

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



934030

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	
TOTAL	

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

intro

→ Myer's - post-col, → culture/ethnicity / identity

→ popular sources.

→ non-white nationalism
→ Gandhi:

① Defn → A, B.

② obvious rels.

↳ A: 1870-1945.

↳ B: hegemony,

↳ D: interwar.

④ H and G → Canadians

nationalism
broader

③

present: A: triumph

F2: the death of

F1: nostalgia

B: French entities

⑤ other focus

religion,

F1 & F2 history.

⑥ intro

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 'reinforce[] political and economic control'. No source defines nationalism, though H describes how we increasingly see nations as 'imagined communities' and only 'provisionary'. We might rely on Jerry Brooker'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
~~There~~ 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-linguistic

'nationalism' (A), and this turn towards race and away from democracy may be explained in part by the existence of Empire and 'Colonial Africa' in B. A and B both obviously refer to the use of ~~the~~ the 'scientific racism' established by such individuals as Walter Bagehot and Herbert Spencer in by regimes (such as Imperialist Japan and Nazi Germany), ~~of~~ and that espoused 'racial fascism and Nazism'. D ~~just~~ 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 ^{seen as} simply an assertion of the 'superiority' of European race) and ~~is the 'corollary'~~ of ~~justifying~~ are the 'corollary' of policies of 'inclusion' that promoted Fascist national unity (B & C). These sources ~~are~~ echo Robert Miles, who asserted 'the ideology of racism can be used to define and justify nationalism'.

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

However, there are much greater complexities in the present with ~~postmodern~~ ~~skepticism~~ towards ~~nationalism~~, rising populism, ~~se~~ and seemingly declining and outmoded 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 agree racism is the legacy of an outmoded belief 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, racist 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, E2 is the most recent (from

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

2019), and thus actually bears witness
to the rise of Trumpism and Bolsonaroism.
E1 may be a little one-dimensional
in its claims, but its focus on 'nostalgia'
points to how 'outmoded' racism still
affects the present. A may be
questioned in this regard - its claim
of 'nationalism has become irrelevant'
is clearly untrue ^(given Trumpist nationalism) 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 ~~the~~ national
'identity crisis'.

Force often challenges nationalism.
Modern race, and nationalism, are states
complex in large part because ~~states~~
~~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
~~several~~ 'secessionist' and 'ethnic
leaders' and 'national leaders' who
aim to get them to identify with 'the
larger political entity'. Nationalism, then
has a more tenuous relationship
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 Catalanian independence, Black nationalism in 1960s USA). ~~and~~ so indeed B states how minority conceptions of race can powerfully oppose homogeneous notions of nationalism: or the 'erese discourse' of Minorities (see Black pride) can 'emphasise distance from other groups' and resist ^(white) nationalist notions.

Finally, we must ~~acknowledge~~ 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~~ its status as an academic source makes 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} ~~it~~ and F2 share the sentiment that ~~history~~ 'history is the raw material for nationalist or ethnic... ideologies'. ~~echoing Pat~~ The sources corroborate each other.

[cont'd 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: "spontaneous"

AS → 1290. K

② diff persp → societal fragmentation

→ v: complex.

→ L + M2 → change. A. Smith

③ J: transition
patterns & trends → broad AS
M1, M2, v,

④ cont / change / past / pres.

I1: triumphalism

I2: matter and.

M2: has changed...

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

Sources 1-N provide a broad view of how nationalism and race caused the conviction of Dreyfus, and how the effects of the conviction still resonate 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 anxieties around French national pride.

I notes 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 notes how Dreyfus' conviction was ~~due to~~

anxieties over ¹² French
caused by 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, K writes how 'the
army was above politics... it was
the greatness of France'. We might
wonder if ~~the~~ French nostalgia for
the Napoleonic greatness of the
recent past ('c. 1806) as well as French
present anxiety over the rise of
Bismarck's Prussia (and later Germany)
in the 1860s with swift victories
over France and Austria - Hungary
were part of a general anxiety over
French military and national power that
~~prompted~~ ^{caused} 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~~ are 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

part of the same pattern of fascist/nationalist /racist thought that made Vichy France 'complicit' (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 a ~~pattern~~ is not only caused by an individual trend in concerns over race and nationalism, but a pattern of concerns about wider France - ~~about the differing perspectives of~~ 'anti-clericalism and anti militarism, xenophobia and chauvinism, socialism and anarchism, the fear of foreign armies' that 'all provided a ^{volatile} environment where Dreyfus could be convicted, causing massive societal fragmentation and outrage.

The Dreyfus affair had a wide range of effects on nationalism and race, expressed in the multitude of differing perspectives. It describes how the Jewish community saw in the Affair the implications for their own safety (and the prevalence of ^{racist} persecution against them) - Theodor Herzl 'conclude[d] that Jews could never ^{be} truly accepted

in predominantly Christian countries' and thus supported 'an independent Jewish state'. This underscores the complex effect of the Dreyfus Affair ~~it prompt~~ 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. ~~Also~~ I 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 were 'jealous' of Jews and were 'reluctant' to 'suffer 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~~ were emboldened to attack what they saw as injustice. I describes how the Affair had the effect of 'shifting'

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

Finally, ~~there~~ while there is historical continuity in ^{part} anti-Semitism, ~~there~~ the present has change to (at least pretend to be) more egalitarian.

M2 describes how 'our understanding of how ~~the~~ anti-Semitism was involved' has 'changed' from then ~~into~~ in the past to now in the present with modern historiography. Indeed, ~~now~~ ~~the~~ ~~Dreyfus Affair~~ while the army continues to feel military (and nationalist) 'shame' (p. 12) our Dreyfus, societal notions of Dreyfus have 'changed' to make him a 'neglected hero of France'. Indeed, ~~but~~ the ^{present} 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' and 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 ~~WTA~~ ~~WTA~~ →

1899 IPA,
1920 IRAA

* NZ felt Challenged — key & smelaw

→ 01 → pride

→ 02 → more pride

} but ~~colonial~~ imp.
the ~~people~~ nation

* ~~Māori marginalised~~
→ P3

* Māori moved.

* P5, P1 → white

orientalist → othered,
+ placating

* 01 haere, Q. here

301 ~~Antich~~ → 2, 02

* marginalised → race
P3, P4, P6.

→ Land Court
→ 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 ~~to be~~ as a vital part of our nation, 1920s NZ ~~national~~ ^{racial} identity was white and British, and our national identity was primarily shaped by war. While Māori fought side-by-side with Pakeha they remained marginalised in 1920. ^{we might conclude} NZ identity was mostly shaped by war, 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 Restriction 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 ~~as~~ it is very useful as it is made by NZ soldiers, evoking a sort of national pride that the common man / soldier had that arose from

our contribution during war. O2
 writes how there was a 'wired
 knowledge of what ANZAC Day means'
 over other British holidays, and a
 nationalist identification with the national
 anthem'. As Michael King and Robert
 Sinelav point out, NZ's identity
 was forged at Gallipoli - war, not
 race, was what sparked the rise in nationalism
 in 1920. The nationhood of 1920 would not exist without WW1
 However, if there is any racial influence
 in our identity, it was British,
 not Māori. O2 writes ~~about~~
 about the privileges and duties of
 being British' and both the posters
 in O1 and Q have the Union
 Jack, and the Union Jack was
 saluted in 1920 NZ schools every week.
 New Zealand racial and national identity
 was ~~the~~ closely tied to Britishness,
 and our nascent national identity
 in the war could be argued to
 really be British identity - ~~sort of~~
 a sort of 'imperial nationalism'
 (in Michael Belgrave's words) as we
 fought for 'Empire', not NZ.

White
Māori
were
always
present.

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

place in NZ conceptions of national identity; for Pākehā and Māori fought together in WWI and NZ had always had an awareness of Māori (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, 'Pōkarekare Anu') became part of the sound of our nation. This formed a strong bond as 'the two races fought side by side as comrades' (PS), and increased Pākehā respect for Māori. Indeed, Māori culture was partially embraced - both OI and Q have ~~the~~ the Māori 'Hae Haere Mai' and P1 alludes to Tū-mata-uenga to encourage Māori participation in the war (and politicians like Māui Pōmare and Apirana Ngata encouraged Māori to enlist too). Nevertheless, P1, OI, and Q to all have a sense of cultural appropriation, othering - 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 NZ 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 ~~it~~ P1 is the work 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), ~~the~~ Māori identity was always subservient to British aims (recruitment for the Imperial war of WW1, 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 ~~them~~ Māori veterans land (P3). ~~It~~ Thus, the

closeness developed though war still
 gave way to latent racism and
 marginalisation. To add insult to
 injury, P4 writes 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
 Court. This confiscation was still
 glorified in 1920 - P6 the memorial
 in P6 ~~glorified~~ praised the 'brave men'
 of the 'imperial and colonial forces'
 in the 'New Zealand Wars'. While
 the memorial is an ~~open~~ unreliable
 source (the 'Victoria 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 is by and
 large ignored these concerns.
 Indeed, it might be more accurate
 to say NZ national identity was
 not shaped Māori race, but by
 the lack thereof. The Native
 Schools Act of 1867 and the
 [Contd p23]



Extra space if required.

Write the question number(s) if applicable.

QUESTION
NUMBER

①

and echo Patrick Henry ~~about~~ 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~~ are less useful to provide ~~the~~ 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, ^{in non-European countries} where Julius Nyerere's assertion of ^{such as Anthony Bonthe} and David Cannadine A-H

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

QUESTION
NUMBER

Tanzanian nationhood ^{and racial identity} or Gandhi's assertion of Indian nationhood ^{and race} were explicitly anti-racist and anti-imperialist. Nyere wrote how 'no people must make decisions for any other people'.

- (3) prohibition of Te Reo in school by 1903 contributed to a precipitous decline in Te Reo and Māori culture, and assimilationist policy aimed to eliminate Māori culture and ethnicity. While the existence of Ratana (P4), and Te Kōwhiri ^{at Mangapō} and the Māori nationalism of King Tāwhiao aimed to provide resistance, ~~the~~ ^{and} ~~even separatist~~ ^{and} assert Māori identity (even separatist a more separatist in the case of Te Kōwhiri), the broad sweep of society marginalized Māori.

Race NZ in 1920 was primarily shaped by war. Race links with war and plays several roles. First, New Zealand adopted a White NZ policy

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

QUESTION
NUMBER

in terms of immigration and Māori assimilation. Second, NZ ~~felt~~ still felt quite racially, culturally and politically British ('the Britain of the South Seas' with an rule over Samoa and Niue). Third, while Māori identity was increasingly recognised, Māori as a whole were still marginalised with many unaddressed land loss, little recognition in terms of soldier settlements, and orientalist caricatures in media.

93403