

No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material
may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose
of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

S

93403



934030

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

 +

TOP SCHOLAR



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 PULL OUT
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.

PLANNING

NB: Marxist view of history
not relevant,

- a force in its own right - ideological - ~~A~~ C, E
continuing? - actual

- a force in how it was used, deliberately or otherwise, to
change or limit other movements

B

- Ideological import: I, S, H

- Success of implementation - note that Marxism ≠ communism
G, I, E (inherent flaws) legalitarianism, "of
poverty"

- its use in impacting other movements

B

* we can understand that he is
aptly summing up the potency of
communist ideology.

Begin your answer to Question One here:

Communism was undoubtedly an important historical force, which had far reaching impacts throughout the 20th Century especially. However, historical narratives differ as to the extent of this impact. To some extent, sources A-I enable historians to understand this impact, ^{most importantly} describing the enticing nature of communist ideology, as well as the import and manipulation of anticommunist forces on other movements. However, many of the sources are limited when discussing the actual impact of its implementation; in incorrectly equating communism to Marxism, these sources can underestimate the unique impact of communist regimes on humanity.

Perhaps the ~~most~~^{most} significant extent to which various narrative's communicate communism's importance is through the movement's ideological impact. Communism was notable for offering an alternative to communism at a time when many people were struggling with capitalism; as social and economic struggles continue, so too will a call for a better way of organising society. In ideology, at least, Marxism and Communism can be equated, as the latter was inspired by the goals of the former. So when Shapiro in source F writes that "Marxism persists in the intellectual consciousness of the West... because for all its failures, it articulates criticisms of the present and aspirations for the future." Shapiro limits his conclusion by referring only to the West, when communism and those who seek similar solutions to society are global issues. However, he aptly sums up the heart of just how important communist ideology was to history; Marxist analysis of class struggle was notable to thousands of people, especially in periods such as the Great Depression which appealed to

prove communism's failure. Many people wanted an easy solution, and communism, through all the isolation and censorship in communist states, was able to appear to outsiders as this solution. These same issues of economic inequality remain, but from source H we may conclude that pure communist ideology likely will not return. Evans in source H points to the modern prevalence of intersectionality in social issues: "new kinds of conflict based on gender, ethnicity, religion or sectional orientation ... seem more urgent." While he does not acknowledge the continuing economic struggles which lead to socialist movements, he does make clear that faith in communism collapsed with the Soviet Union in 1991, and new social issues result in new movements. Thus these sources allow historians to understand the huge importance of communist ideology, but also the likely end of this ideology's prevalence in modern society.

To some extent, these sources also enable us to understand how communism and its backlash impacted other social and political movements in society. While communism was a significant historical force in its own right, it was also important for how its backlash sparked nationalist movements, and how it fed and grew other socialist movements across the globe. Source C does perhaps exaggerate this impact: Sofroniou uses grandiose and perhaps perhaps subjective language when he claims communism to be "a philosophy of history a critical analysis of socialist doctrines and a passionate call to revolutionary action". Communism never managed to achieve Marx's ultimate goal where "workers of the world" would "unite". Yet Sofroniou ~~does~~ hints at communism's true

import in sparking debate and analysis. The backlash of capitalist nations to communism was hugely important to history; most infamously the McCarthy Era and Cold War altered global relations, with remnants of this global import still seen in USA-Russia relations and groups such as NATO, a Cold War alliance. In New Zealand, Taonui in source B accurately describes how anticommunism was manipulated for colonial gain, with the Maori system of collective land ownership enabling claims of "hostile communism", or that this system was "the main barrier to assimilation". Through this source, we are able to get a sense of how communism was an ~~organizer~~ important cultural and political force, because it was so polarising and relevant that its implementers invariably altered other movements.

Finally, these sources are somewhat limited in explaining the importance of communism as a social and economic force. For one thing, by equating Marxist doctrine to the practical implementation of communism, they negate both the inherent flaws of communism and the import of individual leaders on such. In every case, Marxist doctrine was altered or held selectively by leaders to fit unique policy aims or the situation of a country. Marx never intended for communism to occur in countries which had not yet undergone industrialisation; he accurately predicted that this would result in the "egalitarianism of poverty" - and in Russia the USSR and China millions died of famine for this very reason. Further, as source Z implies but does not entirely explain, Marx predicted that the state would whither away, but in reality the unique one-party state

and centralised economy enabled a totalitarian control by a dictator. Shapiro describes the result as "a dictatorship of the proletariat by the vanguard party", referring to a ^{purely} ^{Leninist} idea that rather than the workers overthrowing the state, the masses would be led by intellectuals, the 'vanguard of the proletariat'. This is an accurate summary, but Shapiro's source becomes weaker for not explaining the result. In terms of importance to history, it cannot be discounted that millions died under communism, that millions more were living under a culture of fear led by a dictator such as Stalin or Mao, or even Lenin, who regularly called for the mass murder of those who did not agree. In source G Fitzpatrick quotes Hobsbawm when he ~~wrote~~ wrote that "one third of humanity" was living under Soviet-inspired systems; the resultant human cost shows an importance of communism to history that these sources should better explain.

In conclusion, communism had a significant impact which to some extent is ~~covertly~~ communicated through these sources. Its ideological impact was widespread at the time, although less prevalent now. Its backlash and role in shaping other movements was significant, creating the foundations of other ideologies. Its actual impact on the lives of people is underestimated.

cause effect
pattern trend
general specific

hist. perspectives
change continuity
10

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

- impact on people's lives / culture → specific & general
books/firms/people → whole culture.

L1&2, ~~DK~~

- impact on politics → ~~order~~ specific & general

N - ruined the left

O - fear mongering enabled the right

- impact today ... ~~changed~~ / pattern & trend
~~continuity~~, what does it say abt US culture

Q5

Begin your answer to Question Two here:

McCarthyism in post-WWII was one of the most infemous effects of communism and the Cold War, and spoke to the ability of anti-communist movements to spread paranoia and disproportionate social change. Specific and general is the most important historical relationship to explain the event's complexities: as the chasing of communism in media and politics spread across the nation's culture at large, and specific ^{anti-communist policy} ~~individuals represented~~ made general ~~societal~~ political impacts. Also relevant is patterns and trends, enabling historians to understand the wider social and political implications of ~~the~~ McCarthyism on the USA.

The most significant historical relationship, specific and general, enables historians to understand the effect of McCarthyism on American culture. In Source L it is demonstrated how specific parts of American society were targeted, especially films and media. The idea that communism was an insidious force, capable of indoctrinating Americans through media, was pervasive; in L2 we can see how Hollywood content and financials were purported to support communism. These specific fears, that television was "poisoning the minds of children", represent a much more general social issue: the fear Americans had of communist invasion, and also their willingness to believe ~~these~~ extremist ideas when they played on such fears. McCarthyism predominantly affected the entertainment industry and the government, yet the very public nature of these industries, and the way in which these attacks were made, ensured a very public response which

affected the entire country. The propaganda however, for example, was directed ~~and~~ at children and younger people^{*}. The distress of a few people became the extremist fear of invasion. By considering McCarthyism through the relationship of specific and general, we can understand the 'butterfly effect' which had a disproportionate impact on the culture of the USA both during and after this period.

Similarly, the relationship of specific and general enables us to understand the wider impact of McCarthyism on the American political landscape. In source N, Shrecker writes that "The most obvious casualty was the American left. By this they mean that the fears of external communist infiltration immediately corresponded to a more general fear of the left-wing. The paranoia of McCarthyism was such that any support of a left wing idea would result in the label 'communist'; and the immediate assumption that such a belief was treasonous, anti-American, and went against the values of the nation. Subsequently, the left wing of American politics struggled to avoid such labels and the immediate loss of support a 'communist' label would mean. Finally, the right-wing was able to play into this paranoia: In source O, Tonenhaus writes that "McCarthy's themes, betrayal and disloyalty, were precisely those exploited by [the] Republican Party". While the Red Scare in 1918 (following the Russian Revolution and communist coup) demonstrated that Americans were anti-communist, the ~~Democratic~~ ^{Democratic} government was nonetheless able to win 'five consecutive presidential elections from 1932 to 1968' - and this demonstrates that only with the paranoia and 'melodrama'

of McCarthyist policies was the right-wing able to actively label their opponents as connected to communism. This extremist paranoia is what enabled specific fears and ideas to impact American politics at large.

Finally, by considering patterns and trends historians can understand how the susceptibility of the American people to McCarthyism represents a social issue that continues to factor into politics today. Source Q, by Tye, draws connections between McCarthy and prior political figures who exhibited similar ^{demagogic} ability to manipulate public opinion - and turn to modern-day Trump. The obvious pattern here is not just a connection between right-wing leaders, but rather the response of the American people to extremist claims by such political figures. In Source S, Patterson describes the various people who supported McCarthyism: low-class or minority groups who resented the elites, Catholics or other religious people who hated communism for its atheism or 'godlessness', as well as those who supported Republican ideals. The scope of McCarthy's supporters demonstrates primarily the tendency of people to seek easy solutions and scapegoats. Rather than face up to social and political issues, people under McCarthyism were able to blame everything on communist infiltration. This same attitude is visible today - Trump supporters claim similar conspiracies, blaming or election loss on fraud and several criminal charges on left-wing manipulation. The pattern of this attitude demonstrates to historians not just why McCarthyism was so potent, but also why its study remains crucial today.

In conclusion, the most McCarthyist era in post-WWII America was a complex event best understood through the lens of specific and general, demonstrating how specific anti-communist ideas and actions had far-reaching impacts on American society and politics. In addition, the relationship of patterns and trends allows historians to understand the wider social reasoning which enabled the scope of McCarthyism, and why similar leaders reuse success even today. McCarthyism was perhaps the clearest example of how communism had a global influence, as its backlash significantly impacted Western society.

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

- domestic - enabled workers measures under the excuse of communism. T, U1
 - Māori relations - U1

- foreign - more involvement than prior
 X - more actively taking a side
 BUT this was not solely due to communism

* strict censorship forbade the strikers from promoting their cause.

Begin your answer to Question Three here:

To some extent, fear of communism contributed to both domestic and foreign policy. Communism in New Zealand (NZ) was very minimal - it had relatively little impact. Rather, the fear of communism was encouraged in NZ and used by National government to further other political goals. Internationally, the Cold War created new treaties and global fears of a communist threat - but in NZ specifically, other factors contributed to our shifting foreign policy alongside fears of communism.

The most significant impact on domestic policy was the draconian measures taken by the National government against the 151-day Watersiders strike. In this instant, ~~communism~~ communism did not drive the strikers; rather, this label was used in order to justify a harsher response. The National government in the 1950s followed a long rule of Labour, meaning that the trade unions were stronger than National prepared. The Watersiders strike, as Yvonne writes in Source T1, enabled National PM to "demoralise the watersiders as part of the 'Red Peril'". The government was unusually harsh on the striking strikers: aiding those workers even as indirectly as giving food to their children was a criminal offence, and the union's leader Tom Barnes was eventually imprisoned in Mt Eden jail. This was only possible because they played on the public's fear of communism - although as the strikers were not connected to any real communist causes, it seems unlikely that the government had any real fear of communist infiltration. Rather, they leant into this idea to garner public support. Thus, the fear of communism

Continued to but did not cause the uniquely harsh domestic policy against the Watersiders strike.

The domestic ~~pol~~ policy towards Māori from 1950 - 1954 can be only indirectly linked to fears of communism. While historically Pakeha have maintained that Māori collective land ownership is akin to communism and ~~therefore~~ should be stopped, there is little evidence that ~~the~~ this ideology was behind what Hill in Source VI calls "a government with no Māori support in Parliament". Rather, this seems connected only to the National Government's priorities of developing land over Māori relations. The fear of communism, then, can only be linked indirectly through its role in putting National in charge in the first place. As Source VI clearly shows, National actively campaigned using anti-communist propaganda, using New Zealanders' fear of communism to back their party over Labour, and exaggerating NZ's significance to the Cold War. As a result, one could argue that all National domestic policy at the time was indirectly tied to fear of communism. This, however, demonstrates how minimal communism was in NZ - in many ways it did not impact NZ domestic policy, as plenty of other political and social movements did at the time. Thus through the domestic policy towards Māori, historians can conclude that the fear of communism only partially contributed to NZ domestic policy during this time, but did not shape it.

Finally, the fear of communism contributed in some ways to NZ foreign policy from 1950 - 54, but again other factors were also prevalent. This time period marked a slight step away from NZ's close relationship with Britain, and much closer relationships with the USA and Australia. Source X describes the Manila Treaty and the ANZUS treaty; ~~also, signed onto~~ the South East Asia Treaty Organisation, SEATO. In fact, fear of communism ~~and~~ contributed to these shifts in policy, as the threat of Cold War made many nations anxious to tighten security against communist attack. However, NZ's biggest ~~drives~~ in this decision was the realisation in WWII that Britain was too far away to give aid to New Zealand in the instance of another attack. At the time, many did fear that any next attack would be communist - but ANZUS was actually designed with a Japanese threat in mind, and became anti-communist only later. SEATO, however, was explicitly anticommunist. In these various treaties and shifts in foreign relations, it is clear that the fear of communist attack did permeate most foreign policy in NZ, but especially between 1950 - 1954 it was not the only nor even the most important factor.

In conclusion, fear of communism impacted NZ's ~~foreign and domestic~~ policy to some extent. Most significantly these fears were utilised by the National government to gain support and justify harsher measures. It did not shape all domestic policy under ~~with~~ National rule in the

way that it changed policies in other Western democratic countries. Rather, its biggest contribution to NZ domestic policy can be defined as the ways in which it created more National Party support. Overall, it was one of a few factors which caused NZ foreign policy to shift.

QUESTION
NUMBER

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

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

QUESTION
NUMBER

QUESTION
NUMBER

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

93403