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Abstract: A committed member of the labour movement from the early 20th century, Muriel Heagney demonstrated her capacity for leadership in her approach to the achievement of equal pay and decent working conditions for women workers in Australia. Societal structures, which determined women to be subject to masculine authority and relegated them to second-class status as citizens and workers, meant that Heagney struggled to penetrate the labour movement hierarchy and therefore found it difficult to achieve her goals. Her confident, determined approach to the solution of perceived problems often led to disputes and controversy, thus undermining her capacity to lead.
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At the beginning of the 20th century in Australia, the labour movement’s organisation and culture reflected the attitudes of the broader society to the position of women. Its masculinist orientation was to create difficulties for its women members, who sought to fulfil leadership ambitions. As Frank Bongiorno has argued, ‘in seeking to improve the status of male householders, Labor leaders assumed that what was in their interests was also in the interests of their womenfolk’.1 This attitude required some modification when women gained the franchise federally in 1902. Labor leaders then understood the need to organise the women’s vote by establishing the Women’s Organising Committee (WOC) in 1903. It was to have a limited role, strictly under the authority of the central executive of the Political Labour Council (PLC), which in 1918 became the Australian Labor Party (ALP). Labor women were to assist with fundraising and organising activities but were prevented from contributing to policy development. The industrial interests of women workers were not a priority while the family ideology remained the prevailing discourse. The question of equal pay was a contentious one. Labor women who aspired to leadership positions in the first three-quarters of the 20th century therefore struggled to penetrate the hierarchy of both the union movement and the ALP. A few managed to overcome the obstacles. For example, Fanny Brownbill was elected to the Victorian parliament in 1938;
Dorothy Tangney was elected to the Senate in 1943, representing Western Australia, and Joan Child entered the House of Representatives in 1974. The resurgent feminist movement of the late 1960s and 1970s forced political parties and unions to examine and modify the masculine culture within their organisations. During the 1980s, a few more women were elected to state and federal parliaments and, in 1990, Carmen Lawrence and Joan Kirner became premiers of their respective states of Western Australia and Victoria. Nevertheless, it was not until the ALP adopted its affirmative action policy in 1994 that a larger number of women began to assume leadership positions within the party and in the union movement. In 1996, Jenny George was elected president of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU), followed by Sharan Burrow in 2001. At the beginning of 2011, there were three Labor women premiers: Anna Bligh in Queensland, Kristina Keneally in New South Wales (until late March) and Lara Giddings in Tasmania. Julia Gillard, meanwhile, was prime minister of Australia and Ged Kearney, president of the ACTU.

As an early member of the Victorian branch of the ALP, Muriel Heagney was at the forefront of early to mid-20th century attempts to achieve equality for women in the workforce, and in the wider society, through equal pay and decent working conditions. She worked to realise her goals through the labour movement. The structure of Australian society throughout most of the 20th century accorded women second-class status as citizens and workers. Their role in life was defined primarily as wives and mothers, responsible for the physical and emotional wellbeing of their children and breadwinning husbands, on whom they were economically dependent. Paid work was merely an interlude in the period between school and marriage. Trade unions existed to protect the pay and conditions of their predominantly male workers, who, as breadwinners, were entitled to earn higher wages than women, who were assumed to have no dependants. Women workers earned approximately 54 per cent of the male basic wage determined by Justice Higgins in the Harvester Judgment of 1907. It therefore took an exceptional woman such as Heagney to challenge the status quo and fight to improve the lives of working women. Courageous, determined and a skilled communicator, but sometimes perceived by others as aggressive and single-minded, she was dedicated to the task of achieving equality for women in the workforce and society at large, despite the obstacles she encountered in both the labour movement and the broader community.

Heagney’s efforts to achieve social justice for women in Australia have now been acknowledged. In 1991, seventeen years after her death, the National Library of Australia held a travelling exhibition to mark the centenary of the
Muriel Heagney was born into a family whose political views were shaped by Irish immigrant grandparents with a commitment to issues of social justice. Both sets of grandparents had migrated to the colony of Victoria from Ireland in the 1850s. Her maternal grandfather, Thomas Currie, had been politically active on the Ballarat goldfields. As an early member of the Australian Workers’ Union in Queensland during the 1880s and 1890s, her father, Patrick (Pat) Heagney, honed his political skills and developed his labour values in the unsuccessful shearsers’ strikes of that period. Her mother, Annie Currie, met Pat Heagney when she travelled to Queensland with her brother, and they married at Isisford in western Queensland in February 1885. The pair were early settlers of that region and, as living conditions were basic, Annie Heagney travelled the long distance to Brisbane for the birth of Muriel, her first child, on New Year’s Eve 1885 at the Transcontinental Hotel. Muriel spent her early childhood at Jundah, a small settlement on the Thomson River in western Queensland where her two younger brothers, Herbert (Bert) and Reginald, were born. In 1893, the family moved to Rockhampton where Muriel started school. The fourth child, Essie, was born there but died at an early age as a result of a tragic accident. By the middle of the 1890s, Annie Heagney and the three children were in Bendigo staying with her mother, Johanna Currie. When Pat returned from northern Queensland, they eventually settled in Richmond, an industrial inner suburb of Melbourne.

Muriel Heagney completed her education at the FCJ Convent, Vaucluse, in Richmond, where she trained as a teacher. In the following years, she moved into a variety of occupations as the opportunity arose. From 1906 until 1910, she was employed at the Victorian Government Observatory. Other jobs included waitressing at the Old Melbourne Hospital and working in the dining hall of a meat cannery. She returned to teaching in 1910 but left finally in 1915, having incurred the displeasure of the Catholic archbishop of
Melbourne, Daniel Mannix, in her opposition to state aid for Catholic schools. She acknowledged, nevertheless, that her varied experience of teaching in working-class and middle-class suburbs, and in rural areas, had broadened her outlook. By 1916, she was employed as a clerk in the Defence Department and had joined the Federated Clerks’ Union.5

Heagney’s activism was informed by her political commitment to democratic socialism, but, unlike a number of her friends, she never joined the Victorian Socialist Party. Heagney set out her political position in her biographical notes, written in 1957:

With a socialist family background I became an active trade unionist and Laborite and stayed the course for over fifty years. Elected to a succession of executives, conferences and administrative positions, I entered each new field as a laborite commanding the respect and confidence of my associates. I never joined minority movements of the right or the left and found freedom of expression within the mass organizations. As a student of history I decided that those who broke away and created factions usually increased the difficulties of members who combined against the enemies of progress.6

In agreement with the views of Friedrich Engels and August Bebel on the ‘woman question’, she believed that economic equality was a prerequisite for the liberation of women.7 Heagney fitted descriptions of the ‘New Woman’, who emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In her study of left-wing women, Joy Damousi wrote: ‘The emergence of the “New Woman”—who was independent, modern and well-informed, and who demanded political rights and the right to earn a living and to enter professions—challenged prevailing social conventions’.8

Heagney joined the Richmond branch of the PLC in 1906 at age twenty and remained a member for the rest of her life. Her father, Pat, was a founding member of the organisation in 1902 and her mother joined as well. It was clear that Heagney’s parents’ involvement in the labour movement accounted for her immersion in the Labor community of Richmond and Melbourne. During that period, by her own account, the Heagney home:

was a general meeting place to which all active workers for labour gravitated. Thus we knew all the leaders of the time as family friends. When Ramsay MacDonald [later the leader of the British Labour Party] and his wife visited Melbourne in 1907 they came to dinner with us as did many other distinguished visitors from other states and overseas.9
Secure in her identity as a working-class woman, confident of her political ideology and eligible to vote in federal elections (she had to wait until 1908 to vote in Victorian state elections), Heagney led by example, joining the WOC in 1909 and becoming secretary in 1912. Women members of the ALP of that period were restricted to the role of organising other women to vote in elections and fundraising activities, with no place for them in the decision-making structures of the party. Heagney was influenced by women such as Ellen Mulcahy, Minnie Felstead and Sara Lewis, who, aware of the exploitative conditions under which many women in industry worked, advised ALP leaders that the industrial conditions of women workers should be a party priority. Felstead underlined the connection between political and industrial organisation for women workers, with ‘industrial unionism as a preliminary to the political’. Ellen Mulcahy was secretary of the Victorian Labor Women’s Political Convention held in the Melbourne Trades Hall in June 1909, and Muriel Heagney was minute secretary. Mention was made of the fact that both Mulcahy and Heagney were ex-schoolteachers. Mulcahy, in fact, had had a 30-year career as a schoolteacher before becoming involved in organising women into unions. At the 1909 convention, the question of financing women organisers was discussed and plans were made to secure the support of trade unions for this purpose. In 1910, on their own initiative, Mulcahy, Lewis and Felstead set about organising women into unions and then offered them support by assuming leadership positions. According to Melanie Raymond, they addressed meetings of female workers at factory gates before work, at lunch-time, on street corners and at night. They also went on country and interstate tours. Minnie Felstead organised the domestic workers and Sara Lewis the Female Hotel and Caterers’ Union. By 1913, Ellen Mulcahy was secretary of many unions, including the Clerks’ Union. She had led the women’s section of the Clerks’ Union in the fight for equal pay on the basis of justice for women, rather than the protection of male jobs. These activities gave her a power base within the labour movement, causing some anxiety among male labour members. These women lobbied the executive committees of the Labor Party and Trades Hall, demanding more autonomy and representation in the decision-making structures of the political and industrial wings as a means of forcing women’s industrial issues onto the labour movement’s agenda.

Heagney learned much from those female activists as she sought a broader role for working women in the ALP and the union movement. She was secretary of the WOC when the party debate on equal pay policy was held and witnessed the manner in which the motion was lost. She was aware that Sara Lewis, secretary of the Female Hotel, Club, Restaurant, Hotel and Caterers’
Employees’ Union, disregarded instructions from male party and union leaders and addressed an equal pay rally on the Yarra Bank in Melbourne in July 1913. Lewis was severely reprimanded for association with non-party women’s groups. Heagney understood that she had to be tough and single-minded in pursuit of her goals and could not wait for the men in the party or the union movement to act in the interests of women workers. Perhaps it can be argued that this caused her to adopt ostensibly masculine characteristics of aggression, forcefulness, independence and self-confidence in her leadership style. Once she joined the Federated Clerks Union in 1916, she became a delegate to the Trades Hall Council, although she had represented the Hawkers and Dealers Union at the 1912 women’s convention.

An example of Heagney’s initiative and confidence is the action she took to improve the organisation of the ALP and ensure its long-term viability by attracting younger members. As a delegate of the Clerks’ Union, she proposed the Victorian Labor Guild of Youth at the ALP state conference in 1926. It was formed as a section of the ALP and Heagney served as its secretary until mid-1927. Its objective was to encourage class consciousness and identity in the younger generation as an alternative to the conservative patriotic citizenship that was encouraged in other youth movements in Melbourne at that time. It was also an attempt to allow the young people to exert greater independence and self-governance within the organisation. But this was difficult to achieve while it remained subject to the policies, activities and procedures of the Victorian party’s central executive. Heagney had used her contacts with non-party women to find models of youth organisations, such as the Young Women’s Christian Association, that would be compatible with her ideas. Ultimately the Labor Guild of Youth disintegrated owing to the reluctance of the ALP central executive to allow it sufficient autonomy to conduct its own affairs.

Although Heagney generally characterised feminist organisations as middle class and lacking in genuine understanding of the issues that engaged working-class women, she was sufficiently pragmatic to co-operate with feminist and even conservative women’s associations when the need arose and the labour movement failed to act in the interests of working women. This approach was evident in the establishment of the Unemployed Girls’ Relief Movement, which operated in Melbourne from 1930–32 to alleviate the plight of unemployed women during the Great Depression when neither the state government nor the charity organisations were making provision for their support. In co-operation with Jessie Henderson, president of the Central Council of Victorian Benevolent Societies, Heagney achieved her goal. Her co-operation with conservative organisations incurred the criticism of left-
wing groups, particularly the Communist Party of Australia, which denounced her as one of the Trades Hall fascists.20

Muriel Heagney was a forceful personality who expressed her views fearlessly and was not bothered if she offended her male colleagues or anyone else who opposed her initiatives. She believed that she had ‘acquired a facility for forming opinions—not always conventional but always inherently independent—as to “what is past and present and what is yet to be” as well as a persistent awareness of the world in which we live’.21 But her immovable belief in the justice of her cause and her refusal to entertain other possibilities made her a difficult person to deal with at times. In challenging the masculine hegemony of Australian society so fundamentally, she was bound to make enemies, so it is unsurprising to find negative comments on her personality and appearance. An article in the Evening Sun in 1924 described her as a ‘rather aggressive too-busy-to-waste-time on nonsense labor woman’.22 In an interview in 1979, Bob Brodney, the husband of one of Heagney’s good friends, May Brodney, offered his insights into her leadership style. He explained that Heagney ‘was a terrific worker who would not allow difficulties to deter her. A difficulty for Muriel Heagney was there to be solved and solve it she would, and it didn’t matter how many toes she trod on’. Although he conceded that ‘she was most enthusiastic’, he believed that ‘she was not able to last very long in her efforts; she almost invariably ended with a major quarrel with everybody involved and walked out on the job’.23 Another contemporary of Heagney’s offered this assessment of her personality:

She was a fighter, Muriel, she had ability and she was tough. She was a character too. She wasn’t tall, but plumpish and never fashionable and her cigarette holder was never out of her hand, it was like a part of her body. And she’d have a drink with you. She was a doer.24

A particularly derogatory remark was written across her file for her Australian Dictionary of Biography entry, which was published in 1983. It read: ‘Pity we can’t say “slept with Beria”’, referring to Joseph Stalin’s right-hand man, Heagney’s own visit to the Soviet Union in December 1924 and her subsequent lectures in Melbourne on the Soviet Union in March 1926. The comment went on to quote ‘Berry’, as saying ‘she was a tough, narrow-minded old battle-axe and arrogant as well’.25 The author of the remark had obviously known Heagney when she was an older woman.

Heagney’s leadership on the equal pay issue during the 1930s and early 1940s consolidated her reputation as an uncompromising fighter for the cause.
Struggling to make headway within the ALP or the unions, she established networks with local and international feminist organisations working for the same goals. As a single woman who earned her living, she was acutely aware of the importance of being paid an economically viable wage. In 1935, she displayed meticulous research, writing and advocacy skills in the publication entitled *Are Women Taking Men’s Jobs?* She was commissioned to produce this work under the auspices of the Equal Status Committee of the Victorian branch of Open Door International for the Economic Emancipation of the Woman Worker (ODI). Heagney was a founding member of this organisation, which was established in Berlin in 1929 to guarantee that a woman’s right to work and protection throughout her life were the same as those for a man.26 This publication confronted what Heagney described as the propaganda against women in industry, which implied that women and girls were taking men’s jobs and worsening general unemployment during the years of the Depression. Heagney proved conclusively that women were not taking men’s jobs and that they did not enjoy equal status, opportunity or pay in the work place.27

On the basis of Heagney’s ability and public profile on the equal pay issue, Jack Hughes, secretary of the New South Wales branch of the Federated Clerks’ Union persuaded her to move to Sydney in 1936 to assist with the formation of the Council of Action for Equal Pay (CAEP). This was established in July 1937, with Heagney elected joint president and then, in 1939, secretary. For someone working in a voluntary capacity, this was a major commitment in time, for Heagney earned her living as a travel adviser for the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau from 1936–42. Nevertheless, she assumed the major responsibility of lobbying unions and the federal government to support the implementation of equal pay, indicating her willingness to co-operate with any groups that supported the cause. Unfortunately, in 1939, differences of opinion emerged when the feminist United Associations, an affiliated organisation of the CAEP headed by Jessie Street, suggested a more gradual approach to achieving the goal. This disagreement was resolved when Street left the CAEP and established a rival organisation, the Council for Women in War Work, but the argument fractured the united push for equal pay.

The CAEP recognised an opportunity to achieve its goal when the war escalated in 1941 and larger numbers of men enlisted in the armed forces, leaving their jobs to be filled by women workers. CAEP members argued that these women should be paid at men’s rates and seemed on the brink of victory in late 1941, when the newly formed Curtin Labor government, which had promised while in opposition to legislate equal pay, came to power. Their
hopes were dashed with the introduction of a temporary organisation, the Women’s Employment Board (WEB), in 1942. In the face of fierce criticism from employers, the Curtin government passed the legislation providing for the WEB to determine the rates of pay for women doing jobs previously categorised as men’s jobs, but stipulating these amounts were to range from 60 to 90 per cent of the male rate. The CAEP and Heagney’s implacable opposition to the WEB, based on the argument that the principle of ‘the rate for the job’ should have been implemented, created tensions among some CAEP-affiliated union members who wished to support the government in the face of employer hostility.

The nature of Heagney’s leadership style requires scrutiny. She and other members of the CAEP were convinced that there should be no departure from the principle of ‘the rate for the job’. This may have been tactically unwise in the context, her critics believing that she should have made some attempt to understand and balance diverse perspectives once she realised that the government would not honour the promise Curtin had made while opposition leader to legislate for equal pay. Had she been prepared to compromise, as Eileen Powell, a representative of the Australian Railways Union on the CAEP and ultimately a joint president of the organisation, indicated, the equal pay struggle may have been less protracted. In Powell’s view, Heagney was:

\[\text{dedicated to equal pay in a way nobody else before or since has been and I always likened her in my own mind to Mrs Pankhurst with votes for women, she just let nothing else deflect her from her objective and she wanted it whole and immediately, but things do not work that way.}\]

Nevertheless, Jessie Street could be held equally responsible for undermining the push for ‘the rate for the job’ during 1941 by advocating the gradualist approach and thus dividing the supporters of the equal pay cause. From Heagney’s perspective, however, Eileen Powell had ‘sold out’ on equal pay. From that point, it is clear that senior members of the Labor government and the trade union movement sidelined Heagney on the issue, while Eileen Powell secured a position in the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service.

Heagney entertained ambitions to enter parliament at two stages in her life, despite the fact that the party and union structures did not encourage women to offer themselves in such a capacity. This reality underscores the limits of her leadership on issues that affected women workers and their families. Women were rarely seen in state legislatures during the 1930s and there were
none at the federal level. In 1933, Heagney stood as the ALP candidate in a by-election for the state Legislative Assembly seat of Boroondara, a safe conservative seat. She put up a creditable performance, coming second with 20.54 per cent of the primary vote. She made her second attempt in 1956 at age 70, when she unsuccessfully sought pre-selection for a Senate seat in Victoria.

Nonetheless, it can be argued that senior Labor Party officers acknowledged Heagney’s leadership capacity in 1925 when she represented the ALP at the British Labour Women’s Conference, held in Birmingham, and at the first British Commonwealth Labour Conference, held at the House of Commons, London, where she represented Australian labour as a whole. She had travelled to England and Europe at the end of 1923 after working as secretary for the Australian Relief Fund for Stricken Europe (ARFSE) and was there until October 1925. In 1928, she was invited to attend the inaugural Pan Pacific Women’s Congress, held in Honolulu, as a trade union woman and, in October 1941, the federal Labor government appointed her as a technical advisor to the ACTU representative, Albert Monk, to attend the International Labour Organization conference in New York in November of that year. But the ACTU executive, concerned at her uncompromising attitude on the equal pay question, ensured that her status was reduced to that of observer, thus denying her the opportunity to speak on the subject at the conference.

Although Heagney had established her credentials as a formidable advocate for women’s rights and was respected and admired for her courage and perseverance, she managed to create controversy when occupying official positions, often it seems for putting her views forcefully and for pushing her own agenda. In 1955, at the age of 70, Heagney was elected secretary of the Women’s Central Organising Committee (WCOC), a position she had held back in 1912. The holder of this office also sat on the ALP state executive. The serious split suffered by the ALP in 1955, when many members were expelled or left the party to form the Democratic Labor Party, provided the opportunity for Heagney to be elected to this position. But, unfortunately, by the end of 1957, she had, in the opinion of president Ethel Hart and other members of the WCOC, become impossible to work with as she failed to act on their instructions. Heagney was ousted from the position through a motion of no confidence, which was narrowly passed at a special party conference held in December 1957. As a result, she also lost her position on the state executive. Frank Vincent, a retired Victorian Supreme Court judge and ALP member, was a law student at the time and, together with fellow law student Bill Aughterson, conducted Heagney’s successful appeal to the state Labor conference of June 1958. Vincent has suggested that there was a concerted
campaign to remove Heagney from the job, as she was too tough and upfront for the WCOC, which was still ‘very supportive of the tea and cakes’ idea. He believed that she maintained her radical drive into old age, depicting her as a woman with ‘a turn of the century courage about her’. Such women were, in his view, ferocious, singular women, conscious of fundamental human rights, but the ALP was ‘still a boys’ party’ and Heagney found herself up against some of its main players.  

In conclusion, Heagney was an uncompromising leader in her commitment to women workers and the cause of equal pay. For Frank Vincent, there was power in her commitment. Although she could claim some success when the Commonwealth Arbitration Court awarded women workers 75 per cent of the male rate in 1949, she had to wait until 1974 before ‘the rate for the job’ became a reality. She underestimated the forces that were arrayed against the realisation of equal pay, which upset the breadwinner ideology that underpinned wage structures in Australian society. Her single-minded commitment to the cause and to the labour movement more broadly demonstrates her indomitable will and resilience, particularly when she was cast aside or removed from office. The ALP’s failure to recognise Heagney’s leadership abilities owed much to structural impediments in society and in the labour movement that marginalised issues affecting women workers, but her own personality, sometimes described as arrogant, perhaps also contributed to this oversight. She certainly made enemies in pursuing her agenda, but never lost sight of her goal. As Marilyn Rowe, director of the Australian Ballet School, learned from her mentor, Dame Peggy van Praagh, ‘in any position of authority you make a lot of enemies and you just have to accept that.’  

Heagney’s courage and commitment inspired respect in many people but, ultimately, the change she sought to achieve quickly, despite her obvious ability, required a fundamental shift in societal structures, which has still not been accomplished in 2011.
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