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Abstract

The physical adaptation, remaking and maintenance, or building of the house plays a significant role in immigrants' sense of belonging to a community, especially in contexts of first generation elderly immigrants with minimal English language skills. Psychoanalytic theories propose that objects are integral to a subject's identity, but that the path of effect between the subject and object is not causal or direct, rather it goes via the unconscious. This paper seeks to examine the relationship between immigrants and their houses through these theories adapting them to an analysis of the houses. It draws its data from field research of three elderly immigrant households. The iconography of the house has always been perceived as central to the analysis of dreams, here the thesis is that the house is the most significant object of the immigrant because it mediates the many worlds inherent to the migrant's imaginary landscapes. The analysis will seek to understand this role of the house.

Secondly, while many houses in which migrants live can barely be differentiated in clear physical ways from the typology of houses built in Australia, the perception that they are different is a strong myth. At the least it has resulted in very little, if any, study of this vernacular of new Australian houses. It would be easy to argue that to build a house in Australia is the most important mode of assimilation because a way of life is intrinsically set by this suburban paradigm. But for the reason of this perception of difference I will explore an idea about ethnic aesthetics as a mode of resisting assimilation. In writing on taste in his seminal book, Distinction, the
sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, has argued that taste is a way of classifying people into classes, race, culture, but it is also a way for dominant and ruling classes to resist challenges from other parties, and maintain a particular hierarchy of society. In this case those other parties are ethnic communities in Australia whose tastes are not always the same as that of the dominant Anglo-Celtic community.

Introduction

Sociology is rarely more akin to social psychoanalysis than when it confronts an object like taste, one of the most vital stakes in the struggles fought in the field of the dominant class and the field of cultural production.¹

The sociologist Pierre Bourdieu has written his seminal book Distinction to explain the ways in which aesthetic taste gives appearance to a division of classes, and is an instrument in the reproduction of that class division. Bourdieu’s theories attempt to reconcile the gap between the objective world of structures, products, systems, and the subjective world of the individual and choice. His analysis of taste reveals the entangled web between the objective and the subjective worlds. An individual is located within society (or as Bourdieu called it social space) through their objects, a person’s taste functions to correlate with an individual’s ‘sense of place’ and fit in society. But an individual is also born into an aesthetic tradition and setting; taste is internalised and embodied, and from that social origin has specific access to education fields. This embodied sense of aesthetic can result in “disgust provoked by horror or visceral intolerance (sick-making) of the taste of others.”²

This paper seeks to examine the houses of three elderly immigrant households as a question about the importation of new ethnic aesthetic taste into a context of a dominant Australian taste. Post-war non-British immigration caused a sharp shift from homogeneity to great cultural diversification in Australia. Melbourne was transformed by a southern European
The physical adaptation, remaking and maintenance of the house plays a significant role in immigrants’ sense of belonging to a community, especially in contexts of elderly immigrants with minimal English language skills, who have worked on their houses for decades. Visual analysis of the houses draws on the stories of the inhabitants developed through interviews and from theories that inform critical modes of looking. The objective of the analysis is to investigate the ongoing making of the house as an embodied identity, and how the house extends and mediates the elderly immigrant’s relation to the community and other places of reference.

The house as object

The houses of the three elderly households include House A, a very small timber workers’ cottage; House B, a double fronted weatherboard cottage; and House C, a 1960s brick veneer house (see Figure 1). Historically and stylistically each house correlates with an Australian house style: House A correlates with timber row housing imported from England and built in Australia in the early 1900s; House B was probably built circa 1910-1920 and is a hybrid example, sometimes called ‘Cheap Federation’; and House C follows the brick veneer models of the post-war period.

Two important factors tie these households with normative Australian practices. The first is that all the households own their house. It is argued, Australia is centrally associated with the acquisition of a house. Secondly, House A and House B are houses available as housing stock that is already built prior to the immigration of the households. House C, is a little more...
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complex, but it is also part of the brick veneer developments of post-war housing stock. The houses are not architect designed, rather they are part of an Australian vernacular tradition, a curious category as it is largely a housing stock built by developers. There is extensive literature on the Australian house, and significantly more on the non-architect designed house. Much of this literature elaborates on décor, interiors, gardens, and all other applied aesthetics that is the result of the inhabitants’ aesthetic preference. From the abundance and tone of this literature it can be stated that Australia is preoccupied with its identity. The impact of migration, the way of life of the migrant inhabitants, their taste and traditions imported from cultures other than England and Ireland is barely noted in this body of knowledge.

There are a few exceptions. The affects of migration and migrant inhabitation on the house is noted in Housing in Australia, a study guide about housing that takes a social perspective of architecture. It is a unique publication that exemplifies a position associated with the 1980s (when it was published), at the height of Australia’s multicultural policies.

Apperly et al’s publication has a two-page spread entitled, Late Twentieth Century Immigrants Nostalgic which notes the balustrades and arches as symbolic of success in the new country and proposes this is an aesthetic imported from migrants’ homelands. These two pages are directly preceded by two pages on Late Twentieth Century Australian Nostalgic, referring to the resurgence of ‘colonial’ styles of earlier homestead architecture. Further analysis of this historical coincidence between the Australian and Immigrant Nostalgic (that architectural discourse seems to have overlooked) is material for further analysis, suffice to state here that in the names Australian or Immigrant, the authors unwittingly reveal the unspoken foundation of an Australian aesthetic that is constituted prior to and against a so-called immigrant aesthetic. In addition the heritage movement generated the classification of buildings of the first half of the twentieth century, and thereby established a foundation for ‘good taste’ in architecture as directly associated with an aesthetic heritage.
that primarily originated in England; and secondarily and with a distinctive hierarchy, the houses of the 1920s that emerged from America.

The production, publication, dissemination and policy making (such as neighbourhood character) is what Bourdieu terms ‘cultural capital’. This field of Australian domestic architecture defines a dominant aesthetic taste evident in many fields: lifestyle, biography, history, production of goods, access to the products, collection of objects. Bourdieu outlines the idea of symbolic capital as containing economic capital (wealth), social capital (education) and cultural capital (social origin), but highlights the significance of social origin as a defining mechanism of taste and class. A crucial component of Bourdieu’s theory is the capacity of ‘social actors’ to produce this scholarship and interest of a particular aesthetic and actively impose their symbolic systems. Social actors - historians, historical practitioners, and concerned citizens - reproduce social structures of domination. The effect is what Bourdieu calls ‘symbolic violence’. Imposing a dominant aesthetic ensures a legitimacy of social structures because: 1) it ignores the arbitrariness of the social order, a mis-recognition of power relations (one’s social origins are the key to their cultural capital); 2) it assumes the hierarchy is a natural order (only we should have access to architectural history and heritage because only we can appreciate the artistic content). The violence is that dominant aesthetic taste renders other architectural traditions both undesirable and through the mechanisms outlined above without architectural history.

Two decades of interdisciplinary theories, conceptual frameworks about place, history, and identity borrowed from cultural theory, and five decades of impact of southern European immigration and settlement has not closed the chasm in Australian architectural historiography. Recent studies illustrate how symbolic violence is illustrated by the manifestations of Australia as a multicultural society. The celebrated sociologist Ghassan Hage has argued that there are two types of multiculturalism. Cosmo-multiculturalism is the classy, sophisticated, cosmopolitan multiculturalism evident in official displays and manifested in people’s choice of restaurant or food. It is conscious of the international field
and is associated with a privileged globalisation – a cosmopolitan aesthetic that has access to the world both in the world and at home (in Fitzroy and Carlton). The other, inhabited multiculturalism is a lived condition, lived in by migrants, it is lower class, and involves ordinary home cooking. Hage critiques cosmo-multiculturalism as a multiculturalism without migrants, arguing that the subject of this type of multiculturalism desires an abundance of otherness without others, for his/her own satisfaction of diversity. Hage draws on Bourdieu’s framework about taste to establish the ways in which cosmopolitan subjects become high-priests of taste producing a class differentiated map of taste that will define restaurants and other local places as desirable or undesirable.

Good taste in architecture produces a map of the suburbs and architecture that is of interest or disinterest to a community that values a range of aesthetics from popular and kitsch to high architecture (including heritage, retro and the new super luxurious). Particular styles of facade, garden, interiors and backyards are deemed worthy and produce hierarchies of property value. As terrazzo and the summer kitchen have slipped into this map via cosmo-multiculturalism, will their prior manifestation in the migrant house be missed altogether?

The migrant house is perceived as undesirable. Many houses in which migrants live can barely be differentiated in clear physical ways, or canonical architectural ways, from the typology of houses built in Australia. However, the perception that they are different is a strong myth. Immigration policies presented immigration as something that would fill the undesirable gaps of Australian society. A house is an important mode of assimilation because a way of life evoked in Boyd’s ‘pioneering cult’ is intrinsically set by this suburban paradigm. The veranda and the backyard have become its iconographic elements. Yet writings on immigration and housing have noted a fear that immigrants would compete for housing stock. Fear may also be about the development of a different Australia, one that would be produced through a proliferation of a different aesthetic, and a different way of life. The Australian house becomes a contested terrain in relation to immigration.
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In the next section I will explore the idea about ethnic aesthetic as a mode of resisting assimilation. The migrant house is perceived to have introduced new aesthetic traditions and generated, not assimilation processes, but fields of multiculturalism. In addition the migrant house is symbolic of an un-Australian way of life, an architecture that engenders different modes of dwelling. These two ideas are linked by thinking about aesthetic taste as an embodied and everyday aesthetic, something that appears to be the manifestation of everyday dwelling practices.

Ethnic (Household) Aesthetics

Household A arrived in Australia in 1969 after migrations to Canada and France; Household B arrived in 1968; and Household C arrived in 1954. All households are working class immigrants and Macedonian ethnicity. All the houses are located in Northcote, a suburb within 7km of the CBD of Melbourne.15

The façade of House A presents unusual colours – turquoise and brown – in a juxtaposition that highlights their contrast; and mixtures of materials – perforated metal, timber panelling (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Fragments of Otherness
Resisting Assimilation:
The Mild Aesthetics and Wild Perceptions of the Migrant House

The house is not extensively renovated – it still has its timber window frame and its timber wall. The fence and gate have been replaced. Even so the house is perceived to be other than, or worse, a bastardisation of a Victorian worker’s cottage. Thus while the house is nearly the same, it is not exactly the same as other houses that have participated in the heritage movement of reviving colonial style architecture. It is also not so different as to be perceived as a high artistic approach to façade aesthetic. The difference is slight, but it is this ‘not quite the same’ that tends to loom large in the perception of the appearance of the house. The heritage imperative becomes the mask of ruling class or ‘ruling ethnicity’ taste, in the silent battle of aesthetic taste and national culture. After my study, House A was sold for a relative low cost. In two years after its sale, it was stripped of all details of its migrant aesthetic, all colours and all textures – this process represents the symbolic violence that Bourdieu has identified. The house reappeared back on the market, this time as an object of considered heritage renovation. It was sold again at twice what the new owners had paid. Otherness appears in the inner Australian suburbs as an aesthetic applied to existing housing stock, confusing, resisting, or protesting against assumed British origins. Evident in the differential of property value is the way aesthetic taste operates at dividing class along ethnicity.

Looking and ways of seeing has been a field of extensive investigation, especially through postcolonial theory. Psychoanalytic theorist Kaja Silverman offers an approach to visual analysis that identifies the power of the image, and yet attempts to overcome the subjugating effects of the western gaze critiqued in postcolonial theory. The visual domain is central to the domain of human subjects and identity, but Silverman suggests looking has to involve effort and a painstaking process of reversing positions of subjugation, reversing both taking what is not ours, and projecting onto others what we might not like in ourselves. While such re-viewing is limited, it is a necessary step for the subject to be positioned in an ethical or non-violent relation to the other. The visual documentation and analysis of the three houses and households in this study is an attempt to engage with this level of viewing representations of the other.
The male inhabitant of House A has described his house as “чурук кугляд,” a house that is bad, difficult and not good quality. He talked about his discomfort with the house in addition to a discomfort within the house, a discomfort that was particularly evident as a lack of fit with the house. The male inhabitant was in his early 90s when the interviews were conducted, and had lived in the house for more than 30 years. The colours and textures were efforts to make something better of this bad house. For the male inhabitant, House A becomes a stubborn and defiant object that he is unable to transform into a good house or in ideal terms, a beautiful object.

The migrant façade of House A has disappeared and is now represented as documented images. It is a different aesthetic approach to House C, where the baroque balustrade of pre-cast concrete already denotes a migrant cultural reference. In House C, like House B, a new nature mediates the space between the street and the house (see Figure 4), and provides the setting for the white balustrade.

Nature is manicured to emphasise order, and a control of nature through linearity and shape. We are good observers, our sense of taste picks up minutiae of differences almost as

Figure 3. New Nature interface between street and house
sensory perception. In contrast to the inherited English style garden or the emerging romanticism of the native Australian garden (revived in the 1970s), this migrant garden presents a disturbing aesthetic, introducing a new relationship between architecture and nature/landscape. Sculpted bushes mix with exotic deciduous trees, and with varieties of pine trees, fruit trees, cacti and flowers, each individually accentuated by the whitish ground of the pebbles. It is a garden, an artifice of manicured nature rather than an image of real nature. The brick veneer house is not cream, a colour associated with something essentially Australian. It is a deep burnt orange wire cut brick. Its severe architectural order and hard-edged fabricated look is much more manufactured and brutal than the neighbouring context of Edwardian and Victorian cottages. If the adjective artificial most captures the disturbing nature of this perception, it is because this unfit garden recalls and mirrors back to the viewer the process of constructing the original stage set of colonial settlement. Nature is used to define what is Australian and what is un-Australian, but these operate through the unresolved matrix of dominant taste linked to the history of colonisation.

After moving to a larger house further northeast, Household C returned to House C, a house on the same street as the house they left. House C is built by immigrants of Italian origins, and is in a small enclave of 1960s orange brick veneer houses built after 1962 when a parcel of the property owned by the nearby convent (Little Sisters of the Poor) was sold and subdivided. Smooth wire-cut brick facades, large and clean steel/aluminium windows, and spacious terraces (double fronted, triple fronted), along with new materials – concrete, terrazzo, pebbling – provided imagery of different cultures, other customs, other ways of living. Anecdotes about everything being made out of concrete – tables, benches, barbecues, sinks – give a particular picture of a new Australian vernacular constructed from imported building skills and architectural traditions.

In the 1960s, the urban fabric of Northcote would not have reflected and accounted for the history and cultural background of the households. The construction of new migrant houses produced an environment that alleviated an experience of acute alienation. In contrast to
other parts of Melbourne, Northcote has been a destination for migrants of Southern European origins, and has developed a much more hybrid urban and architectural appearance.\textsuperscript{20}

Enclaves and House-worlds

The house is a pragmatic and fictional construction and involves memories, desires and fantasy.\textsuperscript{21} The manifestation of the inhabitants’ ideas results in new physical conditions and these new materialities produce an extension of the migrant’s sense of being and the migrant’s sense of agency. The house becomes a product that symbolises belonging: space appropriated has laid a foundation for inhabitation, and the house as cultural product extends into the social and cultural fields that is Australia.

The fathers of psychoanalysis, Lacan and Freud, propose that the human subject is split between the Object like narcissistic Being (Moi) and the Speaking subject (Je).\textsuperscript{22} A human subject is not a progressive trajectory from childhood to adulthood, but is stretched over all its four corners; in Lacan’s Schema L (Moi) gives rise to and remains entwined with (Je) for a subject’s life (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Lacan’s Schema L](image-url)
Thus (Moi) might reappear through an object (like the house) in a context in which (Je) operating through language is suppressed because it has undergone trauma (migration, change of language). The house becomes a significant object for the migrant because it acts as the object that mediates the imaginary relations of the human subject. These include relations to family members left behind, and family members in the house, especially children. The house as significant object mediates what is called in psychoanalytic theory, the big Other. At the unconscious level this includes the mother and the motherland left behind; and in relation to the migrant’s present context, the symbolic order of Australia, and being Australian.

While the ubiquitous suburban block imposes a strict matrix of single house morphology, it unwittingly allows for a proliferation of private world configurations, generating ‘worlds within the house’ or house-worlds. House B has a “бавча,” a vibrant and large vegetable garden, mature trees that offer shade and relief from the heat, and flowers. This is typically assumed to be a reconstruction of the homeland. But household B were urban dwellers before migrating to Australia. This other world is not one that is literally imported from the homeland, but an enclave of a lively nature, produced and existing within the framework of an immigrant house and a Macedonian Diaspora in Australia. House B also houses two dogs and many birds. The aviary is a secret world in the rear space. Exotic sounds and glimpses of exotic colour erupt, altering the sterile and silent nature of the suburban landscape. Furry and feathery creatures and flora may represent a way of construing the homeland through the more primal affects of instinct and the senses, an imaginative and fictional landscape world by and for the migrant. The house-worlds of the migrant move beyond the trajectory of assimilation and the stereotypical migrant story.

The view from the first storey rear terrace of House C is a view of the convent to the north, a hybrid mixture of Italianate and Gothic revival architecture, and the exotic deciduous trees adorning its gardens, accentuated by a rising topography. In this picturesque image, neighbouring houses are partially screened out of view by trees (see Figure 5).
Figure 5. Enclave of another world House C

A historical interpretation of this image may connect it to the picturesque movement that was prevalent in England in the 1750s, but it is important to consider the image from the perspective of the immigrant inhabitants. In almost every post-war and 1960s immigrant household of Southern European background a technicolour print of surreal Italian landscape decorated at least one interior wall. The real landscape view of the convent is a vista that triggers imaginative projections of somewhere else, an imaginary place in southern Europe.

House C has three terraces. The perspective of the street is from a raised position, shifting the worldview – raising it from the ground and street. Indeed the balcony at the entry is cantilevered above the garden. It appears to hover, an effect accentuated by the foreground of foliage. In these ways the migrant house operates as a mechanism for crossing distance and manipulating geographic space. On arrival to Australia migrant stories reveal a disappointment about the diminished scale of the existing houses, and their low setting on the ground. Lifting the house above the ground is a repeated practice evident in migrant houses.26 Lifting the house above the plane of the Australian suburban street has engendered a space of mediation between imaginary and real landscapes. The house
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extends in imaginary ways back to the homeland and simultaneously into the street and the morphological pattern of settlement. The house also extends genealogically into the future generations of the migrants' children and grandchildren. The house finally extends as an image – an image that impacts on the aesthetic range of what it is to be Australian.

The interior of House A appears formal through lack of use. Overlayed onto this formal order is a layer of privacy expressed by drawn curtains and blinds making the front rooms darker than is necessary. The privacy seems to be about concealment, there is an interior hidden deep within the enveloping layers of the house. Paraphernalia of objects and photographs of a life history that is of another world belongs in this space as representation, not as presence. It is difficult to explain the life stories as they do not fit or resonate in the present Australian contexts. In contrast to the darker shades of privacy, the kitchen of House A is a naturally lit space, where informality is revealed in the traces of inhabitation, and the ease with which the male inhabitant seated himself on the chair to have a conversation. This was a lived space of everyday conversation during the preparation of a meal. He later sat in quiet contemplation.

Building Dwelling

Subject-object relations are re-invigorated through the repetitive nature of building, adapting, making and maintenance of the migrant house. But the tendency for the migrant is that it becomes a preoccupation, an endless process of attending to the house. “чурук кук ,” captures an idea that the object resists the subject's adaptations. In Vladivostok, John Hejduk illustrates battle scenes between subject and object, presenting each as the symmetrical image of the other. Contrary to ideas that the subject is strategic and animates the object, these illustrations express ways in which the mute object draws the subject into a dynamic being. Tadao Ando elaborates on the idea that the process of inhabitation involves battles with the house, the inhabitant attempting to find ways to live with it as an object. Ando is not arguing about the function of the house, but about dwelling with and within the house. Ad-hoc building illustrates more directly the ways that House A takes shape around dwelling
practices. Bits of enclosure are added as needed; each part is lined and surfaced according to its use. However, it would be a mistake to think that this was generated entirely by necessity or function. House A has made demands on the migrant. Much of the building is an outcome of the necessity to make, a need to find and project oneself into a new realm, to make space for a migrant subjectivity.

Migrants of the generation in this study have been exceptional at using skills in and around the house that otherwise remained invisible in their ‘unskilled’ jobs. Carpentry, plumbing, painting, concreting, and joinery work are skills that post-war migrants used in adapting, improving and maintaining their houses. The building is an ongoing exercise of skill. However, the incapacity to make House A a good house reveals the subject’s struggle with a given aesthetic. In House A a very long and narrow strip of space between the house and the wall of the neighbour’s house is used for storage of timber and other building materials. House C illustrates a similar use of the space underneath the rear terrace, between the retaining wall of the garden and the door to the lower ground floor. The house itself becomes a way of storing materials and equipment that are necessary for its maintenance and remaking.

Figure 6. Summer Kitchen – House B
Alterations and extensions engender new types of social spaces that are often in between the inside and the outside of the house.

An external kitchen and sitting area in House B illustrates how the house takes shape around dwelling practices about cooking outside. Messy cooking for all the winter foods, and summer cooking to avoid heating up the interior, and to avoid smells inside has led to construction of a liminal space, a new sitting area near the back door (see Figure 6). There are mixed levels of interiority and exteriority in this space and mixed levels of formality in social interaction. One part of the floor has a linoleum surface, the other part is concrete; one part of the space is roofed and articulated through doors and walls, the other is open to the garden. It is a less formal space than the rooms of the interior. Through this liminal space the house becomes a particular kind of lived social space. The external summer kitchen has developed as a key component of the migrant house.

Underlying the pragmatic actions of building is a capacity to bring to realization an idea or vision. Imagination is central to this process. It involves drawing upon images collected from external and internal references, extending the scope and landscape of the migrant identity. These constructive processes are tailored by the habits of dwelling, recreated, remembered and amended.

The interface between the house and the street is partly illustrated in the sections of the houses. House A, like all the other workers’ cottages is set very close to the street, under two metres setback. One resident of House A is over 90 years old, and often potters in front of his house, sits on a bench with a neighbour, or talks to a neighbour leaning on the street side of the fence. The residents of House B often sit on the front veranda of their weatherboard cottage to have a cup of coffee. The solid baluster alteration to the veranda allows for concealment, so that they are not directly exposed to the gaze of passers-by. In other similar houses this space remains empty, and serves to separate the private space from the street.
House C (built by immigrants) articulates this in a more expressive way through the spacious terrace that is above the garage. Significantly, all houses engender neighbourly interaction, and/or brief greetings to strangers walking on the street, by orienting their social space to the front of the house, rather than only through the backyard.

House C is in a direct relation to the neighbouring house to the east via the spatial extension of the terrace. Spacious terraces of the neighbouring house, reciprocates this gesture of extension producing an architectural dialogue. Separation through elevation is counteracted by the spatial extension of the terraces. The terraces are generous spaces and are visibly dominant elements in the 1960s brick veneer house typology. Current planning policies designed to prevent overlooking result in defensive small balconies, in direct contradiction to this significant architectural element of the terraces in migrant houses.

Historiography

If historiography is a way of picturing Australian history, the picture of the elderly immigrants and their houses presents a historiography of an Australia other to that in present publications. This is not the ubiquitous image of the colonial homestead, nor the image of the workers’ cottages with their first inhabitants, nor the image of lamingtons and vegemite sandwiches and the quintessential suburban house. Nor is it the historiography of more scholarly and less stereotypical research. Historiography is also the pictures historians paint of the past. Bourdieu’s statement that “taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier,” points to the delicate subjectivity of writing and picturing history. The historian assumes an objective position via a scientific methodology of detailed association, but the best of historians have to pass by the subjectivity of taste in order to see a different picture of history. The house takes on a significance that is due to the measure of time and due to the role it plays in the immigrant’s identity. That it is an artefact gives it a platform for historiography. The migrant has built his/her own testimony of existence and his/her own platform for symbolic subjectivity. The house demonstrates that the migrant has a history both within and outside of Australia. The study of these three houses and households is just a tiny fragment of the historiography of immigration and the house.
Identity mediated by making and organization extends the migrant into the broader social system and social field. The migrant is not merely an unskilled labourer and consumer, but a figure capable of many skilled productions and of imagination. Affirmative processes involve the shift from a sense of being acted upon, to a sense of acting on (an idea); from inadequacy and lowliness to capacity and making. In engaging with the physicality of the house, the migrant has unwittingly produced a new aesthetic. The house as an artefact impacts on public space. The public nature of architecture means that appearances and facades are important – they signify aesthetic preferences and the tastes of people. The appearances of the three houses in this study are examples of how the migrant houses have altered the imaginary capacity of what Australia might look like. However, anxieties lurking in the shadows strike at the constitution of culture itself: appearances signify the contexts for knowledge, language and nationalism. What Australia looks like depends on which Australian houses are represented.

Endnotes

4 This paper is based on interviews and visual field research with three elderly couples who have lived in their houses for a long time (25 years or more). The research was completed in 2001. In addition to Bourdieu’s theories, the conceptual framework is developed through the theories about social space in Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1974/1991); and Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life, trans. S.F. Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).


12 See lack of interest in books in footnote 7, 8 and 9.


16 A 1996 census has revealed that 47% of residents of Darebin (includes Northcote) speak a language other than English in their home.


23 This is one reason why immigrants of English speaking backgrounds are not symbolically nor at levels of subjectivity the same kind of immigrant as those of non-English speaking backgrounds.

24 The Macedonian word “бача” (Bavcha) refers specifically to a vegetable garden.
The idea of edible landscape made popular with new environmental paradigms makes no reference to this history of the “бавчи”.

