PART I

The growth of cities

I

The urbanization of the Australian population 1947–1971

I. H. BURNLEY

A high degree of urbanization has for long been characteristic of Australia as it is of most industrialized countries. However, there is a certain uniqueness in the Australian situation since as with New Zealand, a large proportion of its G.N.P. has been derived from the export of pastoral products. This uniqueness is further enhanced in that along with industrialized Japan and the United Kingdom, Australia is among the first three countries in degree of urbanization. The high incidence of urbanization post-war, however, has been mainly the result of industrial growth, and associated tertiary industries became a very important factor influencing the growth of State capitals and of some large towns. In 1947, according to current boundary definitions, 50.7 per cent of the total population in Australia was found in State capital cities (i.e. metropolitan areas) and 18.1 per cent in 'other urban' areas. In total, the proportion of Australia's population enumerated in urban areas was 68.8 per cent in 1947, while by 1971 this figure had increased to 85.6 per cent. In 1971 the proportion of the population in metropolitan areas (State capitals) was 60.1 per cent, an increase of 10 per cent over the 1947 figure.

There is a clear trend of continuing urbanization, as Table 1.1 indicates.

For Australia as a whole, the proportion of the population resident in rural areas fell from 31.1 per cent in 1947 to only 14.7 per cent in 1971, the greatest drop occurring between 1947 and 1954. In view of the continuous increase in the proportion of the population in urban areas, it can be expected that rural proportions would have declined and this was consistently the case throughout all States.[1] The absolute numbers in most rural areas also fell throughout the period, due to increased mechanization on farms, lack of an adequate living for all farm family members, declining rural incomes throughout the whole period in many dairy farming areas, and in the 1968–71 period the severe rural recession for wool producers which led to out-migration not only of the young between ages 16 and 25 but whole family movement in many districts. Thus in some districts, particularly north-western and south-eastern New South Wales and in western Victoria, rural population declines of 5–10 per cent were recorded between the 1966 and 1971 censuses.

In South Australia, there were significant rural population losses in the

1947–66 period, there being a decline after boundary readjustments of 11,500 (6 per cent) between 1961 and 1966 alone.[2] Hugo found in South Australia a lack of a sufficient range and number of jobs and educational opportunities open to school leavers, particularly females, in rural areas. Furthermore, the substitution of capital investment for labour inputs in primary industry has markedly increased production per unit of man-power throughout most pastoral rural areas of Australia in the 1947–71 era.

TABLE 1.1. *Percentage distribution of population in urban and rural divisions of Australia 1947–1971*

| | Year | | | | |
	1947 %	1954 %	1961 %	1966 %	1971 %
Metropolitan	50.72	54.06	56.26	58.23	60.13
Other urban	18.14	24.88	25.88	25.13	25.53
Rural	31.14	21.06	17.86	16.64	14.34
Per cent	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total no.	7,560,755	8,963,161	10,482,900	11,530,775	12,711,574

Notes
(1) Based on current boundary definitions.
(2) Metropolitan areas are all capital cities plus Canberra.
(3) 1971 figures include the Aboriginal population.
Source: Censuses of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1947, 1954, 1961, 1966 and 1971.

But because markets for most primary products have become relatively inelastic, established members of the primary industry workforce have in fact become redundant, a process which began of course much earlier, and its results in Australia were already evident in the 1933 census. Not all rural areas lost population however; in areas of closer settlement for soldier settlers and richer irrigation areas there were rural population gains. Post-war immigration of divers ethnic groups contributed to the latter.

Throughout the 1947–71 period there were increases in proportions of the population resident in cities of 100,000 or more persons, as Table 1.2 indicates. Centres of 100,000 or more persons have commonly been taken as a reliable index of urbanization,[3] provided anomalous city states like Singapore, Hong Kong, Kuwait and the like are not included. Even in 1947 at the beginning of the period under discussion, Australia had a higher proportion of the population in cities of 100,000 or more people than Canada, France and the Netherlands, and the same proportion as the United States (56 per cent), but a significantly lesser percentage than in

England and Wales. By 1971, the proportion of the Australian population resident in centres of 100,000 or more persons had increased to 64.5 per cent, still significantly below England and Wales but higher than most other industrialized nations. The most significant increase in Australia was that in the proportion of the population in cities of 500,000 or more, as the rapidly growing State capitals of Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth passed the half million mark and the absolute number of persons in cities of more than 500,000 increased from 2,976,000 to 7,372,000. Meanwhile, the proportion of the population in cities of one million or more increased slightly from 39 to 40 per cent. In actual fact, of course, by 1971, as Sydney and Melbourne had reached populations well over 2 million, 40 per cent of the population were in centres of over 2.5 million, a much greater proportion than in highly urbanized Britain and a percentage not exceeded elsewhere (excepting the city states mentioned). However, if the highly urbanized north-east of the United States and the Tokyo–Osaka and adjacent cities in Japan are considered as integrated connurbations,[4] then these two countries may compare with Australia in the proportion of the population in cities of 2.5 million or more.

There has been considerable debate on indices of urbanization as Arriaga and Kingsley Davis have testified,[4] and there are difficulties in the

TABLE 1.2. *Cumulative proportions of the population in various size classes of cities in Australia 1947, 1966 and 1971*

	Year					
	1947 Number	%	1966 Number	%	1971 Number	%
Above 1 million	2,975,914	39.31	4,556,370	39.28	5,106,010	40.11
Above 500,000	2,975,914	39.31	6,553,843	56.50	7,372,085	57.91
Above 100,000	4,256,273	56.15	7,283,715[a]	62.79	8,209,126	64.49
Total population	7,579,358	100.00	11,599,498	100.00	12,728,461	100.00

[a] Includes Canberra-Queanbeyan as one urban area.
Source: Censuses of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1947, 1966 and 1971.

usage of relative figures which do not take into account the size of the cities in a given country. Where this is done, as in a study by Arriaga, in which the mean city size of residence of the urban population and the proportion of the population which is urban are considered together, Australia still ranks among the five most urbanized countries in the world. Again, the social and economic characteristics of urbanism are very difficult to measure in a standard way but it is probable that with the diffusion of urban values to rural areas, and to the non-peasant, highly capitalistic

graziers and pastoralists through the mass media, the press and frequent city visiting, Australia has one of the two or three most urban societies in the world.

Factors in urban growth in non-metropolitan urban areas 1947–1971

Between 1947 and 1971, the officially designated non-metropolitan 'other urban' areas increased their share in the total population from 18.4 per cent in 1947 to 25.9 per cent in 1961 with a slight decline to 25.5 per cent in 1971. Some of this change reflected variations in definition of 'other urban' areas and the physical spread of towns into areas formerly classified as rural, but the growing importance of 'other urban' areas, especially the industrial cities of Wollongong and Geelong, but also the larger country towns, has been evident.

For urban areas other than the metropolitan State capitals (and Canberra), the rate of growth was in general higher than that of the metropolitan cities until 1961, and became lower for the periods 1961–6 and 1966–71. The number of relatively large towns over 10,000 in population size (excluding capital cities) increased from 34 in 1947 to 66 in 1971. In population, these towns contained just over 10 per cent of the total Australian population in 1947 but increased to 15.1 per cent in 1961 and 15.7 per cent in 1971. Whereas in 1947 there was only one non-metropolitan city over 50,000 and containing only 1.68 per cent of the Australian population, by 1971 there were eight such centres containing 6.97 per cent of the population. Thus major growth occurred among the largest non-metropolitan cities. In 1947, only Newcastle (N.S.W.) had a population of over 50,000 persons, whereas by 1961, cities of 50,000 population and over included also Geelong (Victoria) and Wollongong (N.S.W.), as well as Launceston and suburbs (Tasmania), Ballarat (Victoria), Townsville (Queensland) and Toowoomba (Queensland), while the Latrobe Valley urban area (Victoria) was just under 50,000. By 1966, to the list of seven in 1961 was added Goldcoast, adjacent to Brisbane and straddling the New South Wales–Queensland boundaries, which grew continuously to become the second largest urban area in Queensland. It had a population of approximately 53,200 in 1966 and 69,700 in 1971.

Geelong, Wollongong and Newcastle grew as relatively specialized industrial cities, Wollongong and Newcastle in particular becoming Australia's major steel-producing towns, being located close to coal supplies. Wollongong had the fastest rate of growth of these industrial cities, gaining heavily through both internal and international migration. The Latrobe Valley urban area was also an industrial complex, being Victoria's basic source of power and fuel, and an important supplier of town gas; thus it became attractive to industries requiring large quantities

of fuel. It was not a steel producer, but has tended to concentrate on paper pulp manufacture and chemicals.[5] Ballarat, formerly a mining centre, developed light manufacturing as well as growing as a market town and regional centre, while the Queensland cities of Toowoomba and Townsville developed as market towns and ports serving large rural hinterlands and also as light manufacturing centres. Goldcoast specialized as a tourist and resort centre.

Not only did the number of non-metropolitan large cities increase in the 1947–71 period, but each of them has also grown. Newcastle, for example, had a population of 127,000 in 1947 but in 1971 the population had almost doubled to 249,960. Wollongong grew even more rapidly: from only 62,960 people on 1954 it grew to 185,890 in 1971, three times the 1954 population in only seventeen years.

The number of towns with populations more than 10,000 but smaller than 50,000 also increased, from 33 (1947) to 57 (1971), but the proportion of total Australian population which they contained increased only slightly, from 8.58 per cent in 1947 to 8.73 per cent in 1971. The rates of growth of these small to medium sized cities and towns were lower than that of the total country and it appears that some towns in this size class might have experienced population loss through out-migration. Country urban centres tended to retain their aggregate natural increase in population but were able to absorb only 10 per cent of the out-migration from rural areas between 1954 and 1966.[6]

Growth of the metropolitan State capitals 1947–1971

Australia has not had one dominant primate city but rather two competing rivals, Sydney and Melbourne, throughout the twentieth century. However, because of the separate origin of the States as sovereign colonies in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, each State had its capital geographically distant from those of other States and centrally located (with the exception of Brisbane) within it. In fact, as Rose has pointed out, the four State capitals of Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide are spaced at regular intervals between 400 and 480 air miles from each other around the coast of south-east Australia.[7] Rose, Bunker, Robinson, Clarke[8] and others have commented, however, on the extent of metropolitan primacy *within each State*. Thus in Victoria, metropolitan Melbourne was over twenty times the size of the next largest centre, Geelong, in 1971, and in South Australia, Adelaide was also more than twenty times the size of the next largest centre. In New South Wales, Sydney was over eight times larger than the second largest centre, Newcastle. But if Newcastle, Sydney and Wollongong are seen as one urbanizing region (as Clarke argues because of their functional interdependence)[9] the next largest urban centre in New South Wales was over sixty times smaller in 1971. Only in

Queensland and Tasmania has metropolitan primacy been more moderate and the population relatively decentralized.[10]

In all the mainland States, population centralization increased significantly in the 1947–71 period, i.e. an increasing proportion of the population of each State became resident in its primate or capital city. Whereas in 1947, 49 per cent of New South Wales' population resided in Sydney, by 1971 over 60 per cent were located in Sydney. Melbourne's proportion of Victoria's population also increased markedly from 53 per cent to over 70 per cent and Adelaide's from 52 to over 71 per cent of South Australia's population. In Western Australia, Perth's share of the State population increased from 47 to 67 per cent in the 1947–71 period.

In the metropolitan areas, although all capital cities substantially increased their share of population in their States, percentage intercensal increases differed very much between capital cities. This was the case after standardization of statistical boundaries as at the 1966 census statistical division, a procedure followed throughout this work. For the 1947–54 period, the population of Perth increased by almost 28 per cent and Adelaide's increased by 26.5 per cent. Sydney's and Melbourne's increases were considerably less, being only 17.9 and 13.2 per cent respectively, compared with the national increase of 18.5 per cent. In the next intercensal period, 1954–61, Sydney remained the slowest growing metropolis, but Melbourne grew by 24.8 per cent. Brisbane grew much more slowly – 19.5 per cent in 1954–61 as contrasted with almost 25 per cent in 1947–54, and other State capitals also grew much more slowly. During 1961–6, which is a five year intercensal period, Brisbane and Adelaide grew very fast, by 22.3 and 25.4 per cent respectively, or at an annual rate of 4.7 per cent for Brisbane and 5 per cent for Adelaide. Sydney and Melbourne grew by 2.25 per cent a year during this period. Hobart had the lowest growth rate from 1954 – 1.2 per cent a year for 1954–61, and 1.7 per cent a year for 1961–6.

Between 1966 and 1971, Perth grew very rapidly with the expansion of mineral exploitation and associated tertiary activities in Western Australia, increasing its population from 500,340 to 639,600, or an increase of 27.8 per cent. Growth rates for other State capitals during 1966–71 declined slightly, although they were still significantly higher than the State averages. The more rapid growth of Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth was in part the result of a much greater net gain through internal migration than in Sydney and Melbourne,[11] a movement which was not merely rural–urban but was almost certainly inter-metropolitan. Though largely compensated by receiving the bulk of overseas immigrants, Sydney and Melbourne grew during the post-war period at much slower rates than other State capital cities except Hobart.

Immigration and population composition of cities

A vitally important element in the growth of Australia's larger cities has been immigration in the 1947–71 period. The major urban areas became attractive to migrants, especially those from eastern and southern Europe. Occupational opportunities were limited in smaller towns or rural areas where unemployment levels, whole low by international standards, were higher than in larger centres. The attraction in the large cities was the availability of employment in rapidly expanding heavy industry – car assembly in Geelong, South Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney, steel production with the establishment of new plant in Wollongong, building and construction and allied service trades in Melbourne in particular, but also in Sydney and Adelaide. In these industries and in manufacturing, in particular, semi-skilled and unskilled migrants could find openings and ambitious persons establish themselves as independent craftsmen–businessmen and the like.

When various size classes of cities are examined, as in Table 1.3, it can be seen that the largest cities on the whole had a much higher proportion of their population born overseas at the 1966 census than the lesser cities and smaller urban centres.

TABLE 1.3. *Urban centre size and proportion (per cent) of the population born overseas 1966*

| Size of centre (persons) | Per cent born overseas | | | | | | | Total |
	0–4	5–9	10–14	15–19	20–24	25–29	30+	
Above 500,000 No.	—	—	—	1	1	3	—	5
Per cent of centres				20.0	20.0	60.0		100.0
90,000–300,000 No.	—	—	2	—	1	2	—	5
Per cent of centres			40.0		20.0	40.0		100.0
40,000–65,000 No.	1	3	3	—	—	—	—	7
Per cent of centres	14.3	42.9	42.9					100.1
20,000–40,000 No.	—	10	1	1	1	—	1	14
Per cent of centres		71.4	7.1	7.1	7.1		7.1	99.8
10,000–20,000 No.	2	15	12	2	2	1	—	34
Per cent of centres	5.9	44.1	35.3	5.9	5.9	2.9		100.0
5,000–10,000 No.	16	29	11	2	3	—	—	61
Per cent of centres	24.4	47.5	18.0	3.3	4.9			100.1
Below 5,000 No.	128	114	98	4	7	—	7	358
Per cent of centres	35.7	31.8	27.4	1.1	1.9		1.9	99.8

Note. Includes all 'urban centres' designated as such at the 1966 census.
Source : Unpublished census data by collectors' districts and local government areas, 1966. Birthplace data for the 1971 census by sub areas was unavailable.

In only one State capital larger than half a million in population size, Brisbane, did the overseas-born constitute less than 20 per cent of the population, while in three – Perth, Melbourne and Adelaide – immigrants comprised 25–29 per cent of the population compared with 18 per cent of the total population of Australia. Of the five centres with populations between 90,000 and 300,000, two (Newcastle and Hobart) had migrant proportions below the national average and three proportions over 20 per cent (two over 25 per cent). All of the seven centres between 40,000 and 65,000 had migrant proportions under 15 per cent (two under 10 per cent). At the bottom end of the scale, of the 358 urban centres below 5,000, 340 (94.9 per cent) had foreign-born proportions below 10 per cent and 128 (35.7 per cent) foreign-born proportions under 5 per cent, compared with 18 per cent of the total population of Australia. The very small percentage of minor urban centres with relatively high proportions of their population born overseas were mainly special function towns associated with mining activities or small industrial centres close to the major metropolitan areas, or towns which have become dormitory suburbs.

The favouring of the large capital cities, more especially Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, by immigrants has had an effect on the masculinity ratio of the population in these cities as well as the age composition. The masculinity ratios of almost all the immigrant groups in Australia were consistently higher than those of the Australian-born in rural, non-metropolitan urban, and metropolitan areas in 1966. Thus in rural areas, masculinity ratios of the eight largest immigrant groups ranged from 128 to 235 compared with the rural rate for the total population of 116. In the metropolitan areas, masculinity ratios ranged from 100 (German-born) to 149 (Yugoslav-born) with a mean of 112 for the overseas-born compared with 97.4 for the total population and 92 for the Australian-born. The relatively low metropolitan masculinity of the Australian-born, while reflecting higher male mortality of upper ages and the result of a male-selective net migration loss of the Australian-born overseas probably reflected also a female-selective (in the 15–30 age group) rural and small town to metropolitan internal migration.

The effect of the male-dominant immigration to the large cities was to lessen the imbalance of the sexes, although because of cultural and linguistic difficulties, particularly with groups from eastern and southern Europe, this did not facilitate intermarriage with the host society population. Among east European former Displaced Persons (especially Poles), there was a surplus of single men in the original drafts between the ages of 16 and 25, many of whom never married and have resided in rooming houses or in flats or cottages on their own. This was also the case with the Italians and Yugoslav-born, so much so with the latter that the Federal government recently acted to modify immigrant selection and negotiate

new migration agreements with Yugoslavia to encourage more female migration. On the whole, however, sex ratios have been more balanced among north-west European settlers in the metropolitan areas except for the Netherlands-born, and *family* migration has been the dominant role with north-west European settlers in the process of residential adjustment and suburban expansion. For southern and central Europeans, more especially in inner and middle distance suburbs, family settlement was the prevalent residential form in the urbanization process although single men immigrant concentrations in inner suburban rooming house districts with declining total populations also developed.

Workforce changes in the urbanization process

Other demographic trends of significance in the post-war metropolitanization process were changes in workforce characteristics. With the relatively rapid growth of the largest cities, more especially Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, there was an expansion of the labour force within which manufacturing was very important. It was only in the post-war era that the heavy industry base of the Australian economy was established: hitherto, with the exception of the iron and steel industry in Newcastle, and the embryonic steel industry at Port Kembla (Wollongong), much of Australian manufacturing consisted of assembling, processing and manufacturing from imported raw materials or from Australian rural-produced raw materials; light engineering and service industries were also important. Post-war, iron and steel manufacture from native raw materials was extended in Australia, with associated heavy engineering, and large-scale vehicle and other assembly works and petro-chemical manufacture were developed in the three southern State capitals of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. In 1966, 34.4, 37.7 and 32.3 per cent of the workforce in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide respectively were employed in manufacturing (industry group), compared with 25.2, 22.7 and 22.9 per cent of the Brisbane, Perth and Hobart metropolitan area workforces. Immigration played a major part in the growth of the manufacturing labour force in the southern cities, and in all State capitals the labour force grew at a faster rate than the total population. This was substantially because the age composition of migrants was concentrated in the working age groups (16–65 and in particular 20–45).[12] Another important reason however was increased female participation in the workforce: in 1966, 33 per cent of Sydney's workforce consisted of women, while 33 per cent of Melbourne's and 31 per cent of the Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth, Canberra and Hobart labour forces was female. Between 1966 and 1970, female labour force participation increased significantly, particularly that of married women. In May 1969, 39 per cent of married women (in the nation as a whole) aged 30–44 years were employed. It is estimated that over two-thirds of the