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Introduction

Despite the geographical closeness of Australia and New Zealand, comparative studies which outline the shared history of the two countries remain less common than those restricted within national boundaries.¹ This dissertation seeks to examine the history of indigenous administration in Australia and New Zealand by concentrating on the post-World War Two policies of assimilation and integration as represented in the magazines *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou*. *Dawn* was published monthly by the New South Wales Welfare Board between 1952 and 1969 and was distributed free of charge to Aboriginal families throughout the state.² *Te Ao Hou*, meaning 'The New World,' was published by the Department of Maori Affairs between 1952 and 1975. It was a quarterly magazine which was available by subscription and was sold to 2.5 percent of Maori nation-wide. Its readership, however, was most likely significantly higher than the sales figures indicate.³ Its distribution in households and schools make it likely that each copy was read by numerous people.⁴ While historians on both sides


⁴ “Te Ao Hou Goes to Schools,” *Te Ao Hou*, Summer 1953, 1.
of the Tasman have used *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* in wider studies, they remain a rich source of new information, particularly when studied together. To the best of my knowledge, these magazines have never been examined together, possibly because of the preference for nationally bounded histories.

The focus of this dissertation is on the policies of assimilation and integration and how they related to the indigenous groups of Australia and New Zealand, or more precisely, New South Wales and New Zealand. The decision to compare these two places was largely a matter of where *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* were distributed. This is perhaps a fortunate limitation because it overcomes having to account for the variations in policy which were present throughout the Australian states. In addition, it lends itself to a more equal comparison in terms of geographic size and population. *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* served to inform Aboriginal and Maori communities about the work of the Welfare Board and the Department of Maori Affairs and for that reason focus on the policies of assimilation and integration.

---

Most historians write as though assimilation refers to government practices and official and popular ideologies that were characteristic of a particular period of Australian history— the 1930s to the 1970s. However, assimilation is the subject of much debate among Australian historians. As Tim Rowse has explained, assimilation may also be considered as a permanent part of Australian social life that has been present since the earliest days of colonisation.

What assimilation means, when assimilation began and when (or if) it ended is brought into question by the view that in their interactions with colonising Europeans, Indigenous Australians were (and still are) under pressure to accommodate and adapt to standards determined for them by others. The meaning of assimilation can also range from a sense of “general equality” on the one end of the scale, to the “disappearance of the Aboriginal” on the other. Integration in New Zealand suffers from the same kind of definitional uncertainty. Unlike assimilation, however, it has not been the subject of sustained examination by New Zealand historians. On occasion, integration is used interchangeably with assimilation, without consideration of the differences which exist between them. Alternatively, it is deliberately conceived as a term which does not need to be differentiated from assimilation because it refers to a process or policy which is essentially the same. The use of assimilation and integration in different contexts presents another problem. One cannot assume that

---


8 Kerin, 85.1.

because they share the same label that they perform the same function.\(^\text{10}\) Careful consideration needs to be given to how the same terms are given different meanings. This dissertation attempts to clarify the meanings of assimilation and integration by examining how they were employed by Dawn and Te Ao Hou.

Much of the content of Dawn and Te Ao Hou was similar to other popular magazine series such as the Australian and New Zealand Women's Weekly.\(^\text{11}\) They contained advice on homecare, gardening and cooking and incorporated children's interests and community news.\(^\text{12}\) Dawn particularly appealed to children. Cartoon strips, the “Did You Know” feature and the regular children’s section “Pete’s Page” remained a staple of Dawn’s content throughout the years of publication. However, Dawn’s audience was not limited to children. Parents and other adults were also catered for with articles which explained how legislation affected them and addressed the issues of assimilation more directly. Its range of content made Dawn relevant to Aborigines of various ages. Te Ao Hou, by comparison, did not focus so heavily on children’s interests. The tone and subject matter of many articles suggests that Maori parents were the majority of the intended audience. Nonetheless, the magazine

\(^{10}\) Katherine Ellinghaus, “‘Absorbing the Aboriginal Problem’: Controlling Interracial Marriage in Australia in the Late 19th and early 20th centuries,” Aboriginal History 27 (2003): 183.

\(^{11}\) Magazines have successfully been used as historical sources in numerous works. For example, Justine Lloyd and Lesley Johnson, “Dream Stuff: the Post-War Home and the Australian Housewife 1940 – 1960,” Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 22 (2004): 251 – 272.

\(^{12}\) Te Ao Hou would develop into an important medium for contemporary Maori writers. The magazine encompassed a great number of works of fiction in the form of short stories and poetry and encouraged Maori writers through literary competitions. Works by Witi Ihimaera and Patricia Grace among many others were published in the magazine.
attracted school pupils through literary competitions and the young readers section. Children were important to *Te Ao Hou* as subjects of discussion, as the lengthy articles on theories of childhood education, youth employment opportunities and news of newly opened schools demonstrate.

The importance of these magazines to this thesis rests on the political inflection the non-indigenous editors brought upon these popular magazine characteristics. *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* were used to promote assimilation and integration through involvement in the daily lives of Aboriginal and Maori families. Those individuals who desired the lifestyle which modernity offered and adopted the ideals advocated by government were portrayed as evidence of the success of the policies. The more openly political opinions of government also make these publications significant. Indeed, informing the public of official opinions was the purpose of these magazines to a large extent. To a lesser degree, the magazines expressed the indigenous and non-indigenous public’s response to the policies through letters to the editor and other feedback. While this was of course presented in a filtered and selective form, the publication of the magazines throughout much of the 1950s and 1960s gives some indication of the changing climate of opinion. In addition, the magazines provide much needed insight into the practical implementation of assimilation in New South Wales and integration in New Zealand. *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* document the ways in which the policies were pursued, showing which were considered the more important aspects of
assimilation and integration, or at least illustrating those which could be disseminated through magazines.

Dawn

As a publication of the New South Wales Welfare Board, Dawn was an important arm of the policy of assimilation. To fully understand the purpose of Dawn it is important to recapture the outlook of the Welfare Board and their belief that the ‘archaic’ world of the Aborigines was being irrevocably changed by the relentless advance of modernity. The title of the magazine was deliberate and appropriate for the purpose it would serve – Dawn was there to promote a new beginning for Aborigines. The masthead of the magazine illustrated the idea of a new beginning with the stylised image of Gwoja Tjungurrayi confidently looking out toward an urban future (See Figure 4).\(^\text{13}\) In the first issue the Chief Secretary of the Welfare Board, Clive Evatt, addressed the Aboriginal population of New South Wales and explained that the title of Dawn:

suggests the opening of a new era, the heralding of new light and progression from the old to the new. As the dawn ushers in the new day, inviting us to apply ourselves to the tasks and responsibilities of life, so ‘DAWN’ appearing for the first time in the first month of the New Year, 1952, represents a further step in your progress towards that goal which has been set – your assimilation as a race, with the general community. After all, we are all Australians, we share the common heritage, and

there is no logical reason why there should not exist in every one of us the same ideal of good citizenship, comradeship – and service.14

While the Welfare Board’s desire for *Dawn* to signal a new epoch was certainly grand, much of it may be attributed to rhetoric, since *Dawn* primarily functioned as a vehicle of communication between the Welfare Board and Aboriginal population. The first issue established this aspect of the magazine, stating that:

*Dawn* is intended to serve as a means of enabling the Board and the Aboriginal people to learn to know one another better and with a greater measure of understanding. It will fulfill also a useful purpose in the exchange of news and views and should prove to be a valuable source of interest and information.15

It was a space in which the Welfare Board could detail its work and policies. Whether reporting on the conditions on the Aboriginal reserves or describing the annual Summer Camp, much of *Dawn’s* content reflected the Board’s overarching concern with assimilation.

The superintendent of Aboriginal Welfare A. W. G. Lipscomb explained:

*Dawn* is something much more important than just a popular magazine. The Aborigines Welfare Board, composed of men who have a real and sincere interest in the aborigines and their many problems, relies on *Dawn* to tell those aborigines in plain ordinary words, just what the Board has done for them, what it is doing, and what it plans to do.16

---

The message of assimilation in *Dawn* often took the form of an explicit contrast between the superiority of the modern, European way of life and the inferiority of an impoverished Aboriginal lifestyle (See Figure 1). *Dawn* suggested that quality housing, better healthcare and greater educational and employment opportunities were available to those individuals who would willfully assimilate into wider society. Introducing Aborigines to the modern world involved connecting those who were geographically and socially isolated with events and communities in the wider world. The section “Around the World” entertained readers with curiosities from places outside of Australia and supplemented the more familiar world news section. Similarly, “Along the Mail Route” connected Aborigines across New South Wales with news of community events, while “Our Roving Cameraman” provided glimpses of Aborigines in various communities and situations. In promoting assimilation, *Dawn* was critical of those communities which were resistant to the policy. In the October 1955 issue, *Dawn* noted that the Moree Council had passed a resolution to ban the use of the baths and municipal buildings by Aborigines. In the following year, the June issue of *Dawn* was openly critical, stating that: “There is a definite, and indeed, a heartbreaking ‘colour line’ attitude on the part of the white community in Moree, with the result that the average Aborigine gets no encouragement to seek or strive for assimilation.”

Since assimilation was attempting to persuade Aborigines to adopt the ways of the mainstream community, there was a possibility that indigenous culture could interfere with this process. *Dawn* reinforced the belief that the preservation of indigenous culture was, to a large extent, incompatible with the policy of assimilation. In February 1960, *Dawn* reprinted a booklet put out by the federal government entitled "Fringe Dwellers," which addressed the nature of the 'Aboriginal problem' and described how assimilation was to provide a solution.

On the question of Aboriginal heritage, *Dawn* argued:

> Many aspects of the tribal life of aborigines tend to persist and become barriers to the advancement and eventual assimilation of Individuals and of groups... Whilst it is of course, desirable that aborigines should retain the best aspects of their own culture, it is important for them to realise that tribal obligations have to be considerably modified to meet the basic requirements of the new way of life. So long
as the old tribal obligations are felt in their original form, they will retard the advancement of aborigines toward assimilation.  

The expectation that Aborigines would be exchanging their Aboriginal culture and identity for one that was more in line with mainstream Australian society presented a problem for the Welfare Board of how to ‘detribalise’ Aborigines without ‘demoralisation.’ The concern was addressed by Welfare Board member Michael Sawtell in *Dawn* of November 1952.  

The process of ‘detribalisation’ was believed to be an inevitable outcome of contact with European Australians and, as a result, many Aborigines were said to become ‘demoralised’ in modern society, unable to properly acquire ‘civilised life.’ Recognising that Aborigines could become ‘demoralised’ entailed acknowledgement that a loss of culture could seriously impact on Aborigines’ lives. However, since ‘tribal life’ had the potential to prevent Aborigines from advancing toward assimilation, the solution to this problem was, in Sawtell’s words, to “take the detribalised aborigines as we find them and try, as the Board is doing, to instil into them a deeper sense of what we mean by citizenship.” Those who could adopt the Australian way of life advocated by the Welfare Board and become assimilated would be rewarded with the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

---

19 Michael Sawtell, “The Aborigines are not Democrats: But Tribal Laws are Sound,” *Dawn*, November 1952, 9. This message was reiterated in the September 1960 issue in a reprint of the very same article.
Although *Dawn*'s central message was that of assimilation – where assimilation meant the abandonment of Aboriginal culture and adoption of white ways of living – it was surprisingly successful in accommodating the shifting attitudes of the 1960s. Closer to the end of *Dawn*'s years of publication, the opinions of the Welfare Board can be seen to have undergone notable changes. It reflected the adoption of an approach to Aboriginal affairs which claimed that Aboriginal culture could be used to the advantage of the Welfare Board. Much like that of the Department of Maori Affairs in its move from assimilation to integration, the Welfare Board began to realise that its goal of assimilation could be more easily realised by using some aspects of Aboriginal culture to promote a gradual transition to a modern way of life.\(^{21}\)

In an article presumably directed at welfare officers, the question of whether Aboriginal languages were a barrier to assimilation was posed. The article argued that by making use of Aboriginal languages the policy of assimilation could be implemented more effectively as it would allow the policy to be more convincingly advertised to the population. It would enable those involved in Aboriginal affairs to capably guide Aborigines “through the maze of complexities of cultural change” and would improve the instructions given by the Welfare Board.\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{21}\)The shift of the Department of Maori Affairs from assimilation to integration is discussed in Chapter 1: A Study of Assimilation and Integration in Australia and New Zealand.

Te Ao Hou / The New World

*Te Ao Hou*, much like *Dawn*, visually promoted the idea of the Maori people ‘moving forward’ and embracing modernity. The cover of the first two issues of *Te Ao Hou* presented an image of the prow of a canoe heading toward the distant image of an island which presumably represented ‘the new world’ (See Figure 2).

(Figure 2) The cover of the Winter 1952 and Spring 1952 issues of *Te Ao Hou*.

Quite unlike *Dawn*, however, from its earliest issues *Te Ao Hou* incorporated and reinforced notions of integration which recognised the value of Maori culture to the success of the policy. Some caution needs to be exercised with regard to the extent to which *Te Ao Hou*
promoted the perspective of government. The character of *Te Ao Hou* was as much a product of the Department of Maori Affairs as it was of its first editor Eric Schwimmer. In the pioneer issue, Schwimmer explained that:

*Te Ao Hou* is intended as a magazine for the Maori people. Pakehas will, we hope, find much in it that may interest them and broaden their knowledge of the Maori, but this publication is planned mainly to provide interesting and informative reading for Maori homes. *Te Ao Hou* should become like a ‘marae’ on paper, where all questions of interest to the Maori can be discussed.²³

In detailing the purpose of *Te Ao Hou* the intentions of Eric Schwimmer need to be considered because, as Chadwick Allen has explained in his study of indigenous literary texts, from the magazines formative years there was tension between Schwimmer’s personal vision and that of the Department.²⁴ Schwimmer’s introduction of a diverse range of content conflicted with the government expectation that *Te Ao Hou*’s role would centre on disseminating official information. His key metaphor for *Te Ao Hou*, as a “marae on paper,” drew criticism from government officials because it presented a traditional Maori-centred image to represent modern Maori identity. It conflicted with the government’s desire for *Te Ao Hou* to assist the objectives of integration which although it encouraged Maori culture to a certain extent, still envisioned a Pakeha-centred identity for all New Zealanders. Maori Affairs memos showed that after the first several issues, the Department of Maori Affairs, the Information Service and the Department of Tourism and Publicity attempted to discipline

---

²⁴ Allen, 92.
Schwimmer over his handling of *Te Ao Hou*’s editorials. Compared to *Dawn*, the connection between the work of government and the content of *Te Ao Hou* was much less direct.

With increasing frequency, articles appeared in both Maori and English which dealt with social issues affecting Maori. Much more so than *Dawn*, *Te Ao Hou* was a cultural space which was open to discuss various aspects Maori life, having a particularly important role in discussing Maoritanga – the distinctive aspects of Maori culture. One of many examples of Maori culture appeared on the cover photograph of the August 1957 issue of *Te Ao Hou* (See Figure 3). It showed carvings created by the Auckland Academy of Maori Arts and Crafts and was complemented by a featured article titled “The Future of Maori Arts and Crafts.” The article traced the ways in which the movement to develop Maori arts had been encouraged by Sir Apirana Ngata and relevant legislation in the preceding decades. The author, Maharaia Winiata, remarked that the work of the Academy and other institutions in creating and analysing Maori artworks served an important function in promoting the “appreciation of aspects of an indigenous art” and could lead to the adaptation of such knowledge in the community in the form of “contemporary types of carved meeting house,” as well as other public and private buildings. By publishing this article and others like it, *Te Ao Hou* served a distinctive function: it increased awareness of those institutions which produced cultural

---

25 Allen, 94 – 95.
27 Ibid., 34.
knowledge and promoted discussion of how this could help develop a modern Maori identity.

(Figure 3) The cover of the August 1957 issue of Te Ao Hou showing carvings created by the Auckland Academy of Maori Arts and Crafts.

To gain a greater understanding of integration and its representation in Te Ao Hou, it is worthwhile to spend a moment reflecting on those traits which were considered ‘modern’ and were thus suitable to be promoted in the name of integration. An attitude of individualism and capitalism was a characterisation of modern life which Maori had to adopt if they were to be successfully integrated. In the December 1961 issue of Te Ao Hou a news article appeared which was candidly titled “These Maoris are Integrated.” It explained that Maori owners of Haumingi 5B Block in Gisborne Point, near Rotorua had raised the rentals of
quarter acre sections from £10 to £125 per year. When some of the owners of the holiday houses or batches which were built upon these yearly leaseholds complained to the Department of Maori Affairs, Rotorua, they were told: “This is a normal land transaction.” By raising rent prices and using ‘normal’ land transactions to their personal advantage, these Maori property owners were adopting the shrewd attitudes and actions considered necessary to live and prosper in modern society and were thus successfully integrated.

The proper management of finances was an aspect of modern life which was actively encouraged by the Department of Maori Affairs. The Department attempted to assist Maori families to become a part of the economic life of New Zealand society and to succeed in the competitive environment. It was a vital step toward improving the social standing of Maori and making integration successful. Accordingly, the message of integration presented in *Te Ao Hou* often focused on the economic aspect of the process. The June 1961 issue, which appeared soon after the release of the *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs* in August 1960 (more commonly known as the Hunn Report, named after its author J. K. Hunn, Secretary of Maori Affairs), was perhaps the most explicitly dedicated to discussing and advocating integration. This issue evidenced the ‘Kaikohe Scheme’ as an example of “racial integration and spontaneous good-will.” In an article entitled “Working Together” it was explained that *Te Ao Hou* along with Maori Affairs officials, including J. K. Hunn, attended a

---

28 “News in Brief – These Maoris are Integrated,” *Te Ao Hou*, December 1961, 16.
special meeting of the Citizens' Advice and Guidance Council in Kaikohe to be informed of
the Councils work in providing advice on budgeting and other issues associated with
managing household income. The spokesman conveyed to the guests the success of the
scheme, which was indicated by community acceptance and was reinforced by case studies
which told of families “crippled by inordinate drinking,” which “now, after some months of
guidance... can face their lives ahead with confidence.” Hunn, and the Minister of Maori
Affairs, J. R. Hanan praised the scheme and recommended its adoption in other areas. In the
December issue, *Te Ao Hou* noted the schemes introduction in Kaitaia.

** * * *

A comparison of *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* enables one to draw out the differences between
assimilation in New South Wales and integration in New Zealand. The popular
understandings of assimilation and integration provided by these publications indicate that
the inclusion of indigenous culture was tolerated to a much lesser extent under the policy of
assimilation in Australia than under integration in New Zealand. It was not until the late
1960s that *Dawn* began to incorporate perspectives which were critical of the assumption
that assimilation was incompatible with Aboriginal culture. One of the central
rationalisations underlying such shifts in official opinion in both Australia and New Zealand
was that indigenous culture could be used as a stable basis from which assimilation and
integration could be achieved.

31 Ibid., 7.
The three chapters which follow explore different aspects of assimilation in Australia and integration in New Zealand through the lens of *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou*. The first chapter aims to provide an overview of assimilation and integration with a focus on official concerns and the creation of government policy. The second and third chapters concentrate on how the magazines promoted assimilation and integration. Chapter two describes how the younger generation of Aborigines and Maori were targeted by the government in an attempt to shape their values and attitudes. *Dawn* emerges as a particularly valuable source for historians focused on the discourse surrounding the policy of child removal. It represented an attempt by the Welfare Board to address the Aboriginal population, at an informal and popular level, about policy and practice. In acting as an agent of assimilation, *Dawn* functioned to ease public opinion, and perhaps even the minds of the Board members themselves. The power of the Welfare Board over information and knowledge becomes explicit through the contrast between the happy portrayal of institutionalised children in *Dawn* and oral evidence gathered in later years. Chapter three concentrates on the personal realm of the home. Issues regarding the provision of state housing and information aimed at educating Aboriginal and Maori families in the ownership of modern houses were a significant part of the content and purpose of *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou*.

Since it has not been possible to examine every issue of *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou*, this dissertation has used a sampling method which aimed to gain an understanding of the initial
purpose of the magazines while still attempting to appreciate recurring messages and their change over time. As such, all of the issues of *Dawn* in its first two years of publication (1952 and 1953) were examined. In each of the years which followed, a minimum of three issues were examined, usually the January, June and October issues. If the timing of a significant historical event suggested that a particular issue of *Dawn* may provide further information, then that issue was also examined. *Te Ao Hou* has been sampled according to a similar method. The first ten issues of *Te Ao Hou* were considered in detail, followed by a minimum of two issues for each of the subsequent years. Further issues were included if they were likely to be particularly relevant to the topic of integration. For example, the issues of *Te Ao Hou* which surrounded the release of the Hunn Report were given particular attention. The final six years of *Te Ao Hou*’s years of publication were not included in the sample as a means of coordinating the time-frames of the two magazines.
Chapter 1:  
A Study of Assimilation and Integration in Australia and New Zealand

Government policies which sought to guide the merger of indigenous and non-indigenous communities had been in operation in Australia and New Zealand since the nineteenth century. In Australia, such policies were often directed at Aborigines of mixed descent. The *Aborigines Protection Act 1886* in Victoria reflected the racial thinking of the time by separating 'Aboriginals' from 'half-castes.' New South Wales followed the example set by Victoria, using this Act to form the basis of its own Aboriginal Act from 1909. In New Zealand, Governor George Grey's policies of 'amalgamation' had attempted to bring Maori under the same political and judicial system as the settlers but had done little to promote economic and social equality. By 1900, policies aimed at 'amalgamation' had brought some benefit to Maori, but such successes were more often achieved in spite of, rather than because of, such assistance.

---

5. Ibid., 309 – 312.
In the years which followed World War Two, the people of Australia and New Zealand witnessed the emergence of new government policies which were implemented alongside existing methods. These revised policies, called ‘assimilation’ in Australia and ‘integration’ in New Zealand, were responses to the changing circumstances of post-war society.\(^6\) In both countries the geographical separation of indigenous and non indigenous groups was dwindling as increasing numbers of Aborigines and Maori moved to urban centres, prompting the adoption of social policies in education, employment, housing and health which targeted Aborigines and Maori. While the policies of assimilation and integration in the post-war period bore the imprint of previous policies and were the product of contemporary circumstances, they were also shaped by the extended history of each country. The treatment of Aborigines in Australia and Maori in New Zealand in the 1950s and 1960s arose from different historical circumstances, dating back to the earliest years of colonisation. For New Zealand, the relative value accorded Maori culture in the post-war period was inherited from a history which was more respectful of Maori cultural difference. The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi had set the terms of interaction of Maori and Pakeha in a way that the doctrine of Terra Nullius in Australia could not.\(^7\) However, since it is only through comparison, particularly with Australia, that one can say that race relations in New Zealand

---

\(^6\) In Australia, a policy of assimilation was also directed at continental European immigrants. It was prompted by mass migrations following World War Two. The expectation that they would assimilate into Australian culture was, in their case, seen as less problematic because of the shared European racial and cultural heritage. Ann Curthoys, “An Uneasy Conversation: The Multicultural and the Indigenous,” in *Race, Colour and Identity in Australia and New Zealand* ed. John Docker and Gerhard Fischer (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2000), 26.

\(^7\) For an article which takes for granted New Zealand’s ‘better’ race relations and attempts to isolate several contributing factors see Keith Sinclair, “Why are Race Relations in New Zealand Better Than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota?,” *New Zealand Journal of History* 5, no. 2 (October 1971): 121 – 127.
were 'more respectful,' such a statement should not serve to mask the "demonstrably flawed, difficult, and politically fragile nature" of the recognition of Maori rights.\(^8\)

**Assimilation in Australia**

The form that assimilation took in Australia during the 1950s and 1960s was greatly influenced by Paul Hasluck, Minister for Territories from 1951 – 1963. He assigned specific aims and methods to the policy of assimilation, building upon past conferences which had discussed issues concerning the Aboriginal population.\(^9\) In 1937 representatives of the state governments of Australia, with the exclusion of Tasmania, convened in Canberra to discuss at length the welfare of Aboriginal people in each of their jurisdictions.\(^10\) This conference concluded that:

> The destiny of the natives of aboriginal origin, but not of the full blood, lies in their ultimate absorption by the people of the commonwealth and it therefore recommends that all efforts be directed to that end.\(^11\)

---


\(^11\) Ibid., 21.
'Absorption' referred to a form of biological assimilation in which differences between Aborigines and non-Aborigines could be reduced through controlled miscegenation—or 'breeding-out' the colour of the Aboriginal race.\textsuperscript{12} For Hasluck, speaking to the House of Representatives in June 1950, this earlier conference had suggested "a number of admirable principles and made some exceedingly sound recommendations," but he argued that "any action that may have followed that conference was so slight as to bear little relation to its decisions."\textsuperscript{13} Hasluck remained aware that the Australian Constitution placed the responsibility for Aborigines firmly upon the state governments. However, in raising the issue of Aboriginal welfare he articulated the need for cooperation between federal and state governments to properly manage those responsibilities.\textsuperscript{14} He argued that Aboriginal welfare was no longer an issue of 'protection.' Instead, the future of Aborigines and their social advancement lay in "close association with the white community."\textsuperscript{15}

In Hasluck's mind, the breakdown of tribal structures and the migration of Aborigines to the edges of predominantly white communities were inevitable social changes which necessitated government action. It was a belief that circumstances dictated policy and not vice versa, meaning that the specific social policies could only regulate the change, assist the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{13} Paul Hasluck, \textit{Native Welfare in Australia: Speeches and Addresses} (Perth: Paterson Brokensha, 1953), 10.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 6.
\end{footnotesize}
transition and reduce its harmful effects. In 1951, Hasluck explained: “Assimilation means, in practical terms, that, in the course of time, it is expected that all persons of aboriginal blood or mixed blood in Australia will live like white Australians do.” Broadly speaking, assimilation promoted social stability through cultural and economic uniformity. In a policy such as this, which required Aborigines to adopt the lifestyles of the white community, indigenous culture occupied unsteady ground. Many people, including Hasluck, believed that the continuation of Aboriginal culture would prevent assimilation from occurring. Hasluck had direct involvement in the policy of assimilation which was implemented in the Northern Territory. Through the example set there, the state governments of Australia would incorporate similar ideas into their existing agendas, at different times and in modified form, depending on their own needs and circumstances.

In New South Wales throughout the 1930s, organisations such as the Aborigines’ Progressive Association (APA) and the Australian Aboriginal League (AAL) continued to protest the economic discrimination, enforced migration and the distinct lack of civil rights available to Aborigines. The pressure applied by these groups and the growth of non-indigenous support for equal civil rights prompted the government to reorganise and rename the Aborigines Protection Board as the Aborigines Welfare Board in 1940. The replacement of

---

16 Hasluck, Shades of Darkness, 128.
17 Hasluck, Native Welfare in Australia, 16.
19 Ibid., 88.
the Protection Board with the Welfare Board coincided with a renewed commitment to assimilation. The policy of assimilation was promoted through a seven point programme which was designed to: inculcate the habit of self help; keep Aborigines occupied; deal with youth; apprentice outstanding talent; select suitable families for removal from stations and place them into the white community; find employment for people away from the reserves; and encourage local white people to become interested in Aboriginal matters. As described by Peter Read, with the exception of moving families away from stations and into towns, assimilation was a continuation of the older policy of ‘dispersal,’ being Read’s term for ‘protection.’ These seven points became the guiding principles of the New South Wales Welfare Board in the post-war period. In addition, Hasluck’s message of assimilation was distributed throughout the state in the pages of *Dawn* – the magazine of the Welfare Board – which focused on indigenous youth, the relocation of families to houses in towns and the idea of self help. These would become some of the clearest messages of assimilation.

To determine exactly who should be targeted by their policy of assimilation, the New South Wales Welfare Board engaged in distinguishing between different categories of Aborigines according to their level of progress. One such attempt at categorising Aborigines appeared in *Dawn* and divided them into five groups, each of which had certain characteristics. The first group, the “near primitive people,” was seen as a particular problem because its members
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were still semi-nomadic, they were poorly clothed and allegedly did not seek work. The second group was “a little more settled in their habits” because they built more permanent dwellings and sought casual and seasonal work. However, they were still a serious concern. *Dawn* noted that “their aboriginal heritage is very strong and they may leave work at any time to go on ‘walkabout.’” The third group consisted of those individuals “in whom the tribal heritage has faded but is still quite strong.” This group lived semi-permanently and had continuity of employment. The fourth group comprised individuals who were “drifting between the two cultures and belonging to neither.” The fifth were those who “were mostly part-aborigines, who live in urban and farming areas, have more-or-less regular employment” and “maintain reasonable standards of living.” It is worth noting that none of the Aborigines described here were viewed as ‘assimilated.’ This is because, once assimilated, Aborigines would cease to be Aboriginal – the policy of assimilation was informed by the idea that the adjustment of Aborigines to social change lessened their indigenous character. Rather than conceiving Aboriginal culture as an ongoing and adaptative process, it was considered incompatible with a modern way of life. An assimilated individual would thus exist outside of these five groups.
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Integration in New Zealand

In New Zealand, assimilation was the official goal from as early as 1847. Mission schools, while aiming to teach the standard subjects of the English school curriculum to Maori children, were not averse to using the Maori language to that end. Governor Grey opposed such practices, insisting in his 1847 Education Ordinance that instruction be conducted in English.\(^{24}\) The belief that mission schools failed to properly assimilate Maori led the government to assume responsibility for education by implementing the *Native School Act 1867*.\(^{25}\) This provided for the establishment of community schools which, from 1871 onwards, provided instruction in English only.\(^{26}\) This Act and a number of other measures which were designed to promote settlement and establish colonial authority would endure as central components of New Zealand's policy of assimilation.\(^{27}\) After World War Two, however, integration became the affirmed objective. Writing in 1961, W. R. Geddes, Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Sydney, argued that the New Zealand government's decision to adopt a policy of integration, as opposed to assimilation, could be attributed to the implicit acceptance of two propositions:

The first proposition is that for a long time to come Maoris, because of differences in physical appearance and differences in culture, will remain a distinctive section of the New Zealand population. The second proposition is that changes in life-ways bringing
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\(^{25}\) Ibid., 147.

\(^{26}\) Andrew Armitage, *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada and New Zealand* (Vancouver: University of British Colombia Press, 1995), 143.

\(^{27}\) Other measures included the establishment of the Native Department in 1861, the *Maori Land Act 1862* and the *Maori Representation Act 1867*. See Armitage, 143.
greater social and economic equality, similarity and possible identity with the European – supposing for the moment that all three be desirable – will be adopted more easily by a people proud of their ethnic associations and fortified by group membership than by a people disrupted and ashamed.  

New Zealand’s policy of integration embraced the idea that promoting some aspects of Maori culture was a useful means of achieving a cohesive society. It was a way of easing the shift to a modern way of life because Maori culture acted as a stable base from which individuals could make the transition.

Perhaps the earliest expression of the policy of integration was the *Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945*, which granted tribal committees authority which aimed to “preserve, revive and maintain the teaching of Maori arts, crafts, language, genealogy and history in order to perpetuate Maori culture.”29 The Act, in conveying a message of integration, also embodied an attempt to maintain the authority of government at the expense of accommodating Maori aspirations for rangatiratanga (self-determination) which had emerged following the successes of the Maori War Effort Organisation.30 Integration was articulated much more clearly in the *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs* released in August 1960 (otherwise known as the Hunn Report, named after its author J. K. Hunn, Secretary of Maori Affairs). Although it was not an outright statement of policy, it detailed
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the government’s desire for integration, as opposed to assimilation. The Hunn Report understood integration to mean: “To combine (not fuse) the Maori and pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct.” This was directly contrasted with assimilation which meant: “To become absorbed, blended, amalgamated, with complete loss of Maori culture.”

Integration in New Zealand utilised a number of social policies which Hunn connected in a ‘chain reaction,’ whereby “better education promotes better employment, which promotes better housing, which promotes better health and social standing, which promotes better education and thus closes the circle.” The position of education at the open and close of the reaction made it fundamental to this understanding of integration. The Hunn Report was swift to point out that integration was not promoting a strictly Pakeha mode of life, rather it was a ‘modern’ way of life, one common to all ‘advanced’ peoples. Similar to how Hasluck understood assimilation, Hunn envisioned integration as a ‘natural’ process, where circumstances governed policy. The post-war urbanisation of Maori was bringing them into more frequent and intense contact with Pakeha. Upon realising that the urbanisation of Maori was not a temporary phenomenon, Hunn and the Department of Maori Affairs

31 J. K. Hunn, Report on the Department of Maori Affairs (Wellington: Government Printer, 1960), 15. The other alternatives were segregation which would enforce a theoretical concept of “apartheid” or “parallel development” and symbiosis which would see two dissimilar peoples living together but as separate entities, with the smaller deriving sustenance from the larger.
32 Ibid., 28.
33 Ibid., 16.
became concerned about 'frictions of coexistence.'\(^{35}\) The promotion of social and economic equality through the policy of integration was a means of reducing the potential for conflict.\(^{36}\)

The Hunn Report classified Maori in three distinct groups. Group A was "a completely detribalised minority whose Maoritanga [was] only vestigial." Group B consisted of "the main body of Maoris, pretty much at home in either society, who like to partake of both" and was followed by Group C, which was "another minority complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions." The objective of integration was to "eliminate Group C by raising it to Group B, and leave it to the personal choice of Group B members whether they stay there or join Group A — in other words whether they remain 'integrated' or become 'assimilated.'"\(^{37}\)

This type of categorisation, much like that of New South Wales, created a hierarchy which placed the ideal of integration at the apex and relegated those who remained 'backward' to the subordinate group. In contrast to the five group Aboriginal typology already discussed, this categorisation implied that most Maori were well adjusted to social change and were closer to being assimilated than Aborigines in New South Wales. Furthermore, the element of personal choice suggests that those Maori who still retained Maoritanga (distinctive aspects of Maori culture) did not face the same demand to assimilate as was the case in New South Wales.

\(^{35}\) Hunn, *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs*, 16.


As these groupings also suggest, the focus on integration in New Zealand did not mean that assimilation was ignored. Rather, assimilation came to refer to the inevitable outcome of “successive stages of evolution,” where different races moved from their original state of segregation to integration and then to assimilation. This form of assimilation was viewed as “the distant end result of integration, the point at which Maori and pakeha are no longer distinguishable.” Calculations obtained by Hunn in 1961 estimated that the Maori and Pakeha populations would become equal in 121 years. Reflecting on this estimate in later years, Hunn observed:

> Curiously enough, it was just 121 years already (1961) since the Treaty of Waitangi, so we were exactly halfway to demographic parity. I wondered if the day would ever arrive. Six more generations of inter-marriage would blur the racial distinctions so much that it would be difficult to distinguish and define which was which. Integration would be well on the way to assimilation. Food for thought (and planners) — 28 million New Zealanders in A.D. 2082, and all a lovely tan hue!

Understood thus, assimilation was a distant concern for New Zealand, and one which would only become an issue when the country had achieved a certain level of integration. This was an understanding which differed from that of Australia, where assimilation was perceived to be a much more urgent issue, although Hasluck imagined and described the end result as being much the same. Referring to people of Aboriginal descent, Hasluck explained that “In
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38 Hunn, Not Only Affairs of State, 144.
39 Hunn, Integration of Maori and Pakeha, 3.
40 Hunn, Not Only Affairs of State, 147 – 148.
the long run I think that he will also be biologically assimilated and become part of the
general infusion that makes up the Australian of the future." \(^{41}\) Unlike the 1930s, however,
when absorption was the stated aim of government policy, Hasluck imagined this would
happen ‘naturally’ over many generations as a result of inter-marriage.

**Assimilation / Integration Debate**

The understandings of assimilation and integration provided by Hasluck and Hunn suggest a
greater degree of consensus on the meanings of the terms than was actually the case. For as
long as assimilation and integration have been used to describe government policy, they
have been contested. This is as true for contemporary historians, as it was for those living in
the 1950s and 1960s. \(^{42}\) The critical evaluation of the Hunn Report made by the Maori Synod
of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand took exception to the inadequate definition of
assimilation and integration, asserting:

> It is important that these terms should be adequately defined, for there is much talk
in some quarters about the necessity for integration, when it is quite clear that by
‘integration’ assimilation is meant. There is, perhaps, no greater stumbling block to
be removed than the confusion which exists in popular thought on the meaning of
those terms. \(^{43}\)


\(^{42}\) Tim Rowse ed., *Contesting Assimilation* (Perth: API Network, 2005); Rani Kerin, “Charles Duguid and
(December 2005): 85.1 – 85.17.

\(^{43}\) Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. Maori Synod, *A Maori View of the Hunn Report* (Christchurch:
Presbyterian Bookroom, 1961), 8.
The need to live a ‘modern’ mode of life was recognised by the Maori Synod, but they rejected the idea that this entailed cultural loss. They took exception to the Hunn Report identifying the Japanese as an example of an advanced people sharing in modern life. 44 “The Japanese do indeed live in a modern mode,” the Maori Synod argued, “but they still speak their own language, enjoy age-long national and social customs, and are exceedingly proud of their Japanese heritage.” 45

Australians also debated the meanings of these terms. The National Missionary Council of Australia (NMC) was committed to a policy of assimilation but clarified that:

The word ‘integration’, meaning a relationship of incorporation into the dominant society with a measure of group identity would, in many respects, be a better term to use; but it also has several meanings and usages in Australia. It, therefore, seems best, at the present time, to spell out the meaning which this Council desires to give to the word ‘assimilation’, and in doing so, to stress that it stands for a policy of voluntary assimilation.46

For the NMC, assimilation referred to “a policy founded on mutual respect and the mutual recognition of common rights and responsibilities in a land that is shared by two races.”47 To reach this ideal, the policy of assimilation needed to tackle the issue of land. The NMC argued that Aborigines should be compensated for the loss of their land and at the same

44 Hunn, Report on the Department of Maori Affairs, 16.
45 Maori Synod, 11.
time be permitted to seek work, education and residence in the cities. The policy of assimilation needed to encourage the preservation and development of Aboriginal languages because “respect for Aboriginal languages and culture assists the process of assimilation.” It needed to stand for equality under the law, provide training in the exercise of legal rights and encourage a greater level of political awareness.

In the opinion of Paul Hasluck, however, there was no real difference between assimilation and integration:

There is a great tendency in all walks of life to develop a jargon and, though I took a considerable part in spreading this word ‘assimilation’ around Australia and having assimilation adopted as a policy, I am conscious that the term may be deteriorating into jargon. Then one piece of jargon breeds another piece of jargon and some Australians are now starting to use the term ‘integration’ as though it had some special value... I would question, however, whether it is anything more than a romantic notion.

Those Australians now starting to use the term ‘integration,’ to which Hasluck referred, included a number of Aboriginal organisations. A statement prepared by the Aboriginal-Australian Fellowship (AAF) and presented by Bert Groves in 1957 rejected assimilation and questioned the implications of the policy. For the AAF, the policy of integration was said to provide “a truer definition of [their] aims and objects.” Assimilation certainly meant

48 Four Major Issues in Assimilation, Memorandum issued by the National Missionary Council of Australia, Sydney, June 1963, 3.
49 Ibid., 4.
“citizenship and equal status,” but it also implied that “if the Aboriginals are going to lead the same kind of life as other Australians, then they must disappear as a culturally distinct group.”51 From the late 1950s, members of the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (FCAA) began to compare the policies, being aware of a need to change their thinking on assimilation.52 Increasingly, the FCAA favoured policies aimed at integration as opposed to assimilation.53 In Australia, integration came to mean equality without loss of cultural identity and was associated with the right to access services offered in the mainstream community, without that access being conditional upon Aborigines’ rejecting cultural and social relationships with other Aborigines.54

In rejecting assimilation, a number of Australian critics looked to New Zealand as an example of the successes of integration in according some respect to indigenous culture. Debates in Australia about parliamentary representation, respect and recognition and land rights also drew comparisons with New Zealand.55 One such critic of assimilation was Professor W. R. Geddes who compared the attitudes and policies of Australia with that of New Zealand in an article published in the Australian Journal of Science in 1961.56 In Geddes’ opinion, the history of New Zealand had a “strong ideological theme of racial equality” which had clearly

53 Ibid., 61.
56 Geddes, 217 – 225.
influenced how the relationship between Maori and Pakeha had developed. He noticed that the New Zealand government had engaged in compensating Maori for land which had been wrongfully confiscated or appropriated in the past and had also made great improvements in the provision of welfare, particularly in the form of housing. Geddes believed that some of the distinguishing features of Maori culture would inevitably be lost due to contact with Pakeha, but remained critical of the “extreme assimilationists” who did not see that “for many Maoris to abandon all their other values now would disrupt their social relationships and rob them of contentment while they still lack the capacity and means to live happily on the European pattern.” His portrayal of the situation in Australia differed markedly. He argued that the “national ideology of equality” which was present in New Zealand had never become strongly established in Australia. It was a lack of recognition which was apparent in the provision of housing and education. He argued that:

New South Wales, the state with the best record, is on a proportional basis, spending on aboriginal housing only about one-third the sum which the New Zealand Government is spending on Maori housing. In the educational field, teachers are inadequately trained to deal with the special problems of aboriginal children even in schools such as the La Perouse school, where more than one-third of the pupils are aborigines.

In addition, Geddes contended that equal rights in law had been denied to Aborigines. In some states they were prevented from living where they desired and were prohibited
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alcohol, whereas in others they had been completely denied enfranchisement. In highlighting the differences between assimilation in Australia and integration in New Zealand, Geddes made it clear that the treatment and social standing of Aborigines and Maori differed considerably.

Assimilation in Australia and integration in New Zealand were policies which shared a number of characteristics. They were responses to the changing circumstances of post-war society which encouraged the adoption of a ‘modern’ way of life. Assimilation and integration both aimed to promote cultural uniformity as a means of preventing disunity within the community and nation. Both were highly contested terms. The meanings given to assimilation and integration could vary according to the person or organisation using them. The chapters which follow discuss in greater detail the issues of education and housing raised in this chapter. They engage with the debate over the meanings of assimilation and integration by discussing and comparing the messages conveyed by Dawn and Te Ao Hou.

62 Geddes, 224.
Chapter 2:

“The Men and Women of Tomorrow”

*Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* discussed many issues relating to children and also contained content which appealed to them directly. The magazines included cartoon strips and literary competitions which were aimed at children and also documented various ways in which indigenous children were introduced to the modern world in accordance with government visions for the future. This focus makes it clear that the New South Wales Welfare Board and the Department of Maori Affairs believed that Aboriginal and Maori children were crucial to the success of assimilation and integration in their respective areas of influence. Children were believed to be the ‘future of the nation’ and at the same time more malleable than the older generation who were more ‘set in their ways.’ The cover of the June 1968 issue of *Dawn* clearly expressed this view (See Figure 4). Comparing the focus on indigenous youth in *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* - specifically the coverage of indigenous education, the school tour and child removal - shows how assimilation and integration were pursued differently in the two countries.
(Figure 4) The cover of the June 1968 issue of *Dawn* showing an unnamed Aboriginal mother and child from Western Australia. The caption explains: "This woman probably had little opportunity of making her way in the world, but the youngster, facing a new concept of tolerance and understanding, will make rapid progress towards assimilation and the better things in life."

**Indigenous Education**

In the June 1968 issue of *Te Ao Hou*, a comparative article titled “Aborigines and Maori” appeared which asserted that Maori education schemes were more successful than Aboriginal programmes and asked why this was the case.\(^1\) The Australian author, Colin Tatz, referred to statistics from 1965 and 1966 which showed that out of a Maori population of 197,628 there were 54,521 children in primary school, 12,672 in secondary school and over 50 in university institutions. In Australia, by contrast, out of an Aboriginal population of at least 130,000 the same figures were 19,306, 2,596, and 6 respectively. Since these figures
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were not the result of any inherent racial potential, Tatz argued that the central reason why New Zealand had been more successful related to Maori education being seen as a life-long process. He explained that:

The main reason for Maori achievement is that their education is seen as a total process: from infant schooling through to adult education. In Australia, we have sunk all our eggs into the primary basket and avoided, or evaded, the education of the whole community. Assimilation, or equality is for the under 30s only, runs one popular claim.²

To support his argument, Tatz pointed to what he believed to be one very successful aspect of early education in New Zealand – the play centre movement. Started in 1962 by Lex Grey and Roy Saunders, by late in the decade it was touted as engaging shy Maori mothers in an area of child development traditionally seen as belonging to middle-class Pakeha. The appeal of the play centre movement to Maori lay in the idea of self help, personal involvement with their child and participation in the control and management of the centre.³ In addition, play centres prepared Maori children to begin primary school at the same level as European children.⁴ From the perspective of the government, play centres were highly successful in combating alleged parental apathy among Maori parents. J. K. Hunn’s Report as well as Te Ao Hou identified parental apathy as a barrier to integration.⁵ As an exercise in cultural exchange, both Dawn and Te Ao Hou reported the visit of two Aboriginal women to New
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Zealand for training in the operation of play centres in hopes that lessons could be applied in the Australian setting. This evidence of the development of early childhood education for Aboriginal children in New South Wales reveals the Welfare Board's strikingly parallel concern with parental apathy and perhaps its recognition of the narrow focus of indigenous education in Australia.

Engaging indigenous parents in the early education of their children was not the only similarity in the approach of assimilation and integration. The post-war years were a time when considerable changes were taking place concerning indigenous education in both New South Wales and New Zealand. In the previous era, Australian policy toward indigenous education was largely informed by the perceived need for segregated schooling. New Zealand also had separate Maori schools. However, since segregation was at odds with the prevailing ideologies of assimilation and integration – which aimed to bring the races together – it became the focus of intense criticism. Aversion to segregation was not limited to Australia and New Zealand. Segregation fell out of favour on a global level during this era,
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spurred by the negative example set by South Africa and the decision of the United States Supreme Court to end segregated education in the Southern States.\(^9\)

Segregation did not immediately give way to assimilation in Australia. However, towards this end the New South Wales government transferred the control of twenty-six segregated schools on the various Aboriginal stations and reserves to the Education Department in the 1940s. At the same time, all Aboriginal children who did not reside on the stations were encouraged to attend state schools.\(^10\) The article “Better Education” in the February 1952 issue of *Dawn* explained that segregation was being broken down but that certain barriers still remained. It stated that:

> The Department of Education now admits aboriginal children to ordinary public schools except in the case of children living on a reserve, or for whom separate facilities have been provided. Any cases for admission to an ordinary public school which the Headmaster considers should be refused or deferred, are referred to the Education Department for a decision.\(^11\)

Assimilation was perhaps not as easily achieved as government would have liked. By adopting this gradual approach to breaking down segregation the Welfare Board provoked as little hostility as possible. Resistance from the non-indigenous community was still a barrier to assimilation. Later that year, *Dawn* drew attention to a primary school at La
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Perouse which was described as ‘ultra modern.’ The school had been improved and now had a new, clean building, constructed of brick, which replaced the old, wooden buildings. Even more importantly, the school was attended by whites and Aborigines: of about 300 students, over half were Aboriginal. *Dawn* emphasised the unity of this situation stating that “both the white pupil and the aborigine knows and recognises the values of the other.”\(^{12}\) The school served as an example of assimilation in action. In the modern classrooms, whites and Aborigines were to work and learn side by side. It was an idea that was given a prominent position on the cover of the March 1952 issue (See Figure 5). It was hoped that with the education they would receive at this school, Aboriginal children would go on to even greater achievements, since their progress was no longer hindered by the old learning environment. By discussing this school at La Perouse, *Dawn* reinforced its role in distributing information which promoted the role of children in making assimilation a success.

(Figure 5) The cover of the March 1952 issue of *Dawn*. The caption reads: “These two boys at La Perouse have different coloured skins. But they have the same hopes, the same ideals and the same joys. Their colour doesn’t matter... they’re mates!”

The end to segregated schooling had a long build up in New Zealand. In 1955, the Department of Education had declared itself in favour of abolishing Maori schools, which were the same as public schools in that they had the same syllabus, but placed a greater emphasis on arts, crafts and manual training. The Maori members of the National Committee on Maori Education were also in favour but believed that it was too soon to abolish them.  

Debate continued into the following decade. In 1960 the Hunn Report asserted that “school is the nursery of integration” and suggested that the “cause of race relations would best be served by absorbing as many Maori children as possible into board (‘public’) schools.”

Maori responses expressed concern that integrated schools may not cater for Maori as

---

14 Ibid., 25.
effectively as Maori schools and insisted that "some special attention must be given to Maori children in order that they may not go through their years of education hampered by a lack of that background which is presupposed in our educational system."\(^{15}\) Before the remaining 105 Maori schools were transferred to Education Board control in 1969, \textit{Te Ao Hou} recorded three key developments in indigenous education.\(^{16}\) In the April 1958 issue, the work of the Maori Education Committee was said to have led to attempts at giving teachers of Maori children a new and broader outlook on Maori life and culture. It had strengthened the instruction in Maori language and culture in both Maori and Board schools and had developed closer links between schools and the Maori community.\(^{17}\)

The idea that Aborigines and Maori were racially inferior to Europeans in terms of educational ability or potential had also fallen out of favour by the 1950s and 1960s. It was at this time that the world was coming to understand how notions of racial superiority had led to terrible atrocities during World War Two. Rather than European superiority being assumed, Hunn asserted that:

\begin{quote}
Maori children are quite capable of absorbing education at all levels. According to teachers interviewed at Maori schools... the distribution of intelligence is the same among Maoris as among Europeans. Perhaps this is not borne out by intelligence tests administered to all pupils enrolling in Form III at post-primary schools, but this is probably due to the fact that the literary element of the test relates to English, not
\end{quote}

\(^{15}\) Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, Maori Synod, \textit{A Maori View of the Hunn Report} (Christchurch: Presbyterian Bookroom, 1961), 14.

\(^{16}\) Caccioppoli, 64.

\(^{17}\) "Education and the Community," \textit{Te Ao Hou}, April 1958, 1.
Maori, language and thought. A special set of tests would have to be devised to give a true I.Q. rating for Maori children.\(^\text{18}\)

The Chairman of the Aborigines Welfare Board, A. G. Kingsmill held a similar view. In the June 1962 issue of *Dawn* he condemned the suggestion that Aboriginal children did not possess an intelligence quotient similar to that of their white counterparts. In actuality, he was retracting a statement made by the Welfare Board in its annual report.\(^\text{19}\) With reference to the findings of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation and other educational testing authorities, Kingsmill brought the accuracy of intelligence test into question, arguing that they were unable to "differentiate safely between what is due to innate capacity and what is the result of environmental influences, training and education."\(^\text{20}\)

The approaches to indigenous education in Australia and New Zealand during the 1950s and 1960s, as articulated in *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou*, thus shared a number of general similarities. However, it is the differences in the two education systems which make clear the important distinction between assimilation in Australia and integration in New Zealand. For New South Wales, with its focus on assimilation, it was much more difficult to develop educational policies which recognised the extent to which Aborigines identified as members of a group and drew confidence from involvement in that community. The school curriculum took no
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notice of cultural difference and made no effort to accommodate the children’s linguistic backgrounds.\textsuperscript{21} This issue was not as difficult for New Zealand to address. Integration valued Maori culture more so than assimilation and permitted the gradual inclusion of aspects of Maori culture such as language in the curriculum. This more nuanced negotiation of the individual and group identities a person may possess created a less alienating education system and contributed to the comparatively better statistics which Colin Tatz identified.

The School Tour

One experience common to both New South Wales and New Zealand was the school tour. They were organised for rural children to have experiences outside of their community, often with the expressed aim of introducing them to modern, urban life. The organisational and financial support of the Welfare Board, the Department of Maori Affairs and volunteer organisations made such tours possible. In Sydney, the Mosman Lions Club hosted a group of children from Wreck Bay Station in November 1960 which contributed to the 750 miles the children travelled on such tours during the year.\textsuperscript{22} With so many accumulated miles, these trips were a considerable part of the general education of indigenous children. The typical tour in New South Wales would bring Aboriginal children to the highlights of Sydney. The boys from Tabulam Station, who had travelled to Sydney to participate in the All School Sports, had arrangements made for them to experience the electric train which travelled

\textsuperscript{21} Haebich, Broken Circles, 487.
\textsuperscript{22} "Wreck Bay Children Visit Sydney," Dawn, January 1961, 14.
underground to the other side of the city and the zoo which housed animals from all over the world. To carry out assimilation it was not necessary to take practical measures to destroy Aboriginal culture, but the active preservation of it was seen to be incompatible with what government was trying to achieve. As a consequence, tours in New South Wales did nothing to further the children’s understanding of Aboriginal culture.

The reaction of the children to commerce and industry was well covered in articles on the school tours. *Dawn* noted that the iron and steel works at Port Kembla were viewed with great interest. The predominance of visits to factories seems to suggest there was an expectation that future employment would involve manual labour, yet the children themselves had aspirations to enter a far wider range of careers. Essay competitions run by *Dawn* reveal that Aboriginal children had ambitions to become pilots, cattle drovers, air hostesses and artists. But the reality for many Aboriginal children was a lack of opportunity and eventually subservience to whites as domestics and farm labourers. This was particularly the case for institutionalised children, as will be discussed later.
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24 "Wreck Bay Station: Visit by Children to Steel Works," *Dawn*, October 1960, 8; In New Zealand, the children’s enthusiastic response to the processes of the Tasman Pulp and Paper Company were recorded in an article in *Te Ao Hou*, see E. G. Schwimmer, "In Search of Knowledge: A Maori School Children’s Tour (Part 2)," *Te Ao Hou*, June 1961, 8.
In New Zealand these school tours can be read as a lesson in the aspirations of integration. Eric Schwimmer, who was the editor of *Te Ao Hou* between 1954 and 1962 (excepting a small break between 1960 and 1961), recounted with great detail the tour of high school aged children from Punaruku, in Northland, to various centres throughout the North Island in the March 1961 issue of *Te Ao Hou*. He explained that the community from which these children came suffered from a great number of social problems. Upon leaving high school at an early age, with poor scholastic results, many youths took unskilled careers. The outside world was unfamiliar and the desire to learn was waning. The cultural life and economy of the community was in a state of collapse. A sense of defeat enveloped the people.\(^{26}\) It was anticipated that the school tour would cure these social ills. Among other planned destinations, the visit to Matakana Island proved a significant experience for the children, according to Schwimmer. The familiarity of the rural setting allowed children to draw comparisons between the economic success of Matakana and the relative poverty of Punaruku. If only indirectly, the contrast between the old and the modern was seeded in the minds of the children. Integration, it was hoped, would allow Maori to participate successfully in mainstream society and yet allow them to remain a group which maintained unique cultural practices. Directed by these imperatives, the children on tour were to taste wider New Zealand culture as well as ‘modern Maori culture.’ Orchestra, opera and jazz were well received by most of the children, Schwimmer claimed, thus laying a “foundation for the

appreciation of the mainstream of European music.” This particular article portrayed 'modern Maori culture' as a retention of traditional meeting houses, greetings and performances, but also a certain pride and comfort in the ownership of a luxury yacht on Lake Rotoiti.

Tour organisers and indigenous parents felt it was important for the children to be presented in a certain way. This served to ensure standards were maintained by the visiting children to ease the concerns about behaviour and hygiene held by many in white society. As Megan Woods explained in relation to Pakeha, these tours were critical in promoting the children’s acceptance within the visited community. The tours reinforced the standards considered necessary for life in mainstream society, for both Maori and Aborigines. Four Aboriginal children from Burnt Bridge and Greenhill travelling to Sydney for a fortnight were warned by their nervous mothers, “Don’t sniff; Blow your nose,” “Don’t forget to clean your teeth,” “Don’t forget to wash your hands before you eat,” “Don’t forget to say please and thank you!” and “Just behave yourself or watch out!”
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30 “Children fly off on a Great Adventure,” Dawn, February 1959, 10. Presentation also concerned organisers and parents in New Zealand – a full school uniform was an essential part of the tour for Punaruku children, see E. G. Schwimmer, “In Search of Knowledge (Part 1),” 22.
This concern with the presentation of their children was common among Aborigines who desired to represent themselves as possessing traits which are in line with European perceptions of respectability. In doing so, they differentiated themselves from less ‘civilised’ Aborigines and their own ‘primitive’ past. Tim Rowse has addressed the subject of Aboriginal respectability, seeing it as undergoing a renegotiation following colonial contact. He explains that through processes of colonisation, Aboriginal people began to change the terms in which they understood themselves as people worthy of respect. New South Wales Board member Michael Sawtell, writing in the June 1958 issue of Dawn, was critical of those Aborigines who made no effort to adopt European standards of behaviour. He argued that: “we cannot be accepted as an equal in good society, unless we are properly dressed, speak properly and behave decently. Proper social behaviour is a subtle form of an exemption certificate, without which it is impossible to move among cultured white people.” Sawtell’s argument emphasised that individuals needed to reach the ‘approved standard’ of behaviour before assimilation could be achieved.

The children and parents on these tours remained under the watchful eyes of the welfare officer in charge, but observations remained positive if patronising. Speaking of the boys from Tabulam, welfare officer H. J. Green observed that: “The behaviour of both children and adults was excellent.” He went on to say that: “It is a long time since I have found a group of

32 Ibid., 54.
aboriginals so well mannered and they were sincerely appreciative of everything that had been arranged for them.”

The supervision of children and adults by welfare officers clearly indicates that Aborigines were not treated as equals. Until they were assimilated they were to occupy a subordinate place and could not be trusted as responsible members of society. For the Welfare Board and its officers, assimilation was viewed as a work in progress.

For the Maori children of Punaruku the introduction to modern life was said to be profound:

"It has gone to the root of the problem – cultural poverty, lack of experience of the outside world; inborn intelligence has been mobilised and allowed to develop," concluded Schwimmer. By means of the school tours and their representation in Dawn and Te Ao Hou authorities were able to promote assimilation and integration. The tours had succeeded in maintaining the standards of acceptable behaviour and had introduced the advantages of the modern world to young Aborigines and Maori. The positive coverage in the magazines encouraged further use of school tours and showed that government was actively engaged in bringing races closer together.

**Child Removal**

In February 2008, Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd formally apologised to the Stolen Generations on behalf of the Government of Australia. He reflected on the fact that during
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the years from 1910 to 1970 between 10 and 30 per cent of indigenous children were forcibly taken from their parents. This amounted to the removal of up to 50,000 children Australia-wide.\textsuperscript{36} In 1982 Peter Read estimated that 5625 Aboriginal children had been removed from their families in New South Wales. This number was later revised to 10,000.\textsuperscript{37} While the number removed is certainly important, it needs to be remembered that the impact of child removal extends far beyond those actually removed. The removal of a child was a source of anguish for the parents and the extended family. The descendents of removed children were also affected, with some of them growing up knowing little of their Aboriginal heritage and family.

The ‘Stolen Generations’ issue is testament to a great difference in the historical context of New South Wales compared with that of New Zealand. While child removal was an important component of assimilation in New South Wales, it was never used to enforce integration in New Zealand. Until the 1960s child welfare in New Zealand was characterised more by non-intervention and reliance upon community practices than state institutions. It was the extended family who provided welfare for the vast majority of Maori children. Child welfare was developed as a resource almost specifically for urban Pakeha.\textsuperscript{38} The 1960s did see a growing involvement of child welfare systems in the lives of Maori families and children


\textsuperscript{37} Peter Read, A Rape of the Soul So Profound: The Return of the Stolen Generations (St. Leonards, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin, 1999), 27.

\textsuperscript{38} Andrew Armitage, Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada and New Zealand (Vancouver: University of British Colombia, 1995), 165 – 166.
because of the increased focus on integration, the movement of Maori to urban centres and the combining of Maori and Pakeha social services. However, it was the historical circumstances prior to the 1950s, particularly in the initial institutional neglect of Maori and the reliance upon Maori community practices, which meant that the same level of coercion did not eventuate.

Child removal has a long history in Australia. The New South Wales Aborigines Protection Board had developed a policy of removing children of mixed descent from their families and merging them with the non-indigenous community by the 1890s. However, it was not until the Aborigines Protection Act 1909 that “full control and custody of the child of any aborigine” was granted to the state if the courts found the child to be neglected under the Neglected Children and Juvenile Offenders Act 1905. The Aborigines Protection Amending
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40 Many missionaries had a hand in the early cases of child removal. Driven by a desire to convert Aborigines to Christianity and to instill a Western work ethic, they targeted children by placing them in institutions, segregating them from their parents. By 1850, all of the missions in eastern Australia had some involvement in raising children separated from their parents and culture. See Richard Broome, Aboriginal Australians: Black Responses to White Dominance 1788 – 1980 (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1982), 105; Peter Read, ‘Introduction’ to The Lost Children, ed. Coral Edwards and Peter Read (Sydney: Doubleday, 1989), xi.
Act 1915\textsuperscript{43} gave the Protection Board total power to separate children from their families without having to establish in court if they were neglected.\textsuperscript{44} This amendment fell into disuse as a new Child Welfare Act\textsuperscript{45} was introduced in 1939. In implementing this new welfare policy, New South Wales was the first state to reshape its indigenous child welfare system according to the new focus on assimilation. The removal of indigenous children was now governed by general child welfare law, once again making it necessary for the child to be found ‘neglected,’ ‘destitute,’ or ‘uncontrollable.’\textsuperscript{46} Schools played a significant role in facilitating child removal. During the 1920s and 1930s, when demand for segregation in schools was high, Aboriginal parents faced a difficult problem. While their children were excluded from most state schools they were required by law to send them to school. Truancy could be punished with the removal of the child. Moreover, the segregated schools acted as another location to identify signs of neglect. Teachers were required to inform the Board of the attendance, hygiene, presentation, nutrition and educational progress of each Aboriginal child.\textsuperscript{47}

In anticipation of so many children becoming wards of the state, the Aborigines Protection Act 1909 also allowed for the creation of institutions to house the removed children. Two

\textsuperscript{44}Bringing Them Home, 41.
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such institutions were prominent in New South Wales. The first, Cootamundra Girls’ Home, was established in 1911. Girls of various ages were brought to Cootamundra to be trained in domestic tasks before being sent out to work at the age of fourteen. Occasionally very young boys would stay at Cootamundra for a short time but most were sent to Kinchela Boys’ Home, opened by the state in 1918. Each of these institutions had facilities for up to fifty children. The expressed purpose of these homes, as reported in Dawn, was the “reception, maintenance, education and training of aboriginal wards,” so as to “fit them to take their place in the community at the appropriate time, and to acquit themselves as good and useful citizens.” Another tool available to the Welfare Board during the 1950s and 1960s was that of adoption. The February 1962 issue of Dawn explained that the 1909 Act authorised the boarding out of a ward into a selected foster home and the payment of an allowance to the foster parent, however the magazines main focus was on the childrens’ homes.

The portrayal of Cootamundra Girls’ Home and Kinchela Boys’ Home in Dawn followed a familiar format which reiterated the positive message of achievement, opportunity and an improvement in living conditions. Articles on Cootamundra Girls’ Home invariably described the domestic training which the inmates were to receive. Since the Board expected that in the future the girls would maintain a respectable home (whether their own or that of a
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middle-class white family), they were taught the duties of housekeeping such as washing, ironing, cooking, mending, sewing and knitting and were also taught how to maintain a garden.52 Dawn claimed that once girls were trained and sent out into the world they would be able to find jobs as nurses, stenographers and telephonists, but it was primarily domestic work for which the girls were trained.53 As with the boys at Kinchela, the health and education of the Cootamundra girls were key issues for the Board. There were regular health checks and indicators of health such as height and weight were closely recorded.54 Some of the girls and boys attended local primary and high schools and were said to become “good friends with their fellow white pupils,” which represented further evidence of successful assimilation.55 Religious education was also important as all attended local churches or weekly church services held at the home. The happiness of the girls remained a constant theme throughout Dawn’s years of publication. The June 1953 issue asserted that “it would be hard to find a happier group of aboriginal girls anywhere in this country than at Cootamundra.”56

For the Aboriginal boys at Kinchela, life appeared to centre around training for future employment on the farm. According to Dawn, the older boys were trained in general farm duties under the supervision of a farm overseer, while the younger inmates were assigned to

52 “In the News,” Dawn, June 1958, 10.
55 Ibid.
domestic chores and education in poultry keeping. Training for senior inmates was said to include the use of modern milking machines, farming machinery and equipment. Certainly one of the more emphatic messages of Dawn regarding the Kinchela inmates was that they were not delinquents, rather, “they have been committed to the Home by order of the Court because they have hitherto been neglected or have become orphaned or at the request of their parents." Recognition of achievement frequently centred on employment or sporting success. Indeed, Dawn’s articles never tired of reiterating that “Kinchela boys do well.” The life of ex-inmates was typified in an article on William Hughes. Supposedly “one of the happiest young men on the South Coast,” Hughes was employed as an apprentice on a farm at Tilba Tilba. It was reported in Dawn that he worked hard milking cows and attending to general farm duties and earned extra money by trapping rabbits, which was assiduously saved in a bank account. Still, there was time for recreation. Hughes attended the pictures twice a week and appeared at social functions with his employer and family. His ultimate goal was to have a farm of his own. From the perspective of the Board, Hughes was well on his way to being fully assimilated.

An acute disparity in the experiences at these state institutions becomes apparent when one compares the representation in *Dawn* to that of personal experiences. The *Bringing Them Home* report – an outcome of a national inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families conducted during the 1990s – compiled the testimony of a great number of Aboriginal Australians who lived in institutions such as Cootamundra and Kinchela. Far from being “happy homes,” the inquiry found that almost one in every five witnesses who spent time in an institution reported having been physically assaulted there. Almost one in ten boys and just over one in ten girls alleged that they were sexually abused in a children’s institution. A former Cootamundra inmate recalled:

Some of the staff were cruel to the girls. Punishment was caning or belting and being locked in the box-room or the old morgue. Matron had her pets and so did some of the staff. I look back now and see we were all herded together like sheep and each had to defend themselves and if you didn’t you would be picked on by somebody that didn’t like you, your life would be made a misery. I cannot say from my memories Cootamundra was a happy place.

Yet happiness was precisely the image *Dawn* sought to portray of life at Cootamundra. The portrayal of Cootamundra and Kinchela as institutions for training and future employment is also brought into question by the testimonials of former residents who claim that there was very little in the way of training:
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It was a training school, but as for getting any training, I couldn’t see it, ‘cause no one was skilled in anything, no trades. If we’d had training in something, I suppose there wouldn’t have been so much unemployment amongst the blacks.⁶⁴

These and other testimonials of life at Cootamundra and Kinchela show the extent to which *Dawn* misrepresented institutional life in the interests of furthering assimilation. While this stands as one of the clearest, and best evidenced, examples of *Dawn* functioning as government propaganda, it has to be assumed that it did so at other times as well.

With so much of the content of *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* appealing to children or discussing them in detail, their importance to assimilation and integration becomes unmistakable. Children were the most open to learn the ways of mainstream society and they occupied institutions such as schools and children’s homes which were directly shaped by the government. While on the surface, assimilation and integration appear to have treated indigenous children in a similar way, a closer reading reveals that the experiences of Aboriginal and Maori children were influenced by the different approaches of the two governments, which itself was a product of the different histories of New South Wales and New Zealand. The inclusion of Maori culture and community practices which integration permitted, however unsatisfactorily, had positive impacts on the treatment of Maori and their use of the education system. It meant that education was more inclusive and that child welfare utilised the strength of the Maori community rather than resorting to government
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institutions. In New South Wales, the historical lack of recognition of Aboriginal culture was perpetuated in assimilation policy and was reproduced in education systems and in homes such as Cootamundra and Kinchela. *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* make it clear that there were real differences between assimilation in Australia and integration in New Zealand.
Chapter 3:

House and Home

Have we a colour problem in New Zealand? Indeed we have a problem. How unnatural the garden that has no problem, no need for an adaptation of soil and climate, of tending and pruning, or nurturing and weeding. But does our problem include the specific one of colour or do we use the colour-problem as an easy alibi for neglecting our true responsibilities, so that we tend to adopt a laissez-faire attitude towards our gardens.


The garden is an appealing analogy for race relations in New Zealand because it had a very real basis in the policies of the Department of Maori Affairs. As an extension of its housing programme, the Department sought to educate Maori in the ownership of modern houses. Te Ao Hou acted as a means of disseminating information about housing and homecare, which included the maintenance of an attractive and productive garden. The garden was an analogy which also found a basis in the policies of the New South Wales Welfare Board and its monthly magazine, Dawn. Both of these magazine series explained the housing policies of their respective governments and discussed the potential consequences for interested Aboriginal and Maori families. In the pursuit of assimilation and Integration, the step which was to follow the creation of modern housing was a reorganisation of the domestic lives of Aborigines and Maori within the home. Aboriginal and Maori men and women were expected to adopt particular gender roles to reinforce the high standards of household
presentation and cleanliness. This was an attempt to uplift their domestic lives from perceived disorder to the high standards deemed necessary to make houses into homes.

**House**

For decades prior to the 1950s, home ownership had been central to the identity of much of the middle class in Australia and New Zealand. Owning a house accorded dignity, it represented economic independence, and for many it was a piece of the country which was their own.¹ In many situations, this middle class conception of the home has been used as a means of promoting social change in the belief that social relations could be constructed and modified in the domestic setting. In Britain, for example, the renovation of working class life was attempted through the promotion of particular forms of housing and certain aspects of home life. It was thought that these ideals could be used to reform the habits of the working class toward the ‘respectability’ and ‘moral authority’ of the middle class.² In New Zealand, by the 1930s, the modern house was being used as a means of transforming the social and cultural practices of Maori, with the specific aim of improving Maori health.³ *Te Ao Hou* continued to reinforce the link between housing and health into the 1950s and 1960s.⁴

Although by this time, government aspired to extend a wider range of middle class
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¹ John Murphy, *Imagining the Fifties: Private Sentiment and Political Culture in Menzies’ Australia* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2000), 136 – 137.
sensibilities to Maori through housing policies and by advocating certain forms of social life.

In 1961, the Hunn Report clearly outlined the changes which the Department of Maori Affairs hoped to enact with the aid of housing when it stated:

Modern housing raises family status, social acceptability, educational and employment opportunities, and not to mention health and happiness. It works for the good of the public in general as well as the Maoris in particular because it is a strong force for integration.\(^5\)

The New Zealand government had not always been so enthusiastic to develop houses for Maori, however. The state housing programme had initially been designed to eradicate inner city slums and became well known for high standards of construction and design. For many Pakeha, state houses became a popular alternative to houses constructed through the private sector.\(^6\) Until the late 1940s, Maori were excluded from state housing because government believed they could not afford them. The change in attitude from exclusion to urgency arose from increasing public awareness of the poor living conditions that many Maori were forced to endure and the growing numbers of Maori relocating to urban centres.

The course of action, informed by the policy of integration, was to ‘pepper-pot’ houses for Maori, interspersing them in Pakeha communities.\(^7\) The ‘pepper-potting’ strategy was designed to create an opportunity for Maori families to learn what was required of them by the example set by their Pakeha neighbours. It was also designed to facilitate contact
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\(^7\) As is discussed later in this chapter, a strategy of ‘pepper-potting’ houses for Aborigines among non-indigenous communities was also employed in New South Wales.
between Maori and Pakeha and enable the behaviour of Maori families to be monitored by people other than welfare officers. The houses designed by the Department of Maori Affairs were indistinguishable from Pakeha houses, but cost was to remain a primary concern. As Te Ao Hou noted, over ninety plans were made available by the Department of Maori Affairs, all of which attempted to reduce costs per square foot and maximise the available floor space. A typical three-bedroom house assigned most of the floor space to the bedrooms and living room by reducing space made available to passages (See Figure 6).

(Figure 6) A floor plan of a Department of Maori Affairs house with a corresponding picture of the home built for a client in Hamilton, at a cost of approximately £2,200. “Homes for the Maori People,” Te Ao Hou, April 1955, 31.

Te Ao Hou was an important site for the discussion of housing issues. In the June 1959 issue, the article “Housing: An Urgent Problem” was to echo the Hunn Report in its recognition of the potential of housing to solve the social ills of Maori. For the author Elsdon Craig, the successes of the policies of the Department of Maori Affairs were apparent. ‘Pepper-potting’
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had stimulated self reliance among Maori occupants and had made Pakeha question their preconceived ideas about Maori attitudes and behaviour. It had shown that Maori could adopt the standards required to live in a Pakeha community.\(^9\) However, it was not all positive news. Craig explained: “In some of these cases of neglect there is no garden, the section is overgrown, and the paint has peeled off the houses. While these sort of homes are relatively fewer than they used to be they are still numerous enough to bring discredit on the people living in the locality.”\(^10\) Interestingly, later in the article the author referred to a study of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha in the community which showed that “the Maori does not have to imitate the pakeha to be a good citizen,” rather “he derives more respect by behaving like a good Maori. Pakeha neighbours have remarked on the fact that Maori families have their traditional ways which in no way conflict with those of the pakeha and in many cases engender interest and impart character to a settlement.”\(^11\) This was not the only example of the message of integration in \textit{Te Ao Hou} which recognised that some traditional ways need not be abandoned. Appearing in 1956, “Modern Homes” provided a background story to the Department of Maori Affairs project in Rereatukahia Pa, near Katikati. The people had called for the help of the Department in view of the negative publicity of the housing conditions at the Pa. The article explained that new houses were built, yet “what the people previously valued can survive in the new conditions. There is, for instance, a very high standard of community singing... Maori artistry is not suffering as a result of the European

\(^10\) Ibid.
\(^11\) Ibid.
standards of housing." As it had done with many other issues relating to integration, *Te Ao Hou* affirmed that the assumption of cultural loss was not part of the housing initiatives.

While the house, as a structure, was important for raising Maori standards of living toward that of Pakeha, the structure needed to be given an appearance which conformed to notions of respectability. The garden was an essential part of proper housing. A poorly maintained garden, or a non-existent one, reflected harmfully upon the character of the occupants. In the July 1958 issue of *Te Ao Hou*, the regular section “The Home Garden” written by R. G. Falconer, a horticulturalist at the Department of Maori Affairs, Tauranga, explained that “many Maori people today are acquiring new homes” and proceeded to explain how to fence off the section, establish the lawn, the flowers and the vegetables. The gardening section of the magazine frequently concerned itself with information about how to maintain the surroundings of the house and also informed readers of which flowers and vegetables were seasonally appropriate. In doing so, *Te Ao Hou* made it clear that home ownership had responsibilities attached to it. A tidy and aesthetically pleasing garden was a foundation of neighbourhood respectability. Up until the 1970s, the garden was also a large part of the household economy, acting as an important source of home-grown fruit and vegetables. The reduced food bill was most welcome to families with home gardens, but for some families, home-grown food was a marker of cultural distinctiveness. Kumara and maize was
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said to grow in every “well-kept Maori garden.”\textsuperscript{15} Such home grown products were also a link with ones heritage. In the words of H. D. B. Dansey: “If there is any one thing that can link us with the far off days when our Maori ancestors were moving south from their tropical home to this land hauled from the ocean by the mighty Maui, that thing is the food of olden times.”\textsuperscript{16} By promoting tidy and productive gardens, \textit{Te Ao Hou} advocated conformity with the Pakeha way of life, but in doing so remained aware that cultural distinctiveness was very much part of the everyday life of New Zealanders.

In Australia during the 1950s, the poor state of Aboriginal housing and inaction of the Welfare Board was a recurring concern for Aboriginal organisations such as the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (FCAA). The issue of housing had also become central to the debates over assimilation versus integration in Australia, where integration was said to allow a measure of cultural preservation.\textsuperscript{17} By the late 1950s, the link between housing, land ownership and notions of integration was at the front of the minds of FCAA members. Houses signified economic independence to their owners and accorded a great number of other benefits in terms of health and hygiene, but the location of the houses was just as important. Urban locations were important because they were often closer to employment opportunities but, as the FCAA understood it, by establishing quality houses on reserve lands, their aim of integration as opposed to assimilation could be realised. Aboriginal

\textsuperscript{15} Craig, 50.
heritage would be accorded more security through the sense of community which was enclosed within what, for many, represented the last remnant of their traditional lands.  

Housing initiatives for the Aborigines of New South Wales were slow to start. Aborigines were not a high priority when the focus of the government was turned toward post-war reconstruction. Due to shortages of funds and materials needed to repair homes, many of the homes on reserves throughout the state fell into disrepair. For those without adequate living conditions, it must have been demoralising to read in the August 1952 issue of *Dawn* that:

> there is a shortage of funds in the Commonwealth of Australia, and the Prime Minister (Mr R. G. Menzies) has been forced to cut down to a great extent the amount of money handed over to the various state governments. This means in turn that the money received by the Aborigines Welfare Board, will be very much less than it has been in any previous post-war year, with the result that practically no new building works can be started this year.

For a number of Aborigines, the poor living conditions on reserves were a reason for them to try and establish themselves in nearby towns. Yet, as Heather Goodall explains, Aborigines who decided to move to towns only found temporary residence as they were unable to overcome the discrimination of landlords and local councils. It made the Welfare Board's offer of a house in town, on the condition that they would live in "conformity to the
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standards of white people,” even more appealing.21 As in New Zealand, ‘pepper-potting’ was a preferred strategy for New South Wales.22 The Welfare Board believed it facilitated contact between the races, provided another means of surveillance and clearly demonstrated the standards deemed necessary to live in a white community.23 Many of the Aborigines Advancement Leagues were also in favour of ‘pepper-potting’ houses, although for different reasons.24 They were genuinely trying to give Aboriginal people choices by providing funds and labour for housing which would help them to overcome barriers of discrimination. They were not immediately aware, however, that once all the residents from the former reserve had been housed, the land was reacquired by the New South Wales government and passed on to non-Aboriginal farmers who lived nearby.25

Throughout the 1950s, Dawn reported on the successes – limited as they were – of Welfare Board housing policies, but it was not until 1961 that it could announce with confidence that Aborigines were to get a ‘New Deal’ in housing. The State Cabinet was unhappy with the sub-standard housing conditions present on many of the reserves. The first step in the ‘New Deal’ was to increase the funds allocated to Aboriginal housing, enabling the Welfare Board to “put them in houses which were fit for habitation” where they could be taught “to

25 Horner, 70.
understand what hygiene means." 26 Dawn made it clear that the Cabinet favoured abandoning the present method of assimilating Aborigines which focused on transferring them from reserves to houses in towns. They argued that this method had led to neglect on the reserves such that Aborigines who remained on reserves were being "reared in conditions that left them untrained to take their place in the white communities." 27 As an alternative, the Cabinet Minister responsible for Aborigines favoured raising living standards on the reserves and training Aborigines in white ways of life before relocating them to the towns, believing it would lead to "smoother assimilation." 28 The FCAA may well have viewed this ‘New Deal’ favourably. It coincided with their aim of integration which called for better housing on the reserve lands. In the way of numerous other ‘New Deals’ for Aborigines, however, this one was soon discarded. 29

In June 1962 Dawn heralded the arrival of John Thomas Purcell to the New South Wales Welfare Board. He was the Chairman of the Housing Commission of New South Wales which had been responsible for the construction of 60,000 homes during the post-war period. 30 Under Purcell’s guidance, the amount spent on Aboriginal housing continued to increase, but unlike the ‘New Deal’ announced only several months before, this was coupled with the

27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
29 ‘New Deal’ was the name given to numerous policy changes in Australia.
closing of reserves and the relocation of Aboriginal families to towns. The Board explained in an issue of *Dawn* which appeared toward the end of 1962 that:

> the destiny of the aborigine in this state is now linked with that of the white community and artificial situations such as are created by reserves and stations must be regarded as transitory.

This is perhaps the most important test of our policy of assimilation: that the aborigine broken from the group is fully assimilable given the self-respect that comes with a good job, a good home, the example of those around him, an awareness of his social responsibilities, and reasonable hope for the future.\(^{31}\)

Even though the Board’s explanation of why Aborigines needed to move from the reserves to the towns implied a common destiny for all Aborigines, the assistance provided by the Board was selective and aimed at younger Aborigines. The idea that the younger generations were more able to assimilate became a significant part of housing policy. For example, even though Talbragar Reserve near Dubbo was gradually disappearing, the aged pensioners who were satisfied with their lives on the reserve were able to stay. It was a policy which operated for all elderly people on all reserves in the state.\(^{32}\) The Board was more willing to give assistance to families, particularly those who met a specific set of criteria. Before allocating newly built houses, the Board would interview prospective families.\(^{33}\) These families needed to not only show a willingness to adopt the lifestyles and standards of the white community but were also required to possess the desire and ability to face the challenges of urban life with confidence.

\(^{31}\) “New Homes and Jobs will be at Liverpool and St. Mary’s,” *Dawn*, September 1962, 5.


\(^{33}\) “New Homes and Jobs will be at Liverpool and St. Mary’s,” 6.
In August 1963, *Dawn* detailed a ceremony in which four houses, 'pepper-potted' among the outer suburbs of Sydney, were handed over to Aboriginal families who had met the necessary criteria. One of these families, the McLeods and their six children, were moving from a "six-roomed tin shack" which had no electricity and no sanitary or cooking facilities, into a "four-bedroom asbestos cement sheeted cottage, with coloured tile roof, sewerage, gas stove, gas bath heater and a gas copper." As with all four families, employment was secured for the husband before moving into the new house. Mr McLeod had a job at a timber mill in Nowra, but upon moving to Sydney, he was found a job with the Water Board. Mrs McLeod, while responsible for the day-to-day upkeep of the home, found humble satisfaction in being voted into her position as first foundation president of the Parents' and Citizens' Ladies' Auxiliary of nearby Sadlier Primary School. The experience of the McLeod family highlights that assimilation required the placement of young and adaptable families into modern homes and the adoption of particular gender roles.

As in *Te Ao Hou*, the garden and gardening played an important role in *Dawn*, highlighting its importance to the policy of assimilation. *Dawn*’s regular gardening section "In the Garden" informed readers about the care and maintenance of the section and its importance for creating a true home which developed an image of tidiness for its occupants. Furthermore,
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the garden could encompass the virtues which were extended beyond the walls of the home. "Just as the health of the individual is dependent on the cleanliness of the home," readers were reminded in July 1952, "so the health of the plant is dependent on the cleanliness of the garden."\(^{36}\) Undoubtedly because it encouraged so many positive attributes, the Welfare Board actively encouraged gardening through competitions. In 1953, the Superintendent of Aborigines Welfare presented the Arthur Yates Shield for Gardening to Nanima School upon winning the interschool competition.\(^{37}\) The Welfare Board also encouraged the involvement of station residents. The spring garden competition at Boggabilla judged the 22 participants according to the size of the garden, its layout, tidiness and variety of flowers and vegetables. Winners received cash prizes donated by the Aborigines Welfare Board.\(^{38}\)

**Home**

Assimilation and integration were policies which involved Aboriginal and Maori families on a very personal level. Many had taken advantage of the housing programmes which aimed to promote the material advantages of modernity. Yet, as a complement to the construction of houses, the Welfare Board and the Department of Maori affairs wanted a reorganisation of the social relations of the home. *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* played a major part in outlining the roles for men and women which were seen to be necessary for assimilation and integration to proceed. The role of men needed to fit with post-war notions of masculinity which no

\(^{36}\) "In the Garden," *Dawn*, July 1952, 18.


longer relied so heavily upon the image of the wartime hero but instead required a ‘family-man,’ content with home and garden, who was willing to share in domestic life. The role of women advocated in *Dawn* was certainly that of the housewife, but it was never entirely one dimensional. By the mid-1960s information meant for the ‘career-woman’ and examples of women successfully entering into careers began to make an appearance. *Te Ao Hou* as well, presented an image of a modern woman who would maintain the home, but also provided examples of those who found fulfillment outside of it.

Aboriginal men had an important part in assimilation in the domestic setting. *Dawn*’s “Help Yourself” section outlined what was expected of men. It drew upon the increasingly popular do-it-yourself attitude towards the home, providing advice on topics which ranged from silencing a rattling doorknob to replacing a broken window. Steven Gelber’s study of the historical development of “Mr. Fixit” points to the increasing presence of men in the home from the 1950s and the related concern that the husband needed his own domestic niche. The adoption of the do-it-yourself attitude provided a solution because it permitted the suburban husband to stay at home and contribute to its function in a way that was differentiated from that of his wife. Indeed, the idea of the suburban husband as a do-it-yourself character had become so strong by the 1950s that in order to show what it meant to
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39 Murphy, 33–35.
41 For example, “New Member of Parliament for Southern Maori,” *Te Ao Hou*, June 1967, 5.
be masculine and assimilated, it was necessary for *Dawn* to promote this image. For Aboriginal men on low incomes, undertaking home repairs may also have been an issue of economic necessity. While home repair was seen as a form of leisure and an exercise in masculinity, for some it would not have been possible to pay contractors for minor repairs and general maintenance of the home.

As for Aboriginal women, *Dawn* made it clear that they had a particularly vital role with regards to the affairs of the home. Every month, the section “Home Hints” was dedicated to helpful suggestions aimed at lessening the burdens of the modern housewife. How to remove grease spots from carpet and how to remove chewing gum from clothing were just two examples of many which *Dawn* provided to help with household duties. The purpose of such advice was to highlight the extent to which cleanliness and presentation were valued in the mainstream community. The fact that the pictures contained in “Home Hints” were invariably cartoon images of white women only reinforced the idea that these standards were part of a white Australian way of life. The link between the role of the housewife and assimilation was made explicit in the January 1961 issue of *Dawn*. The article “Mothers Can Help: Speeding Up Assimilation” observed that it was up to the mother to maintain the cleanliness of the family, the home and its surroundings. It detailed the need for clean hair, a clean body and clean clothes, and went on to advise that: “homes should be scrubbed and kept so clean that no germs can possibly survive, and our yards must be free of old tins and
rubbish where disease carrying flies can breed and harm our health." While the importance of the housewife to the function of the home was stressed throughout Dawn, it also provided information for those who were interested in careers, reprinting booklets from the Vocational Guidance Bureau of the Department of Labour and Industry. A number of pamphlets appeared which were intended specifically for women, informing readers of the personal qualifications, entry requirements, training and prospects of potential careers.

The representation of women in Te Ao Hou also centred upon the home, often emphasising their roles as mothers and caregivers. The "Mothercraft" articles gave detailed information on how to prepare for the arrival of a baby, as well as how to register, feed and clothe the child. At times, women were described as more able to integrate into the Pakeha community, as Mary Penfold argued in the March 1960 issue of Te Ao Hou. She explained that: "Maori women are in many cases adjusting themselves to the demands of this modern age more readily than their men-folk" and considered that "perhaps modern housing with all its amenities and the cares and responsibilities they bring are more attractive for women than the men's lot of daily, regular (and monotonous) working for a living." Apparently, the experience of modern life was very different for men and women. The image of the modern Maori woman presented in the magazine was broad, undoubtedly because of the influence
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of the Maori Women’s Welfare League. In the “Women’s World” section of Te Ao Hou in the Autumn 1953, Spring 1953 and Summer 1954 issues Maori women were introduced to “modern meeting methods.” The author Beatrice Ashton explained: “Although there is still, of course, a place for the traditional Maori meeting, the modern way of holding one may sometimes save much time and help to get through a big programme of work comfortably.”\(^4^8\) Conducting a meeting in a private setting such as the home was a way for Maori women to engage with their many public responsibilities. Te Ao Hou did not accord Maori men a notable role in the domestic setting. They were more likely to be mentioned with regard to employment or tribal committees. Importantly, however, during the fictitious meeting used to illustrate modern meeting methods, the female participants moved to thank the men (presumably their husbands) for the excellent work they had done painting the room in which the meeting was held.\(^4^9\) While Te Ao Hou did not promote the do-it-yourself attitude to the same extent as Dawn, such comments suggest that it was a widespread and distinctively masculine value which held an important place in conceptions of modern life.

The examples in Te Ao Hou of the way the Department of Maori Affairs approached housing show that there was some concern over Maori culture with the shift to modern housing. It recognised that modern housing was compatible with the continuation of some forms of

\(^{48}\) Beatrice Ashton, “Let’s Have a Meeting,” Te Ao Hou, Spring 1953, 44.
\(^{49}\) Beatrice Ashton, “Let’s Have a Meeting,” Te Ao Hou, Summer 1954, 55.
Maori culture. This idea was a key theme of Te Ao Hou's message of integration. The Department presumed that if most Maori and Pakeha owned clean and presentable homes then they would begin to possess corresponding values. It was a way to reduce tension and prevent conflict which could arise from the coexistence of divergent values. Although the magazine emphasised uniformity, it would frequently remind readers that a complete loss of Maori culture was not the intention, as it had done with the Department of Maori Affairs project in Rereatukahia Pa. In New South Wales the issue of housing was also linked to ideas about integration as opposed to assimilation. The FCAA recognised that government housing policies could be used to secure Aboriginal culture in a group setting. However, the affirmation of assimilation in New South Wales differed from the aims of the FCAA and other organisations, meaning that the movement from reserves to towns would be enforced with the intention of breaking up Aboriginal group identity. In both New South Wales and New Zealand houses would come to represent a site where gender relationships which were deemed to be ideal could be applied in a way which was meant to overcome differences that existed between races.
Epilogue

In April 1969, the final issue of *Dawn* was distributed to Aboriginal families throughout New South Wales. The passing of *Dawn* coincided with the implementation of the *Aborigines Act 1969* in June of that year, which repealed the *Aborigines Protection Act 1909* and specified the dissolution of the Welfare Board. The Select Committee Inquiry into the Welfare Board in 1966 and its subsequent report had condemned the Board largely because it had failed to successfully disband the reserves and actively ‘pepper-pot’ families across the state. The report recommended more education be provided at all levels from pre-school upwards and proposed to increase the availability of houses in towns. The report’s tone was still one of assimilation and remained at a discord to that of the ‘Freedom Riders’ from Sydney University who had worked to increase awareness of the inequitable treatment of Aborigines throughout New South Wales. The functions of the Welfare Board were dispersed and transferred to the appropriate mainstream departments such as the Child Welfare Department and the Housing Commission.

5 Ibid.
6 Goodall, 107.
There was, however, a sense of continuity which accompanied this transition. *New Dawn*, a monthly magazine published by the New South Wales Department of Child Welfare and Social Welfare was to take the place of *Dawn* from April 1970. It presented the theme of a “regeneration” of the Aboriginal people. In an attempt to explain the ideas behind the *Aborigines Act 1969*, *New Dawn* suggested:

> Words go in and out of fashion. Sometimes they don’t really describe exactly what people think and feel. Whether you wish to call it ‘assimilation’ or ‘integration’ the point is that both the government and the Aborigines wish the Australian people to have a similar standard of living and an equal place in a single Australian community. Legislation alone cannot achieve this.\(^7\)

Meanwhile, in New Zealand *Te Ao Hou* would continue to be published until 1975. Under Joy Stevenson’s editorship, Maori were able to begin a literary “renaissance” within the pages of a government publication.\(^8\) It was the visible and forceful action outside the pages of the magazine which also signaled the changing relationship between the Crown and Maori.\(^9\) In 1970, the Young Maori Leaders Conference held at the University of Auckland addressed concerns over the state of Maori language. It was from this conference that Nga Tamatoa (The Young Warriors) would emerge and lead initiatives designed to secure the Maori language. As a direct result of the petitions initiated by Nga Tamatoa, the government introduced the teaching of Maori in primary and secondary schools, although largely as an

---


\(^8\) Chadwick Alien, “Blood as Narrative/Narrative as Blood: Constructing Indigenous Identity in Contemporary American Indian and New Zealand Maori Literatures and Poltics” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Arizona, 1997), 143.

elective subject. After *Te Ao Hou*’s final issue, there would be a gap of four years before the next Department of Maori Affairs magazine, *Te Kaea*.

This dissertation has explored and compared the ways in which assimilation in New South Wales and integration in New Zealand were expressed through the pages of *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou*. Such an approach has demonstrated that the direct flow of ideas and the veiled contrasts which were made across national boundaries contributed significantly to the meaning of assimilation and integration in the 1950s and 1960s. In Australia, critics of assimilation looked to New Zealand for alternatives to their current situation, if only to extract idealised elements of Maori-Pakeha relations. In New Zealand, the policy of integration was partly defined in a negative sense. The Department of Maori Affairs deliberately contrasted integration with assimilation, distinguishing it from New Zealand’s earlier policies and the policy of assimilation adopted in Australia.

Comparing *Dawn* and *Te Ao Hou* has allowed a number of important themes to emerge as significant. The desire for modernity and national unity are revealed as goals which the New South Wales Welfare Board and the Department of Maori Affairs shared in common. In the pursuit of these goals, both attempted to influence indigenous youth and reorganise the social relations of the home. However, the comparison has also highlighted specific
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10 Harris, 48.
attributes which differentiated assimilation in New South Wales from integration in New Zealand. Integration entailed a significantly different perspective on indigenous culture which accepted that culture was a way of promoting, rather than hindering progress toward modernity and national unity. This perspective placed a different set of demands upon the individual. As the typologies which separated Aborigines and Maori into distinct groups showed, an element of personal choice rather than an outright expectation of cultural change characterised integration. As a result, the practical implementation of integration accorded a greater degree of recognition to indigenous culture. Maori language was included in the school curriculum to a greater extent and the school tour could introduce aspects of Maori culture. Modern housing was seen to coexist with traditions and Te Ao Hou could promote and develop various aspects of Maori culture and identity. While integration certainly did not accord due recognition to cultural difference, it possessed an openness which distinguished it from assimilation.
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