

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.

S

93403



SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

# TOP SCHOLAR



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY  
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

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

Tick this box if you  
have NOT written  
in this booklet

## Scholarship 2022 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 (☒). 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.**

Question	Score
ONE	
TWO	
THREE	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

ASSESSOR'S USE ONLY

## INSTRUCTIONS

The materials in the resource booklet contain a variety of historical sources based on a theme:  
**nationalism and race.**

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–H** enable historians to argue that race plays an important role in the shaping of nationalism?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of the theme, nationalism and race
- 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 I–N**, and in particular cause and effect, enable historians to understand the tensions between nationalism and race in the Dreyfus Affair?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of the theme, nationalism and race
- 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 O–Q**, to what extent did race play an important role in shaping our nation in 1920?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of nationalism and race in Aotearoa New Zealand during the early twentieth century
- 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–H enable historians to argue that race plays an important role in the shaping of nationalism?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of the theme, nationalism and race
- 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

- mainly
- Myere - post - col , → culture / ethnicity  
/ identity
- popular sources . → non - white nationalism  
→ Gandhi :
- ① Defns → A , B .
- ② obvious refs . → A : 1870 - 1945 .
- B : hegemony , → C : interwar . → D : Canadians
- ③ present : A : trump , B : anti - antis , → E : the death of racism ?? , → F : nostalgia ??
- ④ H and G - Kanadians
- ⑤ other forces : religion , F1 & F2 history .
- ⑥ mainly

Begin your answer to Question One here:

To first understand the relationship between race and nationalism, we must first define our terms. B gives us a complex understanding of racism by revealing the power structures within: racism 'treated as fixed and biologically determined what is socially constructed' to 'reinfor[e] political and economic control'.

No source defines nationalism, though H describes how we rhetorically see nations as 'imagined communities' and, only 'provisionary'. We might rely on Jerry Porrotti's view that nations are 'aggregates of communities and individuals who are united by a common descent, language, culture, history, and occupying the same geographic area', but Hobson in A thinks 'ethnicity' and 'language' are too 'ambiguous' to provide 'clear-cut criteria for nationhood'. We thus see immediate complexity in what race/racism and nationhood are.

fact

~~These~~ It is an undeniable historical fact that race has shaped (and justified) hegemonic narratives of nationalism in the past. The age of European imperialism in 1870-1914 saw the proliferation of ethno-nationalist

'nationalism' (A), and this turn towards race and away from democracy may be explained in part by ~~by~~ the existence of Empire and 'Colonial Africa' in B.

A and B both obviously refer to the use of ~~in~~ the 'scientific racism' established by such individuals as Walter Bagelst and Herbert Spencer in by regimes (such as Imperialist Japan and Nazi Germany) of

and that espoused 'racial fascism and Nazism'. D ~~says~~ observes ~~that~~ 'racism was endemic in all European societies

in the interwar years' and how the 'myth of the mass rape of German women' by 'black soldiers' represented

'German national humiliation'; and became a galvanising force for the nationalism and fascism of the Nazi regime. Narratives of racism justify a

national identity based off colonial expansion (as this would be <sup>seen as</sup> v simply an assertion of the 'superiority' of European race) and is ~~the corollary~~

of ~~justify~~ are the 'corollary' of policies of 'inclusion' that promoted Fascistic national unity (See C). These

sources also echo Robert ~~writes~~ Miles, who asserted the ideology of racism can be used to define ~~and~~ and justify 'nationalism'. History 93403, 2022

and we must ask if race is still relevant  
7 (or nationalism) today,

However, there are much greater complexities  
in the present with postmodern scepticism  
~~towards nationalism~~, rising populism,  
and seemingly declining and entwined  
racism. The present populist nationalism  
(and its racist implications) are not  
racism in the present day, to A,  
is not a cause of nationalism, but  
an effect of it, which itself is caused  
by 'massive global' economic transformation  
and 'population movements' which 'frighten'  
many and prompt nostalgia for the  
'isolated safety' of nationalism, populism,  
and isolationism. This view, however, is  
challenged by E1, which seems to  
hold that 'the appeal to national  
interests is synonymous to racial  
concerns'; and E2 which holds  
that while 'some argue racism is the  
legacy of an entwined left-wing system  
that disappeared at some point',  
modern populism has 'little to do with  
economics' and has more to do  
with 'ethnic change' - in other words,  
racial anxieties. We might ~~initially~~  
say that E2 is the most reliable out of  
all. While all three sources are  
academic and didactic in nature and  
purpose, B2 is the most recent (French)

while the other sources  
existed before Trump  
and this wave of populism

2019), and thus actually bears witness to the rise of Trumpism and Bolsonarismo. E1 may be a little one-dimensional in its claims, but its focus on 'industrial' points to how 'extremed' racism still affects the present. A may be questioned in this regard - its claim of 'nationalism has become irrelevant' (given Trump's nationalism) is clearly untrue and its economic focus may be due to the Marxist influence of Eric Hobsbawm, who is cited. Yet A is corroborated by H in their shared sense of 'national identity crisis'.

Modern race, and nationalism, are states complex in large part because ~~nations~~ are often multi contain multiple ethnic groups, and minority conceptions of race often differ to traditional, hegemonic white nationalist views. A notes how minorities such as 'French Canadians', 'Zulu South Africans' and other groups are pulled in separate directions by ~~secess~~ 'secessionist' and 'ethnic leaders' and 'national leaders' who aim to get them to identify with 'the larger political entity'. Nationalism, then, has more tense relationships with racism - if nations are not homogeneous, we must ask which races are the dominant ones, and we

must consider the effects of separatist minority nationalism (see Catalonia's independence, Black nationalism in 1960s USA). ~~and~~ Indeed B states how minority conceptions of race can powerfully oppose homogenous notions of nationalism; or the 'reverse discourse' of Minorities (see Black pride) can 'emphasise distance from other groups' and resist <sup>(white)</sup> nationalist notions.

Finally, we must acknowledge the range of other forces shaping nationalism - namely religion and history. C asserts 'Protestantism lay at the core of British national identity', and how 'religion was the crucial unifying force in most nations within Europe as outside it'.

While C is limited by its focus on '1707 - 1837' and nation-building, its status as an academic source make it reliable for that period. F1 and F2 focus on the role of history, not race while F1 implicitly acknowledges a link between 'ethnicity ~~and~~ or nationalism', both F1 and F2 share the sentiment that ~~history~~ 'history is the raw material for nationalist or ethnic... ideologies'.

Conclusion: The sources corroborate each other at 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 I–N**, and in particular cause and effect, enable historians to understand the tensions between nationalism and race in the Dreyfus Affair?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of the theme, nationalism and race
- 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

- ① cause & effect → natl & race
  - ↳ J: AS, M2: "spread"
  - ↑ AS → 1290. K.
- ② diff persp → societal fragmentation
  - ↳ N: complex.
  - ↳ L + M2 → change. A. Smith
  - ↳ J: Brown
- ③ patterns & trends → broad AS
  - ↳ M2. M1, M2, N,
- ④ cont / dyn / past / pres.
  - ↳ I1: temporal
  - ↳ I2: intercultural
  - ↳ M2: has changed ...

Begin your answer to Question Two here:

Sources I - N provide a broad view of how nationalism and race caused the conviction of Dreyfus, and how the effects of the conviction still reverberate today through the historical relationships.

It is clear that Anti-semitism, French nationalism, and national pride all conspired to work towards ~~Dreyfus~~ Dreyfus' conviction. It is very clear that Dreyfus' conviction is a specific ~~example~~ effect of the general cause of the anti-semitism and anxiety around French national pride.

I writes how journalist Edouard Drumont had 'crystallised a new kind of prejudice against France's Jewish minority'. Of course, the general pattern of European anti-semitism is nothing new and continues for centuries - Jewish people were persecuted by ~~the~~ accusations of Blood Libel as early as 1144 in England and were still notably massacred in the Holocaust of the 1940s, where 6 million died. Dreyfus I also writes how Dreyfus' conviction was ~~due to~~ 

anxieties over French caused by <sup>12</sup> nationalism. In one sense, it was a reaction against the drastic change of 'republican principles of liberty and equality' thought to be 'leading the country to waste'. In another, it miles how 'the army was above politics... it was the greatness of France'. We might wonder if the French nostalgia for the Napoleon<sup>c. 1806</sup>'s greatness of the recent past as well as French present anxiety over the rise of Bismarck's Prussia (and later Germany) in the 1860s with drift victories over France and Austria - being just part of a general anxiety over French military and national power that caused <sup>presumed</sup> the army (and public sentiment as evidenced by Drumont's book) to specifically lash out against Dreyfus.

The causes of the Dreyfus affair ~~were~~ are ~~constitute~~ a part of a pattern of anti-Semitism and other societal movements. Both M1 and M2 note the anti-Semitism that caused the Dreyfus Affair is not an isolated trend, but a pattern that continues across ~~History~~ — History — G

part of the same pattern of fascist/nationalist/racist thought that made Vichy France 'compliant' (m1) and that also led to 'French nationalism and fascism' (m2).

~~This pattern of nationalist and racist thought~~ However, the Dreyfus Affair also is ~~caused by~~ caused by a pattern is not only caused by an individual trend in concern over race and nationalism, but a pattern of concern about wider France - about the ~~different~~ <sup>concerns over</sup> perspectives of 'anti-clericalism and anti-militarism, xenophobia and chauvinism, socialism and an aversion to the fear of foreign enemies' that all provided as an <sup>volatile</sup> environment where Dreyfus could be convicted, causing massive societal fragmentation and outcry.

The Dreyfus affair had a wide range of effect on nationalism and race, expressed in the multitude of differing perspectives. It is debatable how the Jewish community saw in the Affair the implications for their own safety (and the prevalence of <sup>racist</sup> ~~racist~~ <sup>presentism</sup> against them) - Theodore Herzl 'concluded' that Jews could never <sup>become</sup> truly accepted



In predominantly Christian countries' and thus supported 'an independent Jewish state'. This underscores the complex effect of the Dreyfus Affair ~~it prompted~~ on nationalism and race - the Zionism it sparked was a direct response to racist persecution, and the need to avoid such ~~persecute~~ persecution ~~sparked~~ ~~in large~~ in large part fuelled the desire for the new nation-state of Israel. It describes a differing Jewish perspective from dominant French ones. It also describes how the Dreyfus Affair had differing impacts on groups with differing perspectives. Some were delighted to ... attack the privileged military establishment, others believed sincerely in a 'Jewish conspiracy', and others still used 'jealousy' of Jews and were 'inclined' to 'suffe the discomforts of military service'. These differing perspectives of the French nation and the Jewish race all saw their views affected differently by the Dreyfus affair - for example those who were skeptical of French militaristic nationalism and anti-Semitism to use emboldened to attack what they saw as injustice. It describes how the Affair had the effect of 'shift[ing]'.

the Jewish Dreyfus was persecuted, yet the values of 'egalitarianism and universalism'. Anthony Smith wrote early nationalism espoused.

Finally, these while these is historical continuity in <sup>part</sup> anti-Semitism, ~~these~~ the present has change to (at least pretend to be) more egalitarian.

(1) describes how 'our understanding of how Anti-semitism was involved'

has 'changed' from then ~~sits~~ in the past to now in the present with modern historiography. Indeed, ~~was~~ the ~~Dreyfus Affair~~ while the army continues to feel military (and nationalist) 'shame' (as I2) on Dreyfus, societal notions of Dreyfus have 'changed' to make him a 'neglected hero of France'. Indeed, ~~but~~ the <sup>present</sup> narrative around Dreyfus has changed to suit present needs - his eventual pardoning is seen as a 'triumph of "humanist" values of respect and tolerance' & and an affirmation of how the present French nation has changed to become more racially egalitarian and tolerant. This effect of the Dreyfus affair on promoting a non-racist national identity may be 'poor history', but suits present needs and perspectives - it is 'good rhetoric' & promotes a modern sense of French pride.

### QUESTION THREE

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

Using Sources O–Q, to what extent did race play an important role in shaping our nation in 1920?

Your answer must include:

- a convincing argument substantiated by a combination of material from the resource booklet and your own knowledge of nationalism and race in Aotearoa New Zealand during the early twentieth century
- an insightful and detailed understanding of this period.

#### PLANNING

- \* NZ was white.
  - 1881 census → 1899 IRA,
  - 1902 IRAA,
- \* NZ felt Gallipoli – kia & smelar
  - ↳ JJ → pride
  - ↳ 1902 → more pride { but colonised { important imp. nation
- \* Staging magnified
  - ↳ P3
- \* racism
  - PS, P1 → white
  - orientalist → other
  - positive
  - OS have, Q. here &
  - British → 2, 02
- \* magnified → race
  - P3, P4, P6.
  - land cont
    - assimilation → 67 native school
    - 1903 etc.

Begin your answer to Question Three here:

While New Zealand's founding with the Treaty of Waitangi acknowledges Māori people ~~as~~ as a vital part of our nation, 1920s NZ ~~national~~<sup>racial</sup> identity was white and British, and our national identity was primarily shaped by racism. While Māori fought side-by-side with Pākehā they remained marginalised. In 1920 ~~we might conclude~~ NZ identity was mostly shaped by racism, with inescapable undertones of race.

New Zealand maintained a white racial identity: in 1881 we passed the Chinese Immigration Act levying a tax on Chinese immigrants, and ~~in~~ the 1899 Immigration Restrictions Act and the 1920 Amendment both prohibited the entry of non-white people into New Zealand. This is the racial context we must view our sources through.

New Zealand's greatest nationalist influence in 1920 was the recent ~~war~~ First World War. OI is a poster commemorating the sacrifice of the ANZACs at Gallipoli, and ~~it's~~ it is very useful as it is made by NZ soldiers, evoking a sense of national pride that the common man / soldier had that arose from ~~the~~

Our contribution clearly was O2  
 notes how there was a 'wind  
 knowledge of what ANZAC Day means'  
 one other British holidays, and a  
 nationalist identification with the national  
 anthem'. As Michael Kay and Robert  
 Sinclair point out, NZ's identity  
 was forged at ~~Gallipoli~~ Gallipoli war, not  
 race, was what sparked the rise in nationalism  
~~in 1920. The nationalism of 1920 would not exist without WW2~~  
 However, if there is any racial influence (white  
 in our identity, it was British, ~~we~~ <sup>Māori</sup> always  
 not Māori. O2 notes ~~about~~ present.  
 about the privileges and duties of  
 being British' and both the posters  
 in O1 and O2 have the Union  
 Jack, and the Union Jack was  
 saluted in 1920 in schools every week.  
 New Zealand racial and national identity  
 was closely tied to Britishness,  
 and our nascent national identity  
 in the war could be argued to  
 really be British identity - ~~as well as~~  
 a sort of 'imperial nationalism'  
 (in Michael Belgrave's words) as we  
 fought for 'Empire', not NZ.

That is not to say, however, that  
 Māori racial identity had no *l*

place in Ngā conceptions of national identity; for Pākehā and Māori fought together in WWI and Ngā had always had an awareness of a status (in part exemplified by Te Tiriti and the giving Māori the vote). Out of the almost 99,000 New Zealanders who served in WWI, many thousands were Māori, and Māori warata (e.g. for example, 'Poharekau Aro') became part of the found of our nation. This formed a strong bond as 'the two races fought side by side as comrades' (PS), and war increased Pākehā respect for Māori. Indeed, Māori culture was partially embraced - both Q1 and Q have # the Māori 'Ko Haere Mai' and P1 alludes to Tu-mata-uewa to encourage Māori participation in the war (and politicians like Māori Pōmare and Apirana Ngata encouraged Māori to enlist too).

Nevertheless, P1, Q1, and Q to all have a sense of cultural appropriation. Otherly - what Edward Said called 'Orientalism'. The purpose of all three sources is not to respect Māori in themselves, (and thus to fully and genuinely) embrace Māori.

racial identity in the Māori nation), but to use Māori culture as a tool to advance Pakeha aims. P1 especially others the Māori soldier, feeding into narratives that Māori are brute and aggressive (it is notable that P1 is the mask of a white man, and thus the racism within the art work and is a reflection of problematic 1920 NZ when Māori could not even draw their own propaganda). Thus, we might say that while NZ national identity was always conscious of Māori racial identity (and this was strengthened by the war), Māori identity was always subservient to British aims (recruitment for the Imperial war of WWI, welcoming the Prince of Wales and so forth).

Indeed, our treatment of Māori seemed in large part to be ignorant of the injustices they suffered and marginalised Māori. P2 juxtaposes against P3: while returning Pakeha veterans were given land as 'soldier settlement[s]' (P2), Pakeha viewed Māori as 'not good farmers' and denied ~~the~~ Māori veterans land (P3). Thus, the

Closeness developed though was still  
gave way to latent racism and  
marginalisation. To add insult to  
injury, Pg 4 notes how 'Māori had  
provided' land for soldier settlers as  
'3 1.4 million hectares - passed out  
of Māori hands' 1910 - 1930. Indeed,  
this is a continuation of the land  
confiscation in the Land Wars 1845-1872  
and facilitated by the 1862 Native  
Lands Act and 1865 Native Land  
Cont'd. This confiscation was still  
glorified in 1920 - Pg the memorial  
in Pg ~~glorified~~ praised the 'brave men'  
of the 'imperial and colonial forces'  
in the 'New Zealand Wars'. While  
the memorial is an ~~over~~ incredible  
source (the 'Victor's League' can be  
seen to be clearly pro-imperialist  
by their name alone), and the  
1926 Sun Committee did find  
land was unjustly taken from  
Taranaki Māori, 1920 ~~as~~ by and  
large ignored these concerns.  
Indeed, it might be more accurate  
to say ~~as~~ national identity was  
not shaped Māori race, but by  
the lack thereof. The Native  
Schools Act of 1867 and the  
[contd pg 23]

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

①

and echo Patrick Henry who sees academic study and history as the first stage of nationalist identity development. These sources are thus very reliable and useful, and assert that race is not as important as history, or in the very least, must be expressed through history to form national identity.

complex.

We must acknowledge the narratives omitted in the past A-H. A-H are all academic, and thus provide little ~~less~~ insight and less useful to provide ~~had~~ insight into the lived experience of someone experiencing racism and nationalism as a popular source or of a citizen in ~~the~~ the past as popular sources would be. A-H do not clearly define ethnicity, a term repeated throughout, and do not distinguish between it and race. A-H are also highly Eurocentric, written all by Anglophone academics. This ignores the emancipatory nature of post-colonial nationalism, where Julius Nyerere's assertion of <sup>as non-European countries</sup> such as Anthony Smith in A and David Cannadine in H

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

Panzanian nationhood <sup>and racial identity</sup> v/s Gandhi's assertion of Indian nationhood <sup>and race</sup> v/s explicitly anti-racist and anti-imperialist. Nyerel wrote how 'no people can make decisions for any other people'.

(3) prohibition of Te Reo in school by 1903 contributed to a precipitous decline in Te Reo and Maori culture, and assimilationist policy aimed to eliminate Maori culture and ethnicity. While the <sup>extinction</sup> of Rataua (P4), and Te Koti <sup>at Mangapoehi</sup> and <sup>had</sup> the Maori nationalism of King tangi aimed to provide resistance, the broad and assert Maori identity (and separate & use <sup>separate</sup> ~~separate~~) in the case of Te Koti), the broad sweep of society marginalised Maori.

Races NZ in 1920 was primarily shaped by war. Race links with war and plays several roles. First, New Zealand adopted a <sup>white</sup> ~~as~~ policy

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

in terms of immigration and Maori assimilation. Second, Ng felt still felt quite racially, culturally and politically British ('the Britain of the South Seas' with our rule over Samoa and Niue). Third, while Maori identity was necessarily recognised, Maori as a whole were still marginalised with ongoing unaddressed (and less, little) recognition in terms of soldier settlements, and orientalist caricatures in media.