

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

☐

+

TOP SCHOLAR



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

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

A Treaty in its own right has no binding power. This has been argued many times, perhaps most famously by Hobbes= “a covenant without a sword is but words”- Rather, a treaty’s significance is determined by the parties to the Treaty themselves- significant only in so far as those in power are willing to bind themselves to the commitments they are ostensibly obliged to uphold. When we look to understand the continued relevance of Te Tiriti, it is therefore crucial to understand how individual historical narratives make up the threads of a broader tapestry of understanding, with multiple ‘truths’ coexisting alongside each other. Te Tiriti’s relevance is as flexible and multifaceted as the incentives and beliefs of its parties- it has variably been both cast aside as a ‘historical nullity’ and uplifted as the bedrock of the ‘Imagined Community’ (Benedict Anderson) of New Zealand. The best framework for understanding Te Tiriti’s relevance then, is provided by the work of Bain Atwood (2022) who argues that the treaties relevance has fluctuated many times since its inception. He warns us that the “historical writing on Te Tiriti has become unmoored from historical realities”, by historical narratives that seek to over generalise its role.

Historical narratives that locate Te Tiriti as central to New Zealand national identity are prone to overrating, or mythologising the continuity of its relevance. In source C, Ruth Ross writes that “ever since the 1840’s the New Zealander has been told that the Treaty of Waitangi is the Maori Magna Carta”, a sentiment echoed in A2, which describes Te Tiriti as “simply the most important document in New Zealand’s history”. There is certainly some merit to this argument- Te Tiriti has undoubtedly become a symbol of New Zealand national identity, particularly well suited to the task given our eagerness to conceptualise of NZ as a bicultural nation- what better symbol of this than a founding document in the language of both cultures. However, in seeking to create a cohesive narrative of national identity, historians like Ross have fallen into a trap of overgeneralisation. Source D provides ample evidence that the Treaty has not always been foundational to the nation in this way- indeed in 1877 NZ’s first chief justice, James Prendergast, entirely disregarded the Treaty as a ‘legal nullity’ because no Treaty could be meaningfully signed between ‘savages’ and a ‘civilised nation’. The curatorial history of the document further paints a picture of fluctuating regard for the treaty – it was lost twice, and both the original treaty and many of the 1840 copies have suffered damage as a result of neglect (F). It is incomprehensible that documents that are of continuous foundational and identity based importance to a nation would be treated in such a way- one can hardly imagine the same story for the US constitution. Thus these sources provide us with good reason to be critical of the idea that the Treaty has been of ‘continual significance’ to New Zealand’s national identity, but such room is not made in Ross’s argument, which weakens it significantly. Instead, a nuanced understanding would point to the Treaty’s particular prominence as a symbol of New Zealand’s national identity as a more recent phenomena. This is consistent with Wright’s argument in F that the treaty is a “socially living entity” which has had its “conceptual place reshaped through history to meet [...] new demands”.

Despite fluctuation in its prominence in the public memory, the Treaty's 1840 signing has enduring consequences that have persisted even when the Treaty itself has been lost. When Nopera Panakero, Te Rarawa Chief, signed the Treaty at Kaitaia in March of 1840, he believed that "It is the shadow of the land which has been given to the Queen, while the soil remains"⁽¹¹⁾- power still lay ultimately in the hands of Rangatira. However, within 9 months, Nopera had reversed his opinion, feeling instead that meaningful possession of the land had gone to the crown. This sense of loss has persisted as an important historical narrative within Māori histories, both written and oral, even as the deference Pakeha have afforded to the treaty has oscillated wildly. Almost a century after the signing of Te Tiriti, Ngata captured the essence of this narrative in his speech at Waitangi "Can anyone conceive of a generation of Māori's agreeing that the Treaty has been good one from the Māori standpoint". This demonstrates the emotional salience the treaty maintains within Māori communities- an arena in which its significance has never waned. However, this source and the broader historical narrative it belongs to, (much like the narrative of nationhood) is limited by its lack of contextualisation. While the Treaty was an important hinge point in the formal colonisation of the Treaty, a mythology has once again been constructed- this time one that neglects the other important hinge points in this process. In the year 1840, it was not just Te Tiriti that projected British power into NZ. Also significant was the establishment of a colonial police force, beginning in Kororareka, with 5 officers brought in from NSW, the sovereignty claims made of the North Island (by way of treaty) and South Island (by way of discovery), as well as the severing of NSW's paternalistic control over New Zealand. Narratives of the Treaties continued significance that revolve around loss and disenfranchisement are not complete without giving these other influential factors their due- after all, the Treaty would not have been able to lead to disenfranchisement if there was no force to be exerted to legitimise it.

In the modern day, Te Tiriti has become the site of fierce political contestation- typified by Act's Treaty Principles Bill, and the more subtle examples of the Foreshore and Sea Bed and Fast Track Acts. This significance is best understood by making a distinction between the historical treaty- the text itself, and the social entity that it has morphed into. Source A2 argues that the Treaty is a "legal instrument, a political tool, and a historical document", but this argument suffers from a lack of clarity on how these functions may operate together. The legal entity of the Treaty as the bedrock of the Waitangi Tribunal may be directly at odds with the weaponization of the Treaty as a political tool to push against co governance and other Māori focused policies, under the reasoning that they propagate division – a violation of 'Hobson's Pledge'. It is more helpful then, to think of these uses of Te Tiriti as separate entities, which, while in dialogue with each other, are also distinct. This is aligned with the view previously discussed as being held by Michael Belgrave. Interpreting the Treaty's many lives in this way also helps to unify the narratives of pride and loss discussed earlier- these narratives can both coexist as manifestations of the Treaty's enduring significance because they serve such different ends- they coexist within overlapping but diverging worlds- in the Pakeha world, and the world of governance, the Treaty is of fluctuating relevance,

because it is primarily significant in so far as it can be used as a tool to promote positive visions of New Zealand- a sentiment that is even present when acknowledging the conflicts that have been had over the Treaty- “we’ve all got better at [the enterprise of building a country based on tolerance and respect] because of our struggles over the treaty” (Bill English, F). In Te Ao Māori, the Treaty persists with greater continuity, because it is more than a symbol- it is a tool, albeit not the only one, that has been used to bring about harm that exists always, whether it is at the front of the public consciousness or not.

Te Tiriti O Waitangi is, in many ways, a national myth. The physical document has been invented and reinvented many times over in the public and political imaginations. This process of redefining and remoulding to fit current contexts is in itself indicative of a continual relevance- we are continually engaging with the Treaty, even in the act of casting it aside.. However, we must be careful not to derive that relevance from a mythologised, notional Treaty, which was imbued with such relevance from its inception. Instead, through a close reading of past, present, and future debates over the treaty, we can come to understand it as having lived many lives- lives which have been breathed into the text by the ways in which we conceptualise of it.

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

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

The North American landscape of treaties with indigenous people is strewn with broken promises and empty words. From some of the earliest treaties on the continent, a pattern emerged of contradiction and dishonesty on the part of European colonists. This pattern is typified by the 1725 signings of Treaties with the Wabanaki- on the same *day* British colonists signed treaties in Massachusetts and Nova Scotia with the same tribe- in one promising the people retention of their land rights, in the other negating it. Historical relationships of continuity and change, patterns and trends, and past and present enable the historian to piece together a fragmentary and incomplete historical record in to a series of connected threads, in order to understand the significant impact that treaties had on the indigenous people of North America.

Treaties themselves were a fact of life on the continent well before the arrival of colonists. Belmessous argues that “treaties were just as much a part of Indigenous as European political cultures”. This cultural continuity is demonstrated in source K which describes a “long history of treaty making [in the Indigenous States of North America] long before they ever encountered people from the other side of the Atlantic.” A well-established system of trade and military alliances extended across huge distances- pointing to the long timeframe over which these political relationships developed. This continuity laid the groundwork for the treaties that would later be signed with colonists- “utilising treaties made sense as the primary peaceful method for dealing with new comers”. However, while the pragmatic reasoning for signing treaties held true for colonists and other indigenous tribes alike, the signing of treaties with colonists brought major, devastating changes to indigenous communities. No longer did treaties “encourage trading patterns which were economically beneficial to both sides”- instead, effects for Native groups were frequently devastating- including in the Willamette Valley, where a series of treaties enabled Native people to be “removed to reservations” to eliminate conflicts and competition- locking them out of what would become “one of the most productive agricultural regions in the Midwest.” (M). This asymmetry of benefit was a major departure from the established pattern of treaties within the continent. This asymmetry is ultimately what enabled such significant economic, spiritual and social harm to indigenous communities- while they were still frequently entering into treaties, those treaties had become tools of disempowerment and control, rather than vehicles for mutual progress.

The specifics of treaty relationships, and the harms that associated with them varied significantly across time and space, however, a clear overarching pattern can be established. The signing of treaties very frequently led to the displacement of indigenous communities as they were 'removed' from their ancestral lands, and confined to undesirable reservations. This pattern can be seen in Minnesota in 1867, with the removal of the Ojibwe people and with the Sioux and Cheyenne people on the Great Plains in the late 1870's. In both cases, this disenfranchisement followed a conflict that broke out over broken or unfulfilled treaty agreements. This pattern is useful to the historian, because it demonstrates how one instance of disenfranchisement or harm tended to beget another. This pattern manifests in the invasion of the Black Hills following the discovery of gold (p1), which led to the Battle of Little Bighorn- and while this was a decisive Native American victory, it returned to the pattern of escalating harm with the confinement of Sioux and Cheyenne to reservations- which was directly precipitated by the Battle. In this way, one negative impact on indigenous people tended to rapidly compound. This rippling pattern is not confined to the increasing levels of violence and cruelty inflicted on indigenous peoples by the state during the frontier period. It is also spreads throughout time- the "failure of the First Nations Education System", in which indigenous children were removed from their homes, abused, banned from engaging in their own language and cultural practices, forced to do manual labour, and often died- has continued to perpetuate harms through to the modern day. This system is one that came about by treaty. The quality Native American education "did not improve" (R) even following the closure of the schools, but it would be hard to make a case that a pattern of escalating educational violence in the strictest sense of what happens inside the classroom exists here. Instead the pattern of escalation is one of further entrenching disparity- with every generation of Native American children that suffers in their education, more and more of their descendants start on the backfoot, and the deeper and deeper the disparity between Native Americans and other communities in the US becomes- indeed "no other group of students in America fails to graduate or achieve proficiency at such a disproportionate rate as students in indigenous communities." This pattern of concentric rings of harm is evident through the other disparities faced by indigenous communities in North America today- including alcoholism and mental health issues. Here, the relationship of pattern and trend has begun to intersect with that of past and present.

Educational issues, substance abuse, and mental health challenges are present issues that are intertwined with each other, but they are also intertwined with the past. In source S, Philips argues that the mass disenfranchisement of indigenous communities, a disenfranchisement that occurred often by the way of treaty, and the disregarding of said treaties, engendered many with a “sense of hopelessness” that has led to these widespread social ills. Other communities like the Akimel O’odham suffer high rates of diabetes in the present because of physiological adaptations to a lifestyle that now only exists in the past- levels of activity and ways of eating that are presumably no longer viable following confinement to reservations, (and later urbanisation). Drawing a link between these modern day issues and the context that they arose from, now several hundred years ago, is important, because it allows the historian to understand the enduring significance of treaties with indigenous peoples in North America. Taken purely in their own time, the death and devastation wrought by many of these transactions is unconscionable. But, the consequences of these treaties also reach a long arm forward into the present- and the future. The Keystone pipeline project provides a clear example of how these harms can be refreshed by new violations of treaty rights, but it also stands as an example of how the consequences of past treaties can be used as building blocks for more positive interaction in the present. The fact that the pipeline project approval “repeatedly ignored treaty rights. tribal sovereignty” (T), is likely one of the reasons there was sufficient political capital to oppose it. A more contested manifestation of this relationship is the “billions of dollars raised by casinos on Indian lands”- revenue which has “revolutionised the finances of many of the first nations” This money can be traced directly back to the creation of the reservations as a result of treaty relationships. However, it is worth noting that the relationship between past and present is more complex than it may first appear here. The revenue can be viewed as positive, however in a counterfactual where treaties had never been used to create reservations and perpetuate harm, these communities would very likely have flourished under their own power.

North American indigenous peoples have suffered deeply as a result of interactions surrounding treaties. The scars of broken promises run deep, and are not always easy to see- but we can attempt to illuminate them through the careful application of historical relationships. This approach allows us to see that many of these wounds are still open today- or, at risk of being reopened by future violations of the treaty rights that do remain.

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

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

The signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840 was not inevitable throughout most of the 1830's. Indeed, for most of the decade leading up to the formal colonisation of New Zealand in 1840, British Officials- both at home and within Australasia, opposed the extension of Empire to NZ in a formal capacity, as did the missionaries. However towards the latter half of the decade, mounting pressure from fears that NZ was becoming an 'untamed frontier' combined with the persistent pressure from commercial interests culminated into a tipping point, past which a Treaty became the most viable path forward.

In order to understand whether a treaty was 'inevitable', we must first understand the forces that countervailed its inception. Colonial Officials within Australasia did not support the extension of formal colonisation- for both principle and pragmatic reasons. James Busby was tasked with the 'maintenance of tranquillity' in the Islands (U2), but he also sought to encourage Rangatira towards 'settled forms of government' a goal which made him pivotal to both He Whakaputanga (v2), and later the signing of the Treaty. Busby sought genuinely to protect Māori interests- primarily motivated to support the declaration of Independence under the belief that it would stop Māori from being exploited by another foreign power. He supported their right to self-govern, and as such did not seek formal colonisation or "empire by treaty" (Weilich). Australian officials were similarly opposed to the prospect of more engagement with NZ- they were concerned about the risk of frontier violence, like that which they were contending with in Australia and South Africa. Hence, NSW supported the 'token intervention' (U2) of appointing a relatively powerless Busby, but were not working towards a more involved formal colonisation.

Also countervailing the idea that the Treaty was inevitable was the 'Humanitarian moment' being experienced in Britain at the time- the discussions of Britain's relationship to New Zealand coincided with those over the abolition of the Slave Trade. This humanitarian emphasis created concerns about adopting a new colonial project- Evangelical James Stephen, head of the Colonial Office wanted colonisation to "be different from elsewhere in Empire" (W2) a desire that presumably intersected with his belief that Māori were "owners and sovereigns of the soil". Moreover, although not included in the sources, it is important to note that the Aborigines Affairs Committee, explicitly recommended **against the signing of treaties**, which in their view "tended to enable imperial expansion", instead recommending to limit contact with Natives wherever possible. These perspectives broadly aligned with those of Anglican and Wesleyan Missionaries, who feared not only for material harm to Māori, but also that colonisation could "jeopardise [the relationship between Māori and missionaries] and greatly weaken missionary influence."

So, what changed in order to pave the way for the treaty? The first change was an increasing perception of NZ as unruly and unstable, a fear which capitalised on the humanitarian concerns in Britain and in Missionary communities. The Musket wars, the Elizabeth Affair (U2), and increasing exploitation of Māori by NSW land speculators began to push in the direction of a Treaty. This view was also held by some Māori, as shown in source Y1- “Is no the land already gone? Is it not covered, all covered, with men, with strangers and foreigners”. This increasing presence of pakeha settlers, without formal British jurisdiction meant that it was not only Tamati Waka Nene who had “no power” over them- but also the British government. This fear of insufficient control pushed both the Crown and Māori further into a position in which the treaty was an ‘inevitability’.

The second factor that pushed the situation closer to one in which a treaty was inevitable was the actions of the New Zealand Company. The company, operating on Wakefield’s principles of ‘systematic colonisation’ “forced the government to act”, (X). The mechanism by which the Company forced the governments hand was the surprise announcement of their first “several shiploads of emigrants”- just two weeks before they were set to leave in September 1839. This unapproved announcement exacerbated the feeling that the situation was spiralling out of control- a formal colonial project was being established whether the British government liked it or not. From this moment onwards, some form of a Treaty can be considered inevitable. A clear point of no return had been established- so the only question left to the British Government was whether to rule by force or treaty. Given the established humanitarian incentives, and pragmatic concerns about violence and resource drain, a Treaty could now be considered the only viable path forward- in another sense, largely inevitable from this moment onwards.

For many Māori, the signing of Te Tiriti was the natural culmination of several decades of mounting anxieties over their relationship to land and power as settlers increased. In source Y1, Tamati Waka appeals to the Governor to remain as “a father, a judge and a peacemaker” 9 years earlier, in 1831, 13 chiefs united to ask King William “the Caring Chief of England” for his protection (U1), an act which is indicative that the groundwork for a treaty already existed to some extent on the Māori side. Developing relationships with missionaries also led many Rangatira down the path to signing the treaty. However, it is not the case that all Māori were interested in establishing a treaty relationship- Ngapuhi (Y1) and Ngaitawake (y2) both opposed the signing of Te Tiriti, as did many other iwi. This demonstrates the complexity of a claim of inevitability – it can be true that on the British side, there came a time where a treaty was an inevitability, and equally true that for Māori, there was a much greater sense of, and desire to take, alternate paths. However, even for those iwi who opposed or were not signatories to the Treaty, it became an inevitability, as the British formalised colonisation and imposed their will upon the land and all of those within it.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi is often considered unique among treaties, as the founding document for a formal colonial project- and later, for a nation. A unique set of circumstances converged in the decade leading up to its inception, that, given the particular incentives of the British Crown, made the signing of the Treaty appear inevitable. However it also true, that the Treaty was put together in an incredibly “hasty” fashion- as famously argued by Ruth Ross. Thus, while we can reasonably consider the Treaty to have been the clearest, most viable path forward by the end of the decade, it would be a mistake to think ‘inevitability’ implies a well-planned out, intentional plan for the colonisation of New Zealand. Rather, te Tiriti’s inevitability, if such a thing exists in history, is best understood as a result of happenstance. While this might be at odds with how we traditionally think of inevitability, the two can, and did coexist. A series of unplanned, and increasingly uncontrolled events intersected, and at that intersection, lay the signing of Te Tiriti.