

The historical context of community development in Aotearoa New Zealand

Love M. Chile

Abstract Community development in Aotearoa New Zealand can be conceptualized as three concurrent processes such as (1), statutory work undertaken by the State through central government departments and local authorities (consisting of a system of legislation, funding assistance to individuals, groups and organizations and the provision of social services), (2) social change processes undertaken primarily through the collective action of individuals, groups and organizations that give voice to marginalized groups and communities and (3) the forces of change within Tangata Whenua communities working for tino rangatiratanga, self determination. Three time-periods are identified to help structure the discussion that begins from 1840, the time of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi between the Queen of England and Maori, the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand, signalling the birth of modern Aotearoa New Zealand. This paper argues that community development as policy and the practice (methodology) of social change through organizing, coordinating and initiating activities that enhance the wellbeing of individuals, groups and communities is more than 'pedagogy of the oppressed' and, therefore, cannot be conceptualized simply in terms of 'resistance'. It is a holistic process of transformation encompassing socio-economic, political, cultural, environmental and spiritual dimensions.

Introduction

This paper argues that community development practice in Aotearoa New Zealand is best understood by examining three concurrent processes. These are (1) community development programmes undertaken by the state (through government departments and local authorities), (2) processes of social change undertaken primarily through the collective action of

individuals, groups and organizations to give voice to marginalized groups and communities, and (3) the forces of change within the Tangata Whenua, Maori, the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand working for tino rangatiratanga, self-determination.

All three community development processes have strong historical roots. As in most social change processes, sometimes their activities, outcomes and objectives converge, and sometimes they are in conflict with each other. This paper is an attempt to explore their histories and how they inform contemporary community development practices.

This review and discussion of the historical roots of community development makes no claim to the existence of community development as paid professional practice in Aotearoa New Zealand prior to the early 1970s. With strong links and similarities to community development in Britain (Craig, 1991), community development was not a recognized profession in Aotearoa New Zealand until the early 1970s (Shirley, 1979), having become a paid professional activity in Britain only in the 1960s (Thomas 1983 in Craig, 1991, p. 17).

However, community development as policy and practice concerned with processes aimed at bringing about desirable change in society through organizing, coordinating and initiating activities that enhance the wellbeing of individuals, groups and communities has been part of the society for a long time. Shirley (1979, p. 11) argues that community development practice can be linked to the history of communitarian movements and cooperative tenant farming in ancient Babylon over 5000 years ago. It is this generic understanding of community development practice, rather than an exclusive focus on paid professional practice, that informs the discussion in this paper.

The paper is divided into three main sections, each section focusing on a specific period in Aotearoa New Zealand's historical evolution. The starting point is 1840, the year of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, which is generally recognized as the birth of modern Aotearoa New Zealand society. The first section briefly notes the beginning of colonization and Maori resistance to the oppressive structures of colonial exploitation. It discusses some of the key challenges for government and Maori in the first century of colonial administration and the introduction of community development intervention in the first decades of the 20th century. Section two examines the programmes of reform sought to address the challenges of the depression in the later years of the previous period and the post-World War II development agenda. Section three looks at how contemporary community development has become an instrument of social and economic development in Aotearoa New Zealand society in the age of globalization and global consciousness.

Colonization and settlement and the challenge of community development intervention: 1840–1935

The colonization and settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand in the 1800s following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 brought serious development challenges for Maori and the settler government. Some of the challenges for the colonial government included the conflict between new settlers and Maori over access to land, the forceful alienation of Maori from their land through a series of judicial confiscations and the resulting Maori resistance, which led to what has become known as the New Zealand wars of the 1860 to 1870s. Economic depression in the 1880s resulted in the dramatic rise of unemployment, fall in wages, deteriorating working conditions and an emerging underclass.

The two depressions following each other in quick succession, the first in the last decade of the late 19th century and the second in the late 1920s to 1933, together with the effects of the great war 1914–1918, created serious community development challenges. With over 18,000 unemployed, an estimated 12 percent of the workforce in 1933, and housing, child welfare and health issues, the social tension that emanated from the depressions and the less than generous government response created crises in many communities. The rate of suicide rose dramatically as life savings evaporated, hunger was widespread, mortgages were foreclosed and people lost their homes.

The colonial government's response to this was the rapid development of welfare policies in the last decade of the 19th century, such as the Land and Income Tax (1891) to increase government revenue to address the emerging social issues and the Old Age Pensions Act (1898) in an attempt to create a framework for community development intervention to address the challenges of demographic change in Aotearoa New Zealand society.

Community-based organizations including trade unions, Church-based organizations and philanthropic individuals started to emerge in Aotearoa New Zealand as early as the 1850s in response to the social problems of the settler society and to provide services to the needy. For example, the Methodist Mission set up soup kitchens in 1851 to feed the unemployed and distributed food, coal for fuel and clothing to the destitute; the Salvation Army established the Samaritan homes for unwed mothers in 1883. Charitable organizations in Auckland alone provided over 50,000 emergency accommodation beds. Although their agenda was primarily a moral mandate 'to rescue those drifting beyond the care of the Church' (Olssen, 2000, p. 269) and 'fallen women' (Lineham, 1994, p. 3) rather than participatory democracy and social justice, their work helped to shape the nature of

community development in the ensuing years as church organizations began to challenge government's social and economic policies and their impacts on individuals, families and communities.

Prior to European colonization and settlement in Aotearoa, Maori, like most indigenous peoples, were engaged in the development of their communities, which ranged from whanau (extended family) to hapu (villages and sub-tribes) to iwi (large tribal areas). The development process that was established in this tradition is what underpins indigenous people's contemporary struggle for self-determination, access to development resources, sustainable development and holistic development. The Treaty of Waitangi 1840 was meant to create a bi-cultural society in which both Maori, the indigenous people, and the new immigrants had equality of access to resources, power and justice. However, by the end of the 19th century, Maori development had been arrested by oppressive colonization processes. The Treaty was ignored, the cultural basis of Maori society and identity was undermined and efforts by Maori for self-determination were thwarted by colonial administration as more than ninety percent of Maori land was expropriated, either through forceful confiscations or arranged sales (Durie, 1997).

Maori were exploited both by colonial government and settlers economically, culturally and politically through a system of policies that discriminated against, exploited and disenfranchized them. They were forcibly deprived of their land, resources and powerbase. Even education became an instrument of oppression:

Education was used as an instrument of cultural invasion. Their [colonial education policies] purpose was to subvert Maori culture and establish a mono-cultural society. The one people mythology meant that Maori must be Europeanised. British law was to supersede Maori customs, while the teaching of English to facilitate the assimilation of Maoris into the English community. There was no place for Maori culture. (Walker, 1982, pp. 73–74)

Racial attitudes against Maori were dominated by narrow-minded intolerance that perceived Maori as 'lazy, happy-go-lucky and slovenly' (Harris, 2004, p. 17). There was widespread disillusionment within Maori communities both with government and Maori leadership, and hence, Walker suggests that 'the intellectuals did not deliver prosperity to the masses, so the people turned to the prophet Ratana for salvation' (Walker, 1982, p. 78). The Ratana movement combined charismatic leadership, spirituality and political action as instruments to advance Maori development. The partnership between Ratana and the Labour government 1935–1949 was

the first major force in Maori communities' social and economic transformation, as discussed in the next section.

Leading up to the end of the first century of colonization, Maori community development was seriously undermined by colonial policies that neither understood nor appreciated it. The statutory community development process was limited to parliamentary legislation and state subsidies that enhanced the activities of voluntary, church-based community organizations and philanthropic individuals. In the philanthropic-community sector, practice strongly emphasized individual benevolence, discipline and self help rather than a social change focus. Both these contrasted with pre-colonial Maori community development approach, which was community-based, and focused on the collective needs and self-determination of whanau, hapu and iwi.

Community development and the establishment of the welfare state: 1935–1970

The major feature of this period is the establishment of a framework for the welfare state and the introduction of community development as official government policy. The first Labour government came to power in 1935 with a passion to create social and human welfare that transformed the social fabric of Aotearoa New Zealand society. While aiming for national reform, the government focused on community-based programmes and community economic development initiatives. The Physical Welfare and Recreation Act 1937 and the creation of the Physical Welfare and Recreation Unit in the Department of Internal Affairs were the first concerted attempts to establish a formal community development programme within government departments.

While the policy involved some direct provision of activities, principles of community development were applied in that the needs of the locality were assessed first and existing organisations were also assisted in their development. (Church, 1990, p. 7)

The Physical Welfare Officers were the first group of statutory community development workers with a variety of roles combining policy development work, project implementation and funding support for community organizations. Shand (2002) summarizes the functions of Physical Welfare Officers as including leadership training for national youth organizations, administration of grants to encourage recreation activities and funding support to local authority community development programmes to help establish a range of community-based organizations such as the YMCA, YWCA, Youth Hostels Association, Boys Scouts, Girls Guides and Life Guards, as

well as grants to enable young people of promise and those with creative talent to undertake further study (Basset, 1997, p. 137).

The programmes evolved over the next three decades with sixteen districts covering the whole country: a core staff of twelve in the Wellington head office and full and part-time staff in each of the districts by 1950 (Basset, 1997, p. 147). The unit also became involved in programmes for the settlement of new migrants and refugees and promoted and funded community centres around the country as part of community development projects to create focal points for community education, health programmes, cooperatives, sports and recreation, community meeting places and War Memorial Halls. By 1956, 131 centres had been built, 99 in the rural areas and 32 in the urban centres, rising to about 350 in 1970 (Church, 1990, p. 12).

Substantial government funding enabled the growth of a strong community sector and attracted high calibre, highly skilled practitioners who were prepared to try innovative approaches to community issues. Between 1937 and 1950, the capacity building programmes of the Unit created nearly 500 clubs and organizations across over 220 communities, trained 1480 community and youth leaders and over 900 sports coaches (Church, 1990, p. 14), thus providing a potent force for community-based social change in the country. The defeat of Labour and the election of a National government in 1949, which did not support some of the activities of the unit, led to drastic reduction in the funding and the role of the State in community development programmes.

The 1960s was a decade of global cultural change that challenged the legitimacy of State actions on behalf of citizens—particularly as social change leaders and this was reflected at the local level in Aotearoa New Zealand as:

‘counter-culture’ movements challenged traditional response to problems and re defined solutions. The Vietnam War Protests challenged the idea that governments reflected the views of the people. James Baxter’s experiment in creating a communal solution to the needs of urban refugees helped to pave the way for more responsive approaches to ‘problems’. The formation of Nga Tamatoa [the Young Warriors] and the Polynesian Panthers gave voice to the young urban Maori and Polynesian youth. Women’s liberation movements challenged the process of decision-making and experimented with new models for organisation. (Johns, 1993, p. 16)

Thus, leading up to the 1970s, community development within the state sector, which at this stage was predominantly within central government departments, was beginning to experience some challenges as the

community sector gained strength and confidence and started to develop and experiment with new models of community building.

Two pieces of legislation provided the framework for Maori community development in the next half century, namely the 1945 Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act and the 1962 Maori Welfare Act (later re-named the Maori Community Development Act in 1979). The 1945 Act set up tribal and district committees charged with the responsibility to:

- i promote, encourage, guide, advance and maintain their physical, economic, industrial, educational, social, moral and spiritual well-being;
- ii assume and maintain self dependence, thrift, pride of race, and such conduct as will be conducive to their general health and economic well-being;
- iii accept and maintain the full rights privileges and responsibilities of citizenship;
- iv apply and maintain the maximum possible efficiency and responsibility in their self-governance and undertakings; and
- v preserve, revive and maintain the teaching of Maori arts, crafts, language, genealogy and history in order to perpetuate Maori culture, [Section 12 (a) i-v].

If adequately resourced, the Act had the potential to enhance community-based development because the tribal-committee structure created a framework for *tino rangatiratanga*. Unfortunately, what was a great policy initiative ended up rather sterile 'as politicians acted deliberately to curb the generally successful, and therefore "dangerous" quest for autonomy' (Hill, 2004, p. 213). The strict control of funding by the Department of Maori Affairs did not allow tribal committees the financial resources to undertake development programmes except those approved by government schemes. Financial control became an instrument of containment and incorporation rather than liberation and self-determination sought by Maori communities. The failure of the 1945 Act and the rapidly changing structure of Maori communities due to rural–urban migration provided the impetus for the Maori Welfare Act 1962.

The spatial pattern of Maori communities drastically changed in the post-war period. Labour shortages, particularly in the urban areas during the war period, created unprecedented employment opportunities for Maori and led to rapid rural–urban migration of Maori. From only about nine percent in 1926, urban Maori population increased to twenty-four percent by 1956 (Walker, 2000, p. 500). Rapid Maori urbanization exacerbated social issues such as housing, health and cultural alienation. The Maori Welfare Act 1962 sought to bring together those factors critical to

the development of Maori communities – economic, social and cultural development.

Community development as social and economic development: 1970s to present

The 1970s were arguably the most critical in establishing the framework for contemporary community development practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. Craig surmises that:

Aotearoa entered the 1970s to experience a climate of political, economic and social unrest and, in the process, was forced to recognise that it was part of an international community. Amidst a period of the development of a counter-culture movement, the second wave of the women's movement, rapid urban growth, and a new wave of Maori renaissance, community development became a 'boom industry'. It was promoted as a methodology for working towards change by both central and local government, as well as by people working at the grass-roots level. Community development became the catch phrase to solve society's problems. (Craig 1991, pp. 45–46)

Reeder suggests that community development in the 1970s was concerned with people's struggle to reclaim ownership and control of their communities from the hegemonic influences of 'local and central government power and corporate influence':

Over that period the 'community worker' appears to have assumed a new status, and there was a strong sense of purpose amongst those who worked with community groups which is reflected in the wide range of initiatives of the time. The establishment of practical responses in the form of half-way houses, community houses, work trusts, social services and other worthwhile initiatives resulted from a process that demands the time and commitment to a vision of improving the quality of life of others. (in Derrick, 1995, p. 7)

The establishment of community development units within local and regional governments (Territorial Local Authorities, TLAs) was a significant development in recognizing the need to find local solutions to local issues. Although Auckland City Council is credited as the first local authority to create a community development unit in 1970, Manukau City Council appointed a Social Services Officer in 1966 to promote greater coordination between the services provided by the voluntary and statutory agencies, build community resources and administer relief distress fund (Bidois, 1978) in response to some of the social and economic issues in new housing areas such as Otara and Mangere.

The Local Government Act 1974 raised the profile of community development within TLAs, because the Act stipulated specifically for local authorities to provide community development functions. Section 37K set out the purposes of Local Government, namely to recognize the existence of different communities, their identities, values and communities of interest and to recognize local communities as the locale for delivery of appropriate services and effective democratic participation. The functions of local government, therefore, were to improve and develop communities (Section 152) and through community Councils to represent the views of the community and 'undertake, encourage and coordinate activities for the general well-being of the residents of the community' [Section 162(c)]. Local authorities' community development function was backed with central government funding. Consequently, while in 1973 there were only three community advisers in local authorities in the country (Johns, 1993, p. 16) 'approximately forty personnel were involved under local authorities in full-time community development work' (Wilkes, 1982, p. 125). Their specific functions ranged from 'identification and quantification of social needs', to 'the development of community groups' and liaison 'between the community and larger social structures' (Wilkes, 1982, pp. 125–127).

Professionalization became a contentious issue for community development workers. The majority of community workers were unpaid volunteers, Maori and women working within the community, voluntary and not-for-profit sector. Community development workers within the statutory sector in central government departments and local councils formed the Community Workers Association in 1980 to protect their interest. However, those in the community, voluntary and not-for-profit sector equated professionalism with elitism (Nash, 1998, p. 278) and attempts to form a unified Aotearoa Community Workers Association have failed (Craig, 1991, pp. 318–324; Nash, 1998, pp. 277–334). Community development training has been largely community-based and/or incorporated in social work training.

One of the most critical issues affecting communities across the country, which occupied government attention and shifted the focus of community development in the 1970s and 1980s, was the engagement of young people. Reeder argues that:

Underpinning almost all of the social issues at the time (1970s and 1980s), whether related to unemployment, shelter, criminal offending, education, substance/drug or alcohol abuse, was that of youth and young people. (Derrick, 1995, p. 7)

Within central government, community development practice sought inspiration from international good practice to address 'youth crisis' of the baby

boom generation such as the international dialogue on youth and the commonwealth youth programme. At the national level, concerns with the number of young people being recruited into gangs reiterated the urgency for holistic approaches to address young people's need. Statutory response was to create the Youth Services Branch in the DIA and appoint Youth Services Workers across the country to develop youth-focused programmes. These included Youth Initiatives Fund and Detached Youth Worker Funding Scheme to support individuals working with groups of alienated young people. Denis O'Reilly, the first detached youth worker, was awarded the Commonwealth Youth Programme Fellowship to study youth penal rehabilitation programmes in Canada and the United Kingdom. O'Reilly's pioneering work with gangs created the first labour cooperative that became a model for Special Work Schemes in the late 1970s (Dyce, 1979, pp. 30–31).

Funding administration to community initiatives and local authorities has been one of the key aspects of community development practice within the statutory sector. From the creation of the Art Union in 1932 to allocate funds to the community sector for the purposes of 'alleviating distress in the communities' (Shand, 2002, p. 9), community development funding grew to over \$140 million in 1997 (Shand, 2002, p. 10). The range of programmes has also grown to include international programmes such as the Peace and Disarmament Education Trust set up in 1995. This funds peace and development and conservation programmes in the Pacific from the compensation money paid by the French government for sinking the *Rainbow Warrior*, the Greenpeace ship, in 1985 because of New Zealand's opposition to French nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

While the discussion of the statutory sector in this paper has focused primarily on the Department of Internal Affairs, because of its central role in community development practice over the last 150 years (Basset, 1997, p. 8), other central government departments have also been involved in community development work, particularly in the period 1970 to present. For example, the Department of Social Welfare, established in 1972, was responsible for coordinating social welfare activities and funded the establishment of the Community Volunteers programme in 1973 and went on to set up a community development unit in 1982 as part of the process of supporting community-based service delivery by community voluntary and not-for-profit organizations. The primary motivation may not have been community development as much as a monitoring mechanism to ensure financial accountability so that organizations' contracts meet the department's key performance indicators.

Transformed into the Ministry of Social Development in 2001, it administers income support, employment services, superannuation as well as student loans and allowances, while the Family and Community Services

programmes focus on 'supporting and strengthening families and communities' (MSD, 2005). The MSD also houses the Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector, whose primary function is to help create an effective working relationship between government and the community, voluntary and not-for profit and Maori organizations, to enable them to better meet the objectives of strengthening communities, offering mutual assistance and self-help to communities and organizations, researching and advocating on behalf of individuals, groups and communities, and expressing and fostering culture and identity (OCVS, 2005). The Ministry has earned the title of 'super ministry' because of the size of its operations with a budget of NZD13 billion in 2002, the largest for any single state agency.

Other departments include the Ministry of Health where community development practice is mainly in health promotion, community health projects, mental health and primary health; the Ministry of Justice safer communities programmes, crime prevention and the department of corrections community assistance and community probations programmes. Te Puni Kokiri Ministry of Maori Development has adopted community development principles and employed community development workers since the 1945 Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act as discussed in earlier sections of this paper. Its community-development focus was further reinforced by the reorganisation of the department in 1977, which created the Tu Tangata programmes that actively engaged district offices in development efforts of local communities (Butterworth, 1989). While many of these statutory agencies make claims to community development principles, it is often difficult for some of their workers to distinguish where their practice is empowering communities towards social change and where they function as agents of social control.

Within the local authorities, one of the most significant turning points for community development was the sixth National Community Development Conference in Manukau in 1988. Thirty local and regional authorities represented by over 100 councillors, community workers and senior civil servants espoused a new vision for the role of community development. The conference communiqué emphasized the centrality of community development as the key to effective local government to empower and enhance the quality of life within communities. In a keynote address to the conference, Colin Dale, city manager for Manukau City Council, argued that:

In my view it is most appropriate to consider the future of local government with community development as a central focus. Local government should ensure that community development activities move from the wings to the centre stage if it is to provide the necessary responsiveness, participation and sense of belonging which it regards as focal to its reason for being. (Dale, 1988, p. 1, 3)

The conference re-emphasised the purposes and functions of local government articulated in the 1974 Act. This view and the recommendations of the conference significantly influenced the submissions to the Local Government restructuring process of 1989. In the aftermath of the 1989 reform, the New Zealand Local Government Association issued a Charter in 1993 titled: *Charter for Local Government on Social Justice Issues, Community Development and Social Services* in which it re-stated the centrality of community development to local government:

Local Government is elected to represent each community in every aspect of that community's well-being. It is the most appropriate level of government to recognise and effectively respond to local needs and aspirations. This requires a council to be involved in issues of community welfare and social justice. (New Zealand Local Government Association, 1993)

It is argued that to achieve the social justice objective, councils must move beyond the traditional four-Rs – rates, rubbish, roads and rats – to a strong community development paradigm, which is development from below, based on social justice tenants of equity and fairness enhanced by participatory democracy. It is in this vein that the 2002 local government Act, like its predecessors, reiterated the purpose of local government stating that:

The purpose of the Act is to provide for democratic and effective local government that recognises the diversity of New Zealand communities; and promotes the accountability of local authorities to their communities, and provides for local authorities to play a broad role in promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of their communities, taking a sustainable development approach.

The Act challenges governments to shift the decision-making process from centralized policies and procedures of the top-down, to a more consultative bottom-up, accessible and flexible approaches that build on community-based initiatives. It requires local authorities to identify community outcomes and develop long-term council community plans incorporating community outcomes that communities prioritize in order of relative importance, providing clear measures of how progress can be achieved. The community outcomes process also ensures better co-ordination between local authorities, the central government and community, voluntary and not-for-profit organizations to reduce duplication between the activities of the local authority and other organizations (Part 5, Clause 73–75). The extent to which the provisions of the Act translate to community empowerment depends very much on the practice of each local authority, which is the challenge to community development workers within

the local authorities, and how much community-based organizations effectively engage with the process (McKinlay, 2006).

One of the key outcomes of central government community development funding programmes has been the growth and complexity of community-based organizations that emerged in the current period. The grants and training programmes combined with nearly three decades of organizational capacity building produced a complex network of organizations that have radically alternative methods of addressing community issues and effecting social change at the local, national and international levels. In 2003, there were nearly 30,000 incorporated societies and over 1000 charitable trusts in the country. Most of those working in these organizations were part-time volunteers, and their contribution to community development and social change has not always been appreciated. The formation of a national organization of community volunteers in 1973 and the creation of the Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector in 2003 to support volunteers working in communities across the country has given legitimacy to volunteering as an important component of community development.

The activities of many community voluntary and not for profit organizations has centred on alleviating distress through financial and material relief. Many organizations were born out of the need for emergency assistance during periods of crises, and much government funding has been to support services that government should, but could or would not provide directly. The distress relief approach has become inadequate as people became more conscientized about the causes of their distress, unemployment and poverty. They could make direct links between their circumstances and that of others and, thus, their private troubles and public policy and political processes. Some community organizations, therefore, sought distress relief as only the starting point for community development; this should be followed in the longer-term by increasing the capacity of individuals and communities to enable them to overcome the distress caused by unemployment and poverty and prevent long term dependence on assistance.

Some organizations have emerged with social change agenda as their main focus. These included groups such as Nga Tamatoa demanding a better deal for Maori, first to honour the Treaty, return Maori land, respect Maori citizenship rights and recognize Maori cultural heritage and language. The Polynesian Panthers drawn from the Pacific Island communities and modelled after the philosophy of the American Black Panthers demanded equal opportunities for Pacific Island youth and challenged racism and prejudice that undermined Pacific people's identity. Organizations such as Tennant Protection Associations, Food and Work

Cooperatives, Half-Way houses for ex-prisoners and mental health patients and faith-based organizations, while continuing to provide for the every-day needs of individuals, started to challenge the system that continued to reproduce the problems. Others were set up specifically to address social justice issues such as Citizens Association for Racial Equality (CARE), which focused on issues of racial prejudice and discrimination.

The growth of international consciousness led to the establishment of national offices of international organizations such as Save the Children, World Vision and Oxfam, but more significantly national organizations that began to make links between local–national and international issues. The world war experiences of New Zealand soldiers led to the establishment of the Council of Organisations for Relief Services Overseas (CORSO) in 1944, the country's first indigenous international development organization. Its focus was to provide practical relief support for post-war southern European countries particularly linked to the Gallipoli campaign and in Italy and Greece. However, the challenge of addressing social justice issues in Aotearoa New Zealand during the 1970s and 1980s relating to Maori led some members to question why the organization could not link international social justice issues and the position of Maori in Aotearoa. The organization, Halt ALL Racist Tours (HART), formed around the issue of New Zealand sporting links with apartheid South Africa in the wake of the rugby tours and the United Nations ban on sporting links with the apartheid regime raised public awareness and mobilized against the Springbok tour locally, nationally and internationally (Chile, 2001). Greenpeace emerged out of concerns for global environment and sustainable development and its principled stand against French nuclear testing in the Pacific in the 1980s, unsustainable logging of tropical rainforests in the 1980s and 1990s, and Japanese whaling in Antarctica in the 2000s.

Community development and Maori self-determination

Community development as social transformation is predicated on the philosophy that social change can only be attained through a holistic approach that looks at the overall political, social, economic, cultural, environmental and spiritual context. The political dimension emphasizes that community development cannot be understood simply in the context of individual pathology, but a holistic approach that seeks to address structural inequality, enhance the capacity of individuals, groups and communities to operate in the political arena through conscientisation, organizing and social and political actions. It is this approach

that Maori have adopted to give voice to their struggle for tino rangatiratanga.

The loss of culture, language and reluctance of Pakeha institutions to incorporate Maori values has been a point of contention for Maori community development since 1840, but the turning point came in the 1970s. Walker suggests that Nga Tamatoa was the public face of Maori socio-political mobilisation and activism, the:

progenitor of a Maori movement that would eventually comprise a potent collection of Maori groups and individuals politically conscious, radical and unwaveringly committed to the pursuit of tino rangatiratanga. (Harris, 2004, p. 26)

It challenged government to introduce Maori language teaching in schools, honour the Treaty, give Maori control over Maori land and Maori finance, and linked the oppression of Black Africans in apartheid South Africa and the American civil rights movement with Pakeha hegemony over Maori in New Zealand. Their collective goal was to raise Maori political consciousness and public awareness on the links between Maori struggles in Aotearoa New Zealand and overseas struggles against colonization, racism, exploitation and social injustice.

The question of land was the most potent issue in Maori grievances. From ownership of over 66 million acres of land in 1840 (almost 100 percent), land confiscations left less than three million acres (about four percent) in Maori ownership by 1986. Thus Harris suggests that 'land was the prism through which Maori could see their loss of culture and identity refracted' (Harris, 2004, p. 26). The convergence of forces Nga Tamatoa and Te Roopu O Te Matakite (those with foresight) under the leadership of Dame Whina Cooper to end all sale of Maori land and repeal all legislation allowing government to sell Maori land took the case of Maori land poverty to the highways, marae and parliament. The mobilization of Maori communities across the country against land sale in the 1970s compares only with the Black Civil Rights movement in the US in the 1950s and 1960s. For example, the 700 mile hiko (march) from Te Haupua in the far North of the North Island to parliament in 1975 was reminiscent of 'Trail of Broken Promises', the Native American land march to Washington DC in 1973.

While the 1970s protest was dominated by land issues and Pakeha acceptance of Maori culture, by the 1980s Maori demands were for recognition as Tangata Whenua, first nation people. The challenge was no longer just for government but for both statutory and non-government organizations to acknowledge in their policies, programmes and practices the place of Maori as Tangata Whenua, and to reverse the exploitation, marginalization

and institutional racism against Maori. Tino rangatiratanga self determination could not be attained without cultural identity, nor could cultural identity have meaning without language. The revival of Maori language was, therefore, a cornerstone for Maori community development. The greater engagement of Maori communities in determining their development priorities created opportunity for innovative Maori community development programmes such as Kohanga Reo language nests to emerge in the 1980s mainly through the application of community development principles of every community determining its needs (Munford and Tapiata-Walsh, 2006).

The success of Kohanga Reo with children revitalized Maori language amongst parents who strove to acquire the language skills so they could reinforce it at home, and the politicization of the programme into a movement, which has brought about the creation of bilingual and Kura Kaupapa Maori immersion schools across the country where the medium of instruction is Maori language. This has established a basis for Te Whare Wananga Maori tertiary institutions and a strong constituency for Maori print and broadcast media including Maori television. The passing of the Maori Language Act 1987 confirmed Maori as an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand, used in legal proceedings, parliament, the media and everyday conversations.

One of the most significant pieces of legislation relating to Maori development is the Treaty of Waitangi Act and the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975:

To provide for the observation and confirmation of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and to determine claims about certain matters which are inconsistent with those principles. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2005)

The purpose of the tribunal is to provide a judicial forum outside of the court system to investigate Maori grievances relating to and arising from the Treaty. The work of the tribunal has brought the Treaty to national and international attention as the key reference point for addressing issues of Maori development. The Act was amended in 1985 to allow the tribunal to investigate claims retrospectively to 1840. While many non-Maori people felt and continue to feel threatened by the Tribunal process, it has been a primary source of empowerment to Maori communities. The return to Maori of substantial treasures including land, forests, rivers and financial compensation and apology from the government for treaty breaches, has enabled Maori to rebuild their resource base for community development and self-determination. The claims process consisting of painstaking research and documentation of evidence has contributed to the revitalization of Iwi organizations and re-established Maori sovereign

identity in their tribal land areas. The principles and practices of the Waitangi Tribunal have been studied for application in other countries such as South Africa and Canada.

Conclusions

In examining the three processes of community development in Aotearoa, there is clearly the dominance of the State as the provider that sets the overall framework for community development practice through legislation that directs community development practice, provides funding and devolved services to the community voluntary and not-for-profit sector that the State could not or would not provide directly. The funding and legal framework supported the emergence of a strong community voluntary sector, which has championed the cause of social change by challenging the structures that oppress, marginalize and exclude some segments of society. The challenge for the community, voluntary and not for profit organizations is its dependence on State funding. Without independent sources of funding, programmes that do not fit the State agenda, such as advocacy and political activism, are curtailed. In an environment of contracting for specific outcomes, community agencies' missions become compromised and social change agenda are diluted as service provision and casework take precedence over conscientization, mobilization and social transformation.

Like most indigenous communities around the world, Maori community development evolved out of hundreds of years of practice based on whanau, hapu and iwi. Development practice within indigenous communities is predicated on their own effective science and resource management practices that are not fully comprehended by colonisers. Development as a holistic process does not divide body, mind and soul, the physical from the non-physical, the individual from the group. Exploitative colonialism created many development challenges for Maori communities as the bases for development namely, land, culture and language were expropriated for colonial development. This invariably generated cultural resistance, hence Maori community development has tended to be conceptualized as resistance to colonialism. However, Maori community development understood as tino rangatiratanga goes beyond resistance, and encompasses a process that returns to practices, methods and strategies that focus on the entire functioning of society. As for community development in Aotearoa, the challenge is how to develop empowering practices that encompass the values, goals, processes and outcomes of a growing multi-cultural society struggling to achieve social justice in an increasingly unequal world.

Love M. Chile is Research and Development Programme Leader, Community Development Institute of Public Policy, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

Address for correspondence: love.chile@aut.ac.nz

References

- Bassett, M.C. (1997) *The Mother of All Departments: The History of the Department of Internal Affairs*, Auckland University Press.
- Bidois, C. (1978) Manukau City community services, in D.J. Robinson, ed., *Community Development and the Local Authorities Proceedings of Seminar*, Wellington City Council, 2–3 November.
- Butterworth, G.V. (1989) *End of an Era: The Department of Maori Affairs 1840–1989*, Wellington Department of Maori Affairs.
- Chile, L.M. (2001) The struggle to end apartheid in South Africa: A review of New Zealand's role, *The African Focus Magazine*, July, pp. 7–11.
- Church, A. (1990) *Community Development: A History of the Involvement of the Department of Internal Affairs in Community Development. Monograph Series Number 13*, Wellington Department of Internal Affairs.
- Craig, W. (1991) From rocking the cradle to rocking the system: Women, community work and social change in Aotearoa. PhD Thesis School of Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Dale, C. (1988) Community development. A central focus for future local government. address to the *Community Development National Conference Manukau City 27–29 July 1988*, Manukau city Council.
- Derrick, E. (1995) *Community Development & Social Change*, 2nd edn., Auckland, Auckland District Council of Social Services.
- Durie, M. (1997) Mana Maori Motuhake: the state of the Maori nation, in R. Miller, ed., *New Zealand Politics in Transition*, Oxford University Press, Auckland.
- Dyce, T. (1979) Community in New Zealand, in T. Dyce and W. Wilcox, eds., *Opportunities for Change: Community in New Zealand New Zealand Community Work Forum Volume 1*.
- Harris, A. (2004) *Hiko: Forty Years of Maori Protest*, Huia Publishers, Wellington.
- Hill, R.S. (2004) *State Authority, Indigenous Autonomy: Crown-Maori Relations in New Zealand Aotearoa 1900–1950*, Victoria University Press, Wellington.
- Johns, K. (1993) *Community Development in Territorial Local Authorities: A Profile*, Wellington Department of Internal Affairs.
- Lineham (1994) A historical perspective on the New Zealand christian social services in relation to church and state. Paper presented at the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services Consultation, July 28–29.
- McKinlay, P. (2006) The challenge of democratic participation in the community development process, *Community Development Journal*, 41 (4) 492–505.
- Ministry of Social Development (2005) OCVS: Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, accessed at: <http://www.ocvs.govt.nz/the-sector/>

- Ministry of Social Development (2002) *He Waka Kotua Joining Together on a Shared Journey Report of the Community-Government Relations Steering Group*, Wellington Ministry of Social Development, accessed at: www.msd.govt.nz/voluntary.html
- Munford, R. and Tapiata-Walsh (2006) Community development: Working in the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand, *Community Development Journal*, 41 (4) 426–442.
- Nash, M.A. (1998) People, policies and practice: social work education in Aotearoa New Zealand from 1949–1995. PhD Thesis School of Social Policy and Social Work Palmerston North, Massey University.
- New Zealand Local Government Association (1993) *Charter for Local Government on Social Justice Issues, Community Development and Social Services*, Unpublished Charter Local Government Building, Lambton Quay, Wellington.
- Olssen, E. (2000) Towards a new society, In G.W. Rice, ed., *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 2nd edn, Oxford University Press, Auckland, pp. 254–284.
- Reeder, C. (1995) Forward in E. Derrick *Community Development and Social Change*, 2nd edn, Auckland, Auckland District Council of Social Services.
- Shand, D. (2002) *Contemporary Community Development Practice in CDG Discussion Series Handbook*, Wellington Department of Internal Affairs.
- Shirley, I. (1979) *Planning for Community*, The Dunmore Press, Palmerston North.
- Te Puni Kokiri Ministry of Maori Development (2005), accessed at: <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/>
- Te Puni Kokiri Ministry of Maori Development (1999) *Discussion Paper on the Review of the Maori Community Development Act 1962*, Te Puni Kokiri, Wellington.
- Waitangi Tribunal (2005) Frequently asked questions, accessed at: <http://www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz/faq/>
- Walker, R. (2000) Maori people sine 1950, in G.W. Rice, ed., *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 2nd edn, Oxford University Press, Auckland, pp. 498–519.
- Walker, R. (1982) Development from below: institutional transformation in plural society, in I. Shirley, ed., *Development Tracks The Theory and Practice of Community Development*, The Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, pp. 69–89.
- Wilkes, C. (1982) Development as practice: The instrument of reason, in I. Shirley, ed., *Development Tracks The Theory and Practice of Community Development*, The Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, pp. 117–134.
-