

93403A



S

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

# SCHOLARSHIP EXEMPLAR



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY  
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD  
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

## Scholarship 2016 History

9.30 a.m. Monday 14 November 2016  
Time allowed: Three hours  
Total marks: 40

### ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Write your answer in this booklet.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–28 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

**YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.**

Skills	Mark
Historical ideas	
Argument	
Synthesis	
Historical relationships	
Judgement	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>/40</b>

ASSESSOR'S USE ONLY

## PLANNING

Intro:

/ Def: BA

/ Simp. J3

/ Subj. BJ2K3

/ Hindsight: AB02

/ Emb: N

/ Broad: H1 H2

/ N.ID: G3 G2

Conc:

This is why they are useful  
& evidence of 1893 ✓

This is a limitation? ✓

Limit their use ✓

Conflicting views:  
not unanimous decision

Astronomical metaphor? ✓

link

"Construct"

cannot predict  
future

Past vs Present

not useful  
because historians  
get it wrong

**PLANNING**

While astronomy is a methodical and evidence based to understand the cosmos, history is a comparable endeavour to interpret the ever expanding universe that is the past. Humans, by nature, do not see stars as isolated specks of light, but as constellations - patterns we instinctively create to make sense of the unknown. According to Mac Millon, turning points are like constellations in history - they are a construct created by historians to untangle the interwoven mass of moments that is the past. I agree to a great extent with Mac Millon's observation -

historians indeed indeed utilise turning points to create a simplified version of the past. Furthermore, this interpretation of the past can come to define the identity and history of a nation. Yet the selective interpretation of the past by historians also alters our view of history in negative ways; historians cannot help but introduce elements of subjectivity and embellishment into the historical narrative.

It is of the foremost importance to understand that turning points are, to a great extent, artificial. In Source B, New Zealand historian Paul Moon asserts that turning points are "chosen events" which have "affected subsequent developments in a nation". Hence, Moon's Piece claims that turning points must cause change in society - the reversing of a development or trend. However, what is most salient in Moon's piece is his suggestion that turning points are 'man made' - that they are "chosen" based on somewhat loose "criterion". Hence, Moon is presenting the idea that turning points are little more than 'markers' in history which denote a change in a trend.

Moore's assertions are supported by Niall Ferguson's analysis of turning points in Source A. Ferguson notes that historians tend to be overly eager to categorise events as turning points. As such, both historians are supporting the idea that turning points are 'labels' - merely names historians give to the moments they deem significant. Thus, turning points can be likened to an historical device - a tool which historians use to filter and prioritise the past. Indeed turning points are artificial - by their very definition, they are man-made divisions in the historical timeline. It is on the basis of this idea which I support MacMillan's argument that historians decide what makes a portion of the past a turning point.

It is an insightful exercise to question why turning points are so often used to characterise history. Like a great ocean, the past may seem deceptively calm on the surface, but is both chaotic and unruly when explored deeper. By viewing the past as a series of turning points, one is effectively trawling through the past, collecting the largest, most notable moments, and discarding the ones perceived as insignificant. As such, turning points are effective at condensing the past into a more linear narrative. However, the simplification of the past which turning points afford comes at a cost. By focusing on particular events, information, such as the motivations and attitudes which inspired change can become omitted from the historical narrative. When the enfranchisement of New Zealand women is explained in popular history, attention is predominantly paid to the events within 1893; the petitioning of parliament and the signing

of the bill itself on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September. However, understanding the context which motivated the Women's Movement is ~~even~~ crucial to understanding why and how women gained the vote. In Source ~~32~~<sup>33</sup>, Dr Charlotte MacDonald describes the enfranchisement. In Source J3, a transcript of a speech by a woman to the Māori Parliament in 1893 is recorded. In the speech, Meri Te Tai Mangakāhia lists the reasons why Māori women should be enfranchised, stating that many Māori women desired to be recognised as land owners and that many women had greater financial literacy than their male spouses. Hence, source J3 identifies the desire for economic independence as a factor which motivated many Māori women to campaign for the vote. That the involvement of Māori women in the 1893 enfranchisement is a dimension which is omitted from history demonstrates how turning points are indeed a selective interpretation of the past. It is a crucial skill of the historian to understand events from the perspectives of minorities - understanding a broad range of views can reveal insight into unconventional motivations and context in history. However, the failure to acknowledge the role of Māori women in 19<sup>th</sup> century history is a trend becoming all too common - a pattern likely due to the selective interpretation of history as a series of primarily ~~our~~ Eurocentric turning points. As this demonstrates, turning points are indeed, as advocated by Mac Millan, constructed by historians. However, this also identifies a key limitation in the extent to which history can be objectively 'constructed' by historians.

time is continuous and thus, ~~and~~ any attempt to "portion" the past into discrete events is done so with bias.

According to Paul Moon in Source B, history is like a landscape, its features ever evolving through time. In this sense, turning points provide a basic map of the past.

Like coordinates on a map, turning points do not hold inherent significance, but, as argued by MacMillan, are assigned significance by the historians who label them.

However, it is vital to recognise that assignment of such significance by historians limits the extent to which any

turning points can portray the past objectively. In popular history, in New Zealand, the enfranchisement of women in 1893 is commonly hailed as a turning point. ~~notably, '1893' appears as a turning point in~~ This is likely due to New Zealanders' understanding that the enfranchisement of women afforded them improvements in rights, and many New Zealanders experience a sense of pride for being the first nation to grant women the vote.

In Source J2, Dr Charlotte MacDonald describes the enfranchisement of New Zealand women as something of a 'social experiment'. In making such an assertion, MacDonald questions the significance of 1893 as a turning point and suggests that women in New Zealand won the vote relatively easily. In addition to being a well-respected New Zealand feminist historian, MacDonald is supported by Source K3, which describes the enfranchisement of British women.

Notably, Source K3 does not mention the enfranchisement of New Zealand women as a cause of the 1918 enfranchisement. This indicates that the enfranchisement of

New Zealand women were relatively insignificant on a global scale. As such, this observation supports MacMillan's argument that historians shape the events we consider turning points. As New Zealanders, it can be natural to assume that events such as 1893 are turning points, because we are exposed, primarily, to history written by New Zealand historians. However, it is vital to retain an awareness that New Zealand is an extremely small, specific demographic, and hence, to people in general, such as those in other countries, 1893 is not a turning point.

Whether an event is considered a turning point by historians depends on the extent to which that event is perceived to have affected people and a trend. However, an inherent limitation, when judging the significance of an event, is that the effects of an event are never experienced in the same way - no effect is experienced 'generally' nor 'universally'. Hence, the categorisation of events as 'turning points' by historians can ~~only~~ only occur in hindsight, once the effects of an event have become known. In Source A, Niall Ferguson argues that historians are often too eager to classify an event as a turning point. Ferguson states that "every new president is expected to have a new foreign policy doctrine" - an observation which ~~sings~~ <sup>rings</sup> particularly true at present. ~~Ferguson's argument~~ As such, Ferguson is making the claim that turning points cannot be definitively labelled as turning points, in the present. Ferguson's argument is furthered by Paul Moon, who states that turning points can only be seen



from "the convenient outcrop of hindsight". Both historians are making the assertion that turning points are indeed 'created by historians'. However, they are identifying a limit to which this is true - historians can only accurately label events as turning points, with the luxury of hindsight.

In Source 02, Time Magazine describes Francis Fukuyama's 1989 essay, "The End of History?". Fukuyama's essay has received much criticism since its publication.

In his essay, Fukuyama postulated that mankind would soon reach a unified state of liberal democracy, in which subsequent evolution of ideology or culture would cease. Fukuyama predicted that the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 would be a global turning point, which would mark the complete domination of the globe by Western Culture. However, at present,

Fukuyama's predictions are far from true - in 2013, Niall Ferguson directly contradicted Fukuyama, claiming that China is poised to overtake the US in the fight for global supremacy. As this illustrates, historians indeed have the power to create turning points in history -

Fukuyama diagnosed 1989 as a great turning point. However, historians can only create turning points to a limited extent. When historians label events as turning points, they are asserting that their chosen event marked a change in a development or trend. As Fukuyama discovered, labelling events in the present as turning points can be dangerous - the effects of an event cannot be predicted for certain, and hence, historians are limited in their ability to designate

'turning points'.

Thus far, I have supported MacMillan's argument that it is historians who 'create' turning points. However, in understanding how historians create turning points, it is also necessary to investigate the effect of such 'creation' of turning points, on the historical narrative. Whether an event is considered a turning point depends on the extent to which different historians portray it as one. Within the media, history is often portrayed as a series of turning points, with easily identifiable links between them. This use of turning points in the media perhaps derives from the ease with which they are explained and understood. However, the simplification of the historical narrative into turning points comes at a ~~sort~~ trade-off. By portraying history as a series of dramatic 'moments', long term effects in history can become overlooked.

Similarly, turning points tend to portray individuals in history as 'great men', who have shaped the past through heroic deeds and actions. Hence, turning points tend to overlook aspects of history such as the role of 'ordinary' people in the general population. Hence, through constructing the past as a series of turning points, historians can often embellish details, limiting the extent to which they are significant for ~~historians~~ or the general public.

In Source N, Mark Kurlansky summarises 1968, stating "there has never been a year like 1968".

In the article, Kurlansky portrays the events of 1968 as an ideological battle between the young and the

old, labelling protestors as 'rebels,' and the government as 'authoritarian'. Kurlansky's version of 1968 is very dramatic and emotional, which suggests Kurlansky himself suffers from a romanticised memory of 1968 - especially considering he is of the baby-boomer generation.

Kurlansky's portrayal of 1968 focuses heavily on the role of individuals, such as the 'rebel' leader Abbie Hoffman. Hence, through giving attention to 'heroes', Kurlansky fails to acknowledge the role of the general population in the 1968 protests. Furthermore, Kurlansky does not recognise that the protests of 1968 were limited to a select few countries around the globe, and that for most people, 1968 is not a turning point. As this demonstrates, historians can indeed 'create' turning points, as Kurlansky has done. However, this example does illustrate that the creation of turning points is not always advisable, as it tends to omit certain aspects from the historical narrative.

When evaluating the extent to which historians create turning points, it can seem almost as if 'historians' are a collective body who unanimously decide to create turning points.

Such a notion is false, and indeed highlights a limit in the extent to which historians 'create' turning points.

Not all historians agree whether on whether events are turning points, and thus, historians indeed have trouble when deciding what portions of the past can be called turning points. In Source #1, historian AJP Taylor hails the French Revolution in 1789 as a turning point.

Taylor supports his assertion, describing the resultant transfer of power away from the Church and aristocracy, and the instatement of the Declaration of the Rights of Man.

However, in Source H2, Simon Sharma directly contradicts Taylor, stating that the Declaration was ineffective at improving the rights of the lower class and that 1789 was not particularly revolutionary. Interestingly, Sharma and Taylor are both well-reputed British historians and television producers, with backgrounds in European history. Both historians have extensive credentials and

evidence to support their arguments, but hold completely contradictory views as to whether the French Revolution was a turning point. As this demonstrates, historians

do indeed attempt to classify certain events as turning points. However, the extent to which they can do so

is limited by the fact that historians often disagree on whether an event is a turning point. This highlights the need to consider a <sup>gr</sup> broad range of views when analysing history as a series of turning points. There

are always arguments for and against the classification of an event as a turning point, and consideration of different views is necessary to form a balanced view.

To summarise, thus far, I have argued that turning points are, as argued by MacMillan, created largely by historians, as a method of simplifying the past. I have also discussed how the creation of turning points can be biased, and why they are often <sup>Poor</sup> ~~not~~ at predicting the future. However, to balance this argument, I feel it is necessary to acknowledge

that turning points also have great uses, not only to historians, but to the general public.

Geographical landmarks are symbols inseparably tied to the culture of a nation. Whether through 'dominant' architecture or ~~colossal~~<sup>colossal</sup> size, landmarks are built to represent the qualities of a nation - beautiful, powerful and ever-lasting. Over time, these landmarks come, not only to reflect the nations they exist in, but define them. Although only theoretical, turning points are landmarks in a nation's history. Indeed, turning points are 'built' by historians. Like landmarks, an appreciation of certain turning points in a nation's history can transcend distance, class boundaries and time. It is thus through the creation of turning points by historians that an essential, unifying aspect of our national identity is forged. This is best exemplified by the evolution of 1769 as a creation myth. When Cook's first arrival in New Zealand in 1769 is recounted, it is often perceived as a glorious moment of transformation for New Zealand, from an untouched virgin land to a new nation built from the tenacity and toil of British pioneers. However, Source G3 paints a very different picture. Source G3 is a secondary source, written by Anne Salmond, describing Cook's first encounter with the Māori. According to Salmond, contact between the Europeans and Māori was very limited, as the Endeavour never ventured far inland. Furthermore, the language barrier between the Māori and Cook's crew contributed to frequently hostile interactions.

Salmon's description is corroborated by Source G2, which is a primary source, in the form of a recount by a Māori Chief. According to the recount, the Chief remembered the crew of the Endeavour as 'goblins' (or the Māori equivalent), and noted the shooting of a Māori thief. As such, this supports Salmon's view that communication between Māori and the Europeans was "uneasy". This disparity between the typical interpretation of 1769 in the present, and the known historical evidence, indicates that the 'discovery of New Zealand' has been the subject of creationist mythology. As historian Niall Ferguson notes, humans "yearn for turning points", and thus, this makes turning points the ideal medium for communities to collectively recount and relate. Hence, historians may initially diagnose certain events as turning points, but turning points, to become national symbols, must also capture the public's imagination. Hence, historians do indeed create turning points, but historians alone cannot shape our view of history.

This pride in turning points is a phenomenon exhibited not only by large, general entities such as nations, but is also characteristic of smaller local communities and hapū. Between 1827 and 1839, the Māori iwi, Ngāi Tahu was invaded from the North by the expanding Ngāti Toa, led by chief, Te Rauparaha. During this period, many fierce market battles were waged, and both iwi lost many

members. Between 1832-33, Ngāi Tahu defended against the invading Ngāi Toa in Lake Grassmere.

Ngāi Tahu successfully defended, killing many invaders. Subsequently, Ngāi Toa retreated, and the two iwi made peace in 1837. Hence, the battle at Lake Grassmere is likely seen as a victorious turning point by members of Ngāi Tahu, and serves as a source of great mana. Hence, this demonstrates that the creation of turning points can serve as a method of relating for communities, both large and small. //

In summary, the past is a complex and multifaceted accumulation of human actions, emotions and decisions.

I agree with MacMillan's argument that historians create turning points - indeed they are constructs which impose some measure of order onto the historical narrative, and thus simplify the past for the historian. However, the creation of large, widely-accepted turning points also requires turning points to capture the imagination of the public, so that they may evolve as elements of a nation's identity. Furthermore, the extent to which historians create turning points is limited by disagreement on whether specific events are turning points. Lastly, the creation of turning points is not always an advisable way of analysing history - although they may simplify history, their creation by historians means they are inherently selective and are thus susceptible to bias and embellishment. //

## Scholarship History Exemplar Comments

### Exemplar 2: Scholarship

1. While the introduction isn't particularly well written or convincing, it establishes a clear argument that is a balanced response to Question 2 – Skill 2
2. This Candidate gained only 4 marks for synthesis because they did not synthesise their own content knowledge and the sources well. They only included a touch of their own knowledge on suffrage & 19<sup>th</sup> century New Zealand. They tended to structure their argument around the sources rather than key ideas. Better use of the Planning Pages may have prevented this – Skill 3
3. The candidate is attempting to judge Source J3 by stating that it is important to discuss the perspectives of minorities. This is a poor attempt. The candidate should explain why it is important, why sources from the Maori perspective are rare & should discuss any limitations of the source – Skill 5
4. The Candidate is attempting to evaluate the Historical Relationships of Patterns & Trends but needs to explain more and give examples – Skill 4
5. The candidate has misunderstood the argument of MacDonald
6. It is a low level judgement to comment on the historian as a "feminist historian". To critique the source the Candidate should explain why this is significant – Skill 5
7. The Candidate is attempting to evaluate the Historical Relationships of Cause & Effect & Specific & General but needs to explain more and give examples – Skill 4
8. This is a valid critique as the candidate has used one historian to comment on the argument of another historian – Skill 5
9. The candidate is attempting to discuss the Historical Relationship of Cause and Effect. They need to explain the relationship more & use examples – Skill 4
10. This is a weak attempt to critique a source by writing about the "dramatic" writing. The judgement would be better if the Candidate explained why it is important that the author is a "baby-boomer" – Skill 5
11. This is a better critique where the Candidate is judging the writer's argument – Skill 5
12. This is a good critique where the Candidate is comparing and contrasting the argument of two historians in the Paper and explaining their judgement – Skill 5
13. The Candidate structures their paragraphs around key ideas. The key idea here is that turning points are used to construct national identity. The candidate includes lots of key ideas by structuring the article in this way – Skill 1
14. The Candidate is making a very low level judgement here by corroborating an historian's view with a source in the Paper. More explanation is needed to demonstrate an understanding of what Salmond is really saying in the Source – Skill 5
15. The Candidate has identified the Historical Relationship of Past and Present but it needs further explanation – Skill 4
16. The conclusion presents a consistent argument with that developed in the body of the article