

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

93403



934030

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

+

OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP EXEMPLAR



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Scholarship 2023 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 any cross-hatched area (AREA TO BE
DO NOT WRITE). This area may 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:
communism as a historical force.

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.

To what extent do **Sources A–J** enable historians to understand the importance of communism as a historical force?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: communism as a historical force
- 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–S** enable historians to understand the complexities of McCarthyism in post-World War II 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: communism as a historical force
- 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 T–X**, to what extent did a fear of communism shape domestic and foreign policy in Aotearoa New Zealand in the years 1950 to 1954?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of communism as a historical force in Aotearoa New Zealand in the years 1950 to 1954
- 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.

To what extent do Sources A–J enable historians to understand the importance of communism as a historical force?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet, and your own knowledge of the theme: communism as a historical force
- 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.

In sources A–J there are ~~discussions~~^{PLANNING narratives} about the nature of history and historical advancement

- Marx's theory of history + Hobsbawm | Source F
Source G
Source H
 - alternative Linear narrative | Fukuyama + Richard Pipes
 - more complex recognition of multiple historical forces acting | MacMillan
Source B
~~Source C~~
~~Source D~~ | Source E
Vietnam
- important
to what extent is communism an ~~important~~
historical force in our understanding
of history?

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

Sources A-J contain a variety of ~~these~~ narratives about the nature of the development of history, and while some uphold Marxism, and Communism in general, as an important tool for the analysis of materialism in historical advancement, others dismiss communism's broad historical significance based on apparent failures. What becomes clear is that significant conflict occurs in historical debate due to the two distinct parts of Marx's theory; that of the development of history through class-struggle and that of history leading to Communism as a final state of anthropological development. ~~By~~ ~~itself~~ Taking a balanced view, ~~Marxist~~^{Communist} theory seems to be a useful tool for analysing history when one also considers other significant historical forces driving a potentially non-linear progression.

Communist historians like Eric Hobsbawm demand that "the manifesto still has a lot to say to the world in the twenty-first century", and remarks on a key ~~per~~ important historical force. Hobsbawm himself is quoted in source F, however here he reveals the nuance of argument explored by most modern Marxists,

recognise in F that communism being the
 "inevitable result of historical development" is
 "by no means clear"; but instead placing
 the significance of his writing ~~in~~ in the
 ability to describe the "general shape of
 human history from primitive communalism
 to capitalism". This sentiment is echoed
 by A. Sofroniou in source C who states
 that The Manifesto of the Communist
 Party was "one of the outstanding documents
 of all time" for its philosophy of history.
 Of course, ^{praise for} Marx's ability to
 describe the broad development of history
 through categories of his own design
 to some extent compromises ~~it itself~~,
 yet the agreement of so many historians
 on the degree to which it is compelling
 warrants further analysis. ~~But~~ These historians
 are quick to dismiss ~~the~~ the ~~historical~~
 connection of Marx's historical theory to
 manifestations of "Communism", like in
 China where 40 million starved in
 the Great Leap Forward, or ~~or~~ 3 million
 died in the Five Year plan, ~~and~~ and
 they are right to suggest that these regimes
 run by increasingly monolithic party's
~~are~~ centered around one leader rather than
 communist ideals themselves ~~which~~ drifted away
 from Marx's core principles. ~~And~~ And further

Other products of communism ~~as~~^a as a historical force that persist to this day like the labour movement are testament to the power and continued relevance of class-centric and materialistic thinking. But ~~the~~ still cannot be considered to be a solely influential and important historical force given it has failed to inform ^{stable} changes ~~on~~ on national and international scales after the fall of the Soviet Union and ^{during} the gradual de-communization of China.

It is for this reason than anti-communist historians like Francis Fukuyama argue that it was always doomed to fail and has no relevance as a historical force today. He influentially wrote in The End of History and The Last Man that liberal democracy was the pinnacle of civilisation and we had in fact reached the end of linear historical advancement. This sentiment is echoed by G. Fitzpatrick in source G. Shaprio I. Shapiro in source T, who ~~says~~ asks "Why should we look with Maxism from the vantage point of the twenty first century?". While this statement seems to be in open opposition to Hobson's argument, however, his ~~argument~~ is substantiated by

analysis of the way in which Marx's belief that "the proletariat could lead the revolution" has ultimately been proven false, or when it has occurred it has collapsed. As both historical narratives deal with only with the evidence most favourable, comparing their relative reliability and validity is complex. S. Fitzpatrick points out in Source G that Hobsbawm is himself communist, as are many other apologists who defend Marx's work. Yet at the same time Francis Fukuyama, was born in 1952, and after polemic historians grew up in environments of anti-communist fervour during the cold war, as likely did I. Shapiro ~~at his~~ publishing in Yale University Press. Thus neither narrative can be seen to be disengaged by historians devoid of historical bias, and a significant generational gap must be considered as Hobsbawm himself grew up prior to the Cold War, born in 1917. This divide, however, ~~does~~ suggests a useful method for analysing the importance of communism as a historical force: in a past and future context. Turning to the past, ~~previous~~ the effect of communism on the lives of polemic historians makes its significance all too obvious,

And on such basis it seems a sound argument that the relevance of communism as a historical force active in the world is diminishing. role is also

Yet a historian's job is to see nuance, and while, Marx, Fukuyama, Hobsbawm, and Shapiro discuss linear narratives of history, it is important to recognize the influence of other historical forces and possibility for other ~~linear~~ narratives of historical development to be more accurate descriptors. In Shapiro's writing itself he recognises the enduring "nationalistic" elements of Capitalism's development, another key historical force that can be seen to act alongside communism in many circumstances. In Source B, R. Taqqu discusses also the attempts to destroy Maoist communism in 1862-1865, themselves a demonstration of colonialism and anti-communism, often significant historical forces acting to create complex events. In Vietnam for example, Ho Chi-Minh's declaration of independence referred to both the American Declaration of Independence and French Rights of the Man and Citizen, demonstrating nationalistic elements within a nation that defined itself as communist. With all of these historical

See back

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–S** enable historians to understand the complexities of McCarthyism in post-World War II 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: communism as a historical force
- 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

Complexities of McCarthyism

Cause and effect?

Motivation and intent
general and Specific

Begin your answer to Question Two here:

Historical relationships are key tools that allow us to interpret history, and it ~~serves~~ K-S the complexities of McCarthyism can only be revealed by using a ~~basket~~ ~~range~~ of them to evaluate different elements of its development and products. Cause and effect is useful as a general framework in this regard, but general and specific, patterns and trends, ~~and~~ continuity and change, and perspectives are crucial relationships for evaluating the motivations of McCarthy and those around him, the methods they used to stoke fear, and the effects of this fear.

~~There are two~~

There are two differing perspectives on the causes of McCarthyism, one that it was a strategy of the Republican party and the other that it was McCarthy's own scheme. ~~Source O~~ Source O links McCarthy's themes of "betrayal and disloyalty" to the those "exploited" by the Republican party seeking to gain ~~re~~ election in 1948 for the first time in five terms. By this ~~was~~ was, ~~as~~ by this perspective, a ~~long-term~~ short-term political cause of the McCarthyism, as it was instigated by political strategy

for ~~the~~ the Republican party, but enabled US Americans being "susceptible to conspiracy theories", a long-term social cause which explains the efficacy of an otherwise outrageous political strategy. Others, such as J. Lepore in some p, however argue that McCarthy was a force unto himself, as in 1950 Margaret Chase Smith, another member of the republican party denounced the use of "Fear/Ignorance, Bigotry and Smear" to win a political campaign. While it is difficult to establish which perspective is entirely true, other members of the republican party certainly didn't speak up, and it wasn't until after the election of a republican president, when McCarthy's claims continued, that he was eventually discredited by his own party based on stories of obtaining cushy military roles for his close friends. In response to Lepore's "Who could rein him in?" these differing perspectives reveal that he certainly was a force of his own yet the Republican party were likely complicit in allowing him to continue as long as it was politically favourable, after which they were able to bring him under rein. A simple identification and classification of a cause for McCarthy wouldn't be able to identify

~~(Damaging the party itself)~~

see multiple complex motivations of McCarthy and the party, highlighting the need for a range of historical relationships to be used when evaluating historical events.

McCarthy's methods, are another demonstration of this, as he used blanket accusations to stoke fear, but as populism was his tool it ~~was~~ also won out when he targeted popular figures.

McCarthy tried to present the media and entertainment as infested with Communists in order to delegitimise critics in a ~~very~~
~~Fascist~~ Trump-esque fashion. Source 12 is one result of this, warning that TV, ~~radio~~ and radio are the "Fifth Column" of Soviet influence in America. It warns not to patronise "the REDS". This is a clear example of this anti-media fervour, to which source M gives specific examples, as Charlie E. Avery describes how Charlie Chaplin, slapstick comic film maker ~~was~~ was investigated by the FBI and attacked by the public. With general and specific evidence aligning we can be confident that these attacks on film and media personalities were widespread, but patterns and trends ~~are~~ ~~still~~ ~~still~~ are also relevant here. Also revealed by Avery is that Lucille Ball, unlike Chaplin, gained "terrible admiration" from the public with investigations

that differed in process" from those made about Chapman. This reveals the complexity of McCarthy's strategy as not only did he broadly denounce media and personalities but had a select few who were upheld as "good Americans", who could then become the mouthpiece of his ideas or figures for the public to rally around as he made them distrust others.

Finally, when looking at the "effects" of McCarthyism, continuity and change is ~~very~~^{more} appropriate as his conservative messaging resulted in a lack of development ~~and~~ rather than active ~~the~~ change. If one was to identify a specific "effect", it would be the election of Republican candidates or a political event like the Smith Act Trials in 1951, but the social ramifications of his rhetoric were more significant for "what did not happen rather than what did" (source N). After World War Two, many nations were undergoing significant change, especially in Europe where once torn economies and tired veterans required welfare states ~~and~~ to prop up their futures, and literature reflecting their experience. Yet as is pointed out in source N, "the works were not univocal" in ~~as~~ the U.S., ~~ad~~ books and films were

made or published while there were elements of ~~welfare state~~, ~~regulation~~ developed in the U.S., they were dressed up in a guise of anti-communism and a return to conservatism, especially as "christianity" was expressed as an alternative to "communist atheism". Thus any change that did occur ^{in terms of social progress} was quickly brushed away when it was no longer needed, and ~~America~~ the U.S. was left ~~as~~ ~~behind~~ and as a socially conservative nation compared to the rest of the world as McCarthyism started change to maintain a narrative of continuity in antithesis to the revolutionary nature of communism.

Complex historical relationships ~~are~~ are the devices through which we understand history, and these three elements of McCarthyism all demonstrate how the most simplistic discussions of "cause and effect" are often insufficient when ~~interpreting~~ interpreting multi-dimensional events. Further, the ~~use of~~ analysis of patterns and trends within specific examples of a general principle that McCarthyism used populism and ~~sabotage~~ discredited the media demonstrates that connections between historical relationships grant historians much deeper understanding ~~of events, thus create an understanding of~~ also forces like communism and its consuge partner, anticomunism, shape the world.

QUESTION THREE

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

Using Sources T-X, to what extent did a fear of communism shape domestic and foreign policy in Aotearoa New Zealand in the years 1950 to 1954?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of communism as a historical force in Aotearoa New Zealand in the years 1950 to 1954
- an insightful and detailed understanding of this period.

PLANNING

To what extent...
changing world order
~~Domestic~~
Fear of Communism in NZ

Domestic policy

Foreign policy

Begin your answer to Question Three here:

The 1950s were a ~~period~~^{transformative} period in New Zealand as ~~Kiwi~~^{the U.S.} and New Zealand as a nation adapted to a new order in the Pacific, as ~~an America~~^{and} became the dominant power, ~~but~~ Communism spread around South-East Asia. Fear of communism had a significant influence on domestic and foreign policy, but so did changing ~~the~~ conceptions of New Zealand's national identity, and other more trivial moral scores, and ~~the~~^{political and} economic concerns. These other issues tended to manifest themselves, however, in ways linked to anti-communism, like strong crackdowns on the 1951 Waterside Workers Union strike, and thus detailed analysis is required to distinguish the real and significant effects of a fear of communism in shaping New Zealand policy from other historical forces.

Fear of communism in New Zealand ~~can be~~ ~~was largely to have been~~ was largely generated by the foreign success of communism. In New Zealand the communist party never numbered more than about 1000 members after its formation in 1921, and as the Union Movement slowly diverged from its communist roots true internationally-ambitious communism had little sway in New Zealand. At the same time, however, world war two had

demonstrated that Britain was no longer a strong enough force to protect colonial interests, and thus Pākehā New Zealanders were looking for new safety in the U.S., a recent close ally in the pacific campaign. From the U.S. Kiwis were exposed to the sensationalised news of "feds under the bed" brought to a fever pitch by McCarthyism in the late 1940s, and the NSI national campaign slogan "your safeguard against communism" reflects this influence of American politics in New Zealand. At the same time, our security concerns, for which the U.S. was seen as a protector in the first place, increasingly focused on Communist states in China, Vietnam, and Korea. Understanding the sensationalised fears of communism in New Zealand between 1950 and 1954 is vital as it is reflected in foreign policy ~~as~~ certainly not solely by fear, though also a new national identification with the U.S., while domestic ~~as~~ policies ^{decisions are} more muddled by ~~as~~ general conservatism, and political and ~~economic~~ ~~social~~ incentives.

Both fearing the spread of communism in the pacific and looking to garner favour with the U.S., New Zealand entered into the Korean war leading to a number of defence treaties. New Zealand under Sydney Holland's national

government committed 4700 soldiers in "Kangaroo", the largest contingent of New Zealand forces, a decision that seems at the time to have been motivated by nationalistic concerns, as New Zealand's ~~part~~ service alongside U.S. forces in 1951 helped to bring the ANZUS defence treaty to fruition that same year. As the war progressed, however, anti-communist fervour increased in New Zealand as the pictures like that in Source X3 would have brought the chaos of the war and danger young New Zealanders were in back into the homes of their families and communities. In conjunction with the 1951 waterfront strike, the ~~ANZUS~~ treaty originally for security concerns led to a broader commitment to fighting communism in the Pacific driven by anti-communist fears as in 1954 the Manila Treaty was signed. In the same year that President Eisenhower coined "domino-theory", the successive fall of nations to communism, this treaty had far more wide reaching ambitions to contain communism in the Pacific. This demonstrated how national security concerns drove foreign policy that itself contributed to fears about communism in New Zealand, leading to the fear itself driving future foreign policy largely on its own.

Domestically, fears of communism were often themselves derived from both a changing national identity and fears about communism on the rise.

embroiled in political gaming and individual economic concerns, as anti-communism became both a driving force and rallying point for other interests, influencing policy decisions.

The response to the 1951 Waterfront Workers Union Strike is one example of this. After the Union refused to accept the result of forced arbitration, National struck the NZWWU off the official list of registered unions removing all its ~~political~~^{official} powers, sparking a 151 day strike that cost the nation over a million ~~man~~ days of work. The national government however seized on this as a political opportunity, denouncing the Union as "communists", which as Jack Marshall reveals in source T2 (ed) do "enhanc[e] political gains in 'public confidence and increased popular support'. While actual links between the Union and communism were tenuous at best (although communist elements participated), the National party's rhetoric struck a chord with the general public. Yet it was not only fear motivating public opinion, as ~~many~~ ~~both~~ farmers and everyone benefitting from New Zealand's export economy were incensed by the strike affecting port activity, especially as the price of wool almost tripled that year due to the U.S. army building a strategic stockpile needed for uniforms in the developing Korean war. The

* Revealed by the CIA report History 93403, 2023
referred in source T1 that

public thus was not phased by the National government's extreme methods used to combat the strike, which unionists called "fascist" and "in Hitler's steps". This ~~was anti-communist~~ in this case anti-communism was ~~simply~~ a helpful alignment of individual interests and the political ambitions of the national party, fueled further by developing fears of communism from New Zealand's involvement in the Korean War.

The fear of communism continued to inform elements of domestic policy, as the National Party refused to appoint any Māori to the executive and renewed land disposition building state housing on the Bastion Point Area (VI).

~~Again this~~ This reflects the ~~anti~~ anti-communist concerns levelled at Māori by Harry Seewell and previous ministers of Māori affairs, probably revived both by fears about communism and general racism.

New Zealand's significant social and cultural development between 1950 and 1954 lead to prevalent fears about communism which can be seen to be an increasing factor of influence in both foreign and domestic policy, while for both the national concerns and individual interests respectively ~~the~~ instigated policy early in the period which solidified fears and New Zealand's ^{western} ~~western~~ alliance identity in the American led, anti-communist ^{western} ~~western~~ alliance.

Extra space if required.

Write the question number(s) if applicable.

QUESTION
NUMBER

Q1

Forces ~~acting~~ interacting in complex ways, ~~and historical narrative is~~ balanced evaluation of the common one-dimensional narratives set out by apologist and polemic historians seem inadequate and far from determining that one is more reliable than the other. It is appropriate to extract the elements of each that align with each other or more nuanced historical analysis.

The culmination of this idea is that we can recognise that communism is an important historical force with many significant movements ^{like the labour movement} arising from it in the past two centuries. But it is only one of many forces that have shaped development of history and as communist nations collapse it will be useful for describing historical movements and events on the micro ^{outwardly} rather than macro level. That being said, the collapse of communism ~~it is~~ is a demonstration that history does not have a "single direction or purpose" and communist ~~historical~~ historical narratives

Extra space if required.
Write the question number(s) if applicable.

May again motivate ~~start~~ important historical ~~stage~~ change in the future!

QUESTION
NUMBER

**Extra space if required.
Write the question number(s) if applicable.**

93403

Outstanding Scholarship

Subject: History

Standard: 93403

Total score: 21

Q	Score	Marker commentary
1	7	The candidate addressed the question in a direct and confident manner demonstrating a thorough understanding of the scope of the question. The candidate constructed a convincing and sophisticated argument that was well supported by insightful evaluations of the source material and, where appropriate, references to other historical narratives not directly provided in the source material. The candidate was also able to make a series of thoughtful and convincing judgements about the reliability and utility of the historical narratives.
2	7	The candidate constructed a clear and developed answer to this question, referencing a range of historical relationships in a balanced manner. The historical relationships the candidate selected were clearly linked to the source material and developed in the response. A clear argument about the importance of historical relationships as a way for historians to fully understand the complexities of McCarthyism was constructed in a convincing and informed manner.
3	7	The candidate acknowledged the complexities of the question in a clear and concise manner, resulting in a persuasive and perceptive argument. The response was stronger about the impacts of communism on the direction of foreign policy than on domestic policy and would have been further strengthened by a greater focus on domestic events. The candidate provided an argument about domestic developments that was thoughtful and relevant to the context.