

## **Navigating The Waka Of Māori Community Development**

### PANGURU, 'THE MAORI AFFAIRS' AND ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE 1950s



BETWEEN 1954 AND 1957, THE PEOPLE OF PANGURU in North Hokianga participated in a community development experiment administered by the Department of Maori Affairs. The Panguru Community Development Pilot Project, as it was officially named, was initiated by John Booth, the first anthropologist employed by the department.<sup>1</sup> The project signalled an experimental policy shift away from individualistic 'land development' to collective 'people development'.

Although the project was a one-off, 'tri-anthropological' engagement was not new; throughout the early and mid-twentieth century, anthropology established a role in determining the pace and shape of the state's assimilation policy, as well as in Māori efforts to revitalize tribal economies. The Panguru project provides a unique window into Māori negotiations with anthropology and the state. At the heart of this complex interaction was a clash of world views about what a 'modern Maori community' could and should have been in the 1950s. Although the state increasingly managed the processes of assimilation within the frame of modernity, such a view was peripheral if not irrelevant to the people of Panguru. Their participation in the project highlights how the leaders and people of Panguru took advantage of what they believed were the most beneficial features of the project. They sought control of their land, resources and economic futures, as well as access to modern technology and ideas. Examining their experience shows how Māori people – at both community and national levels – worked with the state and New Zealand's emergent anthropological community, and negotiated anthropological theory in order to achieve divergent goals in the mid-twentieth century.<sup>2</sup>

#### **Māori and the State: The Anthropological Connection**

The relationship between the state, anthropology (and its antecedents) and Māori extends back to the beginning of the colonial period – a time when colonial officials such as George Grey and John White were preoccupied with researching, recording and categorizing the Māori world. Imperial study of the colonial 'Other' was integral to the colonization of indigenous peoples worldwide; its underlying rationale was that 'to know' an indigenous



**Figure 1:** A map of the Hokianga showing the location of the North Hokianga communities engaged in the Panguru Community Development Project

Adaptation of map accessed on 8 May 2015 at <http://www.hokiangatourism.org.nz/destinations.html>

society was ‘to know what was good for it’; and that ‘to know’ an indigenous people enabled one ‘to rule’ over it.<sup>3</sup> By 1867 the New Zealand parliament had legislated for the establishment of the New Zealand Institute, which in turn produced the first scholarly journal for the publication of research on Māori, *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*.<sup>4</sup> Amateur ethnologists, such as Stephenson Percy Smith, Edward Tregear and Elsdon Best, further contributed to the recording of Māori traditions, customs and histories as members of the Polynesian Society, which was established in 1892.

By the twentieth century, however, anthropological research was also serving the needs of Māori working within the state’s political framework. Māori were also studying anthropological theories, and using the findings of anthropologists to support their arguments about the place of Māori culture and politics within twentieth-century New Zealand. For Apirana Ngata, ethnology was integral to Māori cultural revival, as evidenced in 1923

when he pushed for the establishment of the Board of Maori Ethnological Research (which later became the Maori Purposes Fund).<sup>5</sup> This board made funds available for the promotion of the study and investigation of the arts, language, customs, history and traditions of Māori. Key products of state-promoted research on Māori were the publication of the works of Best and other contributors, including Māori, in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*; the direct publication of individual texts; and the acceptance of other 'less scientific' writings in the *Journal of the Board of Maori Ethnological Research: Te Wananga*.<sup>6</sup> The state continued to support research of 'the traditional Maori' indefinitely and, for the short time that Ngata was Minister of Native Affairs, viewed scientific research as a positive means of assisting Māori to adjust to a Pākehā world.

Ngata's appointment to the position of Native Minister in 1928 corresponded with what Peter Gibbons describes as the emergence of 'first generation' writers 'trained in the social sciences'.<sup>7</sup> The pre-eminent member of this group, Raymond Firth, drew on his scholarly training at the London School of Economics in his theories about the nature of, and solutions to, problems of Māori adjustment to colonization. Ngata engaged with the same theories in his own paper 'Anthropology and the Government of Native Races in the Pacific' in 1928, and again in 1931 when he quoted Firth in support of his ideas about tribal economic development.<sup>8</sup>

Although Ngata engaged with anthropological theory and theorists, he did so critically. As M.P.K. Sorrenson notes, Ngata and Te Rangi Hiroa (Peter Buck) believed that 'their Maori ancestry and upbringing gave them a unique advantage over Pakeha in understanding Maori culture'.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, they both believed that the complete loss of Māori culture was not the inevitable and final phase of acculturation that Firth described.<sup>10</sup> Ngata co-opted, adapted and espoused the language of anthropology, combining theories of cultural adaptation (to western modes of economic organization) with his own philosophy on cultural continuity.<sup>11</sup> In turn, Ngata utilized anthropology to legitimize an argument that state funding of tribal land development would assist in the economic and cultural assimilation of Māori people.<sup>12</sup> On such a premise, state funding for Māori land development was provided in 1931. However, Ngata's use of anthropological theory to support the idea that the land development schemes would encourage Māori acculturation was somewhat hollow. The visible continuation of Māori communal farming methods, with collective and local decision-making at the fore, along with charges of administrative mismanagement, contributed to an inquiry into the schemes in 1934, and Ngata subsequently resigned from his ministerial position that same year.<sup>13</sup>

By applying strategies and uses of anthropology similar to those favoured by Ngata, Māori (and Pākehā anthropologists) continued to problematize the government's policy of assimilation; they questioned the pace, means and impacts of assimilationist strategies on Māori and – after Ngata's resignation – attempted to provide an increasingly uninterested state with solutions to the problems of Māori assimilation. Along with Firth, scholars such as F. Keesing, I.L.G. Sutherland and Ernest and Pearl Beaglehole theorized Māori 'problems' of cultural adjustment. Although there were important differences of opinion between them, and they were influenced by different schools of thought,<sup>14</sup> their publications all called for the state to heed their disciplinary advice and to conduct more anthropological research into the question of Māori assimilation. In 1940, the active alignment between social scientists and Māori was in evidence in a book published under Sutherland's editorship titled *The Maori People Today*.<sup>15</sup> Horace Belshaw, Sutherland, Ernest Beaglehole, Ngata, Buck and others contributed to the literary symposium, critiquing the policy of assimilation on almost every front, from Māori health and education to Māori land development. However, rather than encouraging the state to abandon the policy, the details coming through from social scientists about the 'Maori situation' tended to reinforce the Department of Maori Affairs' duty to enforce a rapid assimilation agenda.

In the community study *Some Modern Maoris*, published in 1946, the Beagleholes analysed an Otaki Māori community 'with a view to a constructive policy'. In their opinion, poor housing, a high percentage of unskilled or semi-skilled workers, lack of local leadership and high alcohol consumption were all symptoms of a generally 'disorganized' Māori culture. The Beagleholes emphasized that Māori needed to become more active agents in their own assimilation. They also emphasized how the Māori failure to fully assimilate was causing a high degree of Pākehā prejudice against Māori in the workplace, schools and wider community.<sup>16</sup> Urging many reforms, the Beagleholes pleaded that both Māori and Pākehā needed more ethnographic information on which to build their relationship: 'If there is a Maori problem in New Zealand today ... then its wisest solution must depend upon the maximum knowledge of the facts and the building up of an informed public opinion among Maoris and Pakehas [*sic*] alike which will buttress and support an enlightened policy based on those facts. The process of social change must be accelerated, but it must also be guided. It can only be guided by knowledge and good will.'<sup>17</sup>

### **Welcome Back: Anthropology Returns**

Although social scientists persisted in their call for state attention, it is

impossible to pinpoint one specific reason for the department's employment of an anthropologist in 1952. Head office expressed unease about flailing Māori land development schemes and tribal committees, continuing Māori urban migration, and anthropological reports of a disorganized Māori culture. Those most concerned were Māori welfare officials and the head of the department, Tipi Ropiha, who took up the position of under-secretary in 1949, and who continued to serve in that position under the Minister of Maori Affairs, Ernest Corbett, between 1952 and 1958. Ropiha was determined that future policies should be well planned and in 1952, he appointed John Booth to the new position of departmental researcher. Although the appointment reinvigorated the role that anthropology had once played in the department (when Ngata was Minister of Native Affairs),<sup>18</sup> hierarchical differences and a varied set of circumstances, priorities and Pākehā involvement complicate this engagement with anthropology.

While Corbett focused much of his attention on Māori land utilization, the planning of future Māori welfare administration and policy was a priority for Ropiha, who began initiating new developments to accommodate changing Māori circumstances. Butterworth writes that Ropiha 'wanted Maori to be economically independent' and viewed 'education as the key to their future'.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, Ropiha introduced vocational training, and played a 'pivotal role in developing' the Maori Women's Welfare League in 1951.<sup>20</sup> Yet less is known about Ropiha's interest in scientific research. This came to light in 1949, when the department participated, at the invitation of Victoria University, in a proposal to establish an independent Council for Social Research.<sup>21</sup> Although Ropiha's suggestions were not undertaken at this time,<sup>22</sup> he had prepared a list of 'aspects of Maori social life' viewed as 'important avenues of study'.<sup>23</sup> The most relevant topics were those related to the rural economy and the ongoing relevance or irrelevance of tribalism. Yet Ropiha waited until 1951–1952 before he decided to employ a departmental anthropological researcher. He made this move around the same time that he made administrative changes in the department, formally placing Māori welfare officers under the control of district officers.<sup>24</sup>

This administrative change fostered an uneasy environment within the department and ultimately led to Ropiha's employment of John Booth. Members of the Welfare Division of the Department of Maori Affairs fostered a political critique of the department's policies and practices. The welfare training officer at the time described the department's attempts to balance both rural and urban Māori needs as a 'death-defying circus act'.<sup>25</sup> In 1952 one of the Welfare Division supervisors wrote frankly to Ropiha regarding the division's concern about the department's policies: 'My experience is that

some of the most thoughtful [department officers] are the most uneasy. I do not mean that they are sure that our policy and aims are wrong. What troubles them is that they are not sure that those things are right. Some of them say we have no policy on fundamentals – that there is no sure charting of our course ... Included in their number are Messrs. Holst, McKay, Bennett, McEwen, Perry and Awatere.’<sup>26</sup>

Within two days of Ropiha receiving this memorandum, the Māori Affairs Research Committee (MARC) was established. With a significant Māori membership, MARC became one of the most direct means of influencing the shape of Māori welfare policies. Some of the first members of the committee were Rangi Royal, Michael Rotohiko Jones, J.M. McEwen, Charles Bennett and Chris Stace.<sup>27</sup> Within a year, J.A. McKay and Erik Schwimmer were also members. The two most important items on MARC’s agenda in the next year or so were Booth’s research in Panguru and a revision of the department’s aims and objectives.

### **Booth: From Anthropological Theory to Practice**

Booth’s interest in the potential influence of anthropology in New Zealand was evident in 1949 when, as a History student at Auckland University College, he submitted a masters thesis on nineteenth-century New Zealand anthropology.<sup>28</sup> Soon after, Booth was studying anthropology at the London School of Economics. While there he became committed to Firth’s structural functionalist theories, as well as the methods of applied anthropology endorsed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Such theories were applied worldwide after World War II, when the beginnings of a global phase of ‘decolonization’ increased the popularity of community development approaches for, amongst a number of additional debatable reasons, promoting the efficient and preferably independent exploitation of the resources of colonial territories.<sup>29</sup>

The United Nations adopted community development as an educational enterprise and monitored, adapted and disseminated information about it through UNESCO. The South Pacific Commission, established in 1947 as a result of the Canberra Pact,<sup>30</sup> promoted a community development approach in the Pacific. New Zealand actively participated in the South Pacific Conferences, with McKay acting as the New Zealand representative in 1955.<sup>31</sup> As John McCreary and Ian Shirley point out, community development ‘enthusiasts’ were ‘convinced that it represented the solution to every conceivable social and economic illness’.<sup>32</sup> The fundamental principles of community development placed focus on the entire community: principles of active participation and self-help; working towards community-identified

cultural and economic needs; and the community's acceptance of assistance from an 'outside agency'.<sup>33</sup> The end goal was a community of enlightened peoples, who had retained their most valuable cultural distinctions, yet discarded those that hampered access to the rewards provided by their productive and self-sufficient use of resources.

Booth would soon get an opportunity to put this theory of community development into action. How he applied that theory was shaped by his view of the challenges facing the department and Māori. As far as he was concerned, the problems of the Department of Maori Affairs arose 'in a situation of acculturation'. Booth elaborated: 'I do not consider this situation, or rather, this process [of acculturation], to involve simply changing Maoris into dark-skinned Pakehas [sic]. Nor do I regard it as being a process of the amalgamation of two peoples, physically as well as culturally. That stage may be eventually be reached, but not in the foreseeable future.'<sup>34</sup>

It is questionable whether Booth saw, let alone foresaw, any actual 'stages' at play – there is no evidence that he had any experience working and researching among Māori communities prior to his appointment. His first engagement came when he embarked on field research for a nine-month period in Panguru, which Booth described as 'probably one of the most backward Maori settlements in the country ... economic opportunities are restricted, educational facilities are poor, and ... many of the problems are exaggerated by isolation, both physical and mental'.<sup>35</sup> Noting that there were few Pākehā in the area and armed with his notebook, Booth recorded the diet, education and work patterns of Panguru people, and observed their ways and values at tangi, weddings, tribal committee meetings, dances, socials and youth group events.

His research included an assessment of the community's economic situation, and especially the farm units administered by the department in Panguru. The department's farms were producing below half the national butterfat averages. This he attributed to poor farming techniques, a lack of capital and, most importantly, weaknesses in the 'personal element', and the 'ability of farmers to use their resources to their advantage'.<sup>36</sup> Booth also noted a drop in the number of farms in the area, due to the policy of land amalgamation, which saw the number decrease from 76 in 1941 to 62 in 1953. Although Booth thought 'it was clear some of the units could never make a living of their present holdings', he believed that the productivity of most of the farms could be increased.<sup>37</sup>

In order to gain access to such in-depth knowledge, Booth had carefully nurtured his relationship with Panguru locals. Although he found a minority of people were suspicious of his intentions, Booth found local leaders were keen to

meet with him. He accepted numerous invitations to meet with them, attending, for example, a 'meeting ... at Waihou on the initiative of the leading men there, for the purpose of discussing ... some of the difficulties which they face'.<sup>38</sup> Booth explained that in order to retain their confidence he 'willingly listened to their complaints about the inactivity of various departments of government (particularly the Maori Affairs)'.<sup>39</sup> By lending a sympathetic ear, Booth was softening the community up for his eventual return and administration of the community development experiment. It was not a one-way relationship, however; each side stood to gain. Whether he knew it or not, Panguru leaders were grooming a new and valuable community asset. Booth provided them with a direct line to the department's head office and potential access to resources and extra support. The project would be about give and take, both ways.

Booth must have begun contemplating the community development experiment while researching in Panguru. His final research report, in early 1954, floated the idea of conducting a community development experiment in a community like Panguru, and in June 1954 Booth submitted a detailed proposal which identified Panguru as the location for the proposed project. He placed the project within the ambit of the Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945, writing that the 'economic and social advancement of the Maori people of Panguru' was its 'central aim'.<sup>40</sup> Soon after, Booth's proposal received official backing from the Welfare Planning Committee and Ropiha,<sup>41</sup> who expressed his view and aims for the project: 'You will notice that this is a Pilot Project from which it is hoped that useful lessons for the whole Department will be learnt. While Panguru has its special problems it is still felt that in many other ways it is typical of a large number of settlements in Tokerau, as well as other parts of the country. It is unnecessary for me to stress the importance of all officers of the Department Co-operating to the full to make this experiment a success.'<sup>42</sup>

### **Taking up the Experimental Paddle**

On 27 July 1954, the Panguru Tribal Executive met at Lower Waihou at the Waimirirangi marae to 'hear and decide upon the Pilot Project of Mr. J. Booth'. Many tribal committee and local Māori Women's Welfare League members were present, as was the Tai Tokerau district officer and his team of welfare officers. Sitting among them was Booth, who set the tone for the project, explaining that 'bad roads, bad communications, bad farms and the inside spirit was holding the people back'. Including himself as part of the community, Booth exhorted, 'Let's show them [the department] we can do it ourselves. If necessary we can go ahead on our own – we can do more than waiting for help ... let's study and work together.'<sup>43</sup>

Booth highlighted what he thought the people could do for themselves, not realizing that the community had always preferred, customarily and historically, to use local resources and work collectively for itself. He suggested that working bees, a common community work pattern in Panguru, could be formed to reclaim land for farming in Te Karaka and Waihou; instead of ploughing by horse and cutting tī-tree by hand, farmers could work together and share a tractor and other implements; timber in the area could be milled locally and houses could be built; co-operative fishing, gardening, and poultry farming could supply a good living through local markets; and the community could pool its savings for such things as the purchase of its own school bus. In order to boost the strength of tribal committees Booth proposed that the project be ‘worked as much as possible with the Tribal Committees and [Maori Women’s Welfare] Leagues’. He concluded with a challenge to the people of Panguru: ‘When I first met you I spoke of the canoe, and the rock in the way that your canoe could not see. If we take the paddle to this canoe, Panguru can lead the rest down the river, be a pilot to all, Maoris and perhaps Pakeha too.’<sup>44</sup>

But was everyone paddling the same canoe past the same rocks? The discussion among community members at this meeting illustrates how different people’s needs were structured according to their various economic connections to the state. Some in the community had a contractual relationship with the department, as nominated occupiers of farm units. Reaching a decision on the project entailed consideration of how the project would benefit their family farm units. Panguru leader Pakihi Peita likened the project’s collective approach to the land schemes of Apirana Ngata, but, he cautiously advised, ‘it is not a new birth, we are individuals now. Farms [are] now run as a business concern.’<sup>45</sup> Pakihi Peita rightly recognized that the philosophy of collective farming was out of step with the department’s administration of their units under the Maori Affairs Act 1953, which facilitated the department’s preference for (nuclear) family farm units. To varying degrees, Maori farmers were isolated from each other on these units, and the department oversaw their decisions in matters as diverse as household budgeting, the disposal of produce, stock management and the purchase of chattels.<sup>46</sup> In return they were assured of the department’s support – albeit support wrapped in paternalistic restrictions and assimilationist intentions – in their ongoing quest to improve their standard of living.

Indeed, many speakers at the meeting focused solely on the possibility of improving their farms. There were 62 units and some private smallholdings in Panguru at this time. The farmers described ‘difficulties’; farms were ‘not progressing’, and they needed ‘more land to break in’.<sup>47</sup> People were

frustrated at the low returns reflected in their cream cheques. A year earlier an ‘animated and heated discussion’ had taken place at a meeting called by the district welfare officer, who recorded that ‘some said they could not see how they could stand further calls on their cream cheques because the department was already taking its share and then the high cost of living’.<sup>48</sup> The project appeared to provide more freedom and support for the running of their farms. A Whakarapa resident, Sam Leef, stated that, ‘[this] has been brought forward for our decision. Co-operation to work our farms – not by force, by wish instead.’<sup>49</sup> The mood was positive, and the reasoning that if the project was faulty, ‘the faults would be found’.

Others present recognized that the project went beyond agriculture, and might benefit all the community, including the (at least) 40% of the population who did not earn their pay from farming,<sup>50</sup> and those who were farming but required supplementary incomes. Employment was scarce, and consisted of labouring work on fencing and roading contracts in the district. John Sampson from Waihou was attracted by Booth’s suggestion that local timber could be used for local construction. If a mill was established in Panguru, the trees from Waireia could be harvested and milled locally – houses could be built and profits would stay in the community.<sup>51</sup> The need for housing in Panguru was another a drawcard for Father Wanders, who highlighted how the ‘old people were being sent to the Town to live among Pakeha. He advised that the remedy be brought here to them.’<sup>52</sup>

The desire to mill local timber and generally maintain control over other local resources and important cultural sites ran deep in Panguru. For many years the people had wanted the Crown to release its control over their local lands at Waireia and their timber in Warawara Forest, and had wanted to have greater say and control over the terms of transfer or sale of Kahakaharoa lands to the state, all for the purposes of developing their community, and especially building their own homes, schools and marae. The project’s principles of self-help and efficient utilization of community resources, therefore, resonated with historical and ongoing calls for the state to address their calls for the autonomous use of lands. In 1936 Pakihi Peita had drawn the Prime Minister’s attention to the Waireia grievance. In 1937 the people of Pawarenga had sought access to timber in the Warawara state forest for housing. That same year, two representatives from Mitimiti made a similar request to make improvements to their marae and build a school, and in 1951 Whina Cooper asked for Warawara timber to build houses.<sup>53</sup> For Panguru people the project seemed to offer some leverage towards the goal of taking greater control over local resources and their use.

Towards the end of the discussion, the district welfare officer, James Henare, declared that Booth had come wanting ‘to know the spirit of the people. If you are to help yourselves, [your] spirit must be born anew ... Your committees are to do the work and he will be your Tohunga ... You are the guinea pigs.’<sup>54</sup> A Pawarenga delegate also advised the people ‘that if Panguru did not take advantage of it Pawarenga would’. Such a threat was unnecessary. Most of the people present were prepared to accept the project unconditionally, and the rest were willing to give it a trial. Sam Leef proposed: ‘Kia awhina tatau te kaupapa kua whakaariatia nei a Hone Booth – that we adopt the Project as put forward by Mr. Booth.’ The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Pakihi Peita announced: ‘Mr. Booth, I have much pleasure in informing you that that a Resolution has been carried unanimously, that your project is adopted.’<sup>55</sup>

### **Padding the Waka of Community Development**

Just four months after adopting the community development project, Booth reported that he was struggling with ‘general apathy and ignorance of the project’s aims’.<sup>56</sup> A few representatives from each community had been placed on a range of organizing committees, like the Housing Committee, which was expected to coordinate the assessment of, and find possible solutions to, the housing needs of each settlement. Survey forms were designed to assess the full extent of the housing problem and the capability of individuals to save toward purchasing their own home. ‘New building methods’ were also being explored, and the committee planned to commence ‘experiments with various mixtures of rammed earth’.<sup>57</sup>

The Library Committee was expected to facilitate the educational aims of the project, by providing community access to books on topics such as farming, cooking, mechanics and dressmaking. However, the committee appears to have been defunct from the beginning. Booth recorded slow interest and he initially shouldered much of the responsibility for organizing the library. He acquired 300 books from the Country Library Service, which he placed temporarily in the spare room of a house in Whakarapa. He also carted books around in his jeep to increase other settlements’ access to the library collection.<sup>58</sup> Nobody could be found to run the library, so Booth ran it until the ‘housewife’ who occupied the house could take over that responsibility in her spare time. William Leef was working as a shop assistant at the Whakarapa store and when a more permanent place was found for the library he became the librarian. Contrary to accusations of apathy, Leef recalled: ‘we had the library ... across from the shop there was another building – used to be an old shop. It was going good ... I was the librarian

... John asked me if I could do it during my lunch hour and first thing in the morning.<sup>59</sup>

Investment societies were a key part of the development strategy. Booth hoped that people would save for house deposits, farm equipment and other needs. Soon after becoming the librarian, William Leef also became the chairman of the Whakarapa Investment Society Committee. Anyone over the age of 18 could join, as long as he or she made minimum contributions of 5/- a month.<sup>60</sup> Although the first project report admitted that some members were not contributing or attending meetings, by December the second report was more optimistic. The settlement of Waihou set up a society as well, and both schemes were increasing in membership.<sup>61</sup> Waihou locals also focused on establishing a cooperative piggery with the aim of rearing pigs for commercial sale at the meat works. The Piggery Committee sought information on how to run it, and Booth organized for a representative from the Northland Pig Council to visit.<sup>62</sup>



**Figure 2:** Waihou community members discussing community development plans with John Booth. From left, Steve Ngaropo, John Samson, Leon Ngaropo and Phillip Matthews.

**Source:** *Te Ao Hou*, 13, December 1955, p.7. Archives New Zealand, AAMkW3495 Box 24 24j R21387560

Despite growing enthusiasm, however, Booth found it difficult to keep in contact with everyone in the community. Families were always busy planting and tending gardens and men were ‘out earning a little extra money’.<sup>63</sup> Booth interpreted this as apathy or confusion about the project’s aims, but in the context of daily life, it is highly likely many in the community considered it unnecessary, if not impossible, to drop day-to-day work in order to attend

project meetings. The lack of modern conveniences such as electricity, running water and transportation made everyday life difficult and small tasks time-consuming in Panguru. Brown Peita remembers his parents leaving home to fence their farms on a Monday, camping out on the farm whilst they worked, and then returning home on the Saturday.<sup>64</sup>

Most Panguru whānau were large, and children a labour force upon which parents relied. Washing clothes in a copper, chopping wood for cooking and hot water, cooking, milking cows by hand, gardening, caring for younger siblings, karakia and school formed the routines of Panguru children.<sup>65</sup> Parents watched their pennies but found ways to make life good. Whānau regularly attended community dances and film nights, which sometimes also served as community fundraisings. Freda Takerei remembers:

We would go to school with sometimes a hinu, pork fat in a bread, that's all we had ... sometimes we were lucky and we got golden syrup on our bread. Come back home, they got a big boil up. Sometimes it's only straight out flour, they boil it up with milk and they put sultanas in it and make it sort of like a pudding ... And our parents would take us to dances ... we would walk barefoot so that our white sandshoes didn't get dirty ... get a crepe paper, wet it, for lipstick and rouge ... and they had their own bands ... it was beautiful.<sup>66</sup>

Such a reflection illustrates not only how people found ways to enjoy life, but also what a leap of faith it took for the people of Whakarapa and Waihou to deposit their spare money in the investment society venture encouraged by Booth and the Department of Māori Affairs. Community reluctance to participate in all aspects of the project should also be measured against the perceived merit of Booth's ideas. Earth-ramming experiments, for instance, were probably not considered necessary when Waireia and Warawara could have provided timber for employment and community housing. Access to a 300-book library was probably not enthusiastically received for similar practical reasons. People urgently needed houses and incomes. But to Booth, the benefits of the project were very clear, and he was easily disheartened when the people failed to participate, or take ownership of every aspect of the project. Apathy, however, was not a community trait. And the people would, when necessary, illustrate a very good understanding of what they believed the project was about. Booth's project put Panguru on the department's radar; in many ways, some of which he may not have anticipated, Booth himself had become a most important Panguru asset.

### **Development the Panguru Way**

There is no doubt that Panguru community members used Booth as their personal department representative, responsible for both welfare and land

administration in the area. He was known as the man who 'had the brain ... and access to a lot of things at the Maori Affairs and the Maori Land Court'.<sup>67</sup> People leaving Panguru sought his advice about accommodation and employment in Auckland. People staying in Panguru wanted his help with their housing needs too, though his attempts to persuade those who were leaving Panguru to rent out their houses were unsuccessful. Moreover, Booth added weight to community causes, travelling as part of a deputation to the Bay of Islands Power Board in August 1955.<sup>68</sup> While carrying out this multifaceted role in the community, he also served as a direct link to the department's head office, keeping Panguru on the department's agenda.

Booth was also a means of obtaining community resources, although more so at the beginning of the project than towards its end. He brought to Panguru a generator, a film projector, and by the end of 1955, £200 for the piggery and £20 for vegetable gardening. By pressing for housing in Panguru, Booth also provided potential assistance in terms of adding pressure to Panguru calls for the department to either provide them with housing loans, or return their lands and forests so that they could build their own houses.

It is on this latter issue that the principles of the project continued to provide the leaders of Panguru with some hope of leverage over the department. As soon as the project began, the people of Panguru had attempted to turn the principles of community development – self-help and utilization of resources – back onto the department as a means of attaining greater autonomy and the return of their lands. This was what the project was all about, and the people wanted to carry it through. The department had knocked them back, but as long as the principles of the project and Booth remained in Panguru, the chances of having their lands returned were higher.

But tensions between community development principles and the collective approach of Panguru leaders led to insurmountable challenges. One example came just a month after the committees had been set up, when the Panguru Tribal Executive and community met with Bruce Souter, the department's Tai Tokerau district officer. Minutes of the meeting illustrate how modern and collective solutions to economic development were favoured by the community, yet prohibited by the department's approach to Māori land development and the regulatory bureaucracy surrounding it. Souter fielded questions about how whānau who were not participating in the land development scheme could apply for housing loans, and he answered that £200 was the preferred housing deposit.<sup>69</sup> The people asked if the Waireia farm station, which was controlled by the department, would consider lending or hiring out its tractor to the community. The station manager replied that they should not 'rely' on the possibility. The people asked whether the

department would assist the farming units to purchase a tractor for communal use. Souter replied that issues of accountability, including maintaining and repaying the tractor, prohibited the idea. He then suggested the impossible in terms of individual financial constraints: it would be better for one farmer to purchase a tractor and then lend it to fellow farmers.<sup>70</sup> Souter's responses to these questions provided the first explicit indication that the core principle of the project – its community approach – clashed head-on with the main principle underpinning Māori land development policy – family farming.

And it was not just land administration that clashed with the project. So too did the MSEA Act and the machinery which was supposed to drive it – the tribal committees. Although Booth had intended that the tribal committees would handle aspects of the project, he found that the committees did not meet frequently enough, and they were restricted in terms of the type of state funding they could apply for and how those funds were to be accounted for.<sup>71</sup> Notwithstanding the possibility that the community met to discuss the project in other forums, it is notable that the Panguru Tribal Executive was active throughout the project, and in fact more so than in any other period of time on record.<sup>72</sup> The minutes of its meetings illustrate that its main function was to go through the regulatory motions required to access resources for community amenities. Applications were put forward for marae subsidies, youth and sport clubroom facilities, and tennis courts.<sup>73</sup> The process could be excruciatingly slow; departmental regulations held up construction of the Waihou tennis courts for over five years.<sup>74</sup> Additional financial support was sought for education and returned servicemen in the area.<sup>75</sup> Access to departmental information was also important: the rush of meetings and wide community attendance at some executive meetings were due to a number of high-profile visits from department officers, who came to answer questions about the application processes for housing loans, marae and education subsidies, and warden and Justice of the Peace nominations.<sup>76</sup> But although it appeared as if the executive was exercising a great deal of authority and autonomy, this was not the case. The department dictated when, why, and under what conditions subsidization payments could be made, and had the last word on community nominations for community wardens. The tribal committees were also expensive to maintain. Pakihi Peita reported in 1951 that the Mitimiti tribal committee was in 'financial straits' and that the Motuti tribal committee was in a similar situation.<sup>77</sup> But rather than the meetings being stopped, methods of fundraising in each tribal district were considered to keep the executive afloat.<sup>78</sup>

As Booth came to realize, Panguru people were not averse to new technologies and active approaches to economic development. Their inability

to achieve such things was due to a lack of tribal control over the way resources could be accessed and utilized.

### **Stormy Seas for Community Development**

Aspects of the project that offered the greatest access and control over community resources were accepted and acted out within the rhythm of community life, and from the community's perspective. Out of the four settlements in Panguru, Waihou dominated the project with full participation. Increased acceptance of land tenure reform in the area indicates an attempt to control how local land development would proceed in line with other project initiatives. It was expected that the piggery, possibly a timber mill, and the investment society would provide a more secure economy for the whole settlement. Land tenure included arrangements to cut out shares for pensioner housing, which Booth was following up with head office. This approach to the project was risky, but at the end of 1956 the piggery promised an income for the whole community, a timber mill was still viewed as a possible community venture, and the Waihou investment society was building funds for further individual and community initiatives. To Booth, Waihou had come close to the ideal self-sufficient community. To the people of Waihou, full participation and full control offered the promise of better futures for everyone.

However, all of the other settlements resisted full participation. Booth blamed a lack of leadership, inter-whānau rivalry and a lack of cohesion, and his own limited ability to spend time in each settlement. The people of Whakarapa enjoyed many of the recreational activities of the project, which by 1956 also meant the library. However, the investment society was the only aspect of the project viewed positively in Whakarapa and Mitimiti. According to Booth, Whakarapa whānau rejected land tenure reform, and the only land tenure reform considered in Mitimiti was the incorporation of land.<sup>79</sup> According to Booth's reports, Motuti was a 'problem child' that rejected most aspects of the project early on.<sup>80</sup> Yet Booth admitted that he was unable to devote time to Motuti in any substantial way, and as William Leef emphasizes, urban migration out of Motuti was pronounced during this period. A combination of all of these factors meant that Motuti ultimately pulled out of the project, and Booth no longer viewed Motuti as part of the project either.

Given such limited success, it is interesting to consider how the leaders of Panguru described the success of the project in June 1956 when a petition signed by Pakihi Peita and other community leaders was sent to Corbett. The petition requested that Booth be allowed to remain in Panguru for an

additional ‘two or three years’ and that the project be allowed to expand into other Māori communities.<sup>81</sup> The reason for their petition to the department was that:

[Booth] has been responsible for the initiation of something that has been of great benefit to us the people who live at [Whakarapa], Waihou, Mitimiti. We are now in a position to appreciate his work because through his efforts we have sufficient money to buy land, stock and to work our lands and also to help in the formation of our tribal meeting places. Further to that he has helped us to send our children to school. Honourable Minister we earnestly pray that Mr. Booth be allowed to remain among us ... so that the work he has initiated will really bear fruit. At present our greatest need is houses.<sup>82</sup>

This petition’s basic intent was to illustrate to the department that Booth was doing excellent work in Panguru, and that the full potential of the project would not be realized unless Booth was allowed to stay. Having outlined the extent that the community was exploiting Booth, it is important to recognize that the petition was a reciprocal expression of support. The leaders who signed the petition signed it in support of Booth because they had come to like and respect ‘Hone Puutu’, the man who ‘always wore a beret’.<sup>83</sup> It is perhaps no coincidence, therefore, that the petition corresponded exactly with what Booth was expressing to the department around this time.<sup>84</sup> Booth and the community had developed a friendly codependency, based on common views about collective community development and a common critical alliance against departmental policies. William Leef remembers Booth criticizing the department for ‘not giving enough money for the farms and things’.<sup>85</sup> Booth never openly indicated his views or involvement with the people’s grievances over Waireia, Kahakaharoa and Warawara, but William Leef remembers Booth helped them gather the necessary information from the Maori Land Court in Whangarei in order to document their claims.<sup>86</sup> Regardless of Booth’s personal views, he consistently remained neutral when expressing the community’s view about such issues to the department. Booth’s main aim was to introduce the community development approach into departmental policy. He wanted the project, or at least the investment societies, to expand throughout the Tai Tokerau region.

Booth was also a shrewd media strategist. He widely advertised the project through articles in local and national newspapers, and in the department’s *Te Ao Hou* magazine.<sup>87</sup> Booth had a variety of reasons for creating publicity about the project. He sincerely believed that his anthropological approach was the answer to the economic problems Māori were facing, and his desire to see the project extended to other communities led him to overplay its success. An article in the *New Zealand Herald* in July 1956 ran with the

heading 'Reviving Tribal Spirit in the North: New Lease of Life for Maori Community'. The article detailed how there was 'a livelier atmosphere at Panguru today than there has been since the days of tribal warfare on the northern shores of the Hokianga Harbour. This isolated Maori Community ... was at bare subsistence level 18 months ago. Today it has a successful community farming scheme, a timber mill, library, a monthly market day and three investment societies. This imposing progress in such a short time is due to a community development programme ...'.<sup>88</sup>

Such an impressive outcome sounded, and was, too good to be true. There is no evidence at all to suggest that Panguru had moved beyond a subsistence farming economy in 1956. Motuti was not even a part of the project any more, and was essentially in the same, if not worse, economic predicament as before the project had begun. When the department conducted an assessment of the project in July 1958, it was reported that all of the project schemes were 'still in operation'.<sup>89</sup> But in reality they were barely surviving. Library membership and patronage were declining because people could not access the kinds of books that they wanted. The piggery in Waihou, which could not afford to run into problems, did. In a case of extremely bad luck, the boar that had been purchased was sterile.<sup>90</sup> The Waihou and Whakarapa investment societies had made advances to investors in excess of several hundred pounds for farm development and the purchase of land and cattle, marae buildings and access, house maintenance, home renovations and electrical wiring, and education.<sup>91</sup> In 1961 department officials had to admit that the project was all but finished: 'many of the aspirations held by this Committee when the Application was made for the Grant are long since dead and I think that I can probably foresee a recommendation ... that the Scheme be wound up'.<sup>92</sup>

Outside forces had also continued to impact Panguru negatively. In 1958 the Motukaraka Dairy Factory closed. Pā Henare Tate describes the closure as the beginning of a 'long slow demise' of dairy farming in Panguru.<sup>93</sup> The Panguru economy had completely collapsed. Although 62 farms were identified in 1954, by 1963 only 14 were recorded as viable by the department.<sup>94</sup> By then most families had stopped milking and raising cattle beyond subsistence levels. When the cream cheques stopped coming, farmers lost the credit line they had once relied on at local stores for flour and sugar.<sup>95</sup> With a poor infrastructure, restricted access to land, and a lack of capital, Panguru could hardly sustain itself, let alone participate in a national economy. Census figures for 1956 indicate that the population of Panguru had decreased by 10% within a period of five years.<sup>96</sup> Some settlements were hit harder than others. William Leef remembers that there was nothing happening in Motuti other than 'more people moving out, none coming back; all going

out'.<sup>97</sup> Booth writes that the department made that option more attractive by 'refusing housing assistance in Panguru but making it available in outside areas where there [was] work to be had'.<sup>98</sup> For some individuals and families, the shortage of employment, combined with land loss – whether in terms of ownership or use – and substandard or non-existent housing, made migration an attractive option. For those who wanted to stay in Panguru, the possibility of renting or purchasing empty houses was often dashed by the unwillingness of people to sever all ties to the land.

### **Beyond the Experiment: More Experiments**

The state's determination to deny the people of Panguru control of their land and resources encouraged Pakihi Peita and other Panguru leaders to align themselves with an anthropologist deeply committed to the principles of community development. Fifty years later the few remaining people in Panguru who knew John Booth remembered the pilot project positively, but with a sense of resignation at its failure to make much impact in the community. It was discussed in the same breath as the 1980s Pre-Employment Preparation (PEP) schemes for the unemployed, which led to a co-operative garden in Waihou.<sup>99</sup> Although John Peita described Booth as a 'good man', the principles of community development have dissolved into a general memory about the department in the 1950s and 1960s. John Peita states that 'when John Booth came, it was just like today, different ideas of the government, you know, every supervisor who came had different ideas'.<sup>100</sup> Despite Booth's attempt to be viewed as someone who occupied a liminal space between the state and the people of Panguru, he is remembered as a departmental supervisor, albeit a good one. William Leef remembered Booth as 'a good, very mild sort of bloke' and a 'hard working fulla who liked the Maoris'.<sup>101</sup>

Indeed, Booth was an anthropologist who worked for the Department of Maori Affairs. He was, in the cold light of day, an agent of assimilation when he went into Panguru. Booth was committed to anthropological theories of community development which were imbued with the ethnocentric ideals of the time. Barely a year into the project, however, Booth was confronted by Corbett's disparagement of the project. In Corbett's view, the solution to problems in Panguru was the relocation of people to places of employment and the ongoing amalgamation of farms. Booth's response was to cross the departmental official line and align himself with anthropological theory and the people and causes of Panguru. In his most stringent memorandum to head office Booth highlighted issues which he felt justified not only the continuation of the project, but also the urgent need to revamp the

department's policies. In his August 1955 project report, dedicated to addressing Corbett's criticisms of the project, Booth attacked the rigidity and economic focus of the department's policies. In his view, 'probably few officers of the Department ... recognised the complexity of Maori problems and their wide ramifications'.<sup>102</sup> Moreover: 'Viewed unemotionally, there is very little altruism to be seen in the work done by governments for the benefit of the Maori people. Land development may be interpreted largely as a response to the pressure of Pakeha farmers who coveted idle Maori land; and it is also part of the current drive for an increase in national production from which, in general, Pakehas will benefit more than Maoris.'<sup>103</sup>

Booth argued that the department needed to reflect on whether it was concerned with the wider and more 'complex and varied' Māori problems or merely concerned with bringing more Māori land into production. If the department was concerned with the latter, Booth explained, then it would have to 'face up squarely to the implications' of the conflicts between the department's land and welfare policies. 'There will', he predicted, 'be occasions when the interests of two or more sections of the Department will conflict and a decision will have to be made in terms of general welfare rather than, perhaps, the welfare of an individual unit farmer.'<sup>104</sup> Booth spoke directly to the situation in Panguru:

I fully agree that any community needs a stable economic basis and this, in Panguru, can only come from farming and can only be achieved by building up fully economic units. But Panguru is a Maori community which is something more than an area of land divided up into productive farms. It would be quite impractical to shift about 40%, the non-farming part of the population, to other centres where work might be available ... It seems essential that other forms of economic development must be encouraged to provide for the non-farming part of the community ... Hence efforts to help growers of vegetables, timber-millers, fishermen, and the piggery.<sup>105</sup>

Booth then specified that the department's land development and housing policies were too rigid and oversimplified; they only assisted some Māori, thereby creating more problems than they solved. The welfare section's aims were 'too diffuse, its methods too haphazard and its influence in the department too restricted for it to be able to do much good'.<sup>106</sup> If the department did not feel that his work on the project had wider relevance and could be used to review department policy, then he was 'wasting his time' and would 'start preparing to withdraw from Panguru'.<sup>107</sup> Booth's dramatic call for social justice and a chance for community development theory secured him extra time in Panguru. The petition from Panguru leaders in 1956 extended the project by another year. But by 1957 Booth was back at head office.

Over the next decade anthropological theories and the rhetoric of assimilation could and would continue to be manipulated to suit both state and Māori agendas – most notably when J.K. Hunn defined the Department of Maori Affairs' policy of integration in 1960, combining Darwinian and democratic ideals to explain the right of individual Māori to lose all or some aspects of their culture. The department's obligation to Māori who did want to retain their culture was to view them with 'sympathy and support where ... appropriate'.<sup>108</sup> Booth, meanwhile, remained critical of the way Māori policy was implemented. In 1970, after serving for some years as the secretary of the New Zealand Maori Council, he wrote: 'The Hunn Report advocated a policy of integration but paid no more than lip service to what should have been integration's main point. Properly applied, a policy of integration would allow a wide range of choices to each individual so that he could shape his life to his own needs and desires ... However, the Hunn Report and the policy of the Hanan administration tended to ... restrict "Maori" solutions and to promote instead "Pakeha" answers to the problems of the Maori people.'<sup>109</sup>

In the early 1960s Booth attempted twice more to conduct community development projects.<sup>110</sup> Assisting him the first time were welfare officer Arapeta Awatere and fellow anthropologist, Oxford and Cambridge-trained Hugh Kawharu.<sup>111</sup> Awatere recommended that community development be 'sponsored, supported and promoted by the Department'.<sup>112</sup> However, the proposals were not accepted, mainly due to welfare priorities in the cities.<sup>113</sup> In 1962, Booth held the position of Chief Researcher in the department. That year he submitted a report to the Justice Department which contradicted the philosophy of the Hunn report. Hunn informed Booth that his position was no longer available after Booth pointed out institutional racism within the justice system.<sup>114</sup> Anthropology – or at least one of the department's main proponents of it – was now, unsurprisingly, out of favour with the Department of Maori Affairs, but in favour with Māori with whom he worked in his roles on the New Zealand Maori Council and the Tai Tokerau Māori Trust Board.

### **The Waka hits the Shallows**

The Panguru Community Development project was the product of Māori, the Department of Maori Affairs and anthropology coming together in 1954. Officials working in the department reintroduced anthropology into the department under the watchful eye of Ropiha. Anthropology offered answers, but also much-needed time to consider how rural Māori communities could be supported and how Māori policy could be adjusted to cope with an increasing urban Māori population. Booth went into Panguru with high expectations about what he and the community development project could achieve.

Panguru was supposed to thrive as a community of active self-helpers. People were going to have a positive outlook, and gain the will to utilize their local resources and land efficiently, paddling in the same waka as the department and Booth towards a more prosperous future. He expected to have to navigate around some rocks in the form of community resistance to new projects of collective development but found that it was not the 'Maori problem' that capsized the waka of community development, but the rocky course created by the state's rigid commitment to relocation, urbanization and assimilation.

The people of Panguru and prominent leader at the time, Pakihi Peita, never explicitly referred to 'assimilation', 'equality', 'rangatiratanga', 'autonomy' or 'anthropology'. However, by signing the petition in 1956 to show their support of Booth, his 'community development' approach, and ultimately the anthropological theories underpinning it, the people of Panguru illustrated how anthropology and the department could be used as a means of attaining their own goals. Between 1954 and 1957, they jumped on the waka of community development and attempted to utilize it to regain collective control and use of Panguru resources and land. The community's willingness to participate in aspects of the project, particularly those that provided economic benefits was driven by a desire to mould and control its own economic future. This desire continued to motivate the community well after Booth left them and ultimately shaped future decisions to continue paddling various other state-carved waka, alongside new government 'supervisors' that came their way.

MELISSA WILLIAMS

*University of Auckland*

## NOTES

- 1 Hereafter referred to as the ‘Panguru Community Development Project’ or ‘the project’.
- 2 This article draws from my MA thesis and my PhD thesis, the latter of which has recently been published as *Panguru and the City: Kāinga Tahī, Kāinga Rua: An Urban Migration History*. I would like to thank Bridget Williams Books for allowing me to reproduce and adapt parts of Chapter 3 in this article, and I also thank the readers for their valuable suggestions leading up to publication of this article.
- 3 Derek G. Smith, ‘The Emergence of “Eskimo Status”: An Examination of the Eskimo Disk List System and its Social Consequences, 1925–1970’, in N. Dyck and J. Waldram, eds, *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, Montreal, 1993, p.42.
- 4 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London and Dunedin, 1999, pp.78–86.
- 5 Ngata was in fact a member of the Polynesian Society from 1897, and became active in its affairs in the 1920s.
- 6 ‘Maori Ethnological Reports’, MA 51, Box 3, 23, Archives New Zealand (ANZ), Wellington. See also F. Keesing, *The Changing Maori*, New Plymouth, 1928; and *Te Wananga*, 1, 1 (September 1929), especially p.1 and back cover.
- 7 Peter Gibbons, ‘Non-Fiction’, in Terry Sturm, ed., *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, 2nd ed., Auckland, 1991, p.87.
- 8 M.P.K. Sorrenson, ‘Ngata, Apirana Turupa’, from *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Vol. 3, 1901–1920, Auckland, 1996, p.362. See also M.P.K. Sorrenson, ‘Polynesian Corpuscles and Pacific Anthropology: The Home-made Anthropology of Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck’, *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 91, 1 (1982), p.17.
- 9 Sorrenson, ‘Polynesian Corpuscles and Pacific Anthropology’, p.7.
- 10 Sorrenson, ‘Polynesian Corpuscles and Pacific Anthropology’, p.17.
- 11 Hirini Kaa, ‘“Te Wiwi Nati”’: The Cultural Economy of Ngati Porou, 1926–1939’, MA thesis, University of Auckland, 2000, p.68.
- 12 Kaa writes that Ngata used the language of anthropology because Pākehā would receive it better than a Māori ‘emotive plea’: see p.67.
- 13 Richard S. Hill, *State Authority, Indigenous Autonomy: Crown–Māori Relationships in New Zealand/Aotearoa, 1900–1950*, Wellington, 2004, pp.122–3.
- 14 While most New Zealand anthropologists were influenced by the London School of Economics, research conducted by Ernest and Pearl Beaglehole was ‘unmistakeably’ influenced by ‘mainly’ American anthropologists and the theory of ‘modal’ or ‘group’ personality: see Daniel Morrow and Barbara Brookes, ‘The Politics of Knowledge: Anthropology and Māori Modernity in Mid-Twentieth Century New Zealand’, *History and Anthropology*, 24, 4 (2013), p.460.
- 15 I.L.G. Sutherland, ed., *The Maori People Today: A General Survey*, Wellington, 1940.
- 16 Ernest and Pearl Beaglehole, *Some Modern Maoris*, Wellington, 1946, pp.ix, xi, 4, 18, 307–19, 332, 334.
- 17 Beaglehole, p.346.
- 18 Walker, *He Tipua: the Life and Times of Sir Apirana Ngata*, Auckland, 2002, p.385.
- 19 Graham Butterworth, ‘Ropiha, Tipi Tainui’, from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography: [www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/5r23/ropiha-tipi-tainui](http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/5r23/ropiha-tipi-tainui)
- 20 Butterworth.
- 21 Letter, T. Hunter to Department of Maori Affairs, 23 March 1949, MA 1, 1/13, pt. 1, ANZ, Wellington.
- 22 The establishment of the Council for Social Research was dependent on a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, which was already funding the New Zealand Council for Educational

Research. This funding came through in 1953 and was divided among the four colleges of the University of New Zealand. For further details, see Rachael Barrowman, *Victoria University 1899–1999: A History*, Wellington, 1999, p.245.

23 Memorandum, Tipi Ropiha to Public Services Commission, 19 April 1949, MA 1, 1/13, pt.1, ANZ, Wellington.

24 Memorandum, Sullivan to District, Assistant District and District Welfare Officers, 27 July 1954, MA w2490, box 21, 36/1/1, ANZ, Wellington.

25 Memorandum, Stace to Souter, c. November 1955, BBDL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

26 Memorandum, Stace to Assistant Under-Secretary, 13 August 1952, MA 1, 1/13, pt. 1, ANZ, Wellington.

27 Memorandum, Stace to Assistant Under-Secretary, 14 August 1952, MA 1, 1/13, pt. 1, ANZ, Wellington. It is also worth noting that Alex McKay had close associations with Tainui, Erik Schwimmer pursued anthropology studies and was editor of *Te Ao Hou*, and Jock McEwen was trilingual in Gaelic, Māori and English. Personal communication, Joan Metge.

28 John Booth, 'A History of New Zealand Anthropology during the Nineteenth Century', MA thesis, University of New Zealand, 1949.

29 The literature on this topic is voluminous. For general information on the theory and background of 'development' studies, see Mitchell A. Seligson and John T. Passe-Smith, eds, *Development and Under-development: The Political Economy of Global Inequality*, Colorado, 2003.

30 Michael King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, Auckland, 2003, p.405.

31 *South Pacific Commission Quarterly Bulletin*, South Pacific Commission, January 1956; King, *Penguin History*, p.405.

32 John McCreary and Ian Shirley, 'In the Rural Tradition: Anthropologists Come to Town', in Ian Shirley, ed., *Development Tracks: The Theory and Practice of Community Development*, Palmerston North, 1982, p.34.

33 McCreary and Shirley, p.41.

34 Memorandum, Booth to Stace, 7 April 1952, MA 1, 1/13, pt. 1, ANZ, Wellington.

35 'Report on the Panguru Development Scheme', Maori Affairs Department, December 1953, p.i, BBDL 1030, 2677a, 3/48, ANZ, Auckland.

36 'Report on the Panguru Development Scheme', Maori Affairs Department, December 1953, p.i, BBDL 1030, 2677a, 3/48, ANZ, Auckland.

37 'Report on the Panguru Development Scheme', Maori Affairs Department, December 1953, p.i, BBDL 1030, 2677a, 3/48, ANZ, Auckland.

38 Booth to Stace, First Monthly Report on Research, 23 October 1952, BBDL 1030, 2677a, 3/48, ANZ, Auckland.

39 Booth to Stace, Second Monthly Report on Research, 1 December 1952, BBDL 1030, 2677a, 3/48, ANZ, Auckland. The colloquial term 'the Maori Affairs' was commonly used by Māori during this period. See the relevance of the Department of Māori Affairs to Māori communities in Aroha Harris, 'Maori and "the Maori Affairs"', in Bronwyn Dalley and Margaret Tennant, eds, *Past Judgement: Social Policy in New Zealand History*, Dunedin, 2004, pp.191–207.

40 Memorandum, Booth to Stace, 9 June 1954, MA 1, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

41 Booth to Stace, 'Panguru Pilot Project in Community Development', 28 June 1954, MA 1, 1/13, pt. 1, ANZ, Wellington.

42 Memorandum, Ropiha to District Officer, Auckland, 'Panguru Pilot Project in Community Development', 30 June 1954, BBDL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

43 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

44 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

45 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

46 Aroha Harris, 'Maori Land Development Schemes, 1945–1974, with two case studies from the Hokianga', MPhil thesis, Massey University, 1996, p.36.

47 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

48 Memorandum, J.T. Henare, District Welfare Officer to Assistant District Officer, Welfare Section, Auckland, 13 November 1953, MA W2491, Box 15, 34/3/52, ANZ, Wellington.

49 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

50 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

51 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

52 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland. Father Wanders believed that Māori were not yet ready to live amongst Pākehā.

53 For further information about the Warawara grievance, see Daniel Watkins, 'Kahukura Report', Department of Conservation and Te Runanga o Te Rarawa, unpublished report, December 1992, p.119. For details of the Waireia grievance, see [no author], 'Waireia', unpublished report, nd; Michael King, *Whina: A Biography of Whina Cooper*, Auckland, 1983, p.70. Details about the Kahakaharoa block can be found in Watkins, 'Kahukura Report', p.121 and at [www.terarawa.iwi.nz/uploads/7/4/6/3/7463762/kahakaroa.pdf](http://www.terarawa.iwi.nz/uploads/7/4/6/3/7463762/kahakaroa.pdf)

54 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

55 Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

56 'Panguru Pilot Project, 'Monthly Report', 2 November 1954, BB DL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

57 'Panguru Pilot Project, 'Monthly Report', 2 November 1954, BB DL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

58 'Panguru Pilot Project, 'Monthly Report', 2 November 1954, BB DL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland. Ralph Hotere and Kāterina Mataira were asked to draw posters for the library.

59 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

60 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

61 'Panguru Pilot Project – Second Monthly Report', 2 December 1954, BB DL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

62 Pakihi Peita retained the documents relating to the Waikato All-Purpose Piggery.

63 'Panguru Pilot Project – Second Monthly Report', 2 December 1954, BB DL, 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

64 Personal communication, Brown Peita, Panguru, 18 July 2005.

65 Freda Takerei, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 September 2002.

66 Freda Takerei, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 September 2002.

67 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

68 'Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive', Whakarapa, 16 December 1955, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

69 'Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive', Whakarapa, 16 December 1955, BAAI

1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

70 'Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive', Whakarapa, 16 December 1955, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

71 Memorandum, Booth to Stace, 9 June 1954, MA 1, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington. Māori participation in the tribal committee networks varied across Māori communities, with inactive tribal committees a cause for ongoing departmental concern. See Aroha Harris, 'Maori and "the Maori Affairs"', pp.194–7.

72 Three meetings took place in 1954, five meetings took place in 1955, and four meetings took place in 1957. No meetings took place in 1956. There are also minutes of meetings on file from 1953 and 1958. Additional files report continuing tribal committee activity into the 1960s.

73 'Panguru Tribal Executive', BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

74 'Lower Waihou Tribal Committee Subsidies', BAAI 1030, 1014d, 32/5/1, ANZ, Auckland.

75 'Panguru Tribal Executive', BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

76 The meetings with Corbett and Souter, for instance, were minuted as Executive meetings.

77 Memorandum, Registrar, Tai Tokerau District Office to Deputy District Registrar, Tai Tokerau, 6 September 1951, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

78 'Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive', Whakarapa, 16 December 1955, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

79 Memorandum, Booth to Secretary, Wellington, 'Panguru Pilot Project Monthly Report', 5 November 1956, AAMK 869, 664d, 19/1/290 pt. 2, ANZ, Wellington.

80 Report, 'Community Development Work in Panguru', c. December 1955–January 1956, MA 1, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

81 Petition, Wiremu Riiwhi (William Leef) to Corbett, 14 June 1956, AAMK/869, 664d, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

82 Petition, Wiremu Riiwhi (William Leef) to Corbett, 14 June 1956, AAMK/869, 664d, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

83 Petition, Wiremu Riiwhi (William Leef) to Minister of Maori Affairs, 14 June 1956, AAMK 869, 664d, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington; Freda Takerei, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 September 2002.

84 Memorandum, Souter to Head Office, 14 November 1956, BBDL 1030, 2677b. 3/48/1, ANZ, Auckland.

85 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

86 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

87 See, for instance, *Te Ao Hou*, 5, 4 (1957), pp.27–30; *Te Ao Hou*, 13, Department of Maori Affairs, December 1, 1955.

88 *New Zealand Herald*, 'Reviving Tribal Spirit in the North', 4 July 1956, MA 1, 1/13/1 pt 1, ANZ, Wellington.

89 Memorandum, Hei Rogers, Welfare Officer, Kaikohe District Office to District Officer, Whangarei, 7 July 1958, BBDL 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Wellington.

90 Booth, 'Waihou Co-operative Piggery', Appendix C, c. November 1957, BBDL 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Wellington.

91 Booth, 'Waihou Co-operative Piggery', Appendix C, c. November 1957, BBDL 1030, 2677b, 3/48/1, ANZ, Wellington.

92 Memorandum, A. Baker, R. Yorke to Whangarei District Office, 25 March 1963, 19 October 1961, BBDL 1030, 2677c, ANZ, Wellington.

93 Henare Tate, 'An Analysis of the Structure, Organisation and Values of North Hokianga Communities', unpublished report, James Henare Māori Research Centre, Auckland, 1995, p.18.

94 A.E. Gibson, 'Review of Northland Settlers', Report of Special Committee, Board of

Maori Affairs, 25 July 1963. AAMK, 1323a, ANZ, Wellington. For farm figures (1954), see Minutes of Extraordinary Special Meeting of the Panguru Tribal Executive, Waimirirangi Hall, Lower Waihou, 27 July 1954, BAAI 1030, 1014e, 32/3, ANZ, Auckland.

95 John Peita, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 20 July 2005.

96 John Booth, 'A Modern Maori Community', in J. Freeman and W.R. Geddes, eds, *Anthropology in the South Seas: Essays Presented to H.D. Skinner*, New Plymouth, 1959, p.243.

97 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

98 Booth, 'A Modern Maori Community', p.243.

99 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

100 John Peita, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 20 July 2005.

101 William (Skek) Leef, interview with Melissa Williams, Panguru, 19 July 2005.

102 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

103 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

104 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

105 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

106 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

107 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington.

108 'Panguru Pilot Project', 31 August 1955, MA 1, w2459, box 48, 19/1/290, ANZ, Wellington, p.440.

109 J. Booth, 'The Hunn Report in Retrospect', *Te Maori* (Summer 1970), pp.98–99: p.4. Although Booth collaborated with Hunn on a publication titled *Integration of Maori and Pakeha*, his sole contribution to the Hunn Report was the compilation of statistics. See Chris Molloy, 'The Hunn Report: Integration or Assimilation?', MA research essay, Auckland, 1993, p.61.

110 Memorandum, Booth to Souter, 14 March 1962, AAMK 869, 1098c, 36/17, ANZ, Wellington.

111 Memorandum, Booth to District Officer, Auckland, 4 August 1960, AAMK 869, 1098c, 36/17, ANZ, Wellington.

112 Memorandum, Awatere, A, to District Officer, Auckland, c.1960, AAMK 869, 1098c, 36/17, ANZ, Wellington.

113 File notation, Sullivan, 27 October 1960, folio 42, AAMK 869, 1098c, 36/17, ANZ, Wellington.

114 Molloy, p.63.