Chapter V

IDEOLOGIES UNDERPINNING THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM

In previous Chapters the structure of the Australian income maintenance system has been described the assumptions which underpin that structure examined. In this Chapter the intention is to go beyond this by detailing the ideologies which inform the income maintenance system and then to discuss the impact which these ideologies have on the mode of distribution (1).

The development of the Australian welfare system by the various governments of the day has been informed by prevailing and at times quite specific ideologies of welfare. Often there has been a combination of differing ideological forces which have come together to give form to the welfare provisions which have been enacted in this country. In the literature a number of distinct ideologies of welfare have been recognised, and in the Australian context conservative, liberal, social-democrat, Marxist and feminist ideologies have been the foci for discussion and analysis.* I will discuss each of them briefly, describing their central features and note instances where specific ideologies have heavily influenced welfare provisions. As will be observed conservative, liberal and social-democratic views have had a major impact on social welfare policy formation, but feminism has in recent years had a growing influence.

* The central tenets of conservatism, liberalism, social-democracy, Marxism and feminist theory are derived from a discussion of them in Appendix B.

The importance which feminist insights bring to the welfare debate derives from the identification of the gender bias which, though seldom acknowledged, is omnipresent in conservative, liberal, social-democratic and Marxist ideologies and the welfare provisions to which they give rise. The feminist critique exposes the ideological positions inherent in present policies by showing how they promote existing unequal relations of power. This aspect is particularly clear in the feminist analysis of the role of the family in welfare policies.

As mentioned above, specific ideologies may substantially influence the form a particular welfare payment takes but it is more common to observe a conglomeration of ideological features having an impact upon the social welfare provisions which various governments have implemented. In examining some of the intricacies of this process it becomes clear that a political party's commitment to conservative, liberal, social-democratic or Marxist positions can only account in part for the unique way in which the Australian social welfare system has developed. Other ideological forces have substantially affected its evolution.

The other ideologies which have made a considerable impact upon the style of social welfare we have in this country are clearly reflected in the social fabric of the nation. Apart from class, the central features which structure and underpin unequal relations of power in Australian society are gender, race, age and locality. These structural features influence almost all aspects of social interaction. Being a woman, a child, old, an Aborigine, or living in an isolated area creates a less valued status than being a city-based, white, middle-aged male. These status positions affect access to power, wealth, employment, education, health services and other community provided programs. These structural features are central to Australian existence and have given rise to particular ideological forms which underlie discrimination on the basis of these characteristics. Sexism, racism, ageism and urbanism are the terms applied to describe the mind sets which are associated with discrimination on the basis of gender, race, age and locality. The Chapter
concludes by showing how these features have influenced the form which the Australian social welfare system takes.

**Conservative Perspectives**

The central elements of conservative social theory are support for traditional values, defence of the established order, the sanctity of private property, a belief in the inherent imperfection of human beings and an abhorrence of planned social change. These views are organised around a commitment to a perceived common good as defined by the ruling elite.

In Australia, conservatives have had a considerable influence upon the design and delivery of social welfare, perhaps nowhere more clearly than in the area of defining eligibility requirements for welfare payments. Here they have been able to insist that applicants have to establish they are in need. They have been able to create a division in the public mind between the needy and the greedy. This distinction derives from the process of less eligibility, so much a part of the poor law administration in 19th century England. It was this distinction which provided the basis for the dole bludger campaigns of the Fraser years. Conservatives are concerned that the supply of welfare payments by the state weakens recipients' attachment to traditional loyalties because unlike traditional charity organisations the state does not clearly spell out a requirement that the recipient observe all the expected social proprieties.

Conservatives take from their belief in the sanctity of property the idea that thrift should be enforced as a part of the requirements expected of welfare clients. It is a combination of the promotion of thrift and an insistence that the concept of less eligibility should be a central principle in the supply of welfare services which causes conservatives to make a firm distinction between those they deem worthy and those considered unworthy. The insistence on thrift allows conservatives to limit the amount of benefits paid to individuals and their determination not to pay to the unworthy lowers the number of people paid.

That such conservative views still have currency is exemplified by Lieutenant Colonel Ian Cutmore in the front page lead article of The War Cry, which, as well as being Australia's largest circulation religious weekly, is the official organ of the Salvation Army...

"Another sign of our self-centred attitude to life is our tendency to look to government for sustenance and security. The cost of this in money is staggering and for the first time in two decades we are all feeling the pinch. But what can one say about the cost in morale and self-esteem? We are not a 'begging bowl' people. We ought to fight against any pending explosion of self-interest and selfishness."(2)

Alex Simpson, Executive Director, Institute of Public Affairs (NSW) goes further than Cutmore in claiming that some categories of welfare recipients, such as supporting parents, are unworthy. He asks

"should governments subsidise those who choose to adopt an unorthodox lifestyle and at an ever increasing cost to those who do not?; or, should governments, to a far greater extent, require that people themselves meet the costs and consequences of their actions? Unlike the aged, the mentally and physically handicapped, the veterans and the widows, who have no control over the circumstances that require them to seek a government benefit, the Institute considers that supporting parents are, in effect, asking the community to compensate them for circumstances arising out of arrangements into which they have quite voluntarily entered and which have not worked out."(3)
The conservative attachment to traditional values will be further examined in this Chapter in relation to family policy and aspects of social control. Conservatives, and to a lesser extent liberals, see the control functions of the welfare systems as a benefit in so far as they help assure stability conformity and maintain traditional relationships*.

**Liberal Ideology**

The liberal position is notable for its reliance upon individualism, freedom, self-help, constitutionalism, property, progress and the free play of market forces. Liberalism has become modern capitalism's official ideology yet it is also the justifying ideology of the welfare state in England, the United States(4) and

* The relationship between need, supply of benefits and social control is examined in Appendix C.

Australia. Liberals reject the organic conception of society. They see the formation of society as the outcome of competing market forces. Liberals whilst not wanting to interfere with market mechanisms, are in favour of much bigger government than are conservatives. Where conservatives want less welfare both in terms of scope and levels of assistance, liberals tend to see more of some types of welfare as beneficial (5).

The liberal beliefs in progress and self-help come together in the ideological assumption that whenever there is development some of the benefits of economic expansion will accrue to the poorer members of society as well as to the more affluent. Liberal commentators have made an assumption that increases in allocation of money to social programs is dependent upon continued economic expansion(6). W.C.Wentworth, a past Liberal Minister for Social Security, believed this(7). Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, also a past Liberal Minister of Social Security, held firmly to this view(8).

Whilst it is clear that sufficient capacity to afford welfare programs is a necessary component in their implementation, increase in wealth in any society is not of itself a sufficient condition to ensure that progressive redistribution from the rich to the poor will occur(9). Liberals, whilst supporting differing rewards, find themselves hard pressed to "justify" some inequalities within the welfare system. It has already been noted that some liberals support government intervention in the market place in order to modify the excesses of capital and to cope with misfortune. The concern with equity finds some support within the liberal camp. Concern about disadvantage derives from a wish to treat equitably those "in need" whom liberals deem to be worthy(10). It is a very qualified form of concern about equity which finds its support provided by either an underlying humanism modified by liberals' commitment to individualism or a commitment to the individual qualified by humanism.

**Social Democrat Perspectives**

Whereas liberals have some attachment to the concept of equity, the social democratic position is aligned with other forces striving towards equality. Socialists particularly those of a Marxist persuasion, regard equality as a prime and immediate goal: social democrats, on the other hand, see themselves working towards its attainment at some time in the future. Equality,
government intervention, representative government and the peaceful transition to socialism are the hallmark of the social-democratic tradition.

Social-democrats welcome the extension of the welfare system. They see it as the mechanism which ensures social stability and which delivers to the working class the social wage, as the method of coping with diswelfares (11). The welfare system is seen as the vehicle for the relief of distress and poverty which in the future has the capacity to reform the capitalist system into a humanitarian egalitarian welfare society. This is so despite the presence in this camp of writers like Titmuss who are conscious of the very limited nature of transfer of income across class boundaries via the welfare system and the major differences in benefits flowing to superannuated and other well-off groups compared with the benefits obtained by ordinary working people through the welfare system(12).

In Australia the last flowering of the social-democratic ideology in social welfare was during the Whitlam era, when with Bill Hayden as Minister for Social Services, Supporting Mothers Benefit was introduced, the clause which allowed officers of the Department of Social Security to reject applicants because "they were not deemed worthy" was abolished, and the government set in chain a number of social inquiries with a view to improving workers compensation and the social welfare system generally. I worked in the Department at the time and the mood changed from being there to ensure that people did not get more than they were entitled, to a feeling that people should get their entitlement.

**Marxist Ideologies**

The central values of Marxism are equality, fraternity and freedom. Marxists are opposed to private ownership, the unregulated play of market forces, individualism, privilege and inequality; all of which they see as forms of exploitation. There are Marxists who see the concessions obtained through the working class struggle within the state as the price of social peace, or the price of peaceful social control, and therefore a bar to the eventual socialist victory. However other Marxists share with many conservatives the belief that, as well as buying temporary conformity, any reform has the potential to raise further demands. Miliband after stressing that a major role of the state is mitigation of disadvantage, goes on to say "reform and repression are tried simultaneously. These are not alternative options but complementary ones."(13)

Marxists are united in their belief that the welfare system in capitalist societies is incapable of moving the society towards an equitable distribution of wealth and income and most accept that it is not even capable of removing the gross inequities which exist because of the predisposition of the capitalist state to constantly attempt to increase rather than reduce inequalities(14). Whereas liberals see the welfare state as somewhat separate from the rest of the economic system, Marxists account for the restrictions on the redistributive power of the welfare system precisely because of the integrated nature of the welfare system within the mainstream economic processes(15).

In Australia Marxist social thought has not made a significant penetration in the sense that, whilst we are a mixed economy, we are overwhelmingly a capitalist society. There are many who work in the social welfare system who derive their criticism of the existing system from Marxist and socialist thought and who do endeavour to move that system towards equality of distribution, encourage unity within the ranks of recipients and create policies which allow recipients a greater freedom and choice. As these progressive workers struggle within the welfare system they are opposed by the majority of their comrades who are committed to less progressive social values. Within the foreseeable future in Australia it is likely that Marxism will simply remain as a yardstick against which to measure the prevailing benefit distribution system.
The only Australian social welfare payment which came close to meeting the Marxist determination to promote equality was Child Endowment, which at the time of its introduction in 1942 provided substantial and equal assistance to all guardians of children.

Feminist Perspectives

Feminists' central insight into the Australian welfare system derives from their experience of the fact that gender discrimination is basic to all human relationships. Feminists have argued that discrimination on the basis of gender is not peripheral to an understanding of power in this society but a core feature which structures social interaction. In relation to welfare payments such as the Supporting Parents Benefit, whilst acknowledging that ninety per cent of recipients of this payment are women, feminists have pointed out that the payment simply ensures that the majority of lone parents are maintained in poverty by the low levels of payment.

Another feature which has resulted in much discussion is the fact that it is women who are called upon to carry out most of the caring for children, the elderly and the incapacitated. This removes them at least temporarily from the paid workforce, undermining women's career prospects and paying them extremely badly for doing so. Adams, in an article entitled "The Compassion Trap" has surveyed many of the intricacies of this dilemma(16).

Perhaps the most successful assault on established patriarchal control waged by feminists in Australia in recent times has been in the area of child care. Central to feminists demand to be allowed to take their place alongside their male counterparts in paid employment is the associated requirement that an alternative has to be found to looking after children in their own homes. The Whitlam Government made the first tentative steps towards providing properly funded community based child care. The Hawke Labor Government has considerably expanded such programs. Feminists still have a considerable distance to go before Australians generally come to see that the provision of adequate child care is not a woman's issue but a responsibility of all Australians.

Associated with the issue of child care is the need for extra leave from paid employment associated with caring for children. Whitlam introduced maternity and paternity leave in the Commonwealth Public Service and whilst it will be some time before we will reach anything like the parental leave provisions in some Scandinavian countries, feminists can claim to have at least placed these issues on the Australian agenda(17).

In laying bare the patriarchal assumptions integral to the ideologies of conservatism, liberalism, social democracy and Marxism, feminists have exposed the sexist nature of the societies organised around these positions. They have shown that beyond other forms of control exerted upon welfare recipients patriarchy adds a further oppression on women, children and dependent men through its welfare programs. Understandably feminists have concentrated upon the family as the centrepiece of their analysis. In isolating the twin issues of dependency and intra-family repression feminists have added a new dimension to the way social scientists have come to look at the role of the Australian family. These issues will be discussed shortly in greater length. They are central to a proper understanding of the way in which the receipt of welfare benefit payments predisposes the client to enforced dependency and hence control. Feminists have made a considerable input into social welfare policy formulation during the period of the Hawke Government (for example, the Social Security Review and the Child Support Agency) but as will be argued further, feminist insights have been distorted in final policy pronouncements.
THE FAMILY AND IDEOLOGY

In order to understand the uses to which the concept of the family is put in discussions of social policy it will be necessary to take a second look at conservative, liberal, social-democrat and Marxist ideologies, this time for a review of their perspectives on the family.

Across the range of ideological positions the issue of the family in social policy has been and continues to be of central concern. The notion of "the family" has been used by the holders of various ideological views to promote very different ends. Land describing this process has commented that:

"In studying the development of social policy it is very noticeable that 'the family', whether defined as the small domestic group comprising parents and dependent children (the nuclear family), or as the wider kinship network of the extended family, is presented as a fragile institution which must be protected. The threat of destruction is sometimes seen to come from state social policies. In Britain, for example, the introduction of government-financed school meals, widow's pensions, old age pensions, and family allowances were all opposed on the grounds that such measures would seriously weaken the family."(18)
Conservative perspectives on the family

Conservatives' support of tradition and sexual restraint has led them to conceive of the maintenance of the family as of central importance. The family is the main vehicle for controlling reproduction and transferring property between generations. Support for the family is seen as a way to reinforce the importance of tradition hence the cliche "the family is the building block of the society".

Conservatives' support for the family* is not a general support for all families - it is support for a particular form of family: a man, a dependent wife, and the children of the marriage**.

Feminists term such a family structure "a stereotypical nuclear family". The general principles underlying conservative support for the family derives from what Wearing calls "the ideology of motherhood"(19), as exemplified in the following quotation:

* At other times and in other places conservatives have supported differing forms of families such as the extended family.

** There is an acceptance of the widow/widower and her/his children as fitting into this category. To some extent they will also accept the divorcee and his or her children - particularly if he or she were the party against whom no fault was attributed in the divorce proceedings. It is an interesting point that whilst fault was removed under the Family Law Act in 1975 it remains part of the Department of Social Security's Widows Pension determining processes. Australian conservatives also find acceptable some forms of extended family arrangements, such as a family caring for an aged relative - it is somewhat more than a happy coincidence that subsidies on granny flats save governments money compared with institutionalised care.
"Esther Doyle, State President, Catholic Women's League (NSW) presented a written submission to the Seminar outlining the League's Christian concept of family, including the concept of sacramental marriage. The submission gave no consideration to any other 'type of family' and stated that they 'do not believe that governments should encourage deviant relationships, particularly in the area of financial support'. In addition 'alternative lifestyles are not conducive to the stable growth of a nation'."

There is a tendency for conservatives to ignore the undesirable consequences of family life. For instance, the development of iron ore mining in the Pilbara region placed a number of extra pressures on the members of families who went to live in this area. The Western Australian Community Welfare Department was frequently approached by wives who wanted to leave the mining towns because they had come to fear assault by their husbands. The Department was approached mainly because wives' relatives and long-term friends did not live nearby. In 1982, Mr Hassell, Minister for Community Welfare in the conservative Liberal Country Party government in Western Australia, instructed Community Welfare staff in remote areas that they were not to assist women to leave remote townships until their husbands had been notified of the wife's intention to leave. The Minister claimed he was acting in support of family life but the effect of this instruction was to ensure the maintenance of patriarchal authority in families.

Conservatives criticise welfare programs such as the Supporting Parents Benefit on the grounds that it provides income for partners of a marriage who have left the marriage of their own free will. They see it leading to the increased break-up of marriages and undermining the importance of the institution of the family.

Unmarried parents who receive the Supporting Parents Benefit are also seen by conservatives as undermining the sanctity of marriage and thereby threatening the stability of the family. Conservatives in Australia urge a return to the pre-1973 situation where there was no Supporting Parents Benefit, and there was only the Widows Pension.

Liberal perspectives on the family

Liberals also support "the family" as the lynch-pin of their social welfare policy, but they are more accepting of a wider range of family structures than are conservatives. Their greater tolerance of diversity derives from their attachment to values such as freedom and individualism but they stop far short of supporting a libertarian position with regard to family structure. They maintain a firm attachment to the conservative view of the family as a sustaining force in the maintenance of traditional values. They are conscious too that "the family" is the institution through which property relations are maintained.

Liberals did not oppose the introduction of Supporting Parents Benefit. They came to see that there were a considerable number of families who were in an equivalent need situation but who were not serviced by the Widows Pension provisions. It was a Liberal-Country Party Government which in 1977 introduced the Supporting Parents Benefit. Labor had, in 1973, introduced the Supporting Mothers Benefit (discussed below in relation to social-democratic views of the family). The Supporting Parents Benefit extended to families in which the father was the sole parent, equivalent provisions to those existing in families where the lone parent was a woman. It would seem that equity was the prime value on which Liberals relied to justify this legislative extension.
Social democrat perspectives on the family

Social democrats have supported more libertarian forms of family arrangements than have liberals and conservatives; this is in keeping with the general thrust of their social policies towards more encompassing forms of welfare programs. Social democratic governments have generally relied on equity or equality principles when they have made improvements in social welfare provisions. Interestingly it was a very limited commitment to equality which the Australian Labor Government adopted when it introduced the Supporting Mothers Benefit in 1973. This benefit placed in virtually identical positions true widows and other women not living with a man in a bona fide domestic relationship who had the care, custody and control of dependent children, but it did nothing about men who were living on their own and raising children.

The argument in favour of Supporting Mothers Benefit was that the cost of bringing up children was the same inside or outside of wedlock. In many ways the justification for the legislative changes amounted to a needs assertion, the needs of the children, rather than a reliance upon an equity comparison between true widows and unmarried mothers. The logic of this argument was easily capable of being extended to include the needs of children being brought up by lone fathers - but this logic was not reflected in the legislation. Jones suggests that Treasury advice had been that to introduce a benefit which included father-headed families would be too expensive (due to the number of sole fathers caring for children)(23). The main political thrust of welfare agencies and client groups at the time had been to highlight the plight of dependent female-headed families who, in fact, comprise ninety per cent of Supporting Parent Beneficiaries. Shortly after the Supporting Mothers Benefit was introduced, other client groups and welfare agencies began to highlight the lack of equity between the provisions applying to sole female parents and lone fathers.

Some feminists explained the Labor government's failure to introduce a Supporting Parents Benefit as being in keeping with most of the other welfare payments made by various Federal governments since their entry into the field(24). They argued that the prevailing patriarchal arrangements presented as caring for or protecting the interests of women and children are the very techniques by which men, through the state, control women. To have men, albeit lone fathers, paid by the state to enact caring "mothering" roles with their children, would confront head-on aspects of patriarchal dominance.

Socialist and Marxist perspectives on the family

Socialists and Marxists are conscious that the prime function of the family under capitalism is to reproduce the working class: that is not only physically to provide the next generation of workers but to inculcate in the offspring the work values which will equip them for life on the factory floor.

Engels distinguished between bourgeois families whose existence he claimed was maintained to ensure inheritance of property and the family of the working class which provided some protection against the demands of the ruling class(25). There are modern Marxists who argue that the working class family is the major source of support against the pressures of other class interests(26).

Other recent Marxists and socialists have seen the family as not only a major force supporting conservative sectors in the society but also a prime source of oppression of family members. Much of the writings of Laing and Cooper deal with the repressive nature of the modern nuclear family(27).

Anarchists, too, point to many aspects of the nuclear family which they consider repressive. Such views are exemplified by Ehrlich et al who, drawing on feminist-socialist views, suggest...
Most people in industrialised societies spend a significant portion of their lives in what may be the last bulwark of capitalism and state socialism - the monogamous nuclear family. The family serves as the primary agent for reproducing the dominant values of the society, both through the socialization of children and the social control of its members. Within the family all of the pathologies of the larger society are reproduced: privatized social relations, escapism, patriarchal dominance, economic dependency (in capitalist society) consumerism, and the treatment of people as property."

In this brief survey of the ideological positions taken by conservatives, liberals, social democrats and Marxists, it has become apparent that there is considerable diversity in the way representatives of each of these positions approach the family. Marxists were seen to be divided even as to whether the working class family was the bulwark against the demands of the ruling class or simply another conservative institution which represses family members.

This section provides an understanding of the ideological support for the retention of the family as the unit of social organisation. This creates difficulties for those who would argue that adopting the individual as the unit of payment for income maintenance purposes would advantage recipients. Clearly conservatives are not going to be attracted by the suggestion that such a change in income maintenance policy will enhance freedom of choice for all family members because the freedom which would be created would promote individualism and would be seen to endanger the traditional network of obligations which are part and parcel of the conservative concept of the traditional family. Nor would there seem to be major ideological support for the proposal to adopt the individual as the unit of payment for income maintenance purposes from mainstream Marxists, social-democrats nor liberals. Only those Marxists who see the family as a conservative repressive institution which promotes capitalism and libertarian liberals would be attracted to the idea of abolishing the family as the unit of payment.

CONSERVATISM, LIBERALISM, SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND FEMINISM: THEIR IMPACT ON WELFARE

In this Chapter, each of these specific ideological forces have been considered in relation to the effect they have had upon the structure and practice of welfare delivery in this country. Whilst one ideological position can be seen to have a major impact upon certain aspects of income maintenance it is clear that other aspects of the complex network of payments and services is influenced by other ideologies, and if a fuller understanding of the welfare system as a whole is to be gained then the interrelationship between these ideological features needs to be considered.

It was noted at the beginning of this Chapter that conservatives have insisted that a distinction must be made between the needy and the greedy and that this has led to the development of limited eligibility categories being created in order to ensure that only the worthy receive welfare payments. This is in start contrast to a Marxist desire to treat all in equivalent financial need equally. Conservative forces have opposed the extension of categories of welfare payments proposed by social-democrats and liberals arguing that such extensions lead to government interference in areas which are rightly the province of charities or the family. Lieutenant Colonel Ian Cutmore's pronouncement that "We ought to fight against any pending explosion of self-interest"(29) typifies the conservative reaction to suggested extensions to the welfare system.

Perhaps the clearest example of conservative reaction to the extension of welfare payments comes whenever proposals are put forward which impact on relationships within families. In such situations the conservatives are almost invariably opposed by feminists and often liberals and social-democrats. The payment of a Supporting Mothers Benefit in circumstances which did not require a woman with children in her custody to prove she had been deserted "without just cause" nor that "she had left with just cause" but simply that she lived apart from her spouse aroused
considerable conservative reaction. Conservatives raised the spectre of young women setting out to have children in order to get the benefit and hence avoid work. The suggestion that sane human beings would set out to attain an income which had the potential to ensure their income remained below the poverty line for the next sixteen years might seem ridiculous, but at the time of the introduction of the Supporting Mothers Benefit it was put with alacrity by many in conservative forums(30).

The 1987 decision by the Hawke Government to stop paying Family Allowance to families who had high incomes could be seen as motivated by a genuine social-democratic desire to ensure that more assistance was then available to be paid towards the upkeep of children who lived in low income earning households. This argument was consistently put by the Government(31) and they were joined by new right spokespersons such as Andrew Hay(32). They were opposed by feminists and socialists: the feminists arguing that even if the earner in a family had a high income, this did not ensure that all in a family would benefit, and that in many families the Family Allowance was the only money over which many wives had total control(33). Socialists argued against the reduction in Family Allowance on the grounds that it would end the one truly generally available welfare payment which was not surrounded by complex eligibility requirements(34). Socialists insisted that if the issue which was being addressed was reducing budget outlays then in order to ensure that more money was going to be available to assist those children who lived in poorer families this outcome could have been achieved by raising the tax rates on all higher earners whilst maintaining Family Allowance payment for all children(35). Given that social-democrats have an ideological commitment to equity and clearly the presence of children in any family decreases the available resources then this socialist proposal would seem to have a real attraction. That it was not adopted is now history, a history which discloses the way in which social-democrat governments come to be heavily influenced by conservative and patriarchal values when they come to implement social welfare distributional systems.

It was noted earlier that Liberal* Ministers of Social Security claimed that the social welfare system in this country operates to support the family. Yet the liberal philosophical position is firmly attached to the notion of individualism. An examination of the legislative and administrative provisions of the Department of Social Security with its dual eligibility requirements - individual eligibility and income eligibility of the entire nuclear family - shows how in many circumstances the principle of support for the family is placed in opposition to individual rights. Such a contradiction is only possible because of the way dependency is interpreted and used by those who make and administer income maintenance policy.

The issue of dependency is central to a conservative conception of all helping systems. The traditional charity systems rely on the suggestion that there exists an interdependent relationship within all families. The connection between this suggestion and conservative ideology is clear. The adoption of the family as the unit of income within almost all social security schemes since federation demonstrates how deeply wedded to such a conservative conception of appropriate family relationships successive Australian governments have become. Implicit in the conservative conception of dependency is the idea of control by the

* Labor Ministers frequently espouse similar views.

head of the household and it is no accident that the household head (breadwinner) has been thought of by governments, from federation to at least the 1970s, as nominally male.

As was seen in the section dealing with the family in this Chapter, neither liberal nor social-democratic ideological positions are committed to as restrictive a view of family life as are conservatives, yet when it comes to designing social welfare distributional systems, no Australian government has been prepared to move away from such conservative ideas.
The issue of control through the supply of welfare payments is one which goes beyond placing expectations upon families who are forced to rely on welfare payments. The industrial control mechanisms are an integral part of the administration of the Unemployment and Sickness Benefit programs and they can be found in the eligibility requirements for Invalid Pension discussed in Chapter II. The governments of the day since World War II have taken differing attitudes to the extent of control which needs to be applied to beneficiaries of Unemployment Benefit. Generally, Liberal Ministers have seen the need to adopt harsher interpretations of the legislative provisions than have their Labor counterparts.(36)

The Hawke Government is an exception to this general rule. Minister Brian Howe, nominally a member of the socialist left faction of the Australian Labor Party, has presided over an extraordinarily restrictive administration of Unemployment Beneficiaries. The 1986/87 Annual Report of the Department of Social Security stated:
"The number of unemployment beneficiaries at the end of June 1987 was 550,850 compared with 569,761 at June 1986, a fall of 18,911 or 3.3%. The number of unemployed, as measured by the Australian Bureau of Statistics at June 1987, was 603,600 and at June 1986 was 561,900 - a rise of 41,700 or 7.4%. In short, there was a substantial increase in the number of unemployed over the year but a substantial decrease in the number of unemployment beneficiaries."(37)

This lowering of the number of beneficiaries at the same time as unemployment is increasing was achieved by amending the legislation and administrative instructions. Earlier in the Report a graph showed that the Hawke Government had been consistently reducing the number of unemployed who were paid a benefit, well beyond the reduction in unemployment levels since coming to office in 1983(38). In the next section of this Chapter details will be given of the abolition of an entire sub-category of unemployed people from the provisions of the Unemployment Benefit program.

The treatment of the unemployed exposes the intricacies of attempting to sieve the ideological underpinnings of any government's actions. Very little evidence can be provided which would establish that Minister Howe is implementing social-democratic policies in his administration of the Unemployment Benefit system. When these matters are considered alongside the abolition of the Community Employment Program and a massive reduction in job training programs(39) then it is possible to observe not social-democratic ideological influences but liberal self-help and conservative control features underlying his administration.

In the 1988 Budget Papers, Howe claimed his Government's setting up of more Benefit Control Teams (inquiry officers who constantly monitor claimants to see they meet eligibility requirements) plus legislative changes had reduced Social Security expenditure from 24.1 per cent of total Commonwealth budget outlays to 22.3 per cent. Most of these savings would have been paid to the unemployed(40), had the eligibility conditions applying to Unemployment Benefit not been tightened.

Governments generally wish to limit their budget outlays; the present Hawke Labor Government has pursued this goal with considerable intensity and in doing so has adopted the catch-cry of the new right in suggesting there is a need to ensure the "user pays" principle applies. This assertion has been paramount in recent Government announcements in relation to child care centres and the imposition of the graduate tax (41). In an attempt to turn this debate on its head, a Council of Social Service consistently refers in its press statements to the "loser pays principle" being the driving force behind such cutbacks(42).

In the May 1988 Mini-Budget, Treasurer Keating - following on his slashing of social welfare provisions during 1987 - removed a number of existing benefit conditions. Perhaps the most miserly reduction was to impose a stricter income test on short-term (less than 13 weeks) Special Benefit applicants. Prior to May 1988 similar income tests applied to Special Beneficiaries and Unemployment Beneficiaries. The majority of those receiving short-term Special Benefit are women just prior to the birth of a baby and immediately after it. In order to receive a payment mothers have to establish they are not working, they are not receiving support from the father of their baby, are not living in a bona fide domestic relationship, and have no other substantial income. The 1988 May statement imposed a 100 per cent withdrawal rate on all earned income in excess of $20 a week(43).

It has to be remembered that these women are often young, living away from home either by choice or because they have been thrown out of the family home, have often inconsequential savings and are undergoing tremendous emotional upheavals as they come to terms with decisions about their own and their child's future. Unless they are able to maintain appropriate nutrition and shelter and develop some way of handling the emotional issues they are facing then their and their child's health suffer.
The question which this reduction in benefit conditions raises is "how could a government committed to social-democratic views reduce benefits to this group of people?" The amount by which budget outlays are reduced by this action is insignificant. They are in obvious need and therefore the Cabinet Expenditure Review Committee in coming to the decision to cut the benefit conditions must have been driven by an ideological concern. Given the alleged commitment of the Hawke Government to social-democratic views about equity, liberty, relief from economic distress and the maintenance of the social wage, it is difficult to see how such a decision could meet any of these goals. If equity were the driving consideration, and assuming the Government felt those on short-term benefit payments had greater financial reserves and therefore less need for financial help than those who remained on benefit longer, this might have led them to reduce the benefit conditions for all forms of benefits paid for less than thirteen weeks. But it did not do this: the action was directed specifically at short-term Special Beneficiaries. This is hardly a step on the path to some future socialism, nor does it do anything to maintain the social wage.

The answer must lie outside social-democratic thought. It runs counter to any liberal view of promoting self help, freedom, progress or the free play of market forces. No, support for such action cannot be seen in liberal philosophy. On the other hand, conservatism with its insistence upon the sanctity of marriage, the maintenance of traditional moral arrangements and the defence of the established order when coupled with the insights which feminism might bring to bear, could account for the Labor Government adopting such a policy. This points to the strength of the conservative and patriarchal ideologies underlying the construction of the Australian system of income distribution.*

That the decision to cut back on Special Beneficiaries who received payments for less than 13 weeks is not an isolated example of the current Government's social welfare policies can be seen in relation to a number of reductions in the social wage since Hawke came to office. The ending of the B class Widows Pension, limitations on the Family Allowance payment, the introduction of the Child Support Agency, and the cutbacks in eligibility for Unemployment Benefit have all been carried out in the name of increasing equity, removing more people from poverty, making people meet their obligations and fiscal responsibility.

* The treatment of this group of Special Beneficiaries, if compared with the treatment of ex-prisoners, underlines the ideological implications I have drawn. In the 1988 Budget, Howe announced that ex-prisoners would be given, on release from prison, double the existing Special Benefit weekly payment and would have their waiting time for rent assistance reduced by the amount of time they had spent in prison. See Howe, B. New Directions for Social Security: Overview, Australian Government, Canberra, 1988, p.23. The majority of released prisoners are young males.

The Child Support Agency is expected to save the Government $200 million in a full year. What Minister Howe does not make clear is that anyone wishing to apply for a lone parent payment will be forced to take action for maintenance against the non-custodial parent irrespective of their wishes, or they will be refused a pension*. This situation is analogous to that prevailing for Widows Pension applicants in the 1960s.

The decision to phase out the B class Widows Pension was motivated by a distorted version of the feminist call to enable women who, as a result of caring for children had long been out of work, to get back into the workforce. The Government simply decided to set a cut-off date beyond which it would not allow women to obtain this pension. The job training programs which it set up were grossly inadequate, short-term, limited in number and restricted to a few major urban centres.
Both the cutback in Family Allowance and the setting up of the Child Support Agency are only partly explained by the suggestion that they were designed to promote more equitable distribution to the lowest income earners. There is another even more compelling explanation of these developments which is that both of these initiatives return responsibility for the upkeep of children to fathers. Fathers constitute 90 per cent of non-custodial parents.

* There are a limited number of exemptions to this ruling, such as in situations where applicants can prove they will encounter violence if they take the maintenance action.

Many of the changes to the system of income maintenance which the Hawke Government has engaged in are promoted by the Government as ways of increasing the welfare of women and children. Hawke has promised no Australian child will live in poverty by 1990, but even researchers from the Social Welfare Research Centre (funded by the Department of Social Security) have published papers questioning such assertions (44). More critical writers have dismissed the Hawke Government's claims as a cover to hide its neglect of the poor (45).

A Safety Net of Welfare Programs

It is the reliance on categorical welfare payments, rather than upon general income guarantees which is the hallmark of the Australian system of income distribution. All Social Security Ministers from Margaret Guilfoyle to Brian Howe (46) have claimed that it is the combination of all the categorical welfare programs which together ensure that genuinely needy people are able to obtain appropriate benefits and therefore the safety net of categorical payments provides a satisfactory way of dealing with the income needs of all poor Australians.

The categorical safety net approach in one sense stands in opposition to the concept of an income guarantee. Yet, in another sense, the safety net approach is compatible with the concept of ensuring all in need an income. The safety net approach in its most developed form - cradle to the grave security - *assumes* that all in "need" will be provided with sufficient to ensure that everyone's particular needs will be met. Were it able to do this, it would approximate the Marxist determination to provide "to each according to his (or her) needs." The safety net approach has the potential to provide **more than** a guaranteed minimum. It purports to provide a guaranteed **adequate** income and services to all. Unfortunately, the methods of delivery and assessment have, at least to this point in time, meant that many who require assistance fail to acquire it.

At a more mundane level, whether a person receives a categorical benefit might have little to do with how well the person meets the eligibility requirements. Issues such as whether the person lives in an urban or rural setting, the person's knowledge of the existence of the benefit, whether the person or a friend is likely to press for a payment, the person's readiness to appeal if refused and other such issues, all have a major influence as to whether a person receives a social welfare payment.

There is a belief in liberal and conservative circles that the **process of determining eligibility** on the basis of personal attributes helps to control recipients of welfare. This makes residual welfare attractive to those conservatives who feel the poor need to be controlled or "at least kept in their place". In the case of Unemployment Benefit and Special Benefit, payment is specifically forbidden to workers who are out of work as a result of industrial action which they or their union have undertaken. Thus these benefits have a clear industrial control mechanism embodied in them. The work test applied to applicants for Unemployment Benefit is intended to
exclude those not willing to work. In fact the intelligent person determined to get the
Unemployment Benefit without having any intention of working can easily do so. Every Benefits
Section of the Department of Social Security has at least one person like this whom the assessment
officers know, but whom they pay because that applicant knows enough about the system to satisfy
minimum requirements and hence to stay on benefit. Many of those who fail the work test have
limited intelligence and/or a lack of sophistication in handling bureaucracies. This means that the
administration of the Unemployment Benefit is far from equitable; "the smarties stay on benefit and
the inadequate are refused payment”(47). As well "the youngest beneficiaries were most at risk of
termination, and that risk was associated with age rather than marital or family status.”(48)

"A fundamental question concerning categorical assistance is why some demographic
groups should receive transfers but not others.”(49)

Even if it is accepted that a high incidence of poverty in certain groups is a good reason for
singling out those groups for special attention in any anti-poverty program, this does not of itself
present a compelling reason to restrict assistance to those groups(50). This point underlines the
need to look carefully at the groups which are excluded from assistance in any program as well as
those included if an understanding of the ideological underpinnings of categorical programs are to
be discovered. For example, despite the fact that Australian Aborigines are the group most likely to
experience poverty, they were until the 1970s the group most likely to be specifically excluded
from assistance.

Socialists and Marxists, and to a lesser extent social-democrats, would argue that equity
considerations demand more general, less selective forms of income guarantees than
Unemployment Benefits or the other categorised programs. One problem for socialists in the
Australian parliamentary system is that they are often forced into a situation where they are
supporting piecemeal changes to categorical welfare payments because each step is a movement in
the direction of more general payments.

Conservative ideologies, particularly in association with liberal ideologies, have heavily
influenced the structure and administration of the Australian welfare industry. Such ideologies
continue to have a major impact upon the delivery of existing services and the development of new
programs. They are responsible for the complex array of categorical payments in preference to
general programs, for the reliance on privatised charity systems providing residual welfare
programs to plug the holes in the safety net, for the individualised nature of welfare delivery, and
for the sense of control which pervades the delivery of welfare services. As was seen in Chapter II
the legislation dealing with the Special Benefit would have allowed it to become an income
guarantee for all Australians except those who were dependent on a spouse or those who were
embroiled in an industrial dispute. However, this benefit has not been used in this way, rather it is
used as a stop gap measure to help those applicants who can establish themselves as worthy for
payment but just fail to meet the specific requirements of one of the other statutory welfare
payments. The discretion of the Department of Social Security staff is paramount. The
administration of this benefit clearly exposes the inherent conservatism which informs such
decisions. The conservatism is reinforced by a liberal determination to treat applicants for social
security as individuals: it is a far cry from any Marxist desire to meet the needs of all in an equal
manner. Social democrats have placed much importance on equality, but they have not been very
successful in translating their belief in equality into practice in the welfare arena. There is a
confusing array of unequal welfare benefits which are offered to people whose economic needs are
very similar but whose gender, age, race, or marital status varies.

In this Chapter so far there has been a concentration upon four ideological cum political
positions, namely conservatism, liberalism, social-democracy and Marxism and an effort made to
show that they alone cannot account for the way in which the social welfare provisions in this
country have evolved. The insights which feminism, with its exposure of gender inequalities, brings to the analysis helps to extend the understanding of the underlying ideological features which structure the mode of distribution in this country. However, in looking at the form which the income maintenance system takes, these ideologies even when considered together are not a sufficient explanation. It is clear that other ideological forces are at play in the construction of social welfare provisions.

**Other ideologies**

Apart from class, the major organising principles which structure Australian society are gender, age, race and locality. When looking at the "political" ideological forces which impacted upon the social welfare system in Australia, the influence of gender inequalities was readily observed. In this final section the way in which attitudes to age, race and locality influence the form of social welfare provisions will be considered.

Discrimination on the basis of age, sometimes termed "ageism", has been brought to general attention by specific age related interest groups such as pensioner groups, senior citizens clubs and the Youth Affairs Council of Australia (51). Older citizens tend to centre their objections around issues such as compulsory retirement ages and the lack of regard shown for the continuing contribution which many feel they could make to the society. They have compared their treatment to that of planned obsolescence of consumer durables. The young have pointed to the lower than adult rates of payment of Social Security benefits, the even lower rates of student allowances (the overwhelming majority of students are less than 21 years of age) and the junior rates applying to many industrial awards where comparable work is done by people of any age.

In 1987 the Hawke Government, not content with maintaining a lower rate of Unemployment Benefit payment to those under 18 years of age, abolished this group's entitlement to Unemployment Benefit. The Unemployment Benefit was replaced by a Job Search Allowance made up of two components: a basic $25 a week benefit which was subject to the applicant meeting the normal Unemployment Benefit conditions including a personal income test) and a family income test for a further amount of $25 a week. It is possible to see this decision as simply another manifestation of ageist policies directed at the young but this only accounts in part for the decision. The other component embedded in this form of payment is designed to support a conservative view of appropriate familial relationships. The parents are forced to provide some income assistance to their children who, prior to this change were seen as independent and part of the workforce.

Chris Sidoti, Secretary of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, has noted that no Australian jurisdiction "makes discrimination on the basis of age unlawful"(52) despite its being unlawful in almost every state in the United States of America following the lead of Colorado in 1903. This is not simply an oversight in Australia. "In New South Wales the Anti-Discrimination Board recommended in 1980 that age should be listed as one of the prohibited grounds of discrimination under that State's Anti-Discrimination Act, and that recommendation has been repeated every year since."(53) Sidoti argues that the basis for maintaining such ageist policies lies in a number of unsustainable assertions about age, namely that the old are more subject to stress, illness, injury and decline in productivity and that the young are less productive(54).

The impact of racism on social policy has received considerable attention(56). As mentioned in Appendix C, Marxists have generally given priority to economic determinist explanations which rely on class conflict as a central feature. However, a growing body of Marxist writers are pointing to race and gender (57) as factors as least as central as class in social welfare theory. The Australian Marxist sociologist, Geoffrey Lawrence is concerned to add the importance of rural factors to this analysis(58):
The very nature of Australia as a colonial country has structured the social relations between whites and Aborigines since 1788. Aborigines were excluded from most welfare provisions available to whites until the 1960s. Asian immigrants also encountered somewhat similar exclusions.

In Chapter IV it was noted that even in the late 1960s the impact of this colonialist mentality was having a major effect upon Aboriginal people. Under State law Aborigines could be forced to reside on a government settlement or church mission: they could also be forced to leave either place. Whilst they lived on the settlement or mission they were paid less than the prevailing Unemployment Benefit and when they came off the settlement or mission the Department of Social Security paid them no more than they received on the mission or settlement because a clause in the Social Security Act prevented officers paying a person more on social security than they were receiving before applying for social security.

As was also observed in Chapter IV, the legislative provisions applying to social security payments amount to an ethnocentric imposition in many Aboriginal communities. The Social Security Act employs the concept of the nuclear family in determinations about who is eligible for assistance. Aboriginal families in much of remote Australia contain more than one wife. The Department of Social Security needs to treat them as if they are not part of the one family if it is to pay them.

Racism directed towards Aborigines is still a major problem in 1988. The newly elected President of the Returned Services League, himself a recipient of a Totally and Permanently Incapacitated veterans payment, was quoted as calling for blood tests to be carried out on Aborigines who claimed welfare benefits in order to determine what amount of "Aboriginal blood they had". During 1988 the Muirhead Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody investigated some of the more than one hundred such deaths since 1980. The Western Australian State Government purchased $300,000 worth of new riot control gear to equip its police force to handle Aboriginal riots.

The other group which has consistently encountered massive racism throughout Australia's history has been Asians. The recent immigration debate engaged in by John Howard, Leader of the Liberal Opposition, and even more racist spokespersons from the National Party such as Senator Stone and rebel Labor member, Graham Campbell have ensured that though we might not return to a White Australia immigration policy we can be clearly identified as a racist country.

Discrimination on the basis of residence has not been afforded the attention it deserves. One possible reason for that is that unlike gender, age or race, residential status can be changed simply by leaving a particular locality. In mobile societies such as Australia for most people any discrimination they encounter as a result of living in a particular locality is of a short term nature. But there are groups of people who spend their whole lives in areas where comparatively few social services are provided. Anyone who lives outside a narrow band of land bordering the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the major cities or near Adelaide or Perth, experiences a diminution of services compared with people living inside that band. The further one lives from such major urban centres, the greater the decrease in services.

The concentration of goods and services in the major population centres, to the exclusion of services to rural areas, is a major cause of the unequal treatment of poor people in Australia. It affects both white and Aboriginal people in Australia, but because Aborigines suffer more poverty more frequently and because of their low literacy levels, they are particularly disadvantaged by living in remote areas.

On the frontier in the United States and in the Australian bush rural dwellers were forced by sheer necessity to engage in forms of mutual helping. This necessity arose out of the neglect of the country people by authorities in the cities. There has been within Australian welfare circles a very convenient belief that somehow people in rural areas join together and ensure that disadvantaged
people in isolated areas see to their own immediate welfare crises - this myth is part of the more general myth of Australian mateship which some city people contend still exists in the bush. Studies by the Poverty Inquiry have shown that whatever assistance the more affluent in rural areas are capable of organising, there are many people experiencing poverty who are excluded from local helping arrangements(63). The assistance which was provided was a very selective form of communal help - long after indigenes had their land stolen they were excluded from such co-operative efforts. City people have come to glorify the support systems in the bush perhaps because those helping arrangements which do exist are a far cry from socialism - they amount to a rural version of liberal self-help.

It is not possible to take seriously the suggestion that the needs of isolated people in rural areas can have totally escaped the attention of the Social Security Department. Yet it was not until the late 1960s that the Department of Social Security began to address the issue of people in remote areas and, up to the present time, has committed very little time, energy and money to this problem. Much of the publicly available information about benefits is in a written form. This creates added difficulties in rural areas where illiteracy rates are much higher than in cities. The Department has begun experimentation with audio and audio-visual cassettes in a number of languages.

In recent years, the Department of Social Security has begun to address some of the issues raised by the urbanist nature of its administration by the employment of Aboriginal liaison officers to service isolated Aboriginal communities, the decentralisation of offices, and the use of agents in small country towns to assist rural people to claim. There has been some degree of bipartisan political recognition of the neglect of rural people. In 1976 the Fraser Government introduced special Unemployment Benefit conditions for farmers experiencing financial difficulties. And in 1983, partly because of the recognition of the extra costs of living incurred in remote areas and partly because people in remote areas were seen to receive less value from fringe benefit schemes, the Hawke Labor Government paid an additional Zone Allowance on many benefits and pensions to people living in isolated areas. The areas covered by this provision were based on the Taxation Zonal system which had long recognised that extra costs of living were incurred by residents of such areas(64).

Concluding Comments

As mentioned in this Chapter, the ideologies of racism, sexism and urbanism pervade the welfare system. The concentration of goods and services in the major centres of population to the exclusion of services to rural areas, is a major cause of unequal treatment of poor people in Australia. It affects both white and Aboriginal people but because Aborigines suffer poverty more frequently and because of their low levels of literacy, they are particularly disadvantaged. Racism, particularly directed against Aborigines, and ethnocentric practices, directed at non-English speaking migrants, are part and parcel of the income maintenance system. The old and the young are discriminated against by the income maintenance and other distributional systems.

Patriarchal arrangements mar the system, as evidenced in the middle class and patriarchal definition of appropriate family structures which has formed the basis of legislative and administrative provisions.

These features when added to the liberal and conservative views which have been so influential in Australia result in the creation of an income maintenance system which is a far cry from any Marxist determination to assist people according to their financial needs.
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