

No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

S

93403



934030

Draw a cross through the box (X) if you have NOT written in this booklet

☐

+

OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP EXEMPLAR



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Scholarship 2024 History

Time allowed: Three hours
Total score: 24

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Answer all THREE questions in this booklet.

Pull out Resource Booklet 93403R from the centre of this booklet.

If you need more room for any answer, use the extra space provided at the back of this booklet.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–24 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

Do not write in the margins (XXXX). This area will be cut off when the booklet is marked.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

INSTRUCTIONS

The materials in the resource booklet contain a variety of historical sources based on a theme: **treaties and Indigenous peoples**.

Your answers to ALL three questions must incorporate information and ideas from the materials provided in the resource booklet, your own knowledge of the theme, and your understanding of historical skills.

Each question has specific sources related to it. However, these sources can also be used to support a response to the other questions.

Space for planning has been provided on pages 4, 10, and 16 to help you prepare your responses. The questions on page 3 are repeated on their respective planning pages.

QUESTION ONE: Historical narratives

Differing historical narratives and the evaluation of historical evidence allow us to understand the complexity of past events.

Using **Sources A–J**, to what extent do the differing historical narratives of Te Tiriti o Waitangi—the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) reflect its continuing relevance?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: treaties and Indigenous peoples
- a critical evaluation of differing historical narratives
- a valid judgement about the nature of historical evidence, establishing its reliability and/or its usefulness and/or its limitations.

Use page 4 to plan your ideas, and begin your answer on page 5.

QUESTION TWO: Historical relationships

Analysing historical relationships is a skill that allows us to understand the complexity of past events.

To what extent do the historical relationships in **Sources K–T** enable historians to understand the significant impact of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: treaties and Indigenous peoples
- a critical evaluation of a range of historical relationships, such as cause and effect, continuity and change, past and present, general and specific, patterns and trends, and differing perspectives.

Use page 10 to plan your ideas, and begin your answer on page 11.

QUESTION THREE: Significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand

Analysing significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand allows us to appreciate the complexity of our past.

Using **Sources U–Y**, to what extent was a treaty in 1840 between Māori and the British Crown inevitable?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of events and issues in Aotearoa New Zealand, during the decade 1830 to 1840
- an insightful and detailed understanding of this period.

Use page 16 to plan your ideas, and begin your answer on page 17.

QUESTION ONE: Historical narratives

Differing historical narratives and the evaluation of historical evidence allow us to understand the complexity of past events.

Using **Sources A–J**, to what extent do the differing historical narratives of Te Tiriti o Waitangi—the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) reflect its continuing relevance?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: treaties and Indigenous peoples
- a critical evaluation of differing historical narratives
- a valid judgement about the nature of historical evidence, establishing its reliability and/or its usefulness and/or its limitations.

PLANNING

Maori:
13, 12, 6

H

Pakeha then
13 F, 13

Pakeha now
D, E, A.

Ideas: Maori honored treaty
→ Pakeha did?

Begin your answer to Question One here:

To a great extent sources A to J allow us to use differing narratives of Te Tiriti o Waitangi to reflect on its continuing relevance. In this, I will discuss Māori view overtime ~~to~~ valuing of the treaty, Pakeha views from the past, and finally Pakeha views now on the Te Tiriti and hence its relevance in our society.

We can see through the sources that Māori honoured ~~on~~ the Te Tiriti and saw it as relevant in their lives. It is because of this relevance in their lives that they often questioned the Crown over whether they were also honoring their half of the treaty. Māori interpretation of the Br sovereignty of New Zealand is often contested by Pakeha ^{today}, however Māori always tend to have a unified idea. This is explained in source 11 where Apirana Ngata quotes the Chief of Rarawa saying "It is a shadow of the land which has been given to the Queen while the soil remains". Ngata's agreement with this statement that the Crown would almost supervise the nation while Māori would have control over their Taonga was a perspective most Māori have even now over the treaty. Especially since through many of the sources we can see this cases of Māori standing up and protesting/questioning whether Pakeha have kept to these promises, which paints this picture that Māori always saw this 'living document' as relevant. Ngata reflects on this in source 12, with a man passing his interpretation of the situation unfolding, compared to what they believed

they were promised with the line: "We can reverse what was said one hundred years ago and say today that the substance has gone to the Queen and the shadow remains with us". This show of concern over from 1840 by the chief to the clear differences of sovereignty promised by Māori (as noted at 1940 celebrations) exemplify how this treaty had not been forgotten by Māori. It was still in their head and was relevant. This concern from Māori can be seen even later in 1860 at the Kūhīmarānua conference. O'Malley states in Source G that many chiefs viewed the conference as a chance to 'debate a wide range of matters, including the true meaning and significance of the Treaty itself. ~~These~~ These sources, ~~to~~ documented by both Māori and Pakeha allow for great usefulness as we can clearly see Māori view of relevance of the Treaty from several people of multiple races.

Pakeha initially didn't see the Treaty of Waitangi as relevant as compared to Māori initially. A prime example of this is with the treatment of the document as described as in Source F. Within the source, it lists how 'it was nearly destroyed in ^{an} 1842 fire...' and 'it was lost in the parliamentary basement ~~to~~ until 1908, by which it had been part eaten by rats. It was effectively lost again in 1940, rediscovered for a second time later in the 20th century and the remains - fatty, yellow, nibbled and faded."

From this source alone, we can see the neglect of the document, ~~not~~ by Pakeha. This is very polar compared to Māori who would've seen the document as sacred and valuable - how many tribes indigenous peoples also saw their respective treaties. However, Pakeha had found this document and repeatedly lost it and neglected it, showing a lack of relevance/importance in their lives. This lack of Pakeha valuing of the document and event is further reinforced in source 13 where it describes the commemoration of the centennial and Phillips says: 'The most revealing fact was that few of the Pakeha population saw the centennial year primarily as a commemoration of the treaty of Waitangi, and even fewer as an opportunity to consider the obligations imposed by that Treaty.' As a result, these sources help to explain the Pakeha attitude to the relevancy of the Treaty at the time, which could be seen as minimal, in contrast, ~~the~~ Māori saw the Treaty and its promises as relevant 100 years on, and even today with Te Tiriti protests, calling for the government to honor the treaty.

Although ~~Māori~~ Pakeha generally showed a lack of care or saw the documents as relevant for the first 100 years, this relevance started to grow. James Belich, part of a group of historians who shared an emerging perspective amongst Pakeha to honor the treaty and knew its flaws acknowledges the old Pakeha Māori discontent for the document saying 'Māori activists have seen it as a fraud and a binding but unfulfilled contract, sometimes simultaneously.' This is quite contrary to the many Pakeha who likely didn't pay attention to Māori

discontent in 1940. He further assesses its significance,

Saying that 'Dismissing the treaty, or accepting it as unquestionable are not options open to historians'. Clearly, he understands that the Treaty should have relevance and should be questioned and discussed overtime, as Māori have, as

that are what treaties are for. Another reputable historian

who is Paketai, Ruth Ross, comments on her ~~bet~~ doubts on the treaty and its implications, providing a perceived relevance in her eyes. She says in source C that 'The signatories

of 1840 were uncertain and divided in their understanding of its meaning; ^{now} who can say what its intentions were'.

Her ~~ex~~ statement about the complexity of the document and acknowledgement of it as Paketai sheds light on a relatively new-fangled

Paketai understanding that the document is relevant. As

it is so complex, it needs to be talked about and negotiated by both Paketai and Māori. And perhaps different interpretations of the treaty add to this complexity and need to agree on meanings today. As a result, Using Belich and Ross

has been allowed for me to explain new Paketai views on the Treaty and show how the Treaty has become more relevant in Paketai eyes over time.

To summarise, these differing narratives found in sources A-) allow us to see how Te Tiriti has continued in relevance. For Māori, this has been evident since its 1840, however for Paketai, this was not always the case and started to really show after the 1970's with things such as the

Waiting: Internal established in the 1970's.

QUESTION TWO: Historical relationships

Analysing historical relationships is a skill that allows us to understand the complexity of past events.

To what extent do the historical relationships in **Sources K–T** enable historians to understand the significant impact of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: treaties and Indigenous peoples
- a critical evaluation of a range of historical relationships, such as cause and effect, continuity and change, past and present, general and specific, patterns and trends, and differing perspectives.

PLANNING

Cause and effect

C # S
- reserve land R/S health
- expanding
O.M

Past present

T - amending
L → Q money

Cont General Specific

Wars/contract: LIP1

Differing perspectives

- economic focused Indians
gold don't agree
-
- Intro: potential wealth
M: hunting fishing - neogran

Begin your answer to **Question Two** here:

Sources K-T enable us as historians to understand the significant impact of treaties on the indigenous peoples of North America to a great extent. This can all be explained through the use of historical narratives, which help us to understand events. For this response, I will be discussing differing perspectives, past and present, cause and effect.

The differing perspectives allow us to see the difference in values between Indigenous and Colonists/English Americans. The perspective for most white Americans tends to follow an economic drive. This is exemplified through Source F where Trump created ~~permits~~ questionable permits for the KXL project which apparently 'was a blatant attempt to prioritise corporate interests over health and wellbeing of the region's citizens and tribes...'. This economic valuing is emphasised in Source Q where the US Supreme Court 'awarded \$100 million in reparations' to tribes. This economic drive and value is further reinforced in Intro Source where it even states motives for gaining land was due to their 'potential wealth'. As

Where the white Americans see economic value as a driving factor, even trying to apologise to indigenous through economic reparations, indigenous see differently. For them, they have always valued land; for them, you cannot put a price on it. In Source M, it states reasons for indigenous staying on land for 14,000 years was due to 'gathering, hunting, fishing'. When they were offered

100 million in reparations, Source Q says a Chief said 'We'd like to see the land back [instead] and "the land was never for sale'. Native Americans weren't familiar or agreed with value of land in an economic sense as land was more than a price tag to them. This dismissal of economic drive is further reinforced by Source S where despite making billions off casinos, 'many Native American object to the greed or commercialism that western gambling fosters'. As a result, these differing perspectives present different values, where that Natives valued the land more than an economic way, they were tied to it for more than 14,000 years. White Americans however, saw land as an amenity and could be compensated as money.

To understand this situation, we can also use cause and effect to understand the significant impact of treaties of North America. A key geographical/economic cause for Colonists to use treaties was to benefit from economic prosperity of land. Source Q states this motive as Lincoln says "extinguishing the possessory rights of the Indians to large and valuable tracts of land." The intro reinforces this idea of the 'desire for access to these lands and their potential wealth'. We can see from these sources that for colonizers, they desired treaties to gain land and use it to house settlers, but also for resources and economic gain.

A key effect of the impact of treaties on peoples of

North America is the social issues Natives are left in now.

Source C says that "some nations... have suffered serious health problems adjusting to a less active lifestyle and a rich western diet." It also goes on to say that "today, more than half of all (Indigenous) adults develop diabetes at the young average age of thirty-six." This is a grand social effect in a negative manner for Natives as due to these treaties being made and the consequent loss of land, many have struggled to adapt to new conditions and westernisation, which has effected their life health significantly.

We can also use the historical narrative of past and present to further understand the implications of these treaties on native Americans. In the past, we can see how colonists had ^{dis}regarded these agreements, which the introductory source highlights as 'rarely upheld'. Source B comments on this with how if natives gave land, 'the federal government would fully operate and fund schools for Native students, in perpetuity'; however, 'Since then, the US government has failed to deliver on that promise'. Source N also describes these unhonoured agreements when ~~white promise~~ ^{Oakida and Ujibwe people} while indigenous were promised 'everlasting possession of their reservation lands'. 'Time would show that these promises were not to be honoured.'

Although in the past, the colonists have shown a lack of attempt to honour treaties, in the present, this is the latter. Source G states that reparations were given to indigenous of a 'more than \$100 million'. While this isn't current, it sends the modern day

recognition of treaties by colonists. One example of this in 2021 was the new TransCanada 'announced that it is terminating its Keystone XL pipeline project' in the interest of Indigenous, whose sacred land was 'in the path of the proposed pipeline'. These examples of how white Americans or second peoples are now looking to rewrite the wrongs of their handling of treatment help us to further understand the significant impact of treaties on Indigenous Americans, as they look to make amends.

To summarise, sources K-T enable historians to understand the significant impact of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America ^{to a great extent}. Using Cause and effect, differing perspectives and past and present, I have been able to further understand the implications of treaties on Native Americans, the clash of economic value between peoples and the effect the treaties had on Indigenous, and what second peoples are looking to do to amend these

QUESTION THREE: Significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand

Analysing significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand allows us to appreciate the complexity of our past.

Using **Sources U–Y**, to what extent was a treaty in 1840 between Māori and the British Crown inevitable?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of events and issues in Aotearoa New Zealand, during the decade 1830 to 1840
- an insightful and detailed understanding of this period.

PLANNING

Key External

- Trade, Sir George Murray
- HCO, Systemic migration
- recognition of Sovereign 1835

Internal forces

- Stewart 1830 Elizabeth
- President Te Kōwhiri

→ To look after citizens
Retika 1831

- 1) lawlessness
- 2) Ed with water
- 3) Trade
- 4) Protection

Thierry Hokirangi

Sources: U1, U2, U2

Begin your answer to **Question Three** here:

To a great extent do sources U-4 show / help us understand a treaty between Māori and the British Crown was inevitable. To ~~ex~~ discuss this, we can look at the external and internal forces at play at the time.

During the early 1830's Britain often to some extent neglected New Zealand and its British subjects, due to the isolation of the colony and the fact that Britain also had several other colonies to worry about. This all changed when the group of northern chiefs 'Te Whānau-a-Māori' signed a petition and sent a letter to King William IV expressing their concerns over several issues. They spoke highly of the King, and which in U1 says "you are the important chief across the waters". The text also highlights key external forces such as the fear of the French as also ~~say~~ stated in U1 & 'We have heard that this tribe of Māori may be landing here to take possession of our land'. This fear is reinforced in U2, where it says '[The Māori] petitioned William IV for protection by Britain against its subjects and French ambitions. One example of this fear was when French sailing but english 'D'Urville' bought land off Hōngi Hika in 1820's and arrived in 1830's, to establish himself as the king of New Zealand. There was additional fear as word had gotten around how the French poorly treated its indigenous they colonised such as in New Caledonia.

Another external force that took place which motivated Crown to intervene and (which would lead to the 1840 treaty) was the

New Zealand Company and its bid for 'systematic immigration'. The idea started with Edward Wakefield and his brother William, buying land off Māori for relatively small prices, and then turning over a profit by selling it to immigrants. This gathered popularity, because ~~as~~ as X1 states "many people in England believed in the theory that as Britain's population continued to rise there would be poverty and starvation ... the solution was to encourage emigration." Since this was a large issue, ~~desp~~ it gathered the popularity despite requirements of being young, married and protestant. This resulted with as X2 says 'the first company land purchase [in 1839]'. Their first colonies were in Port Nicholson and Nelson. As Source X2 also says "[~~that~~ The inevitability of colonisation forced the government to act", which also was the key cause for the Treaty stating that all land purchases be made under the Crown, so they could avoid companies, dangerous to Māori land relations such as these which used systematic immigration to make a large profit.

An internal force which to some extent resulted in the eventual signing of the treaty in 1840 was the lack of law and resultant cases of delinquency and the Elizabeth ~~merchant~~ affair. In 1830, Te Rauparaha bribed Captain Stewart one cargo of flax in return for Stewart to sail to a hui and his war party from Kapiti to Akaroa. Urged on as a boat of alliance doing trade, the trike in Akaroa stepped on, only to be attacked by the war party to fulfill what an

justice. This resulted in a massacre, where Stewart's own wife was killed and a chief was captured. Stewart fled, without being pursued, which angered British in Sydney. This lack of law on Settlers is reinforced through the whalers and settlers in the far north, who often murdered, raped and damaged things. During the time, this area was known as the 'hell-hole of the Pacific' where whalers stayed in their time of voyages. Again, this also argued Māori, how Pakeha were not being held accountable for crimes, and this is evident when they asked King William in 1840 'Also it happens that some of your people play up against us. ... perhaps you can chastise them so that they listen, lest the anger of the Māori people suddenly smite them'. From this, we see Māori disapproval, but also their diplomacy and respect for the King, as allowing warning for him to take action, or they will.

This ~~letter~~ ^{a remedy} to the White ~~that~~ ended up being solidified in the 1840 treaty, with the Crown looking after its subjects, showing how this ~~was~~ ^{was} a problem only fixed by the treaty and ~~reinforcing~~ ^{reinforcing} the inevitability of Te Tiriti. The ~~short-term~~ immediate solution was through sending Busby over. During his time, Busby is most notable for the establishment of the flag for United Tribes of New Zealand in 1840. This arose due to ~~install~~ as U2 says "[a Māori ship (Sir George Murray) ~~the~~ which was flagless] shipping in international waters, and regarding customs in Sydney." Trade amongst Māori was large ~~to~~ with Māori during this decade exporting goods such as Flax, Indian Corn and Kumara to nations such as America, Britain and Australia.

Due to their trading significance, which built external relationships between these respective countries, it was important they got a flag so they could continue this trading. This flag, in 1834, was as Busby hoped to unify tribes as well, ~~to~~ as Māori faced inter-tribal conflict at the time (musket wars). It also led to the 1835 Declaration of Independence 'He Whakaputanga' which declared New Zealand a sovereign ~~stat~~ nation under Māori control, which was even acknowledged by US, France and UK in 1836. While the declaration set out to 'frame' laws for the dispensation of justice, as requested by Māori in 1831, some 'Independent groups continued to defend their ~~at~~ autonomy and seek economic opportunities to enhance their political power in customary ways'. This was a key flaw - while it stated power ~~and~~ for Māori and ~~to~~ law, it wasn't properly enforced. It goes back to a name given to Busby at an arrival that he was 'a man o war with no guns'. He tried to exert power and stop unlawfulness, but this was never quite achieved and led to the need for the 1840 treaty to fully induce these laws on peoples and to some extent stop delinquency.

While these are some internal/external forces that led to the signing of the treaty, it is also worth mentioning the missionaries, who first arrived in 1814, and during the 1830's ~~of~~ ~~com~~ had influence amongst Māori. This also resulted in increased Māori literacy, with one point along this timeline where Māori were more literate than settlers. While they had profound influence on Māori, it is hard to say

whether they were a key cause for the treaty in 1840, as some missives were credited for persuading Maori to sign, and others had doubts over the treaty such as Pampolmer who questioned some of the principles.

In summary, Sources U-Y allow us to see that a treaty between Maori and the Crown in 1840 was inevitable. This can be explained through internal and external forces, which create complexity around the ~~situation~~ situation.

Outstanding Scholarship

Subject: History

Standard: 93403

Total score: 21

Q	Score	Marker commentary
1	7	The candidate developed convincing arguments around the relevance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, utilising and evaluating the source material in an insightful manner. The candidate demonstrated a high level of understanding of differing historical narratives in the context.
2	7	The candidate demonstrated a convincing and consistent use of historical relationships within the context of impacts of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America. The candidate response utilised differing perspectives, such as cause and effect and past and present, in their evaluation.
3	7	The candidate demonstrated a convincing and consistent use of source material, integrated with a range of prior knowledge, to develop a highly persuasive argument as to the inevitability of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840.