

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

☐

+

TOP SCHOLAR



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

1. GMT Theory A1 A2
2. Moderist Critiques D2, Annales, F1
3. Big Beast A1 D1
4. Postmodernist Critiques B1 B2 C F2 G

ANSWER

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

B I U

The Source A - H indicate that the importance of individuals in shaping historical events is complex and highly subjective: to focus overtly only prominent individuals is to ignore the contributions of many groups while also to disregard the power of historical forces. That said, taking a postmodern approach to history requires accepting the validity and usefulness of a variety of perspectives - including those focused on the individual - leading to deeper understanding of history that allows us to construct meaning.

Firstly, the most simplistic view of key individuals as drivers of history is easily, and has conclusively been, refuted. Thomas Carlyle, a 19th-century intellectual, "is often hauled out as an exponent of the theory that key figures - are shapers of the past." (MacMillan, Source A1). He saw history as "the essence of innumerable biographies.", the "product of the work and lives of countless human beings". This view is elaborated on by MacMillan in Source A2, where he assumes without evidence that if not for Winston Churchill, Britain would have surrendered to Germany, leaving "Hitlers domination of Europe would have been virtually unchallengeable". Although he does provide evidence for this second half of the claim, since "there would have been no British air force to bomb Germany, no British supplies for the Soviet forces, no ally left in Europe... for the United States". This example by MacMillan is clearly flawed, since the United States would likely have fared just as well without its (at that point barely managing to feed itself) Britain, nor is it necessarily true that no Churchill meant no copulation. After all, as Zinn argues in Source F1 "the power of the people on top, depends on the obedience of the people below" - Churchill only became Prime Minister once the opinion of the public and the cabinet had turned towards resistance and himself. A more widespread criticism of Carlyle's Great Man Theory in a similar vein comes in the Annales school of thought, which was developed by French historians in the early 1920s. It sees all of history as a result of interacting social, political, and economic forces which mean that individuals, being fundamentally products of their time, are put in power and thus make decisions due to the influence of these forces. Very similar are Marxist historians, who see all of history as a result of a single force: the ongoing class struggle that defines humanity. An Annales view of Churchill would see his election as Prime Minister not due to charisma but instead to the political actions of Hitler, which were themselves a direct result of the social and economic conditions within Germany following the great depression. A further key criticism of Carlyle's theory is a feminist one: that "the theory's most obvious problem is that it blatantly excludes not just women, but the billions other men who have peopled this planet". By focusing on the key players it ignores the many way that collective action drives history: the Women's March on Versailles during the French Revolution, or the many workers who drove communist uprisings in China and Russia.

Secondly however, many argue that this caricature of Carlyle's theory is overly simplistic, and that it can be adapted to something more closely resembling Diamard MacColloch's "Big Beast Theory" which recognises a variety of individuals. As MacMillan argues in Source A1, Carlyle's "view of history was more complex"; that he understood that the secret of "much good history... is to understand the relationship between individuals and their societies." This "Big Beast" version of the theory can be used to both de-gender the theory away from a male focus as well as recognise the Annales idea that individuals are shaped by their societies. However, that does not mean they have to be fully shaped: there is room for individual agency. As Lang argues in Source D1, "events do shape history and individuals shape events... where power lies in individual's hands, those individuals matter."

Thirdly, while this understanding may be more appropriate, it still fails to hold up when the more recent developments of "postmodernist" history is considered. Postmodernism attacks the way that "history is often remarkably arrogant" (Source G), not just in the way that it "dismisses whole groups of people as lost causes, or merely irrelevant" but in its very claim to truth at all. As Carr (Source C) believes, "the belief in a hard core of historical facts existing independently... of the historian... is a preposterous fallacy." This is because "we can view the past... only through the eyes of the present" (Carr, Source B2). Inherently, when viewing history a historian is shaped by society just as much as the individuals who fill the history they are studying. Thomas Carlyle was influenced by the Victorian British values of a focus on men who are given permission by God to dominate anyone who is of lesser wealth, race, gender, or status than themselves. Another example of this is given by Zinn in source F2, when critiquing Morison's discussion of Columbus, "to emphasise [him] and his successors as navigator and discoverers, and to de-emphasise their genocide, is not a technical necessity but an ideological choice." There is only one critique of postmodernism given in the sources; Tuchman (Source C) finds Carr's perspective "untenable", saying that "as I see it, evidence is more important than interpretation, and facts are history." This is a fair but inadequate critique of postmodernism. The idea that history should be confined to evidence is absurd: evidence is simply a collection of dates and events, with no meaning or purpose to be found. Society gains nothing from knowing that in 1789 King Louis XVI was moved from Versailles to Paris, unless they also know that this represented a symbolic challenge to his authority and a key turning point in the French Revolution. Interpretation is far, far, far more important than evidence and is inherently subjective. To understand the role of individuals in history, we must make a judgement of to what extent their decisions would have been made even had it been a different person in their position: was it individual action that altered history, or the culmination of historical forces. The answer to that question will differ wildly by event but also by historian due to their existing biases and understandings. As Evans correctly argues (source B1), we cannot hope to constrain our biases and so must instead "enable readers to study their work critically by making these views and assumptions explicit." Therefore, the extent to which individuals influence history cannot be objectively determined. Rather, it is important to acknowledge both their influence and influences, and not to let a natural human focus on the highly visible stop us recognising the important influence of "subaltern groups", those often marginalised by society. We can recognise that "when soldier refuse to fight... war can't go on" (Zinn, Source F1), while also seeing that maybe if John F. Kennedy was president rather than Lyndon B. Johnson at the start of the Vietnam war we could have avoided it all together.

In conclusion, when viewing history through a (far more useful and accurate) postmodernist lens it becomes clear that it is a variety of opinions and meanings which allow us to best understand history. That means that while key individuals can occasionally be said to shape history, far more often it is the combination of high-level forces with a large number of (often overlooked) individuals which work together to shape events. The exact combinations of how important each of the many theories - individualist, Marxist, Annales, Feminist, Subaltern, and many others - is the driving factor will differ massively between events and likely can never be objectively determined. However, that does not make history meaningless - far from it - but rather allows for a far greater number of perspectives, roles, and influences to be recognised leading to an ultimately better understanding of history.

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

Continuity and Change - shifted a lot in terms of British politics
Differing Perspectives - Strikes vs. international politics
Patterns and Trends - Falklands, RW leader in bad economic times, the wider ideas of

ANSWER

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

B I U     

When analysing the Sources I-S through three of Peter Saixas' historical relationships - cause and effect, patterns and trends, and differing perspectives - it becomes clear that Margaret Thatcher was somewhat influential in shaping events as Prime Minister compared to the wider historical forces at play of the rise of Neoliberalism as well as the economic and geopolitical decline of Britain.

Firstly, when applying the historical relationship of differing perspectives, it appears that while the nature of Margaret Thatcher's influence is disagreed upon, its importance is commonly accepted in the public mind. As Perkins describes in Source Q, on the international stage Thatcher was beloved: "a star in the US, a heroine in the former Soviet Republics of central Europe, a point of reference for politicians" across Europe. This is because she pioneered the new-right, both in style and in policies, that continues to gain ground across many of these nations: Reform in the UK, the AfD in Germany, and Victor Orban in Hungary, and many others. As the cartoon in Source O shows, Thatcher was highly independent in her foreign policy, "clear[ing] the decks" of Britain's commitments of many a treaty and agreement. She also allowed Britain to reassert (at least to its own eyes) its dominance on the global stage through the Falkland War where "Britain found herself in the South Atlantic" which asserted once and for all that "Britain has not changed and that this nation still has those sterling quantities that shine through our history" (Thatcher, Source P). This made her highly attractive to many around the world who similarly try to reassert their countries' lost dominance, but also gave her credit at home. As source L details, "to the public, she became "our Maggie", proof that Britain still mattered", and the following year her popularity meant "the conservatives were re-elected with an even larger parliamentary majority. However, on the other hand many consider her domestic policies to have been highly damaging. Perkins says that "the ideals of collective effort... were replace with the politics of me and mine" through neoliberal policies enacted by Thatcher: "deregulation of the markets and the privatisation of the state's assets" as well as an "attack on the welfare state". Even today many working people in Britain believe that "[Thatcher] destroyed our communities, our villages, and our people" through her anti-unionist and free-market policies. Some still maintain "bitter memories of what she did." (Source R). These two differing perspectives show how Thatcher's various impacts are perceived in very different ways by different people, and the contrast is particularly stark between her foreign and domestic policies. Either way however, this relationship shows that much of the public considers her impact to have been significant.

Secondly however, when applying the historical relationship of patterns and trends, it appears that Thatcher was in fact simply acting as part of wider historical forces. As Source I provides, Thatcher entered her term as Prime Minister with the country in recession, something she "battled... by initially raising interest rates to control inflation". This pattern of throwing out incumbents, even to elect radical leaders in times of economic hardship is clear throughout history: the election of Hitler, the removal of Churchill, the election of Trump in 2024 in the US, and of Reagan at the same time as Thatcher. She represented "the nation's self-appointed saviour after years of retreat" (Sandbrook, Source J). In addition, she shared "similar right-wing, pro-corporate political philosophies" (source I) with Reagan, and some even consider her neoliberal agenda "as a transatlantic import, with Mrs Thatcher heading a British subsidiary of the American New Right." (Source J). This paints her ideology as just that - part of a wider trend that started with Reagan and still stretches into the politics of the west today. Indeed, New Zealand had its own experience with neoliberal reforms just 5 years after Thatcher was first elected in 1979 with the election of the Fourth Labour Government in 1984 here. Even Thatcher's actions in the Falkland Island war can be viewed as part of a wider narrative of Britain, one that Thatcher was trying to reclaim. This is evident in Thatcher's language around the war, one that enacts references to the past: "there are moments in our history when we have to make a fundamental choice" (Source K), the way that "Britain has found herself again" (Source P), suggesting a return to an earlier era of dominance, and her reference to "a little known speech of Winston Churchill." (Source P also). Indeed, we know that "Thatcher is consistent in her desire to have a Churchillian moment" (Hirsch, Source M) providing clear evidence for Thatcher following a pattern in her actions. Therefore, through this relationship Thatcher is viewed as far less influential and simply as a response to the historical patterns and trends which were applied to Britain's economic crises, diminishing relevance, and the global rise of neoliberalism.

Thirdly, when applying the historical relationship of continuity and change, it becomes clear that although Thatcher was part of a wider movement, she was able to ride and harness by adding her unique personality. After Thatcher's term, "Labour accommodated rather than reversed her attack on the welfare state and left her employment legislation almost untouched". This suggests that while Thatcher represented a major shift by breaking "the pattern of post-war politics" (both Perkins, Source Q), the other side of politics was willing to maintain her changes - a strong indication that public sentiment had shifted significantly due to societal forces towards the right. However, at the same time, Thatcher was "out of step with the broad traditions of British political life" (Sandbrook, Source J). Much was changed under Thatcher but at the same time much remained the same - Britain did not regain its global dominance after winning the Falkland War, rather continued its slide into relative obscurity on the world stage. Thatcher may have ended the temporary recession, but was largely unsuccessful at creating long-term growth, and likely did little to reduce long term poverty and inequality, possibly even worsening it. Ultimately, the impact of her government was far from insignificant, but these were far more due to the neoliberal policies carried out by a variety of ministers within her government, rather than her trailblazing, and largely independent of wider forces, actions on the global stage such as the Falkland War. Therefore, Thatcher mostly rode a movement of neoliberalism, but one that she was able to steer and impregnate with her unique personality, so much so that she would have a lasting effect on British politics.

In conclusion, Thatcher can be seen as a woman who was able to fill a societal need in line with Diarmaid MacColloch's "Big Beast" theory of individuals; she took advantage of Britain's desire for economic reform and a display of geopolitical dominance, but through her character created a narrative that still continues into British politics today. Every discussion about neoliberalism must include Margaret Thatcher just as it must Reagan, because these were the people who pioneered it, who shaped it, who turned it into what is the defining economic movement of the last 50 years, just as Marxism was the defining economic movement of the 50 years before that.

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

- colonial arrangements 1, 2
- Yes, GMT
- No, Annales
- Post-modern: Subaltern, a combination proly'

ANSWER

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

B I U     

The Sources T-Z suggest that the extent to which successive governors of New Zealand were impactful in shaping the events that occurred varied massively over the time period 1852 - 1873. There were moments in this period where the personal relationships and decisions that governors (most notably Sir George Gray) took were mammoth in their implications, but there are also many times when they found themselves powerless against other sources of colonial power (such as the New Zealand Parliament and British Colonial Office) as well as simply riding wider social forces.

Firstly, the governing arrangements of New Zealand as a British colony were complex and evolved over the era of 1852 - 1873. Throughout this time period the governors had to answer to the Colonial Office in Britain, but communication with London took months each way meaning the only influence that the British Empire could really have is in broad determinations of policy, for example the way they were "wary of any actions that might precipitate a colonial war" (Source T), rather than day to day decisions. This meant that initially the governors were given massive control over the running of the colony. However, in 1852 the New Zealand Constitution Act was passed which, as described by Source U, granted "a representative constitution to the colony of New Zealand" which allowed males over 21 with sufficient land or wealth to vote for both a central as well as "six provinces to be governed by elected councils". This constitution, by creating "responsible government", initiated the first colonial challenge to the governors power. However, initially the central and provincial governments had little control of the actions of the Governor, as source T attests: "successive governors and their officials were effectively the 'state'". Only later into the period did these elected bodies begin to gain more of a say over the actions taken by the colonial government. Furthermore, even when the governors were able to control the colonial authorities, this still left much of the land of the country in the hands of effectively-independent iwi: "until 1856... their [the governors'] power remained relatively weak". In 1856 Māori still owned well over 50% of New Zealand's land, although that would fall down to around 30% by 1874 while their share of the population dropped from about 70% to just over 10% over the same period (Source V3), and this represented a major challenge to the sovereignty of the governors, especially once the majority of Waikato Māori organised themselves around the Kingitanga movement which occurred in April 1858 when "Te Wherowhero was installed as the Maori king" (Source V1). That said, by 1863, when the major conflicts of the New Zealand Wars were nearing completion, Māori had been made "in reality what by a legal fiction they have long been in name, British subjects" (*Taranaki Herald*, Source X). Therefore, the amount of power the governors had to make decisions evolved over time: while the rise of representative government in New Zealand over this time period diminished their freedom, the area and population over which they ruled rose exponentially in this time period. Thus while somewhat limited, the governors had enormous potential to make decisions that would shape history.

Secondly, applying an individualist narrative, such as the "Great Man" Theory to New Zealand over the time period 1852 - 1873, we can see many clear examples of when the decisions of individual governors had a large impact. A key example is when, in 1857, Tamihana went to meet Governor Gore Brown to discuss a form of independent rule for Māori, similar to the one guaranteed in section 71 of the New Zealand Constitution Act. However, "Tamihana was kept waiting as Pakeha who came after him were served force", an insult which R. Walker (Source V1) believes caused him to "[turn] his considerable talents to the difficult task of electing a Maori king." Similarly, in Source W1, Belgrave describes how "once Governor Gore Browne had decided that the Waitara sale had to be enforced... he could not retreat", suggesting that it was the independent decision of Browne to pursue this specific issue which led to the Taranaki war, rather than wider historical forces. Furthermore, O'Malley describes in Source W2 how once Governor George Grey was called in to replace the unsuccessful Browne as governor, he made the momentous decision to continue the fight, telling "Browne during that [first] week that he means to take the Waikato" rather than a path Ray clearly believes was open to him, to instead "reassure Kingitanga leaders" and deescalate tensions. Indeed, as Ray explains Grey "had been close friends and allies with... Te Wherowhero" in his first term. Had "a version of George Grey who no longer really existed" continued, then the wider Waikato war could have been avoided through deeper cooperation. All of these sources suggest that it was the precise personalities and decisions of both Grey and Brown which led to the New Zealand wars - with devastating consequences for Māori.

Thirdly however, many historians would argue that these decisions were in fact relatively unimportant. A non-individualist narrative such as the Annales School of thought views both the New Zealand Wars and their lasting consequences as lasting effects of wider political, social, and economic forces. The first driving force of the Wars was the economic need for land from new settlers. Indeed, as Source V2 shows, in order to attract new settlers the provincial government of Auckland offered "a free gift of forty acres of good land". The high level of immigration into New Zealand can be seen in Source V3, where the percentage of the population that is Māori drops from 100% in 1840 to 35% by 1860 - a decrease not so much due to falling Māori populations (although this was a factor) but rather to the massive increases in the Pakeha population. While many settlers came with the Gold rushes of the late 19th Century, as Brooks notes in Source X, "gold strikes offered the allure of instant wealth, but the acquisition of Māori land held out more long-term prospects for settler families". The enormous numbers of settlers required enormous amounts of land, and as soon as Māori began to resist the sale of that land, such as through the Kingitanga movement, it was inevitable that economic pressures would cause the Pakeha to intervene militarily. Although the governors may have been the driving force for these military campaigns, the Annales argument is that even had the governors resisted they would have quickly fallen to pressure from the settler parliaments. Additionally, it is important to highlight the roles of non-military forms of Māori subjugation that are described rather generously by Brooks in Source X as "further steps towards assimilating Māori into British law [through] the Native Land Acts of 1861 and 1865. These 'further steps' involved the setting up of state schools which punished the speaker of Te Reo, the establishment of the Native Land Court which "transform[ed] customary title into individual title" (Source X) in a way which cost Māori heavy legal fees and often forced them to sell any individual titles they may have just won. These wider institutional pressures are seen by the Annales school as a result of the wider forces of Colonialism, Racism, and the "white man's project", all of which led British authorities to believe they were doing the morally correct and Christian thing by assimilating and acquiring Māori land. All of these processes happened outside of the direction of the Governors, and many would argue were just as influential if not more as the New Zealand Wars in shifting power away from Māori.

In conclusion, it is clear that while the governors were influential in their personal relationships with Māori chiefs and their decisions regarding the New Zealand Wars, many of the long term effects of these wars were simply an inevitable outcome of the wider historical forces at play. The governors therefore certainly influenced the way events played out, but not necessarily their final impacts. The racism ingrained into the colonial settler government was never going to allow an ongoing alternative source of sovereignty within New Zealand, no matter the position of Governor George Gray. The British simply had more troops, more resources, and more racism. They would have undoubtedly still found a way to assimilate and subjugate Māori no matter the actions of individuals.