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Abstract

Citizenship has been an underpinning philosophy of the Australian welfare state since 1945 and is central to the rights of all citizens in a modern society, including people with disabilities. The ‘social rights’ of citizenship in the Australian welfare state and the associated income support for people with disabilities is one example of these rights in Australia. The historical developments of the post World War Two period within the Australian welfare state were closely aligned with the early assumptions that citizenship in a modern society exemplified legal, political and social rights. During the 1970’s, domestic and international pressures on the Australian welfare state led citizenship to reformulation, one that emphasised ‘rights’ and ‘responsibilities’. Critics of citizenship argued for further rights from the hegemony of the market while others argued for furthering liberty and obligations from an over-coercive state. The latter has been prominent in recent developments in welfare reform and argues strongly about the ‘responsibilities’ obligated to income recipients. This paper explains and analyses these historical changes through an analysis and discussion of Hansard records and newspaper articles from the Sydney Morning Herald from 1945-2004. It argues that income support for people with disabilities has been transformed from a ‘right’ to a ‘responsibility’.
Introduction

This paper examines the ‘social rights’ of citizenship within the income support system for people with disabilities from 1945-2004 within the Australian welfare state. It presents the findings of research conducted by the author in 2004 of Hansard records and newspaper articles concerning these changes to the income support system. It utilises a citizenship perspective in its analysis and discussion and relates the findings of the research to the major interpretations of citizenship in the relevant periods. Commencing with the relationship between citizenship and ‘social rights’ harks back to English sociologist T.H Marshall (1893-1981). In his seminal essay, ‘Citizenship and Social Class’ (1949) citizenship was conceived as:

1. Legal Rights: this argues for the rights for individual freedom. That is, liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and conclude valid contracts, and the rights to justice. The institutions established with this right are legal courts of civil and criminal justice;

2. Political rights: this argues for the rights to participate in a political process, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of such a body. The institutions established with this right are Parliaments and local elective bodies; and

3. Social rights: this argues for the rights to a modest amount of economic welfare and security, to live the life of a civilised human being according to the standards prevailing in the society. The institutions established with this right are the educational system, and the social services. (Marshall 1963, pp. 65-122).

Citizenship in the Post World War Two Period and Challenges in the 1970’s

‘Social rights’ played a substantial institutional design of the Australian welfare state in the post World War Two era, characterised by distributive justice, maximal feasible participation by the people in the decisions that affected them, and social supports that would maximise self-worth and dignity, minimise stigma and create an equitable and just community. (Jamrozik 2001, p. 5).

T.H Marshall argued that the ‘social rights’ of citizenship guaranteed the rights to a modest amount of economic welfare and security, to live the life of a civilised human being according to the standards prevailing in the society and for this right to be established within the institutions of the educational system, and the social services. Therefore, the theory implied equality of its members of a society.

Within the 1970’s, an ideological and philosophical debate emerged by those on left and right of politics in Australia that argued that citizenship was no longer operable. The left argued on furthering equality and entitlements, and reducing the hegemony of the market, the right on the other hand, had a strong emphasis on liberty and obligations. (Fitzpatrick 2001, p. 58). Eventually, those on the ‘right’ gained substantial ground in the debate, by accommodating some of the interests of the left such as health, housing and education, to be successfully implemented. The welfare state was seen as being incapable of operation within the values inherent in capitalism. Even T.H Marshall argued that this combination was particularly uneasy describing it as a ‘hyphenated society’ resulting in a ‘troika of democratic-welfare-capitalism’. (Marshall 1981). These critiques rejected the traditions set out in the
1950’s and 1960’s. Their emphasis was the importance of the ‘market’, a situation which argued providing an alternative for policy making and removing the role of government in welfare provision. This created a ‘new’ emphasis on the role and function of agencies, charities and other welfare providers. This role was an extremely important one that serviced some of the most entrenched disadvantage in Australian society.

Changes in Citizenship and Welfare in the 1980’s-1990’s

Throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s, Australia went through a number of important changes which challenged the role and importance of the citizenship theory and the welfare state. Citizenship, certainly as T.H Marshall envisaged, had to be universal, which defined all social classes sharing the same form of social protection. Australia, with its ‘uneasy alliance’ between the left and the right was defined as a ‘liberal’ mechanism, therefore defining citizenship through the policy prescriptions of means-tested benefits designed to alleviate poverty and advocating the role of the private sector over the public. (Esping-Anderson 1990; Shaver 2001, p. 280). T.H Marshall’s version of citizenship was attacked as being ineffective in addressing the characteristics of the welfare state, particularly when the ideas of the ‘new right’ dominated policy development in the 1980’s in the countries of Britain, New Zealand and United States of America. Whilst these countries, sought to manage policy outcomes in a cost-effective manner, its doctrine permeated all areas of policy management, focusing unfortunately on narrow interpretations of economic development and social policy making. This idea has become known as economic rationalism and it sought and legitimatised the role and dominance of specific forms of economics over other cognitive disciplines in the formulation of policy outcomes. Policy outcomes of the post-welfare state in Australia were measured by these economic parameters and sought particular kinds of management practice for agencies, charities and other welfare providers. Some of these ideas have been recently described as ‘New Public Management’ (NPM), which seeks not only to manage the public sector and administer the services it provides, but also to define and underpin the relationship between governments and citizens. (Pusey 1991; Saunders 1994, p. 126; Rix 2003, p. 238).

Citizenship therefore, particularly since T.H Marshall, has become a hotly contested ground of debate, for those on both the left and right of politics in Australia, and the social policy theorists, who are anxious to reclaim the moral and systematic basis of the declining welfare state. (Jayasuriya 1996, p. 20).

It is no surprise then, with this drive for economic efficiency, the welfare state is seen as an infringement to economic productivity and competitiveness as western governments across the world pursue an emphasis on ‘freeing up’ markets. This economic policy has directly and indirectly affected the size of the public sector and it has had particular serious ramifications on the welfare state. The substantial government programs of the 1940’s-1970’s are now seen as too expensive and creating disincentive effects. The economic ‘golden age’ of high economic growth, rising living standards and full employment is now over, and Australia faces levels of uncertainty that has permeated all aspects of economics including the welfare state. (Jones 1990, p. 50).

These ideas have placed the Australian welfare state under huge pressure as successive Australian governments have pursed in freeing up markets instead of pursuing the dominant economic and social framework of policy making of the post
World War Two period. Indeed, the ‘social rights’ of citizenship model of the post World War Two period is longer seen as being able to delivery services in a manner that warranted its original justification. This ideological shift is seen as the beginning of the importance of ‘free-market’ economics, a situation that justifies a framework that has re-formulated the former goals of the welfare state in the post World War Two period to the ‘newer’ objectives of what’s been called the post-welfare state. These newer objectives have emphasised the importance of a number of implicit goals that have become an important part of this new post-welfare state. The changes have been significant and Adam Jamrozik (2001), shows these changes in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Welfare State</th>
<th>The Post-Welfare State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of responsibility for the welfare of all citizens as matter of deliberate policy</td>
<td>Acceptance of responsibilities for welfare as a matter of rather unfortunate necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal entitlements to social provisions</td>
<td>Selective entitlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim to control the excesses of the ‘free market’ economy</td>
<td>Promotion of market economy principals as a model to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the pursuit of equality at least in access to opportunities and resources</td>
<td>Acceptance of inequality as ‘natural’ and indeed desirable to achieve efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the principals of collectivity</td>
<td>Commitment to individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing money, services and power through citizens participation</td>
<td>Distributing money, some services but no power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social provisions as entitlements</td>
<td>Social provisions as commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control by the state</td>
<td>Social control increasingly by the market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These changes have had enormous effect on the idea of citizenship and the provision of welfare services in Australia. Governments across the western world have been following these trends for their own policy development in citizenship and welfare. ‘Welfare reform’ has been a central platform since the late 1980’s in Australian social policy development and the rhetoric of these developments have been on a more ‘active society’, to supplant these new notions of the post-welfare state. Its popularity has been evident across the western world, as the central arguments advocated by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development was taken up by Australia’s Social Security Review. (Kalisch 1991, pp. 5-6, cited in Shaver 2001, pp. 280-281).

**Citizenship and Welfare in the 21st Century**

Since the election of the Liberal/National Coalition Government in 1996, social policy has been placed under the continual banner of welfare reform. Terms such as ‘mutual obligation’ and ‘work for the dole’ have become popular in the rhetoric of these reforms. Indeed, these terms have been placed in a context of social pathology. ‘Welfare dependency’ and ‘passive welfare’ are seen as language which places
mistrust on some of the most vulnerable individuals in Australian society, individuals who are supposedly ‘abusing the system’ through false claims. (Shaver 2001, p. 281).

Welfare reform is now part of a shift from the social right to welfare to reciprocal relationships: notions of individualism and minimal government support. Indeed, most welfare services are now provided by the charity, non-profit and private sector, a situation that provides a new contemporary contractualism. As Yeatman (1996, p. 39) argues,

“Contractualist doctrines are those which locate the legitimacy of social obligation in the legally sanctioned and freely undertaken contractual choice of individuals. What this means is, contractualist doctrines are those, which require social obligation to be mediated by some form of individualised consent. This means that social processes, outcomes and relationships have to be made accountable to individualised inquiry and judgment.”

**The Relationship between Citizenship and the Welfare State**

There have been significant developments in the literature on the nature of the ‘social rights’ of citizenship and the Australian welfare state since T.H Marshall’s original contribution. This paper will not examine the now extensive literature on the subject but rather will explore the main themes. The two fundamental arguments of T.H Marshall’s thesis were that first, citizenship was a *status* and a set of *rights*. These two terms implied therefore a ‘measure of equality’. Second, citizenship had a conflicting task, and as many would argue, capitalism created forces that it itself unfortunately couldn’t control like inequality. Therefore, the role of the welfare state was a mediating one: comprising between the two factors of capitalism and welfare to achieve some measure of redistribution. According to T.H Marshall, citizenship was incompatible with capitalism because citizenship meant equality while capitalism meant inequality. Certainly, T.H Marshall had a number of challenges in the way citizenship was interpreted. One of these interpretations was the manner in which ‘social rights’ were invoked. If citizenship wasn’t possible in a capitalist economy then at least the principal had to be operational. To be operational then, the ‘social rights’ of citizenship had to have corresponding duties. “Social rights could be established only by the exercise of political power-that is, by the discharge of the duties of citizenship-and the discharge of these duties did not depend on a person’s economic position in society. Nevertheless, a person’s position in society, whether poor or rich should be guaranteed when the issue of citizenship arose. (Marshall 1963, pp. 103-123).

T.H Marshall’s answer was the welfare state, and in his later work, *The Right to Welfare and Other Essays* (1981) he reaffirmed his commitment to citizenship rights by arguing, “It is the fundamental principal of the welfare state that the market value of an individual cannot be the measure of his right to welfare” (Marshall 1981, p. 107).

Christopher Pierson (1991, p. 11) has furthered this argument and suggests, “The state under capitalism might intervene in the reproduction of social relations however it could not:

1. Intervene in such a way as to undermine the logic of the capitalist market economy; or
2. Act against the long-term interests of the capitalist class. Whatever institutional form the state under capitalism might take…it remained in essence a capitalist state.”

Citizenship and welfare therefore was grounded in the mechanism of the state. As Maurice Roche (1992, p. 230) argues,

“The contract was formed between democratic nation states and the nationally based and organised industrial capitalist economies to which they played host. Welfare and social citizenship, both the welfare state and the welfare market were central to this accommodation. Capitalism would undertake to deliver employment and income (and thus market-based welfare), in return for various state services. The state would undertake to produce and reproduce a relevantly skilled and healthy labour force (via an educational and welfare state). It would also undertake to maintain the cultural, institutional and physical infrastructure of the market and of social life in general at local/urban and national levels.”

The welfare state and the economy then exist side by side. Certainly, there is incompatibility, but the welfare state cannot exist without the economy, and it is this relationship between the nature of capitalism that has been a central debate within the last twenty years. (Offe 1984; Mann 1987; Oldfield 1990; Turner 1990).

**Liberal Interpretations of Citizenship**

Liberal interpretations of citizenship highlight the importance of individuals rather than any collective notion. When it comes to the liberal interpretation of citizenship, liberals argue that T.H Marshall’s model is an infringement on individual freedom. Charles Reich (1964, pp. 733-87) for example argued in favour of a ‘new property’ that aligned social rights with private property. The ‘social right’ to a social security benefit must be protected against over-intervention by the state (or private individuals); the rights were to be predictable (rather than discretionary) and they were to be administered in a detached, neutral manner. The objective was to overcome bureaucratic invasions of individual privacy, moralism or disregard for civil rights. (Carney and Hanks 1994, p. 105).

Richard Titmuss took a broader perspective, correlating the major developments of T.H Marshall’s ideas by stretching the opportunities for economic and social equality with his famous models of social policy (1974). In this model, social policy was formulated in three different ways. They were Residual, Industrial/Achievement and Institutional/Redistributive. The residual model was based on historical ideas about social assistance; the industrial/achievement model was based on the wage-related social insurance of the post World War Two period; while the institutional/redistributive model attempted to highlight a vision in which a broad range of institutions enabled the community to share in both giving and receiving. (Titmuss 1974).
Civic-Republican Interpretations of Citizenship

The civic-republican model aligns with Richard Titmuss’s Institutional/Redistributive aspect with its emphasis on a broad range of institutions enabling the community to share in both giving and receiving. It also considers it appropriate in fostering ‘citizenship practice’ within the ambit of the Institutional/Redistributive model as argued by Richard Titmuss whilst borrowing the reciprocal theory of the liberal interpretation, and seeking to reconstitute a ‘social relations of reciprocity’ within the institutions of the law, the political system and social policy.

As Carney and Hanks (1994, p. 107) point out, “the civic-republican model recognizes the interconnected relationships between people and communities, the reciprocal nature of the duties owed by each to others, and the priority given to participation within accessible local, family or community structures”. Ideas of universalism in social policy, such as those argued by Richard Titmuss were challenged in the 1970’s as ineffective in dealing with economic instability, recession and government debt. It was a position but forward by James O’Connor (1973, p. 2) who argued that government expenditure was now outracing revenues. “There is no iron law that expenditures must always rise more rapidly than revenues, but it is a fact that growing needs which only the state can meet create even greater claims on the state budget.” Similar positions such as those by Ramash Mishra (1984) argued about the problem of legitimacy with the welfare state, while Claus Offe (1984) suggested the, ‘crisis of crisis management’ of capitalist welfare states and the ineffectiveness of these state to find solutions to the socio-economic problems they face.

Criticisms of T.H Marshall’s ‘Social Rights’ of Citizenship

Gertrude Himmelfarb (1984, p. 268) advocated a clearer hypothesis of the model particularly around the sequence of its historical development. Why do civil and political rights presuppose social rights? “It is the sequence that gives rise to the familiar idea that political rights are less advanced, less progressive than social rights, that are ‘merely formal’, insubstantial, illusory, until fleshed out with a full complement of social rights.” This suggests that T.H Marshall’s chronology of citizenship determines that the ‘social rights’ of citizenship are the latest addition to the citizenship model when it could be possible that a historical model of rights (civil, political and social) may have evolved in a differing order during the time period T.H Marshall envisaged.

Robert Goodin and Julian le Grand question the very basis of T.H Marshall’s philosophy, the idea that all members of the community are beneficiaries of citizenship. ‘Community’ is too imprecise as a concept to serve as a justification for the welfare state, or to describe the character of program outcomes, as there may be no necessary correlation between welfare programs and well-integrated social structures founded in ‘common membership of a single-status moral community’. (Goodin and le Grand 1987, p. 12; Carney and Hanks 1994, p. 109).

Alternatively, Harris (1987, p. 85) disagrees suggesting the welfare state is the exemplar of social status stemming from membership of the community. Equality as social status is portrayed, as the hallmark of full membership of society, meaning that social status is a relational concept. Social rights exist in order to compensate for inequalities of status created by individuals acting on the basis of their civil and political rights.
The ‘New Right’ Criticisms of the ‘Social Rights’ of Citizenship

The criticisms advocated by the ‘new right’ contend that ‘social rights’ threaten ‘civil rights’ by enhancing the role of the state through high levels of taxation. ‘Social rights’ therefore should be theorised in a negative fashion: to limit the role of the state in all aspects. The foundation of the welfare state requires substantial wealth and the effectiveness of ‘social rights’ are predetermined by the nature and degree of economic development and legislative rights. Charles Murray’s (1984) argued that provisions such as income support for the unemployed present a moral hazard: the promotion of social irresponsibility. The ‘new right’ strongly argues that the welfare state has a produced a destructive, possessive and passive form of citizenship. People, for example, become unwilling to do anything for themselves or for anyone else. According to the ‘new right’ the original model envisaged by T.H Marshall et al. has produced a society of takers rather than givers.

Christopher Pierson (1991, p. 48) has put forward that the ‘new right’ welfare state is characteristic of the following:

1. The welfare state is uneconomic: it displaces the incentives of the market and undermines the incentives of capital to invest and the incentives of labour to work;

2. The welfare state is unproductive: it encourages the growth of public bureaucracy and leads to inflationary wage pressures by that bureaucracy because of its monopoly position;

3. The welfare state is inefficient: it leads to the growth of interests of the welfare producers rather than the welfare of consumers;

4. The welfare state is ineffective: despite huge increases of public expenditure, it has failed to eliminate poverty and inequality and it creates a ‘cycle of dependence’;

5. The welfare state is despotic: the bureaucracy becomes a social control mechanism over individuals and even entire communities whom it is expected to serve; and

6. The welfare state is a denial of freedom: it operates on a compulsory principle.

The ‘new right’ argues that the model of T.H Marshall has not achieved what it originally intended. The dominant paradigm advocated by Marshall et al. has failed to address the original problems they were supposed to eliminate. Concurrently, the ‘social rights’ of citizenship doesn’t enhance the rights of people but rather burdens their individualism, aspirations and independence. (Roche 1992, p. 222).

Recent Evaluations

The recent responses from the ‘new right’ critique have provided an important contribution to the ‘social rights’ of citizenship debate. Higgins and Ramia (2000, pp. 144-149) offer a number of solutions to the ‘new right’ critique. They emphasise the renewal of three specific policy objectives that have more inclusive outcomes for the
‘social rights’ of citizenship. These are industry policy, economic re-regulation and an expansion and integration of welfare and labour market policies.

First, Australia needs an economy capable of generating enough quality jobs and career paths available to all job seekers, and enough revenue to support the requisite income transfers and high-quality welfare and education services.

Second, economic performance depends principally on economic regulation and in particular on the mix of ‘political’ regulation as against unregulated market allocation of resources. Economic liberalism not only turns its face against policy interventions in aid of social citizenship, it also lays waste to the socioeconomic preconditions for it in economic performance.

Third, arrangements that integrate welfare provision with labour-market regulation would allow employees to take leave or reduce their working week on earnings-related publicly funded benefits in order to have children, look after dependents, retrain, or take an extended sabbatical, without prejudice to their permanent, full-time status. As such, a policy of economic regulation—one that is not informed by economic rationalism, and a welfare state and labour market that needs to be treated as interconnected spheres, facilitating a coordinated, and hence purposeful approach to social protection and individual options is required.

Others such as Plant (1991, p. 63) argue that governments ultimately have to be the employer of last resort in any workforce linked to the ideas of citizenship, especially in periods of high unemployment. This necessity conflicts sharply with the views of the ‘new right’ on labour market regulation and public expenditure. If unemployment benefits were made conditional on work, then this would dramatically increase public expenditure in this field since such work would have to be found and manufactured by the state in those areas where the market cannot provide jobs.

**Changes in Income Support for People with Disabilities 1945-2004**

This section examines the findings of research conducted in 2004 of changes towards income support for people with disabilities. In order to examine this question, it focuses on two major sources. First, it examines Hansard records from the House of Representatives and the Senate within the Parliament of Australia dated from 1945-2004, while secondly, it examines various newspaper articles from the Sydney Morning Herald dated from 1945-2004 concerning citizenship and income support for people with disabilities. Other relevant documents were also examined to understand what the story is behind the changes in income support for people with disabilities and these are evident throughout the following discussion and analysis.

**Hansard Records**

An examination of Hansard records that were dated prior, during and after any administrative, legislative and policy changes had occurred was undertaken. Any specific indicators or notions of citizenship, income support for people with disabilities and welfare etc. discussed in any of the articles were noted. Any other changes in the discourse of the language used towards income support for people with disabilities within the political context was also noted. The parliamentary debates dated prior to the 1970’s were searched manually while the parliamentary debates dated after these times were searched on-line through the facilities of the Parliament of Australia website.
Newspaper Articles

A similar approach was undertaken with newspaper articles examined from the Sydney Morning Herald. They were dated from 1945-2004. An examination of the articles dated prior, during and after any administrative, legislative and policy changes occurred or when specific indications of issues were present such as the mention of citizenship, income support for people with disabilities or welfare etc. Again, any specific indicators or notions of the issues discussed in any of the articles were noted as well as any changes in the discourse of the language used towards citizenship, income support for people with disabilities or welfare.

Boundaries of the Research

The boundaries set within the sources pertained to the administrative, legislative and policy changes that occurred with the context of income support for people with disabilities. The boundaries were as follows and were limited to the post 1945 time frame:

1. Any major changes in the administration of income support for people with disabilities;

2. Any major changes in the legislation and the policy prescriptions the incumbent governments have sought;

3. A change in government, whereby the political ideology of the new government was markedly different from the former government’s policy on these matters; and

4. Limiting the search requirements in the research process by the relevant words such as citizenship, income support for people with disabilities and welfare.

Income support for people with disabilities and the ‘social rights’ of citizenship is a mixture of ideology and rhetoric that needs clearer explanation, not only for people with disabilities but in the context of the broader welfare state.

Whilst government policy in the last century has moved in a slow but progressive fashion towards this group, specific administrative, legislative and policy developments have in the main, encouraged people with disabilities to specific and different forms of citizenship.

Income Support for People with Disabilities: The ‘Social Rights’ of Citizenship

Within this period of 1945-1975, the interpretation of ‘rights’ in relation to people with disabilities was seen as the basic participatory level of income support, an argument evident throughout the Hansard records and newspaper articles. The first mention of the ‘social rights’ of citizenship was made in the House of Representatives on the 19th June 1945. It was in the second reading of the Invalid and Old Age Pension Bill 1945 by the member for Wentworth, Mr. Harrison from the Australian Labor Party discussing the idea that social security benefits are a right not a charity.
“The Opposition believes in a liberal policy of social services, as shown by the fact that the government supported by honorable members now on this side of the chamber introduced the original child endowment scheme. We believe that social services should be provided on a contributory basis. That is the only sane and just method of finance for such purposes. The social services of the nation should be made available to all citizens as a right and not as a charity.”


A similar discussion was made in the Estimates and Budgets of the Senate on the 26th September 1945 with the member for Western Australia, Senator Nash from the Australian Labor Party discussing the responsibility of government to provide social security benefits and within those benefits about the privileges of citizenship.

(Australia Senate 1945, 3rd Session, 17th Parliament, 14th September-5th October, p. 5886).

These examples argue citizenship is composed of duties and of rights, but other characteristics were shown on the 23rd May 1947 on the Social Services Consolidation Bill 1947 that had the member for South Australia, Senator Finley from the Australian Labor Party making references to the removal of clauses concerning the disqualification of particular races.

It was reinforced again on the 21st May 1947 with a discussion on the Social Services Consolidation Bill 1947. Member for Western Australia, Senator Nash from the Australian Labor Party argued, “This bill constitutes an instalment of social justice and is a further step towards the goal of social security which our people deserve and require.”


Changes in the conception of ‘rights’ and ‘responsibilities’ was interpreted as the ‘right’ to income support to alleviate disadvantage while encouraging civic duty ‘responsibilities’ and on the 27th September 1955, the member for Sturt, Mr. Makin from the Australian Labor Party spoke of government responsibilities for its people in regard to social services. “In regard to social services, no country can claim to have discharged its duty unless it has afforded security to its people.”


Citizenship, as T.H Marshall claimed, was a basic right within democracies. Therefore, the premise of the welfare state is an instrument that ought to enable individuals to develop their capacities and to transcend the obstacles that birth or circumstance place in their paths. (Beilharz et al. 1992, p. 24).

Under the Menzies Government during the 1950’s however, citizenship was vastly transformed, as interpreted by T.H Marshall et al. Only gradual improvements to social security were made and income support therefore, was a ‘right’ to social justice as an article in the Sydney Morning Herald on the 13th September 1958 entitled, ‘Social Services and Party Policies’ discussed that improved social service benefits was a matter of justice, and not just bait for votes. Citizenship, therefore, under Menzies was not to alleviate poverty but a liberal interpretation of individualism by enhancing the role of the middle class rather than the ‘social rights’ aspects of T.H. Marshall.

It would be inappropriate however to blame the Australian Liberal/Country party for this decline in Marshallian social citizenship in the 1950’s. Menzies worked
consistently with Chifley and Curtin on a number of social security developments, including developments towards people with disabilities. An article entitled, ‘Care of Spastics in Australia Praised’ in the Sydney Morning Herald on the 27th September 1960 had Sir Kenneth Coles saying that Australia was at the forefront in the treatment of spastics. ‘There are a much higher percentage of spastics leading normal lives in Australia than in most countries’. The article also discussed the organisation, The International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. The social movement towards people with disabilities emphasised ‘rights’ to a normal life as well as the support from government resources. This was illustrated during discussion of the Social Services Bill 1966, when the member for Grayndler, Mr. Daly from the Australian Liberal Party/Country Party discussed the responsibility of the government towards the community and its less fortunate members including people with disabilities. He discusses, “This is an election year. This is the occasion when the government sees fit to grant meagre benefits to some of those dependent on social services.” (Australia House of Representatives 1966, 1st Session, 25th Parliament, 16th August-25th October, pp. 931-935).

While attacking the Australian Labor Party, it nevertheless calls to reason once again the real rhetoric during the Menzies years. The granting of meagre benefits is an individualistic conception of citizenship, one with a residual welfare system for those who could not find a place in either the property market or the labour market. Hence, it was a revolt against the Keynesian planners in the Commonwealth public service as well as the Australian Labor Party. It was also a dismissal of their perceived infringement on individual freedom. (Beilharz et al. 1992, p. 24).

For T.H Marshall et al. rights were not enhanced through the liberal interpretation of citizenship, but rather as the 1960’s preceded the re-emergence of social class and poverty in Australia. In 1967, Aboriginal Australians defined political and social citizenship with the full right to vote, but other minority groups such as people with disabilities seemed on the end of many administrative reforms.

An article entitled, ‘MP says Social Service System ‘Confidence Trick’ in the Sydney Morning Herald on the 12th April 1967 discussed the election promise of liberalising the means test for invalid pensioners and people with disabilities working in sheltered workshops. Mr. F.M Daly from the Australian Labor Party condemned the government’s lack of action in the area arguing people with disabilities suffer all types of discrimination particularly between married and single rate pensions. It should allow adequate social service increases to cover the costs of living, make increased pension allowances retrospective to the date of the election, and to abolish the means test. Mr. F.M Daly argued that the new provisions would apply to only one-tenth of pensioners in Australia. He argues,

“Somewhere in the ranks of the Liberal/Country Party government, or in the Social Services Department, there must be a person employed from time to time, with fanatical, fiendish ingenuity, to provide a plan with the minimum amount of benefits to the smallest number of people, but with appeal to as many as possible.” (Sydney Morning Herald 12th April 1967, p. 8).

On the 17th February 1971 when the Minister for Social Security, Mr. Wentworth from the Australian Liberal/Country Party discussed the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service and produced official figures on who was accepted and who was rejected. The accepted applicants were required, as part of their rehabilitation,
employment in a relevant field. The interesting point to note is that the rejected people with disabilities had to find work on their own accord in negotiation with the charity or private organisation that was offering employment. So this discussion seems to prioritise people with disabilities accordingly with their rehabilitation, so they may still receive income support but employment prospects are relegated to their own means. He argues,

“There must be a reasonable prospect of the individual engaging in a suitable vocation within three years after the commencement of rehabilitation treatment or training. Pensioners failing to meet the above requirements are not accepted for rehabilitation assistance.” (Australia House of Representatives 1971, 2nd Session, 27th Parliament, 16th February-2nd April, p. 229).

This change in rhetoric within the analysis is the first one to highlight the difference between the two major political parties in Australia. Part of the reason lies in the political ideology of the Australian Liberal/Country Party who expect people receiving income support (disabled or not) to be able to work. The other reason is the concern shown particularly from the Australian Liberal/Country Party on the rising expenditure growth.

**Challenges to the Australian Welfare State: Rising Expenditure Growth**

The proportion of GDP Australia spends on income support for people with disabilities have been one of the major concerns in the last fifty years in the provision of income support measures. In relation to people with disabilities, it wasn’t a concern for the Labour Party initially. However it was evident that throughout the analysis the Australian Liberal/National parties were particularly concerned and this has remained unchanged until today.

The first instance of discussion of the growth in expenditure occurred in the Sydney Morning Herald on 26th July 1947, which highlighted the cost of social security benefits to government expenditures. The article discussed the growing rates of government expenditure and throughout the article compared Australian expenditure to New Zealand expenditure. The article discussed how generous New Zealand was in creating a strong ‘social fabric’ with considerable outlays in family, old age, hospital, medical, widows, pharmaceutical, superannuation, invalidity, sickness and maternity benefits. The link with Australian citizenship is not that distant. New Zealand suffered major economic depressions during the 1890’s, in 1921 and in the 1930’s, and their aims in creating a strong ‘social fabric’ were because of these very difficult times. Concern with expenditure in the post World War Two period was not a concern for the Australian Labor Party because the Labor government were inspired from the ideas from New Zealand, with the right to social security benefits for all and the intellectual guidance from the thinkers of the British welfare state such as Beveridge, Keynes and T.H Marshall. (Sydney Morning Herald 26th July 1947, p. 2).

The Labor government’s philosophy towards increasing expenditure in the discussion of the Social Services Consolidation Bill of 1947 within the Hansard records made reference to the growing rate of government expenditure required to finance social service provisions. On the 16th May 1947, Senator Nash from the Australian Labor Party discussed the importance of the Bill, and the role of
government in social services, arguing that the rise of expenditure since Federation was part of a wider goal of Labour values in making sure social security benefits were available to all who required them.

It was contrasted as an attack on Senator Sampson from the Australian Liberal/National party who suggested that social security revenue of this magnitude and growing larger every financial year was irresponsible on the government’s behalf.

Senator Nash proclaims, “There is a world-wide broadening of the scope of social services. This government has lit a torch and, with the assistance of the people of Australia, it is doing a wonderful job. The bill is designed to develop a system of social security that will bring us one step nearer to our ultimate goal of the brotherhood of man.” (Australia Senate 1947, 1st Session, 18th Parliament, 15th May-6th June, pp. 2612-2616).

With such spirited discussion occurring within the Australian Labor Party, the Chifley Government enhanced social security with the opening up of the Invalid and Old Age Pension to include incapacity and blindness that occurred within a temporary absence from Australia. The eligibility limits were set as any incapacity that occurred outside of Australia and did not disqualify a claimant if they arrived in Australia within 3 years or had resided continually in Australia for 20 years.

With the further opening up of benefits to invalid pensioners from October 1948, the pension was also paid to recipients undertaking vocational training or treatment. Included was a training allowance and living away from home allowance. By 1950, a medical service was set up to provide free services and during the early 1950’s, discussion of expenditure as growing larger every year was indicated as being a desirable objective creating benefits for everyone. (Social Security Payments for the Aged, People with Disabilities and Carers 1909-2003, 2004, pp. 10-19; Australia House of Representatives 1952, 1st Session, 20th Parliament, 6th February-6th March, p. 719).

The disapproval of rising expenditure growth in the early 1950’s under the Menzies Government had been a hallmark of the early post World War Two years from the Australian Liberal/Country Party. The implications for citizenship in Australia were expanded considerably with administrative changes occurring regularly within the old age and invalid pension. Such developments as rehabilitation for people aged 16-20 years living with their parents became eligible for assistance and the means test for the permanently blind was also removed.

With the Australian Liberal/Country Party altering the income test for pensioners wanting to use the Pensioner Medical Services, an article entitled, ‘Social Services Not Neglected, declares Minister’ concerned post budget debate about social security, and that the Australian Labor Party was insisting the government neglected social security expenditure.

Expenditure growth rose slightly in the year of 1959-1960 under the Menzies Government with the national health scheme as well as other Commonwealth programs related to health being implemented. An article from the Sydney Morning Herald on the 2nd November 1959 discussed these expenditure outlays and their implications. The major development of 1960 within the Invalid and Old Age Pension was the right for Aboriginal people to income support. An important point to remember however is this did not include so-called ‘nomadic’ or ‘primitive’ Aborigines. Reference of this was contained within the Hansard records that discussed...
the removal of all references to “Aboriginal natives of Australia” and their right to social security. (Sydney Morning Herald 2nd November 1959, p. 6; Australia House of Representatives 1966, 1st Session, 25th Parliament, 16th August-25th October, pp. 931-935).

The political debate continued in 1961 with an article from the Sydney Morning Herald on the 13th September entitled, ‘Labour promises Rise to 5 Pounds/10 shillings in Age and Invalid Pensions’, discussing that Labour would increase the basic rate of age and invalid pensions if returned to power at the next federal election. It made no reference to any concern to rising expenditure. In fact the article whether for political purposes or not clearly indicated large expenditure increases in social security benefits. (Sydney Morning Herald 13th September 1961, p. 8).

Whilst social issues were at the top of the agenda in the 1960’s and 1970’s, broader economic changes also had a considerable impact on the delivery of income support for people with disabilities. The state of the labour market and the decline in full-time employment rates were the key factors affecting disability pension recipient rates. As the labour market contracted, and full time employment declined, the recipient rates increased because people with disabilities suffered job losses and the ability of the market to create jobs slowed. As Argyrous and Neale (2003, p. 9) argue, “There are a number of possible (and not mutually exclusive) explanations for this decline in full-time employment rates. These include:

1. Changes in industrial composition, particularly away from manufacturing and toward services industries; (Tonner 2000, cited in Argyrous and Neale 2003, p. 9).

2. Changes in the total amount of public employment and in the hiring practices of public services; (Mitchell 2002, cited in Argyrous and Neale 2003, p. 9).


As a result, the growth in recipient rates of the Invalid and Old-Age Pension rose considerably, and as Carney and Hanks (1994, p. 190) argue, “In the beginning of 1970’s, there were approximately 20 male invalid pensioners for every 1000 males of workforce age. By the end of the decade, it was 30 male invalid pensioners for every 1000 males of workforce age, while by the late 1980’s it was reaching almost 40 per 1000.

During the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, people with disabilities were also more vulnerable to labour market variances as the economy changed from manufacturing to service based. Exacerbated by a lack of training, administrative and policy prescriptions were sought for reform, and to encourage more active approaches to income support for people with disabilities in Australia.
The massive increases in recipient rates within income support for people with disabilities led to cutbacks of social expenditure under the Fraser Government (1975-1983). As a proportion of the total Commonwealth budget, outlays were reduced from 50.8% in 1975-1976 to 46.2% in 1982-1983. (Jamrozik 1993, p. 120). The universalism of the previous government was transformed with policies of selectivity and a shift from public expenditure to private investment. Indeed, two main objectives were changed in these years. First, an attempt was made to stem expenditure growth towards income support for people with disabilities, while second, the eligibility criteria for people with disabilities was reformed with the election of the Hawke Government in 1983. These changes dramatically reformulated the way ‘rights’ for people with disabilities was conceived. From the mid 1970’s, people with disabilities also became ‘responsible’.

The Changing Eligibility for People with Disabilities: The Cass Review

On the 5th April 1976, an editorial entitled ‘Welfare under Review’ discussed the rationalisation of welfare, including a review with special reference to aged and disabled pensions. While making no reference to cutting welfare spending, the use of the term ‘rationalisation’ suggests that moves were made within the Commonwealth government to administratively stem the growth of the income support for people who were aged and disabled. (Sydney Morning Herald 5th April 1976, p. 10).

Indeed, the Commonwealth’s role, relegated some state funding into considerable complications in the following years. An article discussed the cutbacks in support services (income support) for the sick and disabled citing major funding cuts from State and Commonwealth governments. The apparent growth in the rise of recipient rates replicates here with a lack of services. (Sydney Morning Herald 5th June 1982, p. 2).

With further concern shown at the rising levels of unemployment in Australia, as well as concern for the eligibility criteria, ‘the permanent incapacity for work’ within the income support system for people with disabilities, the Hawke Government and the Minister for Social Security Brian Howe instigated a review in February 1986. The ‘Cass Review’ was established and undertaken by Professor Bettina Cass, of the University of Sydney, who acted as the consultative director of the review. The review’s intention was to examine a number of key areas in Australia’s social security system. These were:

1. Income support for families with children;
2. Social security and workforce issues; and
3. Income support for the aged, people with disabilities and the unemployed.

One of the main priorities of the Cass review was to examine how the disability support pension could be reformed. One contemporary newspaper account discussed the changes in the structure of social security payments:

“Present sickness benefits would be replaced by a short-term disability payment. This would help out while people recuperate from a..."
temporarily illness or injury. There also would be a long-term disability support program for people whose handicap was likely to persist. It would provide a full income for people who could not work at all.” (Sydney Morning Herald 17th August 1988, p. 41).

Participation in the workforce for people with disabilities was recommended within the Cass Review by a ‘process’ solution to the existing problems within the old payment system. This instigated an approach for people with disabilities whereby the promotion of carefully screening applicants through multi-member interdepartmental assessment panels which drew expertise from medical, rehabilitation and labour market areas tightened the growth in recipient rates, or at least, envisaged to slow it down. The recommendations from the Cass Review exemplified this and recipients of the disability support pension were required to undertake ever more active approaches to operate in the labour market and/or community participation. Whilst this had considerable success from an economic point of view, this conception of reform undermined the complicated arithmetical rating of impairment within bodily functions, with the Minister for Social Security, Graham Richardson, suggesting, “The new system of invalid and sickness payments was the kind of assistance the ‘disabled’ community have wanted…a chance to work. (Sydney Morning Herald 22nd August 1990, p. 7).

The administrative reforms sought were in effect, designed to get people off income support (or onto lower support rates) and get them into work. Indeed, on all available evidence, these problems were highlighted by the on going changes occurring in the administrative, legislative and policy developments. The confusion from one year to the next was highlighted in 1979 when medical factors determining eligibility were not taken into account. In the following year, Senior Medical Officers (SMO) controlled all cases and vetted all applications. With pressure mounting from a High Court challenge concerning the legality of removing social factors within the income support system and considerable pressure from the community, by the time of the International Year of the Disabled in 1981, guidelines were revised. With the election victory of the Hawke Government in 1983, the administrative criteria were changed again, liberalising the criteria and directing all responsibility exclusively to the Department of Social Security. On all accounts, success in stemming the growth was limited: the relevant legislation was amended to make the assessment of disability more objective. (Carney and Hanks 1994, pp. 190-191).

These debates raged over the 1970’s and the 1980’s and the criteria remained unchanged until the review process of recipiency was tightened in time for the Economic Summit in 1987. It was announced that medical needs determined most of the right to income support for people with disabilities. The logic behind this was that people with disabilities were vulnerable to downturns in the labour market. Hence when the Cass Review report was completed, it recommended a number of important solutions for people with disabilities. In particular, it sought a number of policy changes for the income support for people with disabilities by:

1. The injection of a more ‘active’ focus to the income support program, to reverse the assumption that disability permanently excludes recipients from future participation in the labour market and community; and
2. To facilitate re-entry, a proposal that income support payments be integrated more closely with related service programs (labour market, rehabilitation and community support). (Cass et al. 1988, p. 25; Carney 1991, p. 224).

With the recommendations of the Cass Review complete, it was clear substantial changes took place concerning income support for people with disabilities and citizenship. People with disabilities were required to undertake ever more ‘active’ approaches in their role within the labour market and the social security system. It is clear the theoretical orientation of the reforms dismissed the Marshallian idea of citizenship, with one closer to the civic-republican or ‘new right’ arguments in its persuasion.

Whatever the interpretation of citizenship, the reforms had mixed responses to say the least. For instance, doctors Australia-wide had a set of government guidelines to help them determine if an applicant suffering from a disability was fit enough to get a drivers license. The aim of the new guidelines was to set down a ‘more-flexible, non-discriminatory assessment’ of license applicants who were elderly, physically or intellectually disabled, or suffering from an illness. This arose from criticisms from doctors who often had to make quite arbitrary decisions about a patient’s suitability for income support. (Sydney Morning Herald 5th November 1986, p. 3).

The qualification for the disability support pension was determined by section 94 (1) of the Social Security Act 1991, which provides that a person is qualified for the disability support pension if:

1. The person has a physical, intellectual or psychiatric impairment; and
2. The person’s impairment is of 20 per cent or more under the Impairment Tables; and
3. The person meets age and residence requirements.


The legislative and policy problems of the term ‘disability’ have plagued policy making in the context of the disability support pension in recent years. The reason is the conceptual vagueness, which has permeated the policy formulation discussions. The main arguments have been on the whether income support for people with disabilities should be defined in a medical or a socioeconomic fashion. Throughout the course of the last one hundred years of the age and invalid pension, these two factors have instigated a major problem in the machinery of government, between the policy making community in the legislative arm who are concerned with the budgetary requirements of the rising rates of recipiency, and the policy implementers in the administrative arm who consist of doctors and health professionals. The latter interpret the legislative guidelines in such a way as to over-liberalise the eligibility criteria for the disability support pension. (Argyrous and Neale 2003, p. 274).

An important change in 1991 renamed the Invalid Pension to the Disability Support Pension and in the mid 1990’s, under the Keating government, these reforms sought an expansion of labour market programs, income tests to reduce disincentives
in part-time work and the approaches discussed previously, by trying to get more income support recipients into work. Under these reforms, the concept of ‘mutual obligation’ entered the forefront in Australian social policy development. Quite simply, ‘mutual obligation’ refers to a system in which welfare benefits are made conditional on the recipient’s satisfying certain obligations to the state. It is now commonplace for governments to claim that people are not straightforwardly entitled to a benefit, rather, that benefits are conditional on their fulfilling an ever-expanding range of duties. (Moss 2000, p. 1).

This has transformed income support for people with disabilities, citizenship and the broader welfare state quite dramatically. Indeed, as Carney and Hanks (1994, p. 247) note,

“The notion of rights which the state owes to defined classes of citizens, who are all covered by a single program, is being supplanted by a notion of ‘reciprocal bargains’ tailor-made for the particular citizen, and which integrate or span multiple programs.”

Hence, when we return to the parliamentary debates, participants claim that it is simply too easy to get the disability support pension. Senator Richard Alston from the Australian Liberal/National Party argues,

“All you have to do is a get a couple of medical certificates to say 20 per cent impairment level, and show that it is not likely to gain an income for the next two years, and you’re on the disability support pension. By definition, the recipient’s wife would also receive the disability support pension if the recipient were working, so the primary income earner could stop working if they wished.” It further argued that the welfare system subsidises able-bodied citizens who are capable of working and this is why the welfare state is in the trouble that it is today. (Australia Senate 1991, 1st Session, 36th Parliament, 9th December-12th December, p. 4748).

Ironically, this discussion is contradicted in the same Senate record on the same day by an opposition motion to:

1. Support the Liberal/National ‘Fightback’ policies for assistance to non-aged pensioners and welfare beneficiaries;
2. Increase sole parent, invalid, wives, widows, war windows, disability and carers pensions by 8 per cent;
3. Increase all other benefits and allowances, including unemployment, sickness and special benefits, education study allowances and a wide range of training allowances by 6 per cent; and
4. Condemn the ‘Hawke-Howe-Willis-Beazley’ government for its lack of compassion towards these underprivileged people in our community. (Ibid. p. 4749).
The Liberal/National Party claim income support for people with disabilities will be increased, yet on the other hand, it expects further ‘active’ participation from people with disabilities. The Liberal/National party continue to maintain the ‘active’ rhetoric and it was shown again on the 26th November 1991 when discussion focused on the failures of various work tests to make sure people were eligible for their benefits. Again, Senator Richard Alston from the Liberal/National Party said,

“I note that Senator Richardson (Labour) was at pains to suggest that there was nothing that could be done in the welfare area to tighten up the system. Those of us who have to put up with Senator Richardson over the last 18 months know full well that time and again he claims that not one extra cent can be wrung out of welfare administration. Yet hardly a week goes by when we do not find either the Auditor-General saying that the work test is not being enforced or mobile review teams detecting that hundreds of millions of dollars are going astray in the welfare system. As a result, we have social security system costing something in the order of $28 billion and the number of recipients going up by about a million per decade.” (Australia Senate 1991, 1st Session, 36th Parliament, 20th November-26th November, p. 3307).

Further contradictions is shown with a discussion on the 28th June 1995 in which Senator Eric Abetz from the Liberal/National Party argues that people with disabilities have as many rights as the rest of the Australian community. He argues,

“No matter what your lot in life, your life will never be a burden on society because you are an integral part of society. Your lot in life is also my lot in life. Your lot in life is also our lot in life.” He further argues, “What is an ‘unproductive burden’? Economically unproductive? Socially unproductive? Should the unemployed feel that they are a burden on society? Should the aged feel that they are a burden on society? Should the disabled feel that they are burden on society? (Australia Senate 1995, 1st Session, 37th Parliament, 26th June-30th June, p. 1972).

The debate has continued to rage on expenditure growth often and is in discussions on the 23rd June 2004, mainly as an attack on Labour for its unwillingness to pass into legislation the budget measures passed down in 2002. John Howard (Prime Minister) from the Australian Liberal/National party made reference to the growth in recipiency rates of the pension and how responsible government would attempt to stem this growth, administratively making sure people with disabilities who can work, should or must work. This reinforces the ‘active society’ and ‘mutual obligation’ ideas. (Australia House of Representatives 2004, 1st Session, 40th Parliament, 8th period, pp. 31437-31438).

Complications of Income Support for People with Disabilities

The developments in citizenship for people with disabilities align with the direct reform of the disability support pension, but what have the reforms achieved? Reforming the disability support pension can save money, but it can push recipients onto another payment whereby the eligibility criteria are weaker and the expenditure
is placed onto another government department or agency either commonwealth or state, or is pushed onto the private sector. This couldn’t be more evident than in particular employment programs for people with disabilities who work in sheltered workshops and those workshops receive substantial government subsidies as part of an operating allowance.

An example of this is discussed in an article entitled, “Nasty Round of Changes will Force Thousands to Charity”. This article discussed the ideas and philosophies of further welfare reform. The article claims that thousands of people with disabilities will be shaved off the dole as a result of a myriad of nasty measures announced in the Budget. This article claims that removing people with disabilities from the disability support pension will place them on another benefit such as Newstart or other relevant payments, so expenditure savings in one area may or will led to expenses in other areas. (Sydney Morning Herald 21st August 1996, pp. 6-7).

Findings of the Research

Through the analysis of the Hansard records and newspaper articles as well as other sources, the ‘social rights’ of citizenship in the period of 1945-1970 is framed in the following order. Through the analysis, the ‘social rights’ of citizenship is conceived as a ‘right’ and ‘responsibility’. This ‘right’ is the interpretation of T.H Marshall’s conception of the ‘right’ to social services, that is, ‘rights’ are integral to citizenship however rights don’t exist without correlating ‘responsibilities’. This type and conception of citizenship was the most apparent through the historical records in this time period. On the political level, the analysis shows both major parties as having nearly bipartisan support to ‘rights’ and ‘responsibilities’. This becomes more divisive during 1975-2004. Specifically, 1945-1975 time period suggested:

1. ‘Rights’ don’t depend upon ‘responsibilities’;

2. Our people deserve and require all ‘rights’;

3. ‘Rights’ are afforded to all our people for security; and

4. Australia is a leader in the ‘rights’ of the disabled.

From the 1975-2004, the conception of the ‘social rights’ of citizenship began to change as the language focused more on ‘responsibilities’ than ‘rights’. Specifically, the ‘rights’ component of many of the arguments directly involved ‘responsibilities’, and the idea that one can’t exist without the other. Although, ‘rights’ continued to be discussed, significant issues of ‘responsibilities’ began to take question, as administrative superiority became central to the debate. This seems directly correlated with rising expenditure growth.

Throughout the 1980’s, ‘responsibilities’ were central to income support. At the official government level, rights were enhanced however there is some evidence ‘rights’ were eroded as people with disabilities became relegated to administrative problems within the framework of the government, outside doctors and on going changing eligibility requirements. There is also some evidence from this period that people with disabilities felt their ‘rights’ were threatened.

As pressure mounted on social expenditure and the philosophies of the ‘New Right’ become central, income support became a central requirement of ‘active’
employment programs and community participation. Particularly, under the Hawke/Keating Labour governments, ‘active’ approaches were the main requirement for income support for people with disabilities. Since 1996, this has been reinforced with ‘mutual obligation’ a term central to ‘welfare reform’ under the Howard Liberal/National government.

Through the analysis of the parliamentary proceedings, newspaper articles and other sources, the discussion of the growth in expenditure from 1945-2004 towards income support for people with disabilities changed in the following ways:

1. In the early years of 1945-1975, the Labour Party supported expenditure growth to enhance social security benefits as part of a general philosophy of well being in Australia;

2. Criticisms from the Liberal/National parties were apparent throughout the analysis, and their emphasis was economic growth/management throughout the whole analysis;

3. During the 1950’s-1960’s, expenditure growth was steadily rising, with little regard shown to expenditure increases apparent in the research sample;

4. During the early 1970’s, little concern was shown to expenditure increases under the Whitlam government, and expenditure increased vastly, even under the economic pressures apparent at that time;

5. As the economic issues increased during the mid to late 1970’s and early 1980’s, reform in the income support system for people with disabilities was undertaken. With the implementation of the Cass Reforms, the ‘active society’ approach began towards income support, as administrative problems were an ongoing feature, and ‘New Right’ philosophies became dominant in social policy development;

6. During the mid 1990’s, ever more active approaches to income support have been central to income support debate, as expenditure growth rose rapidly; and

7. Since the mid 1990’s-2004, income support for people with disabilities has undergone further reform, and considerable concern has been towards expenditure growth (Liberal/National government).

Conclusion: Future Directions in Income Support for People with Disabilities

This paper has examined the major developments in the years of 1945-2004 concerning income support for people with disabilities. The major developments of the 1945-1975 era were the development of an income support rights system within the Australian welfare state and the considerable Commonwealth outlays to finance these schemes. Throughout the 1970’s, considerable domestic pressure on the Australian economy led to many changes in the way income support was delivered. In the first instance, a tightening of fiscal discipline occurred whilst broader changes in ideological and philosophic parameters became central to these concerns. The Australian Labor Party advocated increases in expenditure as a wider goal of Labor social values and a Marshallian conception of citizenship, the Liberal/National parties.
on the other hand, believed in tightening up expenditure because they believed in a residual type welfare state, and a liberal interpretation of citizenship. Rhetoric aside, social expenditure wasn’t drastically reduced, but reform was inevitable and the idea of citizenship was reformulated, with an insistence on ‘responsibilities’ for income support recipients. Concern on growing income support expenditures became a major concern in the mid to late 1970’s and has been ever since.

A return to the vision of T.H Marshall and citizenship may unfortunately never arise. Nevertheless, T.H Marshall’s vision of citizenship and welfare may be the best guide for citizenship well into the future. It comes particularly when citizenship theory needs reformulation in the Australian welfare state. Of all the rhetoric of ‘active society’, ‘rights’ and ‘responsibilities’, the Australian welfare system upholds that social integration into mainstream society is of key importance in a democratic society like Australia. The first priority it seems is that policy-makers advocate that people with disabilities become part of mainstream society, while full income support rights are second. The latter has slowly been achieved through gradual change, but the ‘rhetoric’ as other income support groups have experienced (sole parents, unemployed etc.) covers up a discrepancy between the decline in full-time employment and the very ‘active’ approaches to income support advocated by bureaucrats and politicians in the last thirty years. Indeed, the ‘active society’ approach appears bipartisan in 2004, with both major political parties advocating extremely similar schemes. The Liberal/National parties continue advocating ‘mutual obligation’ and ‘work for the dole’ while similar approaches are now part of the Labor Party’s schemes with announcements in the 2004 Budget reply speech of three chances only in reference to chronic youth unemployment and the relevant income support.

The second priority is the broader more intellectual endeavour of how citizenship can be reconciled in an appropriate fashion for the future. T.H Marshall’s argument suggests people have rights, but unless the focus returns to this idea, citizenship and welfare for people with disabilities will place people’s rights second, behind, the ever more dominant area of economic budgets.

Nevertheless, citizenship and income support rights will play a central role in the formulation of policy for this group well into the future. This paper therefore has sought to underline the central patterns which affect the income support system for people with disabilities and how this has changed through different sources of analysis. It is a central concern that the participation of people with disabilities into all aspects of Australian society is a fundamental aspect of citizenship rights in a modern democracy.
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