QUEENSLAND NATIONALISM AND AUSTRALIAN CAPITALISM

GLEN LEWIS

The title of this essay is meant to be problematic. It raises two issues: Queensland's place in Australian capitalism, and the relationship between capitalism and nationalism in Queensland. Both of these questions are difficult ones as there are a limited number of studies of Queensland's history and there have been few successful attempts to discuss the relationship of capitalism and nationalism in Australian history. Plainly, it is misleading to speak of Queensland nationalism, yet it is commonly agreed that there is something distinctive about the northern state which sets it off from the rest of Australia — the problem is to say precisely what.

The first part of the discussion attempts to do this. In the second section, the question of Queensland's distinctiveness is reversed. That is, Queensland is seen as archetypically Australian, and the state's history is used to analyse the relation of nationalism and capitalism in Australia.1

The essay is therefore about an ambiguous but important subject. This ambiguity is largely a result of the subject matter. Tom Nairn recently described nationalism as the Janus of modern Marxism. He skillfully argues that contemporary Marxist studies have failed to deal adequately with the modern nationalist movement.2 The current debate about Australia's place in the imperialist framework may be seen as part of this broader dilemma.3 To describe Australia either as a victim of imperialism, or as a junior partner in empire, is dangerously superficial. Australian nationalism, like any national movement, possesses both reactionary and radical elements, and polemics supporting either view are less useful than clear analysis at this stage. The theme informing this essay is that some of the most salient issues concerning the relation of nationalism and capitalism in Australia can emerge from a study of Queensland's history, and that these issues can illuminate both the national question and the particular role of Queensland in Australian capitalism.

Queensland and Australian Capitalism

When critics attempt to sum up the Queensland situation, the frame of reference that frequently recurs is that of Queensland as a state of puzzling contrasts. Queensland is seen as the warm and generous sunshine state on the one hand, and as Australia's deep north on the other. Queensland's political history traditionally has been marked by parodies of this kind. The first Labor government in the world was formed there in 1899, but it only lasted a few days. Australia's first general strike took place in the metropolitan area; in 1922 Labor abolished the Legislative Council in search of more democratic government, but subsequently it perpetuated some of Australia's worst gerrymandering. And so on. Considering these disparate features, can any one formula plausibly tie them together? The view presented here is that Queensland normally was a conservative state in which radicalism was real but exceptional. This is not a new opinion but the following will suggest how this pattern of behaviour derived from the state's political economy.

If any one factor can be singled out as the dominant motif in Queensland's past, it is regionalism: not distance or isolation, as these terms are too vague, but regionalism. Regionalism in Queensland, however, has had many different aspects, including Queensland's geographical situation in Australia. As particular defence concerns, and its immigration policies. This first level of Queensland's past could be described metaphorically as Queensland versus the rest of the world. Secondly, there is Queensland's uneven pattern of regional and urban development, which can be called the state of Queensland versus the regions of the state. And lastly, there is the matter of Queensland's dependent place in the Australian economy — this is Queensland versus the rest of Australia. Describing Queensland in this way brings out some of the difficulties that Queenslanders have felt in being part of Australia. Queensland has felt itself threatened by the non-Queensland outside world, exploited by the more powerful factors, it can be shown that Queensland touchiness and paranoia has some real basis.

Queenslanders traditionally have been sensitive to defence as an issue and Queenslanders have been hypersensitive. There were some real threats, Japanese occupied New Guinea and bombed Darwin and Townsville in New Guinea was McIlwraith's ostensible reason for trying to annex it in 1883; in fact, he also wanted to extend the blackbirding trade to the
Queensland had a reputation in the nineteenth century as a physically unhealthy environment, and even then the colony's rather unappealing Queensland's immigration policies made for a xenophobic social climate, which was antagonistic to non-whites, non-British immigrants, foreign or southern 'agitators', and local 'bogders'. The issue deserved further investigation but it seems that one social basis of Queensland's conservation was a class of local poor whites, just as in the southern states of the U.S.A.

Commerically fleeced by Sydney we have been and are politically tyrannised over and robbed by Brisbane. Our position has resembled that of the unhappy provinces of the early Roman Empire, which were left to the tender mercies of needy proconsuls.

Port Denison Times
Bowen, 26 January 1870

After external vulnerability, internal divisions were a major factor in the Queensland experience. In the last century there were three Queensland politicians—Northern, Central, and Southern—and colonial politics were bedevilled by energetic separation movements in the 1860s, mainly in the Centre, and in the 1880s in the Centre and North; the second movement almost succeeded in establishing a plantocracy as a separate state. Federation finished these movements as political campaigns but their economic basis remained. There were real differences between the regions which centralist state policies could but do justice to. On account of these differences, Queensland voted only narrowly in favour of federation. South Queensland interests, especially in Brisbane, feared the effect of the removal of colonial tariff barriers on local manufacturers and business. The Centre was divided: Rockhampton merchants opposed federation as it meant the end of their chances for separation, while Central-western pastoralists and shearsers were for it. North Queensland voted most heavily in favour, but only after its sugar interests in the North for defence and the White Australia Policy.

These inter-regional tensions continued to frustrate development after federation. Decentralisation became the program all politicians gave lip-service to, and meant, when it promised any concrete advantage for their electorates. The issue which highlighted the destructive effects of regionalism best, however, was rail construction. When Queensland's first line was built in 1864 it ran west from Ipswich and was not joined to Brisbane until twelve years later, because the early squatters preferred Ipswich as a metropolitan centre. This was the shape of things to come, Central Queensland was not linked to the South by trunk line until 1903, and Cairns not until 1923, as a result North Queensland's trading connections developed by sea with Sydney rather than Brisbane. Railways
then had become the most expensive item in Treasury budgets. The dilemma here was that a great amount of wasteful branch-line construction took place in the 1890s under regional pressures; they by 1930, when Queensland had built one of the largest state rail networks in Australia, road transport emerged as a threat. The Commissioner for Railways wanted to boost his revenue by making long haulage rates applicable to wool, but this proposal cut across vested regional and shipping interests and was rejected.6 So whereas in the 1880s railways had been seen as bringers of prosperity, by the 1940s the financial difficulties of the system had become a popular joke and symbolised the failure of public enterprise in Queensland.7

The difficulties of local government were another example of the destructive influences of regionalism in the state. Their inadequacies have been concealed behind a smokescreen of decentralist and agrarian rhetoric, while behind the scenes local authorities have fallen asleep and been manipulated by business and real estate interests. Queensland's situation was specially difficult here because of distance. The pattern of settlement in South Australia was concentrated around Adelaide, so that local government there, and in Victoria and Tasmania, had manageable problems in serving the areas; but in Queensland the difficulties were too great. When municipal incorporation was made compulsory in the late 1870s local government came from the top down—like so many other things in Queensland.8 Its subsequent development was slow and unsound and when semi-government authorities such as the Harbour Board were set up in the depression years of the 1890s, they were mainly an effort on the part of the state government to reduce its expenses. Hospital Boards faced similar problems and the failures in this area eventually were so bad that the government had to step in. This was the beginning of the state's free hospital system.

A final example of the strength of internal divisions in Queensland is the traditional Australian antagonism between city and country. This has been especially marked in Queensland, where it has been more a case of city versus country town versus country. Two features stand out here: the retardation of Brisbane's development, and the vitality of the country towns. The contrast with South Australia is illuminating. In effect, Adelaide is South Australia; in Queensland, Brisbane is only the capital city. In 1954, Queensland's country towns held 34 per cent of the state's population, as against an Australian average of 25 per cent, and the low South Australian share of 14 per cent. South Queensland had five non-metropolitan centres of more than 10,000 people between 1933 and 1954, while there was one in the Centre, and three in the North; this result showed the South's—especially the South-East's—traditional economic dominance.9 The leading six country towns were normally Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Townsville, Ipswich, Cairns, and Mackay respectively. Conversely, Brisbane's development was retarded for a long time. Brisbane grew slowly for a number of reasons but the most basic was country antagonism. County politicians sat at the head of state government, ironically elected in Brisbane, and there developed policies for the benefit of the country, not the city. The Labor Party was no better than the Country Party in this respect; not until Haddon's premier in the extreme south-east corner of the state was a major hindrance to its being able to act as a centre for state development, and it was not until 1939 that Brisbane had the rail facilities to act as a state-wide distributing point. There were also serious physical disadvantages to Brisbane's site: it was not on Moreton Bay, but eighteen miles upstream on a crooked bend of the river, and its topography was rough and hilly. This had two stant duggling consequences: Brisbane's port site was a poor one which required con- large area. Shipping was often delayed, and due to the private monopoly of wharfage in the port, the matter was aggravated by the absence of a port authority. The dispersal of settlement: on the other hand, posed immense problems for local authorities in providing transportation and sewerage. By the 1950s Brisbane was the only8 dunmy-capitul capital left to cope with the problems, and the formation of the unique Greater Brisbane experiment in 1925 owed as much to Brisbane's special needs as to Labor's preference for centralisation. Lastly, as early as the 1890s Brisbane had the reputation for being a branch-office capital—a trait which it has retained to the present.11

When Brisbane did grow, it was a country city. It had a style of its own which made it the centre of conservatism in Queensland. Many people justifiably describe it as a large country town—which was exactly what country people preferred it to be. The one distinctive style that emerged was a country style: timber houses on stilts, galvanised iron roofs, and cool verandahs.12 Yet the idea of a country city was a con- tradiction in terms. In a sense, Brisbane is a city without a style, and in the success of its architecture and lack of layout is one of its least attractive of all Australian capital cities apart from its appealing natural surround- ings. The quality of urban life in Brisbane has a certain sense of aliena- tion which derives from the physical formlessness of the city itself. Brisbane's unusual topography and its suburban sprawl have had important consequences in defining the social pattern of the city. Because through it, the elite traditionally have occupied the high ground, so only a few suburbs of Clayfield and Toowong lost century and half-seas and divisions therefore have not been as apparent in Brisbane as in some other Australian capital cities. What makes the Brisbane pattern of class re- lationships more difficult to grasp is the city's tremendous sprawl—it is a long urban area—Red Hill, Milton, South Brisbane, Spring Hill, Mayne; there is next a
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for greater share of manufacturing; also the level of savings bank deposits between 1939 and 1956 brought out the fact that South Australians had the highest per capita rate of saving in Australia, while Queenslanders had the second lowest. 19

So Queensland was one of the most highly protected and taxed states and one of the most generous with its social services. Its protection came from the combined political strength of certain industries, notably sugar, its tax rate was due to the high cost of state administration as much as to Labor policy, and its comprehensive social services were partly due to the lack of private initiative in hospital and charity organization. 20 The South Australian comparison suggests that primary industry had been of more importance to Queensland for a much longer time and that South Australians were possibly better off than Queenslanders. Queensland's position may have been halfway between the richer and poorer states in terms of state government finances, but the Report's own figures suggested that Queensland's place in the Australian economy was dependent and precarious. Wealth was concentrated in the pastoral and mining industries, or dependent on political protection in the sugar industry. The Report stressed that Queensland's natural resources were among the richest in Australia, but did not acknowledge that these were often owned by outside interests.

In fact, one of the distinctive features of the development of the Queensland economy has been the high proportion of non-Queensland ownership and control of the state's resources. The South Australian parallel is helpful here again. South Australia's natural resources are much poorer, but South Australians have been more enterprising in making use of them. One example was the success of the Adelaide Steamship Company. The Queensland shipping trade was a profitable one to be carved up among the overseas lines and the Australian coastal companies; and considering that the state's coastline was much longer than South Australia's, and Queensland was more isolated from the major Australian trading routes, there was a great need for a locally based shipping company. But though several attempts were made, none succeeded. South Australians, on the other hand, set up the A.S.C., which became an important coastal line even trading in Queensland waters. This example of Queensland lagging behind was repeated in many other areas. Sugar was a distinctive Queensland industry, but CSR is based in Sydney; the Queensland cattle industry became the biggest in Australia, but the deeds to many Western properties were held in Melbourne, and the processing plants were divided up between Veveys and Smith.

But given this fact of non-Queensland influence in Queensland, then the next key issue is how the state standard of living compared with those of other states. Did non-Queensland control mean lower, higher, or comparable standards? 21 Unfortunately there have not been enough historical studies of subjects like the distribution of income, or levels of real and money wages, to be able to answer this question properly—the aggregative approach of Butlin and his followers neglects this kind of issue. And actually the subject has been a contentious one in Queensland.

Queensland Nationalism and Australian Capitalism

For years. After Labor came to power in 1915 it periodically described Queensland in glowing terms as 'the worker's paradise', and employers responded by branding it 'the loafer's paradise'. It is highly unlikely, in New South Wales and Victorian. As a result of the state's serious unemployment overall rate of growth has been slow apart from boom periods of mining investment in the 1880s and 1960s. Queensland's position in the Australian economy has been therefore a dependent one and the persecuting complex of Queenslanders is to this extent justifiable. Younger and talented Queenslanders still migrate south to better themselves today, while at southerners who move to Queensland. Through this migration pattern the metropolitan in Sydney and Melbourne have exerted a traditional dominance over the Queensland hinterland. 22

At present nearly all our school grounds have a bare and dismal aspect. Nothing better calculated to implant patriotism and love of home in our children, or to beautify Australia at the minimum of expenditure has been thought of.

The Judge, Brisbane, 26 July 1894

The first was J.D. Lang's plans for a Cookshold of Northern Australia, where an independent yeomanry of cotton growers would be the sturdy base of the new colony. Next came the land grant immigration schemes Hans and Dutton's 1884 legislation, influenced by Henry George's ideas, as the acts in New South Wales in promoting agricultural settlement. The agrarian social ideal in colonial Queensland was a strange mixture of independence and dependence. The demand for land rights was partly updated by latter-day Chartist land demands, plus a colonial antagonism and the German love of the soil brought by those immigrants. Lastly, rural life, which became institutionalised in the Rural Catholic movement of the 1890s and intellectualised by Colin Clark in the 1940s. With such
mixed ancestry the agrarian ideal was unfeasibly ambiguous and there
certainly was a strong hierarchical element in it.38
The 1890s were a turning point. They put an end for a time to the idea
that Queensland should be the garden colony of Australia. The co-
operation of agricultural settlements was essentially responses to the
operating agricultural settlements did not survive.39
The few radical agrarian cooperative settlements were important, but
in twentieth-century Queensland agrarianism was still important. All
certainly political parties faithfully acknowledged the worth
more pragmatic. All political parties faithfully acknowledged the worth
more pragmatic. All political parties faithfully acknowledged the worth
of the man on the land. Labor's platform of 1915 included many agrarian
components and did win rural support. After the war, soldier settlements
These sectors of the economy were central in maintaining the influence
of the introduction of central milling in the 1880s, small-growers in the
industry became important users of coloured labour, so the planters were
not only the supporters of the Kānaka trade. After the first world war,
forestry special allowance for farm labour needs. Lastly, after the 1930s, forestry
became an increasingly strong department, that worked in conjunction
with local timber entrepreneurs. When complaints about environmental
problems, and the belief were to make the government response was to publish
re-afforestation program, but this was something economic rather than
ecological. Native flora and fauna could not survive within the area
of the state forests' pine trees.39
Despite suggestive arguments by some writers, the role of agrarianism
in Australian history is still not widely realised. If militancy was the
dominant national ideal, then after bush life itself, agricultural settlement
was the setting believed best for realising the militancy goal.40 In the
1850s Caroline Chisholm had wanted her Catholic girls to raise happy
families in a healthy rural setting, and after 1918 C J. Dennis ritually
purified the Sentimental Bloke by marrying him to Doris, then removing
her from the city. This agrarian ideal was very
strong in Queensland, perhaps as a reaction to the early dominance of the
pastoral industry. Queensland's equivalent to Lawsons, Patterson, and
Dennis was A H Davis - Sooke Rudd, whose 'On Our Selection' stories
fostered the belief that the real Australian virtues were found in
the country. Dad and Dave were less superhuman than the Man from
the country. But they were more believable.41 The main result of Australian
agrarianism, however, has been the persistent neglect of urban problems
and this was exemplified in Queensland.
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A form of populism. Australian populism differed from the American
land because the labor parties in Australia successfully incorporated
large agrarian elements in their platforms, because America had no labor
parties, and because the Australian railways, being state-owned, could not
be singled out as the agents of private monopoly they were in the
USA. In Queensland the Labor Party, which was in power almost
continuously between 1915 and 1977, the longest term of any state Labor
government—was itself a country party dependent for its survival on a
country union, the AMU. One result of the strong populist-agrarian
sympathies in the Queensland party was its contempt for education;
anti-intellectualism is a populist characteristic. When Ryan's first
ministry was formed in 1915, the Minister for Education, Hardacre, was
an expert on land laws; his greatest ministerial achievement was to retain
brass bands in the primary schools to prove Labor was not lacking
in patriotism during the war.42 The Party's attitude to secondary education
in the inter-war years was to leave it to the private schools wherever
possible and treat the existing state secondary schools as vocational
enterprises.

The main economic effect of agrarianism in Queensland, however,
was to ensure that the state's principal task was seen as primary produc-
tion. There were real political differences between different kinds of
primary producers—large pastoral, mining, and sugar interests were
Labor's main opponents, while pastoral workers, small sugar growers
and dairymen sometimes supported Labor—yet the overall result
was a concentration on agrarian economic policies which contributed to the
backwardness of manufacturing in Queensland until after 1945. A
related consequence was that through the inter-connection of pastoral
finances, companies, banks, insurance firms, mine-owners and large-sugar
growers, and rural and merchantile capital was the main form of private
capital investment in Queensland, and industrial capital played a very
small role.43 This was another reason for the new feudal style of capita-
lism in Queensland.

I again wish I had the desire to establish a
Department of Trade, Commerce, and Manufactures. I do not
in any way wish to restrain private enterprise in its individualism,
but these are certain duties that can only be carried out by the
community as a whole.

Brisbane Chamber of Commerce,
President's Report 1905

The other two main sources of conservatism in Queensland were the
corporatist use of the state and the power of overseas and interstate
monopolies. A distinctive brand of state paternalism developed in
Queensland. Under the Tory ministries of the nineteenth century this
paternalism tended to be benevolent, while under Labor in the next
century it was more egalitarian, but the common factor between them was
a paternalist use of the state which resulted in a form of state capitalism or corporatism. Like New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land, Queensland was originally a convict colony and state enterprise was more important than private until the 1850s, when separation and the election of the first parliament dominated by the ‘pure miners’, the government became an agent of private enterprise. Queensland lacked a strong Liberal party or laissez-faire movement and the colony’s developmental policies concerning land, immigration, and railways were carried through with an unusual degree of thoroughness, if not always success. The first phase of public activity was in the 1860s, when the Lands, Posts and Telegraphs, and Rail departments were established, then in the 1890s the first Public Service Act was passed and some semi-governmental authorities were set up. By 1900, a tradition of practical paternalism had become the characteristic style of government in Queensland. Its crowning achievement was perhaps the Queensland National Bank, a Queensland-based concern whose scale of operations was fabulously large. Edwin Drury as manager, had close association with Thomas McIlwraith as Premier, and the state was perhaps the state bank. Like the government of the state was a close association with Thomas McIlwraith as Premier, and the bank was in effect a state bank. Like the governments in the state was corrup. 23 The next new development in the use of the state was in the 1920s. Ryan’s government consolidated the role of Labor’s steps in the 1920s. Ryan’s government consolidated the role of the state. The Arbitration Court, developed a primary cooperative marketing, and set up state butcher shops and an insurance company, and set up a Ministry of Agriculture, and set up its own Ministry of Agriculture. The main point to emphasise about the use of the state by successive Queensland governments is that it has been seen as a reactive force to complement private enterprise. It has not been a passive instrumentality and it has often taken initiatives in its own right, but these have been aimed at fostering capitalist development. The state has been seen as a developmental agency, not as a competitor for business. Queensland has a long tradition of state intervention. In the 1920s the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland, Main Roads, and Department of Industrial Development were established and extended. Lastly, with the advent of a growing tourist trade in the postwar years the Queensland government suddenly discovered culture and set up its own Ministry of Culture. When we turn to consider the role of private enterprise in Queensland’s development, the picture is a curious mixture of strength and weakness. Big business certainly existed in Queensland but it was rarely owned and controlled locally. It has only been with the post-war boom that local business has really taken off. Before 1939, local companies were pale reflections of the powerful overseas and interstate monopolies which dominated economic activity in the state, and this contrasted between large non-Queensland owned companies and the much smaller state-based firms typified the development of private enterprise in the state. A recent list of the top ten Australian companies includes Mount Isa Mines, CSR and Comalco, whose main operations are in Queensland, but they are not state-based companies. Non-Queensland companies traditionally have been involved in developing Queensland’s rich primary industries and the transport system. Mining, oil, wool, meat, and shipping have been such areas. In the late 19th century, British investment was crucial to Queensland mining, in Mt. Morgan and in the North; this century, Australian and European funds have been more important, at Mt Isa since 1930, and in the Centre and the Gulf since the 1950s. Queensland Aluminium, for instance, in 1964 was 52 per cent owned by the American Kaiser Aluminium Company, 20 per cent by Alumina of Canada, and 20 per cent by Pechiney of France. Other large Australian non-Queensland firms, such as CSR, AMP, the CBC, Elder Smith and Golsborough Moot, have also involved themselves in mining enterprises such as Nalbino in the Gulf. Non-Queensland based pastoral finance companies, banks, and insurance firms have controlled the Queensland pastoral industry, and Swifts and Venturers have monopolised meat processing and exporting. The media has been another heavily controlled sector, with the Herald Sun...
WOOLLEN MANUFACTURING COMPANY AT IPOWICH

The structure of ownership and control in Queensland private enterprise has thus been remarkably unbalanced. The weakness of local entrepreneurship has contrasted starkly with the dominance exerted by some of the big companies in the state and this has had several effects. It has been one reason for the slow growth of manufacturing, and it has contributed to the greater political weight of the Country and Labor parties as against the Liberals. More significantly, though, the linkages of Australian capitalist power have stood out with great clarity in Queensland. A style of Queensland imperialism has developed, with the activities of Burns Philp a North Queensland firm based in Sydney in the South Pacific, and the important business links between Queensland and the white community in Papua New Guinea. Queensland traditionally has entertained grandiose imperialist ambitions, such as McIlwraith's abortive proposal to build a transcontinental railway between South Australia and the Gulf using coolie labour, or the Government's ambition to make Sorrento, at the top of Cape York, another Singapore in the 1860s; currently Joh Bjelke-Petersen, Lang Hancock, and Charles Court are planning a rail link between Queensland and Western Australia. As Rover Darragh and others have suggested recently, a new style of resources diplomacy may now be entering internal Australian politics. Queensland's geographical situation, its rich raw materials, and the dominance of large companies in the economy, all make the state an ideal place for such projects.

A final point in this regard is that private enterprise in Queensland has exerted a substantial degree of control over state politics. In 1965 the Country party invoked the use of Emergency Powers Regulations against the Mt Isa strikers, while one reason for the strike itself was the American parent company's determination to oppose wage increases and so offset falling profits in their Mexican operations. Yet the best illustration of the power of capital in Queensland was the 1929 loans crisis, which has some parallels with the 1975 dismissal. In 1929 a delegation of pastoralists and financiers led by Robert Philp went to London to persuade City investors not to take up the Labor government's current loan in response to the move to raise pastoral rents. The pugnacity of the conservatives at this time was astonishing. Even Alfred Blyth, one of the partners in the Melbourne Shipping firm of Gibbs, Bright, which had pastoral interests in Queensland, privately described the delegation as an amazing indiscretion. During the affair the General Manager of Dalgety's arranged financial support for Labor's defeat and urged that an anti-Labor electoral win would have a great moral effect on the other Australian states. As a result Theodore was forced to negotiate a costly loan on the unfamiliar American market, and Labor's political influence in the state was weakened. It contributed to the adoption of more reformist policies by the state party. This incident, which has never been properly examined by historians, is one of the most blatant instances of the blackmail of an Australian Labor government by financial in-
A number of characteristic features of politics in Queensland have developed from the state's political economy, such as a close connection between business and politics, and the pervasiveness of corruption in every sector of Queensland's economy. The Australian Republican Party, under the leadership of Sir Samuel Walker, was instrumental in establishing a system of patronage and clientelism in Queensland politics.

It is true that the equality of citizenship was understood. The assumption of dignity by certain portions of the population in every district in Australia is becoming sensible. No arrears are more careful of his dignity than the Australian leading citizen. We shall obliterate this last phase of class society existing in our towns.

The Australian Republican Party, under the leadership of Sir Samuel Walker, was instrumental in establishing a system of patronage and clientelism in Queensland politics.

Another crucial factor influencing Queensland politics has been the influence of regionalism and agrarianism. The Labor Party did well after 1915 because its policies were firmly rooted in the rural areas. They pre-empted Country party policies in many ways, and Labor in Queensland was almost as much a country party as the Country Party was itself. Forgan Smith never felt fully reconciled to the virtues of the primary producer. Similarly, Queensland politicians identified themselves with one particular region, which was normally a non-metropolitan area—Kilcoy with Rockhampton, Mackay with Townsville, Forgan Smith with Mackay, and Moore, Nicklin, and Bjelke-Petersen with agricultural areas. The main damaging effect of these influences on Queensland politics was that they have often been bi-partisan issues and so have significantly narrowed the scope of political activity. Queensland has produced a series of political dynasties as a result—McIvor, Griffith, Pilch, Follot, Forgan-Smith, Moore, Gair, Bjelke-Petersen—and continuous governments. It now seems likely that the National-Labor coalition could remain in power as long as Labor previously did. Political inflexibility is a Queensland characteristic.

The last point to be raised here is the place of the labour movement in Queensland. It is important to distinguish carefully between the Labor Party itself, the trade unions, and the labor movement in Queensland history. One can read Murphy's account of Ryan as a great Labor Premier, or...
of the role of organizers in the party, and be in a different and non-militant
world from that described as accurately by Harris or Daddow, in their
national union of the trade unions and the labour movement.
non-academic histories of the trade unions and the labour movement.
The Queensland labour movement was very much a house divided. The
idealist Australian Labor Federation promised to be Australia's first
union with its system of machine politics and corruption, in fact
sovereign union and remained a force behind the
became Queensland's major union and remained a force behind the
right-wing in the party. It finally over-extended itself and was put in the
place by Gair in the 1950s. Yet if the AWU was the state's most successful
union there were still some radical alternatives. The W.W.F., the
T.U.C., A.M.I.E.U. and the A.R.U. were, at one time or another, involved
in bitter fights with both private capitalists and right-wingers in the party.
The T.L.C. reflected these divisions, but its annual conference only
affirmed a series of anti-capitalist resolutions. So the major part of the
Queensland labour movement was apathetic, reactionary, corrupt, or
rurally oriented, but on the other hand there was a continuing radical
campaign run by an embattled but significant minority. Radical
opposition followed a subterranean but definite course and emerged to
challenge the system periodically. 37

Nevertheless, the present political situation in Queensland is a de-
pressing one. Bjelke-Petersen preserves the tradition of authoritarian
leadership in the state but he has added a new and ominous ingredient:
leadership in the state he has added his own.
Unlike the other political strongmen who have preceded him, Bjelke-
Petersen's position is strengthened immensely not so much by his own
intrinsic abilities — although he is arguably the cleverest politician
Australia — as by the fact that he represents a new, successful, and con-
fident locally-based Queensland middle class, something the state has
traditionally lacked, and only developed in the last twenty years. His
style of leadership in Queensland has helped to move the Australian political spectrum further to the right. This
new style of the National Party in the state was created by Joh and his tactics as a response to Whitlam's new nationalism, in the early seventies, and
Joh's homely rhetoric about Queensland for Queenslanders touched on
the traditional pride and paranoia of Queenslanders about their different-
ness from the rest of Australia. Radio station 4IP has ridden on the crest
of this new wave of cultural conservativism. A National Party controlled
of the new wave of community involvement in its PR campaigns
station, it has succeeded because it is a locally controlled enterprise
attuned to the Brisbane social climate, but it has skillfully used the latest
American techniques of community involvement in its PR campaigns
and has also taken over the superficial side of the counter cultural
production methods such as the importation of an ex-2JJ announcer as
well as some cricketing superstars. 4IP showed where it was really at
recently, however, when one of its directors spent a large sum of money to
buy and demolish a house in the exclusive suburb of Hamilton so that it
would longer interfere with the view from his own modest dwelling.

Queensland and Australian Nationalism

The relationship of nationalism to Australian capitalism will now be con-
sidered via the Queensland experience. The problem here is: what
exactly is the nature of Australian capitalism? Has it a distinctive national
style? Is it right to describe it, as N.P. Nairn does, as "civilized capi-
talism"? It is difficult to answer this question because the mainstream of
temporary writing on Australian economic history is predominantly
conservative and quantitatively oriented. Little is known about the
history of monopoly in Australia. For example, because of the monopoly
of economic history writing that economics departments have assumed in
the universities since the war. To make matters worse, the leading
exponent of an intelligent literary economic history is Geoffrey Blainey,
who has eulogised a series of capitalist heroes in the Australian past,
just as American historians did in the 1950s. The approach taken in this
essary to argue that Australian nationalism did have a definite economic
dimension to it, and that to consider nationalism only in social or political
terms, as many have already done, can be a superficial way of treating a
complex problem. Generally, the theme here will concern the way in
which the nationalist economic ideologies were used as weapons of class
exploitation and control: the way in which there has been a war of attrition.

On a technical level, between the economic ideals of equality and authority,
and between progress and egalitarianism, with authority and progress
normally coming out to top. The point of taking this radical idealist
approach to Australian history is that it intentionally runs counter to the
dominant empirical approach of Australian historiography, and it
suggests where Australian concerns about progress have diverged most
sharply from those about equality.

Thus the following treatment will be more academic but less general than
the preceding section. The business ideal of free competition will be
defined, followed by an outline of how this competitive ideal was
influenced by various restraints namely cooperation, state enterprise,
and arbitration. An important related question will be how the non-
competitors — the poor and the unemploy — fitted into the overall
picture. The aim is to provide a plausible taxonomy of Queensland's
economic history between 1890 and 1930 which suggests a rough model
of Australian national capitalism. This time period is a significant one
as it spans twenty-five years of non-Labor rule, fifteen years of Labor
in power, and includes the two depressions and the first world war.

To introduce the discussion, a few comments are required about the
state's economic growth in the period. The Queensland economy grew
steadily between 1906 and 1927, except for the interruption of the war,
and it withstood the two major depressions better than the southern states.
But if Queensland's short run depression performance was encouraging,
the long run prospects for the economy were not; the price paid for this
greater stability was primary dependence and severe regional inequalities. Yet the worst aspect of the state’s economic performance was not so much that its absolute growth was inadequate, but that the structure of the economy was not diversified. The tendencies towards industrialisation in Queensland by 1920 were not present in Queensland. By 1921 Australian manufacturing employment was nearly equalled combined employment in the agricultural and pastoral industries; in the same year, Queensland manufacturing employment remained less than agricultural or pastoral employment taken separately. Also in the 1920s the state economy was not readjusted to keep up with the Australian molar phase of dairy expansion. For instance, the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, a state’s leading commercial body, the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, was founded in 1890, while the Preservation Act of 1906, which protected Queensland from low-cost industry, was also concerned that Queensland should be protected against interstate competition. The Chamber became most enthusiastic about the Federal Common Market in 1860, while the Queensland government in 1862, while the Queensland government had no intention of protecting Queensland from low-cost industry. The Queensland government had no intention of protecting Queensland from low-cost industry. Despite these efforts, the Chamber normally recognized that commerce in Brisbane was conducted in a different atmosphere from that in the United States, with its ‘robber barons’ or the U.K., with its tradition of a commercial aristocracy. The Chamber’s ideal form of competition was most often termed ‘fair competition’. In sum, the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce’s attitude to competition was ambivalent and qualified and far from being an endorsement of the American type of competitive ideal. Unfettered competition was modified by other factors which acted as restraints. The Chamber’s ideal of ‘fair competition’ in practice meant controlled or collusive competition. That Queensland’s businessmen preferred this kind of competition was a reflection of their weakness in their own community—between 1890 and 1930 only five of the Chamber’s twenty-nine Presidents were in Parliament—and of the dependence of the Queensland economy on external sources. To broaden the scope of this discussion, it is useful to consider a wider economic debate in which Queensland took some part. One of the most important Australian arguments about competition took place in 1906 when federal parliament passed the Industries Preservation Act. This legislation derived from a moderate sense of nationalism and reformism and did not arouse great enthusiasm. There was a general feeling that it was unlikely to succeed because ‘the spirit of concentration’ was a feature of the times. Many members of parliament made a distinction between reasonable and unreasonable trusts and most supported the control of the trusts, but not the doctrine of free competition was advanced for entirely free competition. There was agreement that the aim was not only to prevent monopolies of trade and commerce, but to prevent Australian industries from being destroyed by unfair competition. Yet dividing lines did exist. Conservation argued for self-restraint on the part of large companies, and some radicals responded with threats of socialism. The Queensland senator Tom Givens, for example attacked CSR’s monopoly as predatory, while Dugald Stothert, a North Sydney M.H.R., saw the films as a great Australian success story. He claimed not to be defending CSR as a New South Wales company, but on the grounds that it had succeeded in New Zealand and Fiji as well as Australia. Considering the nationalist aims of the Act this was a shrewd defence. Though quite different in intention, these arguments both assumed that business enterprise in Australia was weak in contrast to overseas, and that public enterprise played a large part in the Australian economy. Interestingly enough the debate did not draw significant Queensland participation from either side. The strongest response came from the Liberal senator J.G. Drake and was pro state rights. Drake argued that protection was required for the Queensland economy, but that the attack on CSR was a mere excuse for protecting Australian industries, and that the anti-dumping clauses in the proposed legislation could harm Queensland. The Act might be used as a means of further commercial invasion of the state by southern firms. So this reaction to the issue by Queensland parliamentarians suggests that the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce’s passivity and poor ideological
The Restrains on Competition

There were three principal restraints on the ideal of free competition: the various cooperative societies, public enterprise, and the arbitration court. Each economic form embodied an implicit social ideal, and both were in the public interest. The particular ideals impressed themselves on the capitalist ethos. The particular ideals impressed themselves on the capitalist ethos. The particular ideals impressed themselves on the capitalist ethos. The particular ideals impressed themselves on the capitalist ethos. 

The Masonic ideal of competition was only one ingredient in the broader capitalist ethos. It was the point of departure, but other influences now to be discussed were equally influential.13

The restriction on competition was not as severe as it might appear at first sight. There were many industries where the private enterprise system was not the dominant form of organization. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system. However, in many industries, the private enterprise system was the dominant form of organization. In these industries, the cooperative movement was not able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were natural barriers to entry. These industries included the production of food, such as wheat, and the production of textiles, such as textiles. In these industries, the private enterprise system was unable to compete effectively with the cooperative movement.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were economies of scale. These industries included the production of electricity and the production of water. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to produce at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were social benefits. These industries included the production of public utilities, such as water and electricity, and the production of social services, such as education and health care. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were political benefits. These industries included the production of government services, such as defense and foreign affairs, and the production of international services, such as international trade and finance. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were cultural benefits. These industries included the production of arts and culture, such as music and dance, and the production of intellectual services, such as education and research. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were environmental benefits. These industries included the production of natural resources, such as minerals and forests, and the production of environmental services, such as water and air. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were economic benefits. These industries included the production of goods and services, such as clothing and food, and the production of economic services, such as finance and insurance. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were social benefits. These industries included the production of social services, such as education and health care, and the production of social services, such as welfare and housing. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were political benefits. These industries included the production of government services, such as defense and foreign affairs, and the production of international services, such as international trade and finance. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were cultural benefits. These industries included the production of arts and culture, such as music and dance, and the production of intellectual services, such as education and research. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were environmental benefits. These industries included the production of natural resources, such as minerals and forests, and the production of environmental services, such as water and air. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were economic benefits. These industries included the production of goods and services, such as clothing and food, and the production of economic services, such as finance and insurance. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were social benefits. These industries included the production of social services, such as education and health care, and the production of social services, such as welfare and housing. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.

The cooperative movement was also able to compete effectively with the private enterprise system in industries where there were political benefits. These industries included the production of government services, such as defense and foreign affairs, and the production of international services, such as international trade and finance. In these industries, the cooperative movement was able to provide these services at a lower cost than the private enterprise system.
politician, eulogised cooperation in 1913 as the way to social salvation, his figures showed that only agrarian cooperatives had succeeded properly in Australia. The centre-piece of the English cooperative movement had been the cooperative retail store, but in Australia this was the least rewarding form of cooperation. Queensland’s first cooperative dairy was formed at Pinnaroo in 1896, the first consumer cooperative began at Maryborough in 1914, and the first fruit and poultry cooperatives dated from early twenties. Most of these societies were for dairy farmers, fruitgrowers, and poultry farmers, and only a few cooperative produce agencies and consumer cooperatives took root. In the 1920s, however, Labor built up one of the most complex systems of marketing for primary produce in Australia. A central issue here was the relation between unionists and farmers. Some predicted that when agricultural co-operation developed the two would find themselves at odds about land taxes and farmers’ interest in securing cheap labour. These problems were taken care of with Labor’s comprehensive agricultural policy of 1913, however. Just as Queensland Labor was not a socialist movement, so the agrarians were usually pragmatic in their attitude to Labor, and the growth of rural cooperation helped to reconcile them. Given Labor’s mild brand of socialism, agricultural cooperation could be seen as part of the collective self-help tradition to which the party was committed; equally, the success of the cooperatives could not be ignored by Labor politicians. So by 1930 agricultural cooperation had succeeded in Queensland beyond the wildest dream of its founders, and agrarianism had been reconciled with socialism, but the compromise had been made at the expense of the socialists.

* * *

With public enterprise such a clear connection cannot be seen between economic form, social ideal and political result; but the indirect link is broadly similar. As with cooperation, there was the possibility that public enterprise might be used for radical ends, but the result was state paternalism rather than state socialism. The ideological complement to this was the formulation of a public service ethos which was paternalistic and conservative.

There can be little doubt that the role of government in nineteenth century Queensland was paternalistic. Queensland’s normal climate of political conservatism reinforced the role of state involvement in the economy everywhere except in the area of social reform. Here the government did nothing for as long as possible, then enacted humanitarian but paternalistic remedial legislation. The treatment of Aborigines was one example, and the factories and shops issue was another. After tolerating the extermination of Aborigines for decades, the government finally passed the Reserves Act of 1896 which protected the blacks by excluding them from white society. Similarly, before the progressive Factories and Shops Act 1897, the government had delayed acting until industrial conditions in Brisbane were among the worst in Australia. Then with Labor’s advent in 1915 the situation seemed to change: state

Queensland Nationalism and Australian Capitalism

insurance, Greater Brisbane, and the state parochial stations and butcher shops were all important departures in the use of the state. Labor’s cunning enterprise, on the other hand, was part of the government’s concern for primary industry rather than an enterprise in its own right, and the state’s one hotel at Athabaska was not a serious attempt to move into the liquor trade. Of all the state enterprises, the insurance project was the most potentially significant tactical move against capitalism. Labor’s early insurance plans definitely had some radical overtones. J.A. Fihelly, a fiery pro-Irish Assistant Minister of Justice, apparently had in mind a wider set of changes in the economic system, including the creation of labour exchanges and unemployment insurance; there was also a fairly hard edge in Labor’s attitude towards the private companies. Yet there were utilitarian aspects to the issue even then. Fihelly complained, for example, that there was no interference cooperation and this was an unnecessary source of expense. Both of these radical and practical elements in Labor thought on the matter could be seen in the actions of John Goodwin, the first SGIO Commissioner. As the government’s plan to broaden state insurance developed, his position changed from support for a mild radicalism to a preoccupation with practical details. During the preparation of the Insurance Act of 1916 which empowered the SGIO to move into other areas of the industry, he emphasised that the most controversial parts of the Bill had been "conceived in the spirit of cooperation with the companies and not with any idea of handicapping them." Although the SGIO set itself up as a successful competitor against the private companies by the mid-1920s, its policies then were predominantly business-like. In other words, even in the most potentially innovative area of public enterprise, paternalism had not been replaced by radicalism. The same failure could be seen in the government’s Workers’ Dwellings project and its conduct of the Government Savings Bank. The middle class drives of thrift and respect for property were reinforced by these projects more effectively than by empty sermonising.

The continuation of the earlier paternalist tradition of public enterprise under Labor was clear also in the social attitudes of the leading public servants. Their most consistent theme was unquestioning loyalty to the service. It was believed that public service required the strictest discipline for members of the service, and there was no support from the bureaucracy for workers’ control, even during Labor’s most radical inter-war years, upheld unquestioning loyalty, punctuality, and discipline as the required public service virtues. There should be a minimum of argument and a maximum of work, he stressed, ‘‘no argument at all. A similar emphasis could be found in other government departments. The aim of the QGO—the first government broadcasting service in Queensland—was service, not profit, maintained the Director in his first report in 1928: ‘‘Each member of staff is imbued with the spirit of service and is attached very closely to the institutions which he helps to man’. And the first report of the Land Administration
When the arbitration system is next considered as an influence on the Australian capitalist ethos, the theoretical link between its economies, social ideals, and politics is less clear again, yet the system itself is historically the best illustration of how Australian capitalism really works. Unlike cooperation or public enterprise, the Arbitration system contained no possibility of being used as a means of overthrowing capitalism. While working towards its aim of an egalitarian minimum-wages system, arbitration was also intended to regulate industrial conflict to preserve competition. Its strongest negative theme as a social ideal was the preservation of industrial law and order, and its political effect was to act as a mediator in adjusting radical unions to moderate parliaments.

There was a tradition of protective labour legislation established in Queensland well before 1915. Arbitration and Industrial Peace Acts were passed in 1894, 1908, and 1920. The Accommodation Acts, dealing with the living conditions of seasonal workers, went through in 1905 and 1915; provision for low-cost housing was made in the Workers' Dwellings Acts of 1909, 1916, 1919, and 1920. Considerable attention was paid to working and housing conditions as well. Factories and Shops Acts and awards were passed in 1896, 1900, 1908, and 1916. Accommodation Acts, dealing with the living conditions of seasonal workers, went through in 1905 and 1915; provision for low-cost housing was made in the Workers' Dwellings Acts of 1909, 1916, 1919, and 1920. Lastly there were some miscellaneous but important pieces of legislation—the Labour Exchanges Act of 1915, the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1916, and the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1923. While it is true that Ryan's ministry 1915-19 passed some valuable and innovative measures, the non-Labor parties had been active in the field for years previously. What distinguished Labor's era from the period of non-Labor rule was not so much the greater attention paid of labor matters after 1915, but the more generous spirit in which they were administered. A tradition of conservative paternalism was replaced by a new style of egalitarian paternalism, but the one was no less authoritarian than the other.

The state arbitration system was the result of experiment and accident as well as intention. Queensland, like Victoria, first adopted the Wage Board system in preference to arbitration, due to the greater strength of political conservatism in the state. Then, until 1915 arbitration was not given a very free rein. It was worked by conservative governments, which were wary of the system and reluctant to give it the right to operate preference to unionists. In 1915 Labor recognised, however, that union preference would not necessarily encourage labor militancy, while it would increase the scope of arbitration. Because of the combination of in time of war, the court's reputation took on a patriotic tone it had previously had at the state level. Subsequently a spirit of point-counter-point developed between the state and federal courts to the advantage of the former. Throughout Australia the twenties were a time of industrial turmoil and the federal governments of this era were unwittingly hostile to working class ambitions and did their best to use arbitration to improve of labour conditions—though still opposed to industrial dis-support than any other Australian court. There was no attempt to re-define the court's role until 1929.

Yet through the 1920s Labor was as insistent on maintaining industrial law and order as preceding conservative ministries had been. This policing function of the system can best be highlighted by looking at its ideological level. The dominant themes of the Queensland arbitration publicised of these as the basic wage was rigidly seen as something uniquely Australian. It was the economic expression of the paternalist ideal; everyone deserved a fair go, hence the minimum wage. All political parties endorsed the idea of a basic wage in the twenties, except that whereas Labor Premier Forgan Smith referred to the state's high wages of the dangers of living beyond one's means. Yet in practice, arbitration was merely a rigidly ordered and highly technical method of wage determination. Any real understanding of the system was extremely difficult for ordinary workers because of its complex methods. So the effect of arbitration here was elitist and egalitarian; it required the services of trained lawyers and economic technicians. Also, the system's complexity was, for some, give way to a preference for compulsory arbitration: people had to work to get the basic wage and they had to join unions when arbitration was made compulsory. An analogy be- the Nationalists favoured military conscription and wanted to reduce the compulsory elements in arbitration, Labor opposed conscription but wanted compulsory arbitration. Lastly, the third social movement of arbitra- tion was its utopianism. Here it bore the marks of its origins in the nineteenth and the first world war. In 1915 the prospect of a lasting in- order. Some conservatives dissented from the general enthusiasm about arbitration, arguing that it would sap the spirit of enterprise, but they were in the minority. So while the system's aspirations had been partly idealistic, the result was elitist and conservative as well as utopian and egalitarian.
egalitarian aim was that of the basic wage but the price it exacted was that arbitration had to be compulsory and this in effect made unionism compulsory. Queensland shared in the Australia-wide trend for arbitration to encourage the growth of trade unionism in general, while fragmenting its ideological base. Unions were formed by groups that were normally anti-union under the pressure of the system, and in this kind of unity there was weakness rather than strength for the whole labour movement. 19

The Non-Competitors: the Poor and Unemployed

Whereas cooperation, public enterprise, and arbitration were important restraints on the competitive ideal, there was another group in the community which was affected by the capitalist ethos but had no restraining effect on it—the poor and unemployed. The poor and the unemployed were the non-competitors. They exerted no positive influence over the commercial value system, yet they were an important factor—practically as a reserve pool of labour and ideologically as an example of the cost of social disorganization or inefficiency. Most Australian historians have ignored the poor, but the permanent poor in fact have formed a significant sub-group in society. 20

In Queensland this group had been treated with distinctive harshness. The state maintained a frontier society in many ways even in 1900: the obstacles to settlement created by its great distances, its later colonisation, the hostility of the Aborigines, and its unpredictable climate, all made locals preoccupied with their own concerns. They were distrustful of the personal weakness to which many believed poverty was due. It was almost a case of pioneering versus poverty—concentration on one excluded the other. It also seemed incomprehensible that a new land could have similar social problems to the Old Country’s and it was practically disloyal to say so. Private charity in Queensland was less active than in any other Australian state and its attitudes were singularly unenlightened. The Brisbane Charity Organisation Society is a good example. Formed in 1892, it was under the poverty of many of the mid-Victorian beliefs about poverty as a consequence of character weakness, into the new country. It had difficulty in winning public support and came to view itself as a protection agency for businessmen who wished to keep beggars off their premises. ‘Businessmen look upon their subscriptions to this Society as a good investment’, reported Secretary S.C. Carter in 1914, ‘and as an efficient protection from impostion’. In 1933 the C.O.S. recognised that unemployment and sickness were more important factors in creating poverty than drink, laziness, or incapacity, but by then the Society had become almost bankrupt and was quite ineffective. During the depression the government’s creation of the Social Service League to coordinate charity in the state was an acknowledgement of the failure of private charity in Queensland. 21

Because private charity was so weak in Queensland, public activity had to be more extensive. What was characteristic of government attitudes to the poor and unemployed, however, was an alternation between neglect and paternalism; as noted, conservative ministries tended to be benevolently paternalistic, whereas Labor governments developed a style of egalitarian paternalism, both could be neglectful. Unsympathetic attitudes to poverty were normal in Queensland until Labor’s win in 1915. Till then the matter was considered only because of the pressure of special groups or when a scandal took place. When the Accommodation Act of 1906 was passed, for instance, to deal with seasonal unemployment, or in 1908 when there was an inquiry into the sorrell Street Refuge. One illustration of these unsympathetic public attitudes was a report on outdoor relief made in 1900 by Dr J.E. Hare, the recently appointed state’s first Inspector of Charities and a leading medical man. In applying for aid the destitute had to supply information about their sobriety, length of residence in Queensland, state of health, poverty, and the situation of their relations. Hare was familiar with the problems met with in England concerning the Poor Law and was sharply critical of any ‘outbreak of sentimentality’ in the state which might lead away from the enlightened principles of the 1834 law. He warned against the danger that recipients of the 5/- allowance might come to regard it as a right, criticised the lack of coordination of private charity, and raised the threat of misguided benevolence might pauperise one and all. 22

With Labor’s victory in 1915 there came a wave of enthusiasm about the chances of solving the worst social problems, but the optimism soon found themselves in difficulties as the war’s end caused severe economic dislocation. Queensland had the highest average rate of unemployment of any Australian state in the immediate postwar years. Yet the existing avenues of relief were extremely unpopular. The agency responsible in Brisbane was the Government Relief Office, managed by J.S. Hagan, who had originated in the 1890s depression. The agency’s remit was to inspect the circumstances of relief applicants. Further, in non-metropolitan areas this was the duty of the local constable, and the attitudes of Hagan and his staffs were normally punitive. He firmly upheld the need for the ‘average public officer’ in the Office in exercising the power of his office. The question of whether the police should be involved in the relief of the poor has always been a controversial issue. Similarly, the question of how to deal with the consequences of poverty has been a long-standing issue in the history of social welfare. The 1930s saw a growing realization that the existing systems of relief were inadequate and that new approaches were needed. This led to the establishment of the Commonwealth Government’s Department of Social Services and the creation of the Commonwealth Department of Social and Community Services. The Department was responsible for administering various social welfare programs, including unemployment and sickness benefits, old age pensions, and various other forms of assistance. The Department also played a key role in the development of social policy and in the formulation of social welfare legislation. The Department’s work focused on providing support to individuals and families who were experiencing hardship due to poverty or other factors. The Department sought to ensure that those in need had access to the support they required to sustain their livelihood and to enable them to participate fully in society. This included providing financial assistance, counseling, and other forms of support. The Department’s work was guided by principles of social justice, equality, and respect for individual dignity. The Department also sought to address the root causes of poverty and to work towards creating a more equitable and fair society. The Department’s efforts in this area included advocating for policy changes and working collaboratively with other organizations and governments to develop solutions to the challenges faced by those living in poverty. The Department’s work was not without its challenges. It faced a range of obstacles, including limited resources, complex social dynamics, and the need to navigate political and social divides. Despite these challenges, the Department continued to work tirelessly to support those in need and to contribute to the development of a more just and equitable society. 23

The next step, which seemed a real breakthrough, was the 1932 Un-
be portrayed as a contract between the government and those in the service who required loyalty in return for security and some social prestige. The aspiration of the system was undermined by its own inherent authoritarianism, though this tended to be concealed by its utopian aspects and ideologies as well. Each had some feature that could plausibly be presented as favourable to the working class, but which worked to the result of these ideologies? The dominant economic ideology was collectively competitive, but the normal reality was controlled competition. This underprivileged in Queensland were mobilized in a distinctive way: they were rigidly hostile to climate of opinion that made them into social outcasts. The existence of the poor and unemployed seemed to threaten the identity of those who had succeeded in Queensland.

Equality, Authority, and Exploitation

Queensland capitalism was viable because it made a workable fusion of some of the main national ideals. Nationalism thus militated against the formation of a clear working class ideal in a number of categories. One of these was the ideal of controlled capitalism, held by the business classes; the themes of confusion and control, which really, were credos of monopoly capitalism, could be represented as "civilized capitalism" of socially responsible materialism—an object to which the right wing of the Labor Party lovingly devoted itself. Another was the ideal of agrarianism, coupled with cooperative self-help, held by small farmers and members of urban cooperative groups; elements of these could be publicized as authentic ideals for the working man, whereas they really served the interests of the ruling class concerned. A third ideal was that of paternalism held by the leading officials in the public service. This could
land Labor against Hughes' Federal government. So probably Queensland conservation is not something unique in Australian history, rather, it is Australian society which normally has been conservitive and this outlook has been exemplified in Queensland. There were four main sources of Queensland's conservativeness: The strength of regionalism, the dominance of primary producers, the corporatist use of the state, and the power of monopolies. Some of these factors were present in other states, but Queensland was the only one in which they were pulled together so tightly. The result was an authoritarian social and political climate: Queensland was the first state to introduce compulsory voting, and Labor governments consistently downgraded the value of education between 1915 and 1957. In this sense, the Bjelke-Petersen government was the result of years of Labor vortipation and maladministration, but the long term sources of the state's conservatism were the factors just mentioned.

Secondly, how have capitalism and nationalism been related in Queensland? This is a more important question than the first in some ways, as it transcends state differences. This essay argues that the main ideological link between capitalism as an economic system and nationalism as a social ideal has been the goal of collective competition. Collective competition was the economic expression of the Australian mateship ideal. 'A Fair Go', 'Cradled Capitalism', 'Colonial Socialism' — the old slogans — have much truth to them. Ethnographic was the ideological basis of the Queensland economy, not just an ecopan theme of the bush poets. However, equality, as Engels and others have argued, often implied authority. The direction of Queensland's economic life oscillated unsteadily between egalitarian aims and authoritarian results. Agrarianism at its worst could become romantic anarchism, state enterprise degenerated into state paternalism, and arbitration could be reduced to a rigid stress on law and order. This type of reductionism was most harmful when it affected the weaker groups in the community. Society was divided into a majority of more or less contented groups and an ill-used but powerless minority: there was a strong sense of stability in the larger groups and extreme instability in the smaller. The larger were held to their social ideals with great rigidity — attitudes to agricultural cooperation, state and private enterprise, and arbitration changed in degree with the politics of the government in power, but not in kind. Attitudes to the weaker groups, on the other hand, were extremely unstable. Poverty was acutely rationalized away and then over-compensated for, while a general sense of public hostility to underprivileged groups remained constant. Because of this the position of many people could be threatened with the possibility of a drastic change for the worse. So long as they were members of a major group they were relatively secure, yet if they became unable or unwilling to work they could be forced into the ranks of the outcasts.

Lastly, if the Queensland experience is representative then we can say that the most significant feature of Australian capitalism in international terms between 1890 and 1930 was the development of the technical of corporate neo-capitalism at a remarkably early time. Just as KoRo discerned the triumph of conservation in American capitalism during the Progressive era, so a similar spread of bureaucracy and concentration and 1930s. Though business never had the same dominance over America and it invariably worked to the benefit of the ruling elite. A that was more acceptable to Australians: it was a fusion of American and British methods that had the same logic and goals of its own. To see the Whirlam mismanagement makes sense only in a short term perspective. Australian and regulated societies for some time.

What has been historically distinctive about the relation of nationalism and capitalism in Australia is more the degree of class control than of history precisely, because the underlying cosmist of Australia has been frequently put into practice there. In this light, Queensland's place in the world is historically compatible with that of the regionally depressed economic regions; and further, the countries whose national political economy corresponds most closely to Australia's are also in danger of being swamped by nearby cultures. For a variety of Canada or South Africa, and this contributed significantly to a more Queensland was quite utopian in this way because the state lacked a changed and now Queensland is logically leading the way to an Australian variety of fascism.
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