS was already in place. Although initially a temporary measure, this system continued to be operable until 1986, when the PBF took responsibility for public ethnic radio funding (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 210).

SBS Radio has not been extended beyond Sydney and Melbourne and their regional areas. Consequently the extension of ethnic radio has been developed through the public broadcasting sphere, thus the philosophy and operational guidelines of public 'ethnic' radio stations follow similar guidelines to those of public radio generally. The Public Broadcasting Association of Australia (hereafter PBAA) has cited the following Code of Ethics:

1. Public Broadcasters are primarily accountable to the communities defined in their Promise of Performance.

2. Public Broadcasters should recognise an obligation to cater to the needs for those denied effective access and those not adequately served by the existing media.

3. People working in or for the station, and members of the community served, should be able to be involved in decision and policy making.

4. Public Broadcasters should aim to satisfy the needs of their communities.

5. Stations should seek the highest standard in program consistent with the widest possible community participation.
6. Station policy should be regularly, and clearly, stated on air and publicly through their outlets.

7. Broadcasters should adopt a programming policy which opposes and breaks down prejudice on the basis of race, nationality, ethnic background, sex, religion, sexual preference or mental condition. (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 210)

Public radio stations operate in accordance with these principles and formulate programming schedules to reflect the required needs of their audience.

The five different models of public radio stations are:

1. State, or state agency owned and funded stations let out on long term licence to a particular group. Elements of this scheme are present in the original 2EA and 3EA.

2. State or state agency owned, funded and operated stations which broadcast to and for specific groups not catered for by the rest of the system. Elements of this scheme are present in the ABC-FM service, in 2JJ, and again in 2EA and 3EA.

3. State or state agency owned, funded and operated stations which would be available for the use of a variety of different community groups. This was the 'access' model, and the ABC's 3ZZ grew from it. It also influenced some of the early public licences, including 5UV's, where the condition that 'time on the station should be given to experimentation in public access broadcasting' was written into the licence. That was how 'public ethnic' started.

4. and 5. Community owned and operated stations which were either funded by the state or state agency, or were self-funding. The latter model became the dominant one in public broadcasting, although we can see that 'public ethnic' stations, where they accept SBS funds, derive in part from the former. (Bear, 1980, p. 25)
With the closure of access radio 3ZZ in Melbourne, on the grounds that it was duplicating the services provided by the SBS stations, went the only serious attempt at making a public station, in the mould of model three, a success. Through its closure came the need to re-evaluate the state of public broadcasting, especially its relationship to the SBS and ethnic radio in general. The establishment of SBS gave recognition, on an official level, to the needs of migrant and ethnic communities. Since Sydney and Melbourne were due to benefit from official provisions granted, so too, it was recognised, other states were in need of support and provision. Public broadcasting licences were offered in those places where they already existed, and did not necessarily aid in the extension of ethnic radio services. Andrew Bear, (1980), states:

Those decisions were taken by the Department of Post and Telecommunications, but it was the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal that had to award the licences. The Tribunal had no policy on ethnic broadcasting. No decisions had been taken about the relations between 'SBS ethnic' broadcasting and those ethnic groups already broadcasting on public stations. Then, because there were vacant licences, some of the ethnic groups applied for them in their own right. Lacking a policy and any indication of what the SBS was going to do (would there be a 5EA in Adelaide?), the Tribunal played it by ear and granted licences to the ethnic applicants in Adelaide and Brisbane. Thus we got our variant kinds of ethnic broadcasting with vast areas of the country still in the 'No ethnic' situation. (p. 26)

The two fully ethnic stations, 5EBI in Adelaide and 4EB in Brisbane have found different ways of fulfilling
their commitment to the principles of public broadcasting. The Adelaide station is a co-operative comprising of two members of each programming committee which has been allocated a share of airtime. The programming committees are in turn elected annually at a public meeting open to all those people who define themselves as members of a particular ethnic group. Rather than selecting radio committees at public meetings, the system at 4EB in Brisbane provides for interested organisations and individuals to become members of the Ethnic Broadcasting Association of Queensland (EBAQ) which is a company limited by guarantee (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 214).

In the other major centres, Perth, Canberra and Darwin ethnic umbrella organisations operated under a contract with a local public broadcasting station. These organisations were democratically elected and acted as a point of liaison between the public stations and the ethnic communities. In each case the ethnic organisations had representation on the public broadcasting station's management committee or governing body. Ethnic programs were integrated into the general programming of the station and they were regarded on the same terms as all other interest groups operating through that station. Government subsidies, for ethnic broadcasting, were granted to the station rather than the ethnic body (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 214).
The issue of operational expenditure is at the core of debates relating to the extension of ethnic radio in Australia. On one hand the PBAA states that by basing a service to the community upon volunteer labour, that service will be comparatively inexpensive. If the service fulfills the needs of the community then it is said to be cost-effective. However, the main advantage of this model is that 'control' of program matter remains in the hands of the ethnic broadcasters. The PBAA lists the following positive characteristics of ethnic public broadcasting:

- they are directly responsive to their communities, without the need for external advisory machinery because the services are substantially controlled by them (and usually owned by them);
- they are highly cost-effective for two reasons:
  1. because the broadcasters are volunteers,
  2. because they operate locally and do not require large bureaucratic superstructures;
- they operate to standards acceptable to their audiences, and
- they are all local services — a feature which...is essential for the proper discharge of the functions of ethnic radio.
  (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 223)

On the other hand, recommendations made by the Galbally Report (1978) suggest that ethnic radio should be extended through the existing facilities provided to and by the SBS stations. Recommendation 51 provided:

The extension of ethnic radio should be phased over the next three years to cover all capital cities and
provincial centres with large migrant populations. The Sydney and Melbourne stations should also be upgraded to provide wider coverage in these centres. (Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs [AIMA], 1982, p. 287)

This report argues its recommended procedures would be far more cost-effective especially in the light of new satellite technologies and the initial high costs involved in the proposed national extension. The establishment of a national ethnic radio network, through the SBS, in place of the recommendation by the PBAA (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 221) for individual stations would work hand in hand with SBS's plans for developing 2EA and 3EA into fully professional stations. If the SBS proposal for a national network was to be accepted, there would be no reason to provide assistance to public broadcasters in those centres where an SBS transmitter was established.

Questions arising on the issue of 'local' content were summarised in Clause 6.25:

....SBS proposed that its national program would consist essentially of news, public affairs, community and settlement information and the more complicated and expensive radio material such as drama and documentaries. In centres where there are public broadcasting stations ethnic programming on these would provide complementary local input and more material of a purely entertainment nature. (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 219)

The PBAA, in its submission to the report, summarised the position of all ethnic public broadcasters and stated that they were not in favour of the extension
of ethnic radio through SBS, either by way of independent
EA stations or through a national network. Rather, SBS
should continue to fund public ethnic broadcasting
stations. It states:

*Ethnic radio is inherently a form of service which
will raise problems. It does not have a single
audience, rather a large collection of different
audiences, all making claims on a single service
with limits to its capacity. Providing these
services directly by the SBS means that the
Government becomes involved in a plethora of
complaints and arguments over scheduling, the
community's right to influence if not to control the
services, the ethnically unrepresentative nature of
the SBS or its advisory bodies (meaning, usually,
that ignored), and a dozen more, all of which
arouse strong passions among the people involved.
No government in its right mind would want to be
directly involved in so problematic an area where
there is any alternative process available.*

There is, of course, [an alternative] in ethnic
radio. It is not free from many of these problems;
it is notable, however, that they rarely create
screaming headlines nor often involve a Minister or
the Government. Because stations' democratic
processes provide a mechanism for the aggrieved to
pursue their grievances.

(ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 221)

The PBAA maintains that the essential feature of
ethnic radio should be to provide a 'local' service, one
which is responsive to the needs of the communities
involved. This, they believe, can and is being achieved
through the public broadcasting sphere. There are,
however, programs of likely interest to their audiences
which, due to limited funding, they are in no position to
provide through their limited resources. These types of
programs, they recommended, should be produced by a
central, professional production unit, which they say
should be operated through the SBS - 'Any extension of SBS radio should be as a resource provider rather than as a broadcaster' (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 223).

The PBAA has listed the following as desirable resources which the SBS could provide:

- the provision of comprehensive overseas news material, with homeland news unedited;
- the production of special feature programs, with use of local talent and production resources where practicable;
- the provision of direct broadcasts from overseas of important national or international events;
- the provision of a resource pool of hard-to-obtain materials (records, tapes, as well as newspapers, magazines and books) for either sale or loan;
- the provision of information regularly to stations on sources of resource materials;
- the provision of information from government departments and agencies in community languages (ACRS, Report Two, 1985, p. 223)

In the *Synopsis and Summary of Recommendations*, 1985, the ACRS stands in favour of the extension of ethnic radio either through networking the existing EA stations in Sydney and Melbourne or setting up individual stations in each capital city. The committee also supports the continuation of ethnic radio through the public broadcasting sector. Clause 2.24 states:

To ensure that locally-relevant ethnic programs, as well as EA-produced programs, are
available in all centres with substantial ethnic communities, we have recommended that ethnic public broadcasting stations be licensed wherever in Australia there is sufficient community interest and support......

Nonetheless public ethnic broadcasters are still alarmed by the apparent imbalance in the proportion of the total revenue allocated for ethnic radio, whereby the favouring of the EA stations maintains inequality of ethnic radio services in Australia.

To date, no further consideration has been given to the extent of ethnic radio, either through the public broadcasting sector or SBS Radio. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, SBS Radio and ethnic radio generally have been neglected to a large extent, in favour of potential expansion of SBS TV. It has been necessary to analyse the collaboration between the philosophies and policies of the different models of ethnic radio, to formulate how this has lead to the establishment of an independent public ethnic station in W.A.

Multiculturalism seems to be the new direction ethnic radio is heading towards with the near commencement of broadcasting of the Multicultural Radio and Television Association of Western Australia through its station 6EBA FM. The circumstances leading up to the establishment of this station will be dealt with in the following chapter, but it remains to be seen how this station will operate in the national scheme of ethnic
broadcasting when a national ethnic radio broadcast policy has yet to be established.
CHAPTER TWO

Migrant Needs in the Ethnic Broadcasting Sphere

To determine the effectiveness of official policy provisions in the ethnic radio broadcasting sphere, migrant/ethnic needs within this sphere require evaluation. This chapter will outline the needs of migrant/ethnic communities in Perth in the context of national policy structure. This will establish:

1. How 6NR community radio was utilised by ethnic groups.
2. What provisions were granted to ethnic groups through 6NR.
3. Why the provisions granted through 6NR were not sufficient in catering to the needs of migrant/ethnic groups.
4. Why 6EBA was needed and established to take over the responsibility of ethnic radio in Perth.

At this stage it is difficult to discern whether or not the provisions granted through 6EBA will or will not be adequate in catering to the needs of its participants. However, any incongruity which may occur between the policy of the new station and the perceived needs of the community groups involved will be dealt with in the next chapter. For the present this chapter will focus solely on the 'needs' of ethnic groups in the context of radio broadcasting, rather than the philosophies behind ethnic radio broadcasting.
To define the meaning of 'migrant needs' it is necessary to identify the distinction between the choices available to the majority culture and the provisions endowed for the needs of minority groups, such as migrants/ethnics.

In the broadcasting sphere, mainstream television and radio are predominantly English-speaking and are heavily weighted towards American and British culture. Language and/or cultural maintenance for other than Anglo-Australian groups is virtually non-existent. Foster and Stockley, (1988), state that the prime media issue of pertinence to the ethnic communities in Australia in the latter part of the twentieth century has to do with cultural dominance/submission. Associated with this issue, they say, is the matter of access (p. 181). To understand the notion of cultural dominance/submission and its accord with access it is appropriate to abstract the implications of migrantness and ethnicity in Australian capitalist culture. Michael Morrissey, (1984), terms the 'ethnicity model' as one in which:

...the degree of the individual migrant's exoticness (in Australian eyes) is the major factor which determines the number and type of problems that migrant will have in adapting to this country. It is the 'migrantness' of an individual which explains his or her position rather than any intrinsic dynamic of Australian Capitalism. (1984, pp. 74/75)
In these terms, migrant/ethnic groups are perceived as the 'other', that is, people who live outside the norms of the social, political or sexual standard (Angus, 1988, p. 57). These people in a WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) culture are relegated to the margins of power, even though their exoticness is embraced and celebrated in a multicultural society where 'culture' pertains to food, dress, music and dance. This extension of 'culture' contributes to the sphere of capitalist consumption and enhances the plethora of 'choice'—"the emergence of cultural identities is centred on consumer choices", (p. 130). Morrisey states that both assimilation and multiculturalism follow the 'ethnicity model', the disparity being multiculturalism admits to the necessity of some adjustment by Australian society, however, this adjustment is intrinsically a 'cultural' one (p. 75). The political culture of the migrant/ethnic is ignored. Angus states that migrant needs cannot be met within the limits of choice-making, and the fact that they are not satisfied threatens the identity of the majority concerned (p. 132). Moreover:

....the exotic other is set against the background of the consumer society's obsession with non-essential tokens, the other, as enemy is expressly situated in the nuclear age. ...the appearance of the individual's choice in the sphere of consumption tends to conceal the real necessity of social determination of genuine needs. ....Even in the countries which have, taken as a whole, access to modern technology, there exist groups that have been shunted to a side-track with no exit. eg. many members of racial and ethnic minorities.

(Angus, 1988, p. 130)
Access to the media in Australia is limited, *per se*, however, this accentuates the significance of the need for provision of access to migrant/ethnic groups. The primary need ethnic groups have expressed, through interviews conducted, is that of 'access'. In summation, access to the air-waves has meant that ethnic groups:

1. have been granted a 'voice' to speak to their respective communities;
2. have an avenue whereby they are able to preserve their language and culture thereby reinforcing their cultural identity;
3. are alleviated of the feeling of isolation in a foreign country.

Access to the air-waves, moreover, has not simply been granted because a group of people have joined together to produce and air a radio program. Each group and each program must work within the confines of a philosophical, institutional framework. This means that official policy structure sets out various guidelines and stipulations specific to ethnic broadcasting. Broadcasters must abide by the regulations set out by policy in order to have their programs aired. But official policy does not always speak the same language as ethnic broadcasters. What broadcasters would like to 'air' is not always within the boundaries of policy regulation. Public ethnic broadcasters in Perth, in their relationship with 6NR, have been restricted by:
1. point vii of the Criteria for Ethnic Broadcasting;

2. the SBS code of ethics which determined funding;

3. unavailability of air-time due to the requirements of other interest groups and the increased number of ethnic broadcasters.

Individual broadcasters, further, cannot be heard on an official level unless they mediate their needs through a unified broadcasting body. In Perth's case, this body is the MRTA. Thus the MRTA's stance is that of organiser and mediator. It has been its role to promote and 'voice' the need for an independent ethnic broadcasting station in Perth.

The MRTA of W.A. has been committed to the idea of establishing an independent broadcasting station for many years. Although for the past fourteen years ethnic community groups have been broadcasting through 8NR Community Access Radio, the needs of these communities were not being met and subsequently the push to establish an independent station was highlighted. The fundamental motivation behind the push to establish an independent station was the need for more transmission time. As more and more ethnic groups became aware of the dimensions of ethnic radio, greater broadcasting time was needed to accommodate them.

To discern how and why access was restricted, and an independent ethnic broadcasting station was needed, it is
appropriate to outline the history of ethnic radio broadcasting in Perth.

Ethnic broadcasting began in Perth on 16 October, 1976 on 6NR Community Access Radio. Nine groups began broadcasting in their community languages under the umbrella of the Good Neighbour Council [hereafter GNC] (Lutero, 1990, p. 10). The GNC was a Commonwealth agency set up by the government to mitigate the needs of newly arrived migrants. In 1978, the GNC was disbanded due to withdrawal of Government funds. The ethnic broadcasters thus established the Ethnic Broadcasting Committee of W.A. [hereafter EBC] to continue the service, with Alex Lutero as president. As ethnic groups became aware of the radio facility available to them, the number of broadcasters began to grow. In that year SBS began its subsidy program. Funding was provided at $50 per hour, which was allocated to the public broadcasters, that is, 6NR, for approved ethnic programs (1990, p. 10).

By September 1983 thirty-seven groups were broadcasting on 6NR with twenty-five and a half hours of air-time. Other groups were on a waiting list, while those already broadcasting were pressing for additional air-time. In 1986, due to ongoing differences between the public broadcasting sector of ethnic radio and the bureaucracy of SBS, the Public Broadcasting Foundation (hereafter PBF) assumed responsibility for all funding of ethnic radio in the public broadcasting sphere. With
this transference came a reduction in the subsidy granted to public ethnic radio. The subsidy granted was reduced to $30.50 per hour of air time with 6NR charging $60 per hour. During the last two years of broadcasting the subsidy granted by the PBF was $40 p/h with 6NR charging $80 p/h. The discrepancy between the subsidy and the actual production and transmission costs was to be made up by the individual ethnic group (1990, p.10).

Earlier, in 1985 the Minister for Communications called for applications for a category 'S' special interest public licence. In the same year the participants of the EBC suggested a name change. This recommendation was taken to a general meeting and thereafter the EBC entitled itself the Multicultural Radio and Television Association. The recently named MRTA submitted their application to the ABT. Although the Tribunal found the MRTA qualified for the licence, the licence was granted to the Good News Broadcasters, broadcasting as Sonshine Radio. Subsequently the MRTA continued broadcasting through 6NR (ABT, 1988, p. 3).

On 9 December 1987, the Minister for Transport and Communications invited applications for a special interest (ethnic) public radio licence to serve Perth. One application was received from the MRTA of WA. Following the hearing in February 1988, the licence was granted to that applicant (ABT, 1988, p. 3).
A sum of $350,000 was required to purchase all equipment and to establish the studio facilities. The PBF provided $74,000, the Lottery Commission Board, $150,000 and the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission of W.A. (hereafter MEAC), $5000. The rest of the money required was obtained through a bank loan (ABT, 1988, p. 7).

The premises for the station were secured at 20 View St, North Perth, and while it seemed that the new station would go to air by the end of 1989, at the latest, an antenna site could not be found. The MRTA had been contracted to broadcast on 6NR until December 1989, anticipating commencement of broadcasting on the new station in January 1990. At the end of December 1989, the MRTA prevailed in their search to secure an antenna site. Without a fully operational station, they extended their contract repeatedly with 6NR. The end of March saw no progress. Concurrently, 6NR had sold air-time, normally allocated to the ethnic broadcasters, and thereby refused further contract extension (Lutero, see Appendix Two). The MRTA's contract with 6NR expired at the end of April, 1990.

The MRTA has not broadcast since the end of March 1990. In the interim 6NR has granted air-time to individual ethnic groups for 'Cultural Programs'. These programs are to be broadcast in English with no 'foreign' language content except that of music. In June 1990 the
Department of Communications approved of the antenna site, which was secured on top of the ABC tower. In the interval there have been further delays with the construction of the antenna. The MRTA is yet to commence broadcasting due to further delays in acquiring studio equipment from interstate. The new inauguration date of 6EBA FM is 1st December, 1990.

While there has been no criticism of the cooperation and assistance given to ethnic broadcasters, by 6NR, the function of 6NR as a community access station, could not expedite the specific needs of the ethnic communities. Public broadcasting, generally, is concerned with the needs and interests of minorities, yet, at the same time it is committed to diversity and a differentiated audience. Ethnic broadcasting on the other hand, although specific insofar as it concentrates on ethnic community needs, is in itself committed to diversity and a differentiated audience. The scope of ethnic broadcasting was too vast for 6NR to sanction adequate provision.

The cheapest way for the Government to undertake the extension of ethnic broadcasting to all centres outside the compass of SBS and the independent ethnic stations was to include ethnic broadcasting as part of educational and community broadcasting on existing public stations. 6NR, paralleled with most public stations, has been faced with financial difficulties, and further is bound
by institutional politics. 6NR's program emphasis was on 'educational material'. Ethnic broadcasters in Perth were required to fit into the overall policy of 6NR. While they had representation on both educational and community public broadcasting management boards, they remained a minority. The majority of air-time was allocated for educational programming, thus ethnic broadcasters were required to share the remaining air-time with various other interest groups. Although 6NR had expressed willingness to increase its ethnic content, the increasing demand for further 'access' could not be facilitated. Nonetheless, the delay in the establishment of 6EBA can be ascribed to the lack of cognition of ethnic community needs.

Tirza Cohen, (1983), writes:

*Some ethnic groups are awaiting air-time, but the delay is due to the unavailability of Special Broadcasting Service funding. Demand for increased air-time has not been demonstrated and a survey (by the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Office in August 1983)[sic] supports 6NR's contention that the needs of most ethnic communities are being met.*

*Whilst the resources of the Special Broadcasting Service are of assistance to program producers, the local system, whereby the ethnic communities are directly responsible for the production and content of programs, is likely to be more attuned to the needs of their listeners.*

*Whatever future structure is adopted for the administration of ethnic broadcasting on a national basis, equality of access, a better balance of programs, a broader coverage, and more objective funding would be of prime importance, particularly to smaller and more recently arrived and less established ethnic groups.*

(p. 2)
In Western Australia, the total percentage of people born in a non-English speaking country, in 1981, was 27.35%, most of whom resided in and around Perth. This is compared with a national average of 20.60% (MEAC, 1985, p. 86). This suggests that Perth’s migrant population was sizable enough to warrant an independent station.

The establishment of 6EBA FM follows the lead of 5EBI in Adelaide, 4EB in Brisbane, and the newly established 3ZZZ (3 Aug 1989) in Melbourne. Like its interstate counterparts, 6EBA will be subsidised by government funds, administered through the PBF, and managed by the ethnic broadcasters (for more details on funding arrangements see Chapter Three, pg. 58, and Appendix Three). Local broadcasters will also have more available ‘air’ time but with a reduction in broadcasting costs; that is, the costs which individual groups must pay for production and transmission, charged per hour of transmission. As yet this amount has not been finalised. An expansion of creative resources will also be encouraged by the Association. In addition to Australian programs available through SBS, the Association has made arrangements with the Western Australian Aboriginal Media Association and with the Ethnic Music Centre of W.A. for the provision of programs. Further to this, the Association intends to have facilities to enable outside broadcasts to be made at the various ethnic festivals that take place each year and to record particular
performing ethnic groups for broadcast on the station at a later stage (ABT, 1988, pg. 5). All these factors will aid in the development of community programming, thereby extending 'provision' for ethnic communities 'needs' in the broadcasting sphere.

It is difficult to determine how responsive audiences are to community language broadcasts in Perth. While the SBS stations have adequate funding designated specifically for survey purposes, there are insufficient funds available to conduct such research here. Although the MEAC has published various reports and books on the state of multicultural affairs in W.A. (Newsletter, Spectrum, 1988-90, no's 1, 2, 3; Needs and Priorities, 1983/85, Vol 1, 2; Diversity is Great Mate, 1989) little attention has been paid to the condition of ethnic radio services.

The lack of resource material on audience participation, needed as a foundation of research for this paper, led to the required development of an interview schedule with program co-ordinators. Since the scope of this document is limited it was necessary to keep respondent numbers minimal *. Nevertheless, these people, as representatives of their individual community

* Because some respondents wished to remain anonymous, all respondents have been designated by their ethnic affiliation. For a list of respondents consult Appendix Two.
groups, expressed the 'voice' of their communities. As program co-ordinators they are familiar with their community's needs and/or lacks in the radio broadcasting sphere, therefore, they were able to outline the specific broadcasting needs of their communities, and subsequently responses to their broadcasts. This, in a broader context, formulated a related pattern of audience complicity. Although they were all removed from the politics of ethnic broadcasting, they were able to clarify how successful or unsuccessful, they inferred, policy provisions had been in the ethnic broadcasting sphere. These responses will be utilised to evaluate 6NR's role in ethnic broadcasting which, in turn will clarify why 6EBA is needed to take over the responsibility of ethnic broadcasting in Perth.

All respondents agreed the fundamental aim of their broadcast is to provide a communication channel for and between their respective community groups. They all stated that news, information and entertainment were incorporated into their program formats, while broadcasting through 6NR. The Indian respondent adequately summarizes the benefits of ethnic radio to ethnic communities:

When people come to Australia they feel a lack of cultural identity. This is where the radio program can fill the gap. It covers things like news and interviews, history, literature but mostly musical items. It gives people the opportunity to listen to items related to their cultural background.
The respondent from the Chung-Wha Association, representing approximately 3000 Chinese members in W.A., is the only respondent whose community group is largely populated by newly arrived migrants. The Chung-Wha association has been broadcasting on ethnic radio for approximately three years, compared to an average ten year relationship between the other selected community groups and ethnic radio. With the continuing influx of Asian migrants to Australia, ethnic radio services rendered through 6NR have been utilised to provide information and advice on the rights and obligations of residents in Australia. The respondent states:

We would like to think that for the migrants who do not read the newspapers or are unable to obtain a local newspaper in the language that they speak, we can use this radio medium to project news bulletins etc if they are applicable to them. For example if there is a change in immigration policy then we would put that down on the radio station and get it broadcast. We use it mainly as an information medium.

The Macedonian and Indian respondents, however, both separated their audiences into two categories; the majority who prefer the format of songs and announcements and a minority who prefer more cultural content. The Macedonian respondent went on to say;

There's a big demand for announcements - engagements, birthdays etc. For some listeners this just won't do. All you need are four or five of these announcements and there's your whole program.
The German respondent also expressed difficulties when arranging program content. While audiences were generally receptive to music and general information, content such as poetry and drama were more difficult to accept because audiences had not been accustomed to hearing such program matter on radio. She expanded on this point by stating that there were several members within the German community who were prepared to offer their talents in developing the program's format, but without any financial support (even something as minimal as a petrol allowance) they were unable to offer their support.

This evidence supports the notion that 6NR's major role in ethnic broadcasting was simply to provide a 'service' to migrant groups. On a national scale, ethnic radio generally is given favourable comment for the provision of community language programs used as a means of diminishing the sense of isolation of non-English speakers. It has also been commended for its usefulness in disseminating public information on services and other related issues. However, while broadcasting through 6NR, with minimal time allocated and the lack of funding provisions granted, ethnic groups concentrated on inter-community communication, rather than actually maintaining, and/or educating audiences on, their cultural traditions.
More significantly, however, the majority of listeners to ethnic radio on 6NR were the so called 'older' generation. *Needs and Priorities* (1985), states that fifty-seven percent of the sample indicated listened to programs in their own language. These listeners were concentrated in the over 65 year age group and among those who arrived between 1950 and 1954 (p.55). The Macedonian respondent stated:

*The program caters for the middle/older age group, much more so than the younger generation, and that's a shame. The younger people are more assimilated into Australian culture and show little interest in the radio broadcast. Hopefully if we improve the quality of the program, through the new station, we can attract some of the younger people.*

The German respondent supported this claim:

*We are mainly speaking to the older generation who have come from or have been to that country. The younger generation are not particularly interested in our program. They might listen in for the music but that's about all.*

These statements suggest that point two of the Criteria for Ethnic Broadcasting, that is, 'assist those from other cultures to maintain those cultures and pass them on to their descendants and to other Australians', falls short of its intentions. Criticism of this criteria has been set out in the Galbally Report, however it supported the claim that;

*Community language program provisions alleviate a sense of isolation felt by many migrants. They assist and maintain community languages and cultural traditions for children of migrants and help to*
bridge the cultural gap which can exist between parents and their Australian born or educated children

(AIMA, 1982, p. 290)

Nonetheless second generation migrants constitute a minority percentage of audiences. Thus to generate a higher percentage of these listeners, program formats and audience participation need to be re-evaluated. As Foster and Stockley, (1984), state;

... ,community involvement and responsiveness are not catered for adequately by the existing structures and there is no mechanism to monitor program content and standards nor to assess the responsiveness of programming to changing needs, interests, whether among non-English speaking ethnic groups or English-speaking members of migrant or host communities. (p. 121)

The capacity of 6NR was not adequate to provide for the need of program extension, which could, potentially, reach the second generation of migrant listeners. In their licence application, however, the MRTA has stated they will extend their programming to include educational programs, special programs for the aged, for the handicapped and for children both in the mother-tongue of each respective ethnic group and in English (ABT, 1988, p. 4). In the local context, it has been difficult to ascertain responsiveness to community programming. Audience feedback, asserted through the respondents interviewed, however, has been adequate in determining a loose break-down of audiences from different age groups. Whilst programming has been limited by the provisions granted through 6NR, the
potential to expand audience participation on the new station, particularly that of the second generation, is vast.

Migrants have had an ongoing need for information. This need as well as the need for educational programs, especially the teaching of the English language, has not been empowered through ethnic radio on 6NR. While three of the respondents interviewed stated they broadcast their program in the community language, the Indian respondent stated that their program was broadcast in English, not however, for educational reasons, but because there are sixteen official languages in India. The Indian program, moreover, did not attract funding from the PBF, but from private sponsorship and a grant scheme from the MEAC. SBS funding negotiations insisted that program formats were to include little or no English. Programs had to be directed towards specific ethnic groups in order to attract SBS subsidy. Thus programs which might have been effective from the community's point-of-view if presented in English or dual language were not always eligible for subsidy. Second generation ethnics who could not understand the community language were discouraged as potential listeners, so too were listeners of other cultures and the broader community.

In its licence application, the MRTA asserts that the experience gained in introducing ethnic broadcasts on
6NR has clearly established the need for ethnic communities to be able to access information in their own language, not only music and entertainment but also news and information. They see the need for migrants to have the means by which to retain and maintain their own ethnic and cultural heritage whilst at the same time interacting successfully with the non-ethnic Australian population. (ABT, 1988, p. 16)

These 'needs' seem achievable. Now with an independent station on the fringe of broadcasting, it appears access will be extended to allow for diversity of ethnic programming, thereby embracing the philosophy of 'cultural interchange'. Nonetheless the public ethnic model cannot exist without restrictions. 6EBA will continue to conform to set criteria and limited funding arrangements. The advantage of this model is that programming and control of the station remains in the broadcasters' hands, however, even with the philosophy of multiculturalism as its foundation, given the 'ethnicity model' outlined earlier in the chapter, there are several contradictions which arise amidst the variables of policy construction, migrant needs, ethnic needs, cultural interchange and paramountly 'access and equality'.

CHAPTER THREE

Parallel Contradictions:
Philosophy/Policy & Policy/Needs

A multicultural Australia is one in which Australians have equal right to participate in all aspects of the nation's life. Just as importantly, it is one where all Australians are encouraged to take up an equitable share of the responsibilities for the country's future. The policy of multiculturalism ...recognises the fact of diversity in Australia and the enriching value of diversity. But our policy of multiculturalism also insists that all Australians, of whatever origin, accept the overarching principles and institutions which make us one single nation. Multiculturalism does not seek to import or entrench division into the Australian community. And I reject utterly any suggestion that has in fact done so.

*The Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, 19 July 1988* (AGPS, 1988, p. 2)

Chapters One and Two, respectively, outline the policy structure of ethnic radio broadcasting and the perceived needs of the communities involved. This chapter will identify the inconsistencies between official policy and migrant/ethnic needs. The above quote, spoken by Australia's Prime Minister, gives us an insight into the state of multicultural affairs in Australia. It suggests the ideology: "..multicultural Australia is one in which Australians have 'equal' right to participate in all aspects of the nation's life"; and the conflict; "Multiculturalism does not seek to import or entrench division into the Australian community", in which case the issues of 'equality' and 'division' come into play.
Notions of 'power and control' and 'core/periphery' will be instated in this analysis to establish the contradictory nature of Australian multiculturalism, which, in turn, will challenge the philosophy of access and equality. This chapter will analyse the contradictions which exist between:

1. Funding provisions;
2. Content restrictions;
3. Multicultural ideology, in the ethnic broadcasting sphere, the broader community, and migrant/ethnic communities;

in the context of ethnic radio broadcasting. It will also determine that conceptual issues of multiculturalism need to be aligned with policy issues, in order to understand how concepts of 'power and control' and 'core/periphery' are expressed in concrete financial and bureaucratic terms.

Australian multiculturalism follows the Canadian model. Theory and criticism of multiculturalism, as an official government policy, can be applied to an Australian context. On Canadian multiculturalism, Roman Onufrijchuk writes:

*Ethnicity is already a construct - an edifice. It is the product of history and discourse. This ethnicity emerges from the official discourse of Canadian federal multicultural policy which is*
itself already circumscribed by cultural policy, even if the latter represses the former. (1988, p.23)

Applied to Australia, if we consider the principles laid down by the Galbally report, simple rhetorical statements such as 'equal access to programs and services'; 'encouraged to embrace and understand other cultures' and 'equality of access and provision', are based on the assumption that Australian society is egalitarian and a fundamentally cohesive entity. The political economy of Australia would suggest otherwise. Because of the nature of the electronic media, extensive control rests with the Government and its statutory authorities. The initiation of policies arises within the institution of government itself and is contained within the routines of parliamentary action, that is, it can be passed as legislation or it can be removed from parliamentary concern by the legislative process.

Added to this, is the dimension of concentrated media ownership. These owners, with concentrated interests in the core capitals Sydney and Melbourne, in both the electronic and printed media, exert their economic ascendancy over peripheral communication avenues. This power ensures that the economic elite are able to monopolise the ways in which knowledge and culture is translated to the broader society.
In terms of ethnic broadcasting the core of the controversy over provisions for ethnic radio services exists in the conflict between mainstream versus special services, that is, commercial versus public broadcasting. Public broadcasting is divided into two sectors: government and non-government. Whilst the non-government public sector does not pose a great threat to the material security of the commercial sector, the government sector, that is, the ABC and the SBS, does. This is due to high productivity of television revenue. The non-government broadcasting sector is specific to radio, while the ABC and the SBS operate on both radio and television mediums.

This has contributed to the issues arising from provisions granted to SBS which have, periodically, thrown its existence into question. These contentions have developed from the broader community arguing that the SBS is extravagant and wasteful of public funds; and from the ethnic communities; stating alleged incompetence, and more specifically, insensibility to the needs and interests of ethnic communities.

The politics of ethnic radio, however, are far more complex. The issue of 'control', that is, who should control ethnic radio services, also comes into play. The establishment of the SBS certainly has not alleviated this problem. The ACRS, (1985), published its summary of recommendations, none of which have been acted upon to
solve the problems of extension and/or more evenly balanced funding distribution. The recommendations read:

6.65 We recommend that ethnic public broadcasting stations should be licenced wherever there is sufficient community interest and support to warrant their establishment. The present category system for public broadcasting stations should be expanded to provide for an 'ethnic' category. The government should call applications for such a licence in Melbourne as soon as possible, and in Sydney and Perth if demand is established. Should the ethnic public broadcasters in Canberra not be successful in their current application for a licence, consideration should be given to calling a further licence application in that city. (p. 24)

6.86 We recommend as a high priority that government funding for ethnic broadcasting be increased to $1 million for 1985-86. (p. 26)

Four years later 3ZZZ was established on 3 August, 1989, in Melbourne; five years later 6EBA is about to commence broadcasting in Perth, and Canberra is yet to be granted an independent ethnic licence. 6EBA is uncertain of the amount of annual funding they will receive from the PBF. This funding is allocated to the PBF's office in Melbourne, and subsequently divided to all the public ethnic radio stations operating throughout Australia. In the long term, the number of public stations in Australia is of little consequence to the government, as funding remains fixed. The total amount of funding, received from the government, for public broadcasting for the 1990 financial year, was $1.15 million. When compared to the approximate $12 million granted to the SBS radio stations, for the same year, it remains minimal (see Appendix Two).
The system of ethnic radio broadcasting in Australia is grossly uneven and unequal. Communities in Sydney and Melbourne and their regional areas have an extensive service provided for them by a statutory authority at government expense. While Adelaide, Brisbane, and now Perth have independent ethnic stations, most of the financial backing comes/will come from donations, sponsorship and individual communities. While the SBS radio stations are steering towards a 'professional' mode of production and transmission (as established in Chapter One), the other ethnic stations continue to battle for funds, in order to maintain their service.

This matter has been amplified by point c (ii) of 'The Criteria for a Public Radio Licence', which states, the ABT may refuse to grant the licence if:

it is not satisfied that the applicant has the financial, technical and management capabilities necessary to operate the station effectively.

(ABT, 1988, p. 9)

Consequently, 6EBA, must place more emphasis on high quality programming and production. A special course for prospective programmers and announcers was initiated, in October of this year, with funds granted by the PBF. Whilst individual community groups were eager to participate, the Macedonian respondent stressed:
all the participants on ethnic radio are volunteers, and it's very difficult to get people to give up their time and to contribute to something free of charge. It's a case of 'beggars can't be choosers'. Hopefully those who have put up their hand to do the job will do it the best they can, but it is difficult, professional radio producers can't be sought when you are offering your services voluntarily. The standard just can't increase overnight.

To maintain control over program matter, production, and distribution, public ethnic radio stations have had to subsidise themselves. Unlike SBS, these stations are not administered and controlled by a bureaucratic structure. Part of SBS's troubled history stems from the differences arising between broadcasters and administrators. Since public ethnic broadcasters do not have a bureaucratic base, there is no inevitablity of this type of dispute. Inter-departmental rivalry at the SBS stations has led to a consequent lack of morale, (ACRS, 1985, p. 105), which, in turn has affected broadcasting.

The structural and hierarchical differences which exist between commercial and national broadcasters, and national and independent broadcasters, positions the MRTA of Perth, (with other public ethnic broadcasters operating on independent stations or through public stations), as a peripheral broadcaster on three levels:
1. as an ethnic broadcaster it is subordinated to the cultural dominance of mainstream Anglo-Australian radio control and programming;

2. primarily, as a radio broadcaster, its significance is subsidiary to that of ethnic/multicultural television;

3. outside the domain of SBS radio, as a public ethnic broadcaster, it is affected by subtle discrimination in the higher spheres of policy making due to its demographic/geographic position.

English-speaking Australians receive professionally prepared programs from the ABC and commercial stations. In many areas, where national programs are networked to regional areas, local programming compliments these services. Nonetheless each sector has its place, and its audience, invariably, has a choice. Like the nation as a whole, the ethnic population is unevenly scattered, with a high concentration in the large cities. This explains why ethnic broadcasters in Sydney and Melbourne have been given first priority as beneficiaries of a fully-subsidised government ethnic broadcasting facility.

The inequalities of funding and provision in the ethnic radio broadcasting sphere cannot, however, be separated from the issues that are incorporated into Australian broadcasting as a whole. Australia has a vast land mass, with a relatively small population. This means that broadcasting is extremely expensive, due to the multiple transmission facilities required to cope with the great distances. Inevitably there are vast inequalities between the core capitals (Sydney and Melbourne) and the peripheral capitals. Nonetheless, the
Peripheral capitals are often much better off than the rural regions.

In the best interests of Australia's political economy, power and control are regulated from the core. Through its bureaucratic channels, the core manifests its discourse through official government policy. This policy disseminates its ideology, and contributes to the establishment of the economic and political affairs of the periphery. Andrew Jakubowicz, (1987), writes:

The Labour Government has been through a number of stages since inheriting the policy of what used to be called 'multiculturalism' under Fraser.... The Government has committed itself to a notion of 'mainstreaming', with the intent of ensuring that the core institutions of Australian society are capable and competent to respond to the needs of all Australians, whatever their ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The Government, in pursuit of these ends, has carefully avoided addressing issues to do with racism, or indeed recognising issues of sexism and class relations which are extremely important in all these policy areas. It accepts the mainstream in communications, as elsewhere, as inherently valued, whilst in fact that mainstream serves the interests in the 'main' of the powerful white Anglo-Saxons.

(p. 31)

Whilst SBS Radio and TV services were both initially deemed as being 'ethnic', a slide has occurred whereby SBS Radio remains predominantly 'ethnic' and SBS TV is currently considered to have a 'multicultural' function. This disparity has essentially been left unquestioned. On ethnic radio, clause 1.17 states:
SBS radio stations have always performed a dual role: assisting migrants of non-English speaking background to settle in Australia, and helping migrants to retain their languages and cultural traditions and to pass these on to their children. This remains their role today. (Department of Transport and Communications [hereafter DOTC], 1988, p.5)

In the 1989/90 Year in Review Report (OMA, 1990), there is no mention of the status of ethnic/multicultural radio. In brief, there is a section dedicated to the extension of SBS Television to Darwin and eight other metropolitan centres (p. 66), yet radio, with all its broadcast potential as an advocate of multiculturalism is granted no priority.

In terms of access, radio is a much cheaper operational and communicational medium. Minority or local community groups wanting a 'voice' in broadcasting can obtain access on radio. Television, on the other hand, is dominated by the commercial sector. Its emphasis and focus is on 'entertainment' which serves the best interest of its owners, whose imperatives are predominated by 'mass audience appeal'. High ratings, in turn, are sold to advertisers who buy air-time. This is how the commercial broadcasting sector generates its profit. The public sector is not driven by this imperative. The absence of commercials makes allowances for quality, informative, and educative broadcasting.
In the Review of National Broadcasting Policy—
Discussion Paper on SBS (DOTC, 1988) little attention is paid to SBS Radio. No new dimensions or directions are granted to its radio service and no clear rationale is given for its lack of regard. On the other hand SBS TV receives considerable attention. The discussion paper outlines complete statistical data on SBS TV’s progress and its future directions. However, the philosophy behind SBS cannot be and is not identifiable when SBS, since its inception, has lacked a charter. Clause 2.7. states:

SBS has lacked a Charter since it began its service. While multiculturalism is widely accepted as being at the heart of SBS’s rationale, ironically the only legislative mention of multiculturalism is with reference to the ABC, not the SBS (Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act, s.6(2)(9)(iv)). The legislative prescription for the SBS, ‘multilingual radio service and...multilingual television services’, while providing some partial guidance for both SBS Radio and SBS TV, is particularly inadequate to define the kind of television service which has evolved and should continue. (DOTC, 1988,p. 13)

To date, however, SBS TV has been primarily used to broaden the cultural awareness of Australians generally, rather than those Australians of ethnic origin. Audience statistics for SBS TV indicate that it is not drawing the very audience it was established for. On a national average, SBS TV constitutes approximately 1.5% of viewers. Of these 28% are from a non-English speaking background, while 67% are Australian born, or have been born in an English speaking country (Evans, 1987, p. 19).
Little use has been made on SBS TV to facilitate the non-English speaking audiences, that is, through educational programming, or to promote better understanding between diverse cultural groups.

Further, the issue of control can be extended to the bureaucratic structure of SBS.

Central to the SBS's internal problems has been the requirement that it engage staff under the Public Service Act 1922 and its relationship with the Public Service Board. One consequence has been a construction of people of Anglo-Celtic background in the major decision-making positions and in most of the administrative jobs, and ill-defined and insecure employment terms and conditions for creative people - many of whom are of non-English speaking backgrounds.

(ACRS, 1985, Report 1, p. 15)

Ethnic broadcasting in Australia happened by circumstance rather than as a result of any over-all plan or policy. Legislation and policy adjustment came after the events and the systems we have to date were merely established in response to immediate pressures and short-term demands. When it was decided that the SBS Radio stations were to become permanent entities the ABC public access station 3ZZ was closed down on the grounds that it was duplicating the services of 2EA and 3EA (see Chapter One). In many ways it was, insofar as 3ZZ was being heavily utilised by ethnic groups, however, 3ZZ was an ABC station, and therefore the 'a-political' clause was not imposed. Furthermore, once ethnic broadcasters were absorbed by the SBS bureaucracy, much of the control over
programming matter was taken out of individual program co-ordinators hands. It seems ironic, thus, that a new ethnic 'access' station, 3ZZZ in Melbourne, has been established four years after the recommendation made by the ACRS, and more than ten years after its sister station was closed.

Additionally, in the past, ethnic broadcasters operating through public radio stations were obliged to conform to SBS criteria if they were to receive a subsidy. (see Chapter One) This meant that, not only did SBS Radio benefit from favourable financial assistance, it also contributed to determining what ethnic broadcasters in peripheral areas actually broadcast. This guideline is no longer in place, nonetheless 6EBA must remain faithful to the Government's Codes and Principles for ethnic broadcasting. The precept that programs should 'avoid political partisanship' has caused much debate within the ethnic communities. The ACRS write:

...it was interpreted to mean the avoidance of any form of current affairs or political comment, and aroused considerable resentment in the ethnic communities. The restriction applied to public broadcasters as well as the SBS. The contrast with the ABC, which had almost total discretion in the broadcasting of political and controversial material, was a telling one.

(ACRS, Report 2, 1985, p. 102)

A. Bonnici, (1980), Chairman of the Media Committee of the Ethnic Communities Council of Victoria, writes:
The commitment by the Government to develop a service which is professionally non-partisan is commendable. To develop a service which is free of political influence is laudable. But, to develop a service where "political matter and controversial matter" is expressly excluded (vide the Broadcasting and Television Amendment Act 1977, section 79ZJ) is repressive. It cuts deep into the fabric of democratic society. The rights of a citizen in a democratic society must not be curtailed on the grounds of political expediency. . . . The whole exercise is particularly disappointing, especially so because of the censorship that has been imposed by the Government in ethnic broadcasting - a censorship that the Government has not seen fit to impose on the commercial stations in Australia and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. (p. 29)

In Perth, the German and Indian respondents made no complaints about the a-political clause. However, the Chinese respondent said:

As far as political content goes I don't believe politics should be discussed on ethnic radio as it could be used for propaganda purposes.

On the other hand, the Macedonian respondent stated:

By saying we're Macedonian is political. The policy states you shouldn't say anything that creates disharmony and you shouldn't incite hatred, but I don't know whether you can not be political. We would never talk about Australian party politics, but if something political is happening in the homeland we would mention it on the radio as 'objective' observers, which is hard when you're talking politics. But we have more of a problem when chauvinistic, simpleminded people suggest we don't exist as a cultural group, these same people consider stating one's position as Macedonian political.

Whether justified or not, the Government, vaguely, state their position as one which has been created to
deter inter-ethnic rivalry (Foster and Stockley, 1988, pp. 165-170). If we consider the core/periphery model, however, we can deduce that through discourse production, the power of the core can order what goes on politically in the periphery. People, therefore, become reluctant in opposing the 'given' order of things. This is related to the 'ethnicity model' (see Chapter Two, p. 36). Morrissey, (1984), states:

_In the case of the multicultural variant [as opposed to assimilation] a lamentation of ideology is added by defining 'culture' as pertaining exclusively to food, dress, (some) music, dance and family organisation. The political culture of the migrant's home country is systematically ignored or, in the case of multicultural television and radio, specifically excluded from the list of acceptable topics._

(p. 75)

In this case 'ethnic politics' become isolated from the ideology of 'cultural pluralism', or, multiculturalism.

When the political culture of the migrant/ethnic is removed from his/her identity - through the powers of discourse production, the migrant/ethnic is induced to play the core's cultural game. Onufrijchuk, (1988), writes:

_..the imagined community is based, to a great extent on language, shared history, and the dissemination of shared cultural expression through the media....Cultural diversity throughout the world is being eroded by the impact of industrial technology, mass communication and urbanisation - in which mass produced culture and entertainment of large impersonal institutions threaten to denature and depersonalize men. One of man's basic needs is a sense of belonging, and a good deal of contemporary social unrest - in all age groups - exists because this has not been met._ (pp. 9/10)
Migrant/ethnic experiences in the hierarchial structure of Australian society are taken as 'given'. The origin of the socio-economic-political pyramid are also taken as given (Morrissey, 1984, p. 76). Because the political culture of that migrant/ethnic has been denied successively, that migrant/ethnic feels a sense of displacement. It is then up to the individual to find his/her way through the structural pyramid.

This point has been expressed in the principles laid down by the Galbally report:

...self-help should be encouraged as much as possible with a view to helping migrants become self-reliant quickly.

(DOC, 1982, p. 2)

In support of the 'ethnicity model' aligned with the notion of the core's power of control, Morrissey states:

Quite clearly, migrantness-as-ideology conforms to this [marginal productivity] tendency. Effectively it locates the origin of the working-class migrant's predicament to a large extent outside the area in which collective social action in Australia might change anything, and certainly it offers no hint that the migrant's class relation within Australian society might have anything to do with this predicament. This ideological thrust is, as one might expect, extremely pervasive and its expression ranges from incipient racism to the subtleties of liberal social engineering.

(p. 75)

Migrants and second generation migrants/ethnics, in the position of 'disadvantage', are forced to conform to the tenents of the dominant ideology. Research evidence has
indicated that language and/or cultural preservation, in a predominantly mono-lingual society, is increasingly difficult after the second generation (Foster and Stockley, 1988, p. 161). In Australia where there is only one official language, mainstream television and radio services only provide programming, whether it be informational, educational or of entertainment value, in English. Ethnic broadcasting, is the only division of the electronic media which has the capability to tender to the needs of migrants/ethnics by endorsing adequate provision. This throws into question the tenability of point four in the Criteria for Ethnic Broadcasting (see Chapter One, p. 13).

If ethnic broadcasting adopted a wider use of the English language in its programming, this would promote the aspects of its educative and multicultural philosophies. Multicultural radio is quite distinct from that of ethnic radio in that its philosophy makes provision for 'cross-cultural interchange', along with the original intention of providing a 'service' to the newly arrived migrant.

The Indian respondent did not believe his program promoted cultural interchange, however he suggested, those involved in ethnic broadcasting should incorporate a line of mutual interest for both Anglo-Australians and their own cultural groups. The Macedonian respondent expanded on this by stating;
What I think has been happening is Macedonians are listening to their program, Italians are listening to theirs and not many groups are listening to each other's. We sometimes get the spillage of listeners from the programs before and after ours, however our main focus is to help the community itself organise cultural activities which help to affirm us as Macedonians. This is promotion of Multiculturalism in one way, in that it promotes each individual group, but I don't believe it promotes the sharing of cultures between different groups. But Multiculturalism is a relatively new concept, it takes a long time, especially with the older generation of Anglo-Saxons to accept this new concept. A lot of people laugh at Bruce Ruxton, but a lot of people agree with some of the things he has to say. It will take a long time for these people to find ethnic and Multicultural broadcasting acceptable.

The moves to progress from specifically ethnic to multicultural radio broadcasting were initiated by the public broadcasting sector several years ago. The resolutions passed at the PBAA's Ethnic Broadcasting Conference, July, 1982, were:

1. Multicultural English programs should be directed at the entire Australian Community.

2. Multicultural English programs should present issues of general interest from and by the ethnic communities, aspects of multicultural events, news and current affairs from a multicultural point-of-view, and analysis and debate about multiculturalism.

3. Multicultural English programs should highlight the contribution made by migrants to Australia and its development.

4. Multicultural English programs should encourage the production of Australian multicultural radio material.

(PBAA, 1983, p. 8)
While these resolutions were passed in 1982, the SBS funding criteria still stipulated 'little or no English', up to, and including 1986. It has been established that mono-lingual programming alienates potential listeners. This type of programming creates a dialectical situation between migrants/ethnics and the broader community. On one hand the broader community feel segregated by ethnic broadcasting and, thus, perpetually feel reluctant to accept migrants/ethnics. Adversely migrants/ethnics become dependent on their ethnic communities thereby feeling reluctant to participate and contribute to the broader community. Multicultural radio programming, unlike ethnic radio programming, has the potential to bridge the cultural divide.

The German respondent believed 'education' was a determining factor in the promotion of Multiculturalism through 6EBA. She explained:

I think people here are afraid of anything they don't understand. Now we have the influx of Asian immigrants, and they seem to be even more different than those immigrants which have arrived here from Europe in previous years. Australians are frightened of this difference. It's supposed to be our country, but we in fact took it away from the Aboriginals. It's these thoughts that people don't express, but they exist. Education is essential here, just in explaining to people that they should not feel intimidated by those things which they don't understand. I see that the problem mainly exists with the first generation because of the language barrier, but this barrier can be bridged through educational programming. For example, on the new station we will be able to have programs where ethnic groups talk about their cultures, in English. This will be done in five minute slots and will be broadcast at a certain time every day until
the half-hour program is finished. These programs are educational and cater to the broader community.

While migrant/ethnic communities broadcast in their community language, their 'voice' cannot be heard outside their individual community group. Ethnic radio broadcasting on 6NR was proficient, primarily, in providing a service to community groups. It gave these groups the opportunity to establish a communication avenue. This service will be continued on 6EBA however, with the extension of air-time, community groups can, potentially broadcast programs on and about their cultures bi-lingually. Still, the Asian respondent is sceptical of multicultural promotion on 6EBA;

I believe the only cultural interchange that will take place will be between the people involved. The only people that will be listening to each individual program will be the people from that particular ethnic community so there is no merging of ideas or cross-cultural interchange. I think that each individual community group is entering a relationship with the Association so they can air programs which will provide information and entertainment to their own individual community. I'm afraid that the whole idea of cultural interchange will not take place, and in fact I do not believe they have really considered the cross-fertilisation of ideas. Perhaps the only way to get around this kind of problem is to have a radio station run by different communities from different backgrounds with unified programming, rather than having separate programs. Unfortunately nobody has told me what to put on my program.

The interviews suggest that ethnic broadcasters in Perth, because of their marginality, in terms of demographic and geographic isolation, have not been quite as vocal, on a political level, as their counterparts in
the core capitals. Alex Lutero (see Appendix Three) has pointed out that communication with and between the National Ethnic Broadcasting Council (hereafter NEBC) and the PBAA often occurs over the telephone. Further, he stated, Perth could not play host to annual conferences due to the high costs of travelling. Perth's isolation poses communication problems with the rest of the nation, and therefore removes Perth from the centre of activity. This reinforces the core/periphery dichotomy insofar as Perth broadcasters seem to have accepted the structure of the ethnic broadcasting system as 'given', thereby operating within its boundaries without objection.

Presently, conclusions cannot be drawn as to the effectiveness of 6EBA. Although broadcasters will continue to be limited by financial arrangements and content restrictions, 6EBA will have a far greater scope in terms of air-time. Whilst inauguration of broadcasting has been delayed for almost a year now, once 6EBA is operational it, potentially, has the aptitude to cultivate understanding, not only of trivialised notions of cultural diversity, but of historical, political and economic differences, amongst its participants and the broader community.
CONCLUSION

Determining the 'needs' of local migrant/ethnic communities, in the radio broadcasting sphere, is problematic, when research and analysis is reliant on a definition of 'multiculturalism'. Multiculturalism, as the official government policy, is controlled by the dominant, political ideology of our epoch. This, then, is translated through the rhetorical implementation of government legislation and regulation. The official language of multiculturalism, however, does not address or define class, race or gender relations in Australian society. These terms are denied attention in the evolution of official government discourse, and are therefore taken not to exist.

Although the population of migrant/ethnic groups, in Australia, is on the increase, the socio-economic control of the country rests in the hands of the Anglo-Australian, middle-upper class, male, power elite. The discourse of multiculturalism, as the philosophy behind Australia's 'national identity', is thus manifested through the social, economic and political institutions of Australian society. Richard White, (1981), writes:

The most influential images are those which serve the interests of a broader ruling class, on whose patronage the intelligentsia rely. Every powerful economic interest likes to justify itself by claiming to represent the 'national interest' and identifying itself with a 'national identity'. In the view of the world there is no room for class conflicts, and sexual and racial exploitations are also obscured. The 'national interest' must appear to work for the good of all.  

(p. ix)
The power of discourse production, and its associated ideology, invariably lead to the contradictions between the philosophy of national policy and the actual implementation of policy provision. Migrantness and ethnicity have been defined from the outside, thus, migrant/ethnic 'needs', divorced from the issues of class, race and gender, cannot be effectively accommodated. The inequalities of access and equality will prevail within the ethos of Australia's dominant, ideological climate.

This paper serves as a summation of Perth's position in the progression (or digression) of ethnic/multicultural radio policy structure. The needs of migrant/ethnic groups in Perth are subordinated to Perth's position on the scale of potential policy adjustment. The delay in the establishment of an independent ethnic/multicultural radio station is posted on a structural level. The political ramifications of power and control, in the core, have been instrumental in this delay. Perth's peripheral demographic and geographic stature has determined its position at the bottom end of potential policy adjustment.

The absence of a national ethnic broadcast policy has contributed to this delay. As Bonnici, (1980), says;

*It is perhaps worth remembering that the motto of several countries is: "In unity is strength". It is this strength that governments now fear.*

(p. 29)
A unified ethnic broadcasting body, no doubt, would pose a threat to the security of the ruling class. National ethnic public broadcasters have the NEBC and the PBAA as supporting bodies, however, the SBS radio stations are not affiliated in these unions, subsequently national ethnic broadcasters remain segregated.

Perth's peripheral status, although somewhat of a hindrance in the past, can be used advantageously. On the eve of broadcasting, Perth is in a position to set a precedent. Whilst ethnic radio stations have been operational for several years in other major cities of Australia, none have fully explored the options of 'multicultural' programming.

Within the boundaries of limited funding, and content restrictions, program control on 6EBA will remain with ethnic broadcasters. This gives broadcasters the flexibility to provide the services previously granted through 6NR, and additionally, to encourage and promote 'cultural interchange'.

This, however, is an optimistic view, it could go either way: Firstly; with the escalation of migrant/ethnics up the hierarchial pyramid, and the turnover of migrant groups in the base position, potentially, given time, ethnicity based sector inequality will disappear. This could occur if migrants progressively became economically located, according to
the same principles which apply to the Anglo-Australian 
born. If they are to retain a level of understanding and 
tolerance of the new migrants, cultural interchange will 
occur. Education is a vital imperative in this case. On 
the other hand, if the pragmatic conditions, held 
together by the economic discourse of the core, sustain 
the divisions within the broader community and 
migrant/ethnic groups, these oppositions will ensure lack 
of acceptance, and therefore, a resistance to cultural 
interchange.

The contradictions of multicultural policy and 
philosophy aid in supporting the divisions within the 
broader community and migrant/ethnic groups. 
Multiculturalism could, and should leave cultures open to 
the dynamics of 're-creation'; a blending and merging of 
ideas, goals, information and folk culture, which work to 
break down the boundaries of inclusion/exclusion. 
Multiculturalism should be seen as something more than a 
constructed ideology, formulated to overcome the 
limitations of assimilation. It should extend the 
provisions, historically located at the centre, to all 
people regardless of class, race and gender, thereby 
enabling them to 'voice' their culture and identity.
APPENDIX ONE

Reference pg. 24; from article by Murray Green, former station manager of 6NR, entitled, 'Exerts from an Address to the Western Australian Public Broadcasting Association (Inc)' (hereafter WAPBA), in Fast Forward, June 88.

Fast Forward is the official newsletter of the WAPBA. Independent member stations include, 6UVS FM, Sonshine FM, 6NR, 101 FM (Rockingham), 100 FM. Each member station has representatives on the Associations board, Ann tonks (6UVS FM) being the President.

The WAPBA is recognised as the legitimate collective 'voice' of the public broadcasting sector in Western Australia
APPENDIX TWO

Western Australian Regional Stations Featuring Ethnic Radio Programs

Outside Perth, four regional stations produce programs with ethnic content. The three commercial stations are:

6VA Albany - featuring an Italian language program.

6WA Katanning - produces Malay program and relays Italian program from 6VA.

6NW Port Hedland - produces Malay program which is relayed to Karratha, Tom Price & Paraburdoo.

Newman Community Radio Incorporated runs station 6NEW. Indian, Croatian, Yugoslav and Scottish programs are produced. The premises and equipment are provided by Mt Newman Mining Company, but the company does not interfere with programming.

Management stipulates programs must be presented in both English and the community language to prevent isolation of the broader community.
APPENDIX THREE

Interview Listing

4/5/90 Alex Lutero, President of the Multicultural Radio and Television Association of WA.

8/10/90 Macedonian Respondent

10/10/90 Chinese Respondent

16/10/90 German Respondent

Telephone Interviews

8/10/90 Indian Respondent

26/11/90 Production and distribution department of SBS to determine budget for ethnic radio. The total budget for SBS radio for the 89/90 financial year was $12,552,000. This, however, incorporates both government funding and revenue received, although it was stated approx $12 million was granted by government.

26/11/90 Deborah Collings from the Public Broadcasting Foundation, Melbourne stated the annual budget for 1989/1990, received from government was
$1.15 million. This figure included subsidy allocation and establishment costs for new public broadcasting stations. Of the $1.146 million granted in the year 1988/1989, $74,000 was granted to both 3ZZZ Melbourne and 6EBA Perth. She couldn’t determine how much subsidy 6EBA would receive for programming. This figure would be established once broadcasting commenced.
APPENDIX FOUR

Interview Schedule

1. What are the specific needs of your community?

2. Are these needs being met?

3. Do you feel restrained by policy stipulations?

4. What language/s do you broadcast in?

5. How did you get involved with ethnic radio broadcasting?

6. Were you satisfied with the service offered on 6NR?

7. Will your program format be the same on the new station?

8. Do you believe multiculturalism will be promoted on the new station?
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