

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



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 2025 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.

Page 1

Make sure you have the paper Resource Booklet 93403R.

INSTRUCTIONS

The materials in the resource booklet contain a variety of historical sources based on a theme: **the role of the individual in shaping historical events**.

Your answers to ALL three questions must incorporate:

- carefully selected information and ideas from the resource booklet
- your own knowledge of the theme
- your own 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.

QUESTION ONE: Historical narratives

To what extent do the historical narratives in **Sources A–H** enable historians to understand the importance of individuals in shaping historical events?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: the role of the individual in shaping historical events
- 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

Individual agency centerpoint of history A2, D1, F2, E, G

History is shaped by the context and events which occur at the time A1, D2, F1, H

Historical narratives and the way they are remembered, and subjective history all are important

ANSWER

Type your answer to **Question One** in the space below.

B I U     

The individual plays an essential role in shaping historical narratives which then shape history, however this occurs within the context of broader societal forces during the time. Individuals undoubtedly play a defining role in the shaping of history, as proposed by figures such as Thomas Carlyle who claim that "History is but the biography of great men". However, this is far too limited as societal pressures play a huge role in determining the course of history; "Before he can shape his society, his society must shape him" (Herbert Spencer). It is important to find an intersection of these two points. Equally important is the remembering of the past, the role of the historian in such endeavours and how history should be interpreted.

Historical narratives frequently credit individual agency as the driving force which shapes history, however this is a limited view which does not take into account the broader context. The pages of history are littered with great men; behemoths who shaped the world around them and had a tangible impact in shaping the flow of history. Few loom larger in recent memory than Winston Churchill in Source A2, who became Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in its darkest hour, where many wanted to make peace terms with the Nazis. Churchill, however, refused to allow this to happen. He personally refused to surrender, and if he had failed to intercede then "Our world would have been very different indeed". However, this perspective only tells us of the members of British society who wanted to surrender, and not the resilient British attitude or multitude of people who also wished to fight on. If these attitudes did not exist, none of Churchill's rhetoric, irrespective of the quality, would have inspired resistance. Furthermore, Sean Lang argues in (D1) that "events do shape history and individuals shape events". However, this argument solely posits that certain individuals shape events, with no reference to how societal forces may play into those events, or any people who may not be deemed 'great' enough. It excludes many from history to the point where "Entire sections of society, usually the poor, the minorities and the politically powerless are thereby obliterated from memory" (G). This is one of the most powerful criticisms of the narrative that individuals shape the flow of history, and this severe limitation makes it clear that history is not only shaped by these individuals.

A more modern approach to historical narratives is the acknowledgement that history is shaped primarily by the context of the time period, and large impersonal forces in areas such as social, political and economic. These factors play a role in how history is shaped, as in (A1) MacMillan, in his analysis of Carlyle's view, says that "society itself, ... was the product of the work and lives of countless human beings". This point is further argued upon when MacMillan argues that people of the past had an entirely distinct set of values which shaped the way that they acted and thought, summarised when he says that "They were shaped by different social and political structures", a point which makes it clear that these forces have a definitive impact on the flow of history, even if it is by impacting the many individuals shape it. However, this does not seem a complete analysis of Carlyle's perspective, because he definitely believed 'Great Men' were essential in shaping history, and that they played a significant role. In source F1, Howard Zinn argues for the power of the individuals in shaping history, and claims that "the power of the people on top, depends on the obedience of the people below". However, in arguing in the power of the many to rule society, he fails to mention what happens if individuals are in line with their society, or are supported. This one sidedness and lack of depth is a restriction on this source, and makes it more difficult to credit it as a reliable narrative. It is clear that societal factors play an extreme role in shaping historical narratives, however there are some limitations that make it clear they do not solely cause history to change.

How historical narratives are formed, mythologised as well as historiography and what history is considered to be is critical in understanding the role of the individual in shaping history. E. H. Carr in source B2 argues that history can only be subjective, because the historian who analyses the period in history and synthesises the evidence will always contain some degree of bias. This is viewed as an inevitability, as "the historian is of his own age and is bound to it by human existence". This posits that history is, and will always be subjective and that there is no such thing as the objective truth. He argues that narratives will always shape the telling of history and impact our understanding. However, this comes under attack by Barbara Tuchman in source C, where she argues, contrary to Carr, that historical facts can exist independently of the historian and their own interpretation of the facts, if they work hard enough to emancipate themselves from their assumptions and attitudes. She does not think that history is the interpretation of facts, but rather is reached earlier, as "facts are history - whether interpreted or not". This wildly conflicting perspective points out the fallacy in Carr's argument, that it is impossible for objective truth and that historians are incapable of providing an unbiased view of history. Another key argument in historiography is related to who is writing the history which we are basing our perspective on. With regards to history, it is clear that historians need to use a range of historical narratives as it can often exclude many people. In the case of Columbus and the Indians in F2, it becomes clear that simply judging their achievements while ignoring their wrongdoings - "the quiet acceptance of conquest and murder in the name of progress" will simply lead to an unbalanced telling of history.

Historical narratives are key forces in allowing us to allow the role of the individual in shaping history. It is clear that history is not shaped solely by the individual, but that they play a role. Similarly, wider societal forces play a role in shaping history but do not tell the full story. Clearly, then a compromise is needed, one which "acknowledges the power of the individuals but makes sense of it through contextualisation" (D2). The way historical narratives are gathered and told is also essential, and it is important for historians to remove themselves of all bias in order to discover the objective truth of history and form the appropriate historical narrative.

Page 2

QUESTION TWO: Historical relationships

To what extent do the historical relationships in **Sources I–S** enable historians to assess whether Margaret Thatcher was the key force in shaping events during her time as British Prime Minister, rather than broader historical factors?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: the role of the individual in shaping historical events
- 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

Patterns and trends - her and america very similar

Specific and general - speeches and actions against unions vs general attitude (resurgent UK)

Continuity and change - impact on British politics enduring to this day

ANSWER

Type your answer to **Question Two** in the space below.

B I U     

There are a variety of historical relationships which allow us to assess that Margaret Thatcher was the most significant force which shaped events during her tenure as British Prime Minister, and completely changed the course of British politics. These relationships are continuity and change, patterns and trends and cause and effect.

One of the most important historical relationships through which we can understand Margaret Thatchers enduring legacy in history as British Prime Minister is continuity and change. Her tenure came after a long period of Labour governance, and at a time when the British economy appeared to be becoming more socialist. It was notable for ideals such as collective effort, full employment and a managed economy. However, as seen in source Q these "were discredited in the popular imagination" after her years in governance. As Prime Minister, she caused a complete change in all of these, and replaced them with "the politics of me and mine" which saw Britain transfer to a open economy, one where government regulation was removed and assets were privatised. She also clearly believed in individuals rights to choose and personal freedom and liberties. Since the time of Thatcher in government, there has been a large amount of continuity in British politics regarding her policies, as Labour have done nothing to reverse her attack on the welfare state, as well as unions, and have additionally left her unions practically entirely in place. In May 2010, when the Conservatives returned to her power, they drew on the language and priorities of Thatcher over 20 years after her tenure as Prime Minister finished. This continuity of attitudes and ideas, as well as the fact that she "broke the pattern of post war politics and changed its nature" proves the dominant and enduring legacy Margaret Thatcher has had in events during her time as Prime Minister.

Another key historical relationship which addresses whether during Margaret Thatchers time whether she was a dominant force in Britain is that of cause and effect. In particular, the Falkland Islands are an external event where the Argentinian military junta attacked and seized the Falkland Islands. In this moment, "Thatcher made up her mind from the start and never shifted: Britain was going to take the islands back" (L). This is exactly what Britain did. She immediately assembled a task force and fought back, making it clear to the Argentinian leadership that Britain would not seek peace until the islands were returned. This is exactly what happened, and this cause has an incredibly powerful effect. It is hailed as the "most significant moment of her career and a turning point in modern British history" as described by Source L. Immediately her approval ratings doubled, to 51 percent, and she became well loved by the public. This victory meant that "The Prime Minister has complete freedom of action now" in the words of Alan Clark. This had the effect of securing her re election, and allowed her to do many things that none other would be able to do. This freedom to push her own personal agenda allowed Margaret Thatcher to become the dominant force causing change of her time.

A third key historical relationship which allows us to understand Margaret Thatchers importance in directing events during her time as Prime Minister is specific and general. This relationship is particularly clear in the immediate aftermath of her victory over the Argentinians in the Falkland Islands. As shown in source P, she first espouses the strength of the British nation and makes reference to their glorious past. She then immediately follows up by attacking the ASLEF, a group of eight railwaymen who went on strike and paused some of the railways. She says they are contravening the best wishes of the nation by setting out to "delay Britain's recovery, which all our people want to see". This clever rhetoric is typical of what became coined as 'Thatcherism', a system which was loosely agreed to involve her acting as a demagogue and "arousing public support by exploiting issues such as crime, race and education." (J). This allowed her to launch repeated attacks on unions and implement the policies she wished to, which had the result of causing harm on many. This harmed many working people in particular, which was typified by former miners in source R who felt angered by pit closures which her Conservative government had pushed through. After her death, several people said that "she destroyed our community, our villages and our people," and cause lots of harm, which caused a lot of harm for people.

There are a variety of historical relationships which enable historians to assess that Margaret Thatcher was the key force in shaping events during her time as Prime Minister. She caused a large amount of change in British society, however since her term has finished many of her policies have continued into the modern day. The Falkland Islands war allowed her the opportunity to solidify herself as the "Iron Lady" who had British interests at heart, and allowed her political freedom unseen since Churchill. Finally, specific and general, with the political philosophy known as 'Thatcherism' typified by her attacks on trade unions. To conclude, Margaret Thatcher was "the most dominant and divisive force in British politics" (L).

Page 3

QUESTION THREE: Significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand

Using **Sources T–Z**, to what extent did the governors of Aotearoa New Zealand shape historical events in the years 1852 to 1873?

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, in the years 1852 to 1873
- an insightful and detailed understanding of this period.

PLANNING

Governors

Maori

Other societal forces/events eg gold rushes

ANSWER

Type your answer to **Question Three** in the space below.

B I U     

The Governors of Aotearoa New Zealand to some extent shaped events within the country between 1852 and 1873. The position of governorship was the most powerful position a European could obtain while within NZ, and they had quite a bit of power which enabled them to shape events in New Zealand. However, Maori agency was also prevalent during this time, with particular the Kingitanga movement which was shaped and caused by Maori. Further, other events, attitudes or societal pressures also shaped many of the events during this time period.

The Governors of New Zealand to some extent shaped the events in NZ between 1852 and 1873. Although it was the most powerful position a European could obtain within New Zealand to the point where they they had de facto control over many of the policies that were enacted, they were limited by the London colonial authorities, as source T tells us such that "their power remained relatively weak" as there was concern about their actions precipitating a colonial war. This limited Governors to gaining chiefs favour with flattery and money, as they could not simply coerce Maori compliance as their actual powers to make war were limited by the Colonial Office. This meant that it was important for the government to maintain iwi support for their actions, shown by the Kohimarama Conference in 1860. Even though he was potentially planning to go to war and force the sale of Maori land, he could not risk starting a widespread colonial war with the Maori, which meant he needed support from the local iwi. This is a fairly extreme limitation on the power of governors, and shows they could not entirely shape the actions of the time. However, then Governor George Grey came back in 1861, as source W2 tells us, amidst the Kingitanga movement and a large power sharing dynamic, conflict becomes inevitable. This is because "Grey is an autocrat" and would be unprepared to share power with anyone, be it Maori or colonial ministries he frequently conflicted with. This led to him exerting a great more control than his predecessor Governor Gore Browne, and showing that Governors can still shape events. This is because he fully intended to begin the Waikato Wars, telling Gore Browne as he is leaving that "he means to take the Waikato". This conflicts with the prior source, and shows that perhaps individual agency from the governors was essential in determining how much power they could truly wield, as although ministries may disapprove of his handling of the Waikato, if he has a pretext for invasion the only real authority above him is in New South Wales or Great Britain, which will take weeks or months to get back to him. This afforded him a great deal of autonomy, which meant that as long as he was successful in The Land Wars as they later became known, he would face very little actual resistance.

Governors were not the only ones exerting power in NZ from 1852-1873, Maori agency was also very prevalent during this time. Maori were discontent with their reducing power, and as source V2 tells us, Maori were alarmed by the influx of European settlers being enticed by the promise of free land. This led to the Maori holding large, inter-tribal meetings as shown by Source V1. In these tribal meetings, they decided to slow down settlement by withholding land from sale, pupuri whenua. In addition, they discussed Kotahitanga, or the unification of tribes but instead settled on placing all of the Maori's collective mana under one person. To this end, the Maori discussed electing a King, and this later spawned the Kingitanga movement, the primary opposition in the Waikato Wars and broader land wars, and a symbol of Maori autonomy and agency. They elected him in order to "stop the flow of blood, to hold the peace between one man and another, between one chief and another chief". This was after the Governor's office refused to even entertain a Maori who sought for a Council of Chiefs to be set up to advise the governor on policy. This act of Maori defiance is an example of how the Governor did not have total control over the actions which occurred within New Zealand, and that Maori at this time still wielded significant power. In source V3, we can see that Maori still had over 50%, and nearing 60% of all the New Zealand land, and likely over 50% of the population in the early 1850s, although this number quickly dropped due to the influx of European settlers and large land purchases, confiscations and requisitions carried out by the Europeans.

In addition, wider societal pressures and forces as well as events were driving many of the events inside NZ between 1852-1873. Principal amongst these is the desire for colonial expansion demonstrated by the British. This was a primary objective of theirs, as a huge influx of settlers necessitated land disenfranchisement of Maori in order to settle all of them. This influx of settlers is clearly shown in (V3) where circa 1840 Maori are over 90% of the population in the New Zealand. Around 30 years later in 1874, this was down to barely over 10%. This rapid influx of Europeans caused Maori owned land to fall from 100% in 1840 to around 35% in 60, as shown in graph 6. This rapid emigration of British cannot be entirely attributed to the actions of the governor, as although they may have encouraged emigration by offering free land, sometimes up to 40 acres (V2), this quantity was also caused by a desire to explore, expand and assert the British Empires dominance. The discovery of gold fields in New Zealand, and the subsequent Gold rush that followed due to the allure of a quick fortune. This drew men "to the gold fields from within New Zealand, as well as from Australia and California" which caused more people coming to New Zealand. Many of these people then wanted to settle and needed land. In addition, a reasonable quantity of Asians came to New Zealand in the Gold Rush to seek a fortune. A combination of these external factors caused events in New Zealand to occur.

In conclusion, the Governors of NZ can only to some extent be accredited for the events that occurred from 1852-1873. While the governors held the highest post within the borders of New Zealand, and certain figures such as George Grey stretched this in order to begin the Waikato Wars and the broader land wars, as well as confiscation, they were not the only force. Maori agency, notably in intertribal unity and the Kingitanga movement was also evident at this time. Further, events such as the desire for colonial expansion and influx of settlers and gold rush also were key factors. Only by looking at all of these separate factors can one begin to create a clear picture of the causes for events throughout New Zealand from 1852 - 1873.

Outstanding Scholarship

Subject: History

Standard: 93403

Total score: 20

Q	Score	Marker commentary
1	6	The candidate wrote well and with confidence in response to the question posed, developing a substantiated argument that was relatively complex and consistent. The candidate was also able to critique the limits of the narratives provided at several points in their response.
2	7	The candidate responded directly to the question and identified a range of historical relationships in the source material supplied: cause and effect, continuity and change, and general and specific. These three historical relationships were then explained and developed to varying degrees throughout their response.
3	7	The candidate developed a sound argument about the impacts that governors had on events in Aotearoa New Zealand from 1852–1873, using the source material supplied and their own knowledge of this period. The source material supplied was used successfully to create an argument that the candidate was clearly in control of throughout.