

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

☐

+

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.

tain a variety of historical sources based on

to incorporate information and ideas from the materials

d to it. However, these sources can also be used to

pages 4, 10, and 16 to help you prepare your responses.

assembly

Capt Stewart Kapiti is → ~~Kapiti~~ Takapūkeke
Te Rarapunga + ~100 Ngāti Tū

king William 4

En el Barrio de Tierra

new ship

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.

implying equality

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?**

not "their"?

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

1865 FitzGerald

1972 Ruth Ross

traditional

- Britain wanted to protect Māori
- Te Tiriti o Waitangi
- The ToW was the fairest treaty

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

To a large extent, sources A-J show the differing historical narratives which reflect the continuing relevance of Te Tiriti/The Treaty.

The sources make it clear that to the pakeha controlled government, the Treaty/Tiriti were of little importance before around the 1960s. Source D shows this narrative (that the government ~~by~~ acted as though the Treaty/Tiriti were not relevant) by arguing that there was legal precedence for the ~~that~~ treaties to be disregarded by the courts. On the other hand, Source F argues for the same narrative but from a different source. It uses the physical condition of the treaty documents to argue that historically, the treaty had been seen as irrelevant. Both sources agree that the treaty had been seen as irrelevant, so add reliability to their claims. These sources are both limited by their concise nature: they are intended to provide an overview, but the selections adapted from the sources for this exam do not provide a full overview of the events.

When the treaties were signed, Chief Nōpera Pahi-kareao laid out the Māori ~~per~~ narrative

on what had been signed. He said (translated) "It is the shadow of the land which has been given to the Queen while the soil remains." (source I1). As one of the signatories to ~~the~~ Te Tiriti, Panu-kareao ~~us~~ has a large amount of credibility, except this source is relying on a memory of an event 82 years ago, ^{or writing} and relies on being part of another person's speech. In general historians must exercise caution when relying on accounts of memories and ~~of~~ hear-say. However, because modern translations of ~~The Treaty~~ ~~to~~ ~~Maori~~ Te Tiriti into English support this viewpoint, its reliability and usefulness is high enough to be relied on in conjunction with other evidence.

In contrast to this historical narrative that Te Tiriti and The Treaty of Waitangi have vastly different meanings, until around the 1970s (source B) most pakeha believed that the Treaty and Te Tiriti were equivalent. Source H states that the Waitangi Day Act 1960 declared the 6th Feb to be a day of celebration. This act included with it a copy of the text of The Treaty, but made no mention of Te Tiriti.

This is in contrast to a new historical narrative that has been growing in popularity from the 1970s: that Te Tiriti and The Treaty have two different meanings, which was exploited by the British to unfairly take control of NZ. While not everyone is aware of this detail (including some important politicians), it drastically redefines the understanding of New Zealand's history between Māori and settlers. The narrative seeks to disprove the notion that Britain only sought to work in the best interests of Māori. This historical narrative is very much still relevant in New Zealand today. While many people are aware of this, many grew up in a time where the curriculum only taught the Treaty. Even still today, even while acknowledging Te Tiriti's existence, some documents imply an equivalency between the documents, like how this question refers to Te Tiriti - The Treaty as one document.

There are many narratives that have been prevalent throughout the country's history. The disagreements on what many of the sources agree is a foundational document for the country shows that the narratives around such an interpretable set of documents is still relevant today.

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 + effect
 ↓ ↓
 'Merica wants resources illegally takes land

continuity + Change
 ↓ ↓
 land taken some PI successful opposition

Past + Present
 ↓ ↓
 Treaties repeatedly ignored source T shows a treaty was followed

General + Specific
 ↓ ↓
 American Indians were often having treaties broken Source N

Differing perspectives

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

To a large extent, the historical relationships present throughout sources K-T enable historians to understand the significant impact of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America.

The relationship of continuity and change shows how the impacts can be felt over long periods of time, proving their significance. In multiple of the sources provided, it is shown that there has been continuity with the US government refusing to adhere to treaties they signed when it doesn't advantage them. Source N shows examples only 5 years apart where the Dakota people and Ojibwe resisted the US' attempts to relocate them away from their lands that had been guaranteed to them under treaties.

The change that contrasts this continuity is visible in source P1, which documents the leaders of the Sioux people successfully defeating an invasion by the US. While the disputes with the US government remained continuous, the Indigenous peoples' ability to successfully win through force changed. This vast victory showed that the multiple previous treaty violations had a significant enough impact

on the indigenous Americans to risk casualties in order to change the status quo.

The historical relationship of cause and effect allows historians to understand the significance of the impact that treaties had on indigenous Americans. While America was being settled by Europeans, there was a strong attitude that white settlers had the god-given right to "manifest destiny" - to take over as much of the continent as possible, and to benefit as much as possible. When the Sioux and Arapaho people were promised that they would have permanent control of the land of the Black Hills, the US was under the assumption that the land wasn't valuable. However the discovery of gold on the land caused the US (because of their belief in manifest destiny) to alter the deal to benefit them. The effect of this is that treaties were ignored when it benefited the US.

The historical relationship of past and present allows historians to understand the significance of treaties on indigenous North Americans. The sources show that in the past

the value of a treaty signed by the US was effectively nothing because the US could change its mind whenever it wanted with no consequences. Source Q shows that in the present, there are similarities and differences to the past. On the one hand, there are efforts to make amends and respect treaties. ~~Examples~~ of this are the 1980 US Supreme court ruling that paid out reparations, and the KXL Pipeline cancellation (source T) in 2021. This attitude of respect for the treaties shows a difference from the past. On the other hand, the land under the control of indigenous Americans is still ^{roughly} where it was once the treaties had settled. Despite calls for land to be returned, it is still being taken by the US.

The historical relationships show that treaties had a vastly significant impact on Indigenous Americans because of the ways they were ignored. The lands that had been promised were taken. The uncertainty that brought lead to disputes that are still ongoing, still impacting the US government and descendants.

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

U1 "only your homeland has been showing kindness to us"

- French
- Deal with ur ppl before we do

U2 Busby came from Sydney as a response to Elizabeth in

V1 Te Kara mimics England flag

V2 Māori strengthening alliance

W1 the translators had lots of mana

W2 attitudes to colonisation had changed

X2 NZ Company

Y not all Māori agreed

Intro

Māori had a strong rel w/ Britain

- U1 - willing to use diplomacy
- V1 flag
- V2

Declaration of independence

NZ Company response

British desire to protect

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

To a significant extent, sources U-Y suggest that the events in 1830s NZ would inevitably lead to a treaty between Māori and Britain.

During the 1830s, many Māori had developed a strong relationship with settlers and missionaries. The ¹⁸³¹ petition to King William IV says "We are writing to you, because we are hearing that you are the important chief across the waters" (source U1). The petition is asking for the King's help, and asking him to "become a friend for us." They were asking the King for help in multiple areas, including to be protected from British settlers who had been causing trouble for Māori. At this point, Māori significantly outnumbered the population of British people in New Zealand. Māori would have been able to bring their own justice against settlers who had wronged them, but instead decided to engage in diplomacy with the King. This choice shows that Māori were attempting to grow ~~at~~ their alliances with Britain.

At the same time, Britain was realising that they needed to do something about

the lawlessness in NZ. While at one point an attempt was made to have the Australian courts have jurisdiction in NZ, this wasn't successful because of the lack of British authority to control NZ at the time. The main event that highlighted the lawlessness to the rest of the empire was the Elizabeth Affair. In exchange for a ship load of flax, Captain Stewart agreed to transport Te Rauparaha along with ~100 Ngati Toa ~~fighters~~ soldiers from Kapiti Island to Takapokere. Once the boat Elizabeth arrived, the local rangatira recognised the boat as a trading ship, so boarded it. The rangatira was killed, along with most other local Maori. While Captain Stewart hadn't been directly involved with the murders, he still facilitated them happening. Because legally New Zealand was unrelated to Britain, British forces had no jurisdiction and no grounds to bring him to justice. This event, along with the pleas from rangatira (from source U1) meant that Britain would need to have some kind of intervention with New Zealand.

To at least do something, James Busby was appointed as British Resident to NZ

(source V2). In reality he wasn't able to achieve much because he didn't have any weapons or power to exert. However, he was able to step in when there were rumors that an English person was attempting to colonise the islands without the backing of the British government. Baron de Thierry had plans of taking control of NZ based on the doctrine of discovery - because there was no government with sovereignty he believed that being the first person to claim the land according to British laws, he would take control of it. Busby stopped this from happening by drafting the Whakaputanga / The declaration of independence. This document established Māori as the sovereign leaders of NZ under international law. As source V2 states, this also strengthened their British alliance. The flag chosen - Te Kara (source V1) reflects the Māori closeness with Britain by having a British style layout.

Now that the declaration of independence established Māori as sovereign leaders of NZ, under international law a treaty would need to be signed to allow another nation to exert their authority in the land.

The New Zealand Company's attempt at organised colonisation also prompted the British government's intervention. Edward Wakefield's plan was to cheaply buy land from Māori and resell it to settlers for a profit. The first NZ Company ship (Tory) left without the permission of the British government. Claudia Orange sees this as a sign that colonisation was inevitable, and therefore it could either be done by the government, which ^{could} act in the best interests of humanitarian ideals (eg because the Colonial Office was led by an evangelical humanitarian) or it could be colonised by companies that only have the goal of making money.

Once it became clear that the NZ Company would attempt large-scale migration, some sort of treaty became inevitable between Māori and the British government (controlled by the Crown). These sources show a wide range of events leading up to this inevitability.

Scholarship

Subject: History

Standard: 93403

Total score: 14

Q	Score	Marker commentary
1	5	The candidate developed a clear and concise response to the question, integrating the source material and their own knowledge effectively. The candidate demonstrated a clear understanding of differing historical narratives around the continuing relevance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
2	4	The candidate developed a clear response about the impact of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America. The candidate identified and analysed a range of historical relationships in a clear manner, demonstrating an awareness of historical relationships in the context provided, with some evaluation of their importance to an historian.
3	5	The candidate constructed a clear argument about the historical inevitability of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, integrating their prior knowledge of the context with the source material provided to some extent.