



National Certificate of Educational Achievement
TAUMATA MĀTAURANGA Ā-MOTU KUA TĀEA

Exemplar for Internal Achievement Standard History Level 2

This exemplar supports assessment against:

Achievement Standard 91232

Interpret different perspectives of people in an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders

An annotated exemplar is a sample of student evidence, with a commentary, to explain key aspects of the standard. It assists teachers to make assessment judgements at the grade.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority

To support internal assessment

Grade: Achieved

Achieved requires the interpretation of different perspectives of people in an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders.

This involves investigating and explaining perspectives in an historically accurate manner either from the perspective of named people or people in an identified historical context, or from the point of view of historians, with supporting evidence. The perspectives should consider a person's point of view, attitudes, beliefs, and include reasons for the perspectives and the related actions/responses.

The student has presented diary entries for Olaf Nelson and Colonel Sir Stephen Allen that explain their perspective on the Mau movement. These are largely historically accurate.

The points of view that each person has in relation to the Mau movement are identified, and reasons are given to explain why these perspectives are held. For example, Nelson's perspective in support of the Mau is shaped by the oppressive decisions of the New Zealand administration, his desire for Samoan independence and his belief in peaceful resistance. The related actions for each person are identified and discussed. While greater specificity and detail is desirable, there is sufficient evidence to satisfy this aspect of the standard.

While the diary entries do contain several generalised sentiments (with some repetition), there is sufficient use of supporting evidence to meet expectations for Achieved at curriculum level 7. This includes reference to legislation, historical people and events, short quotes, and dates.

For Merit, the standard requires an in-depth interpretation which shows depth of understanding, with relevant supporting evidence. For the use of evidence to have reflected expectations at Merit, more frequent inclusion of specific named examples and detail is needed. For example, elements such as named examples of ordinances made or of culturally oppressive actions (such as banishment of chiefs).

To show depth of understanding, the above example might also include an accompanying explanation of how these actions were felt by Mau members, and why they were significant. It may also involve more explicitly articulating the paternalistic attitude that influenced many of the actions taken by the administration.

Diary Entry One

Date: March 10, 1929

Dear Diary,

More than ever today, I felt how burdensome our struggle for freedom is. The Mau movement grows in strength, and our people are more united than I could have ever hoped. Yet every step that we go forward is resisted with a fresh obstruction of New Zealand's government. The 1920 League of Nations Mandate that gave NZ sweeping power of governance over Samoa under a class C mandate, has been felt in the worst ways for too long: New laws imposed on our people, ignoring our customary practices, taking away the authority from the Fono of Faipule, and I cannot stand by while our people suffer in their own land. I find that my Samoan-European origin is a bridge I have to use, in order to put the fight of the people across to the world's understanding. I have reminded the Mau that our way is the peaceful resistance way.

Diary Entry Two

Date: April 12, 1929

Dear Diary,

Today has been a sad day. News has reached us that the New Zealand administration is stepping up its effort to muzzle the Mau. They have been arresting our members. All these things pain me; our peaceful movement is being labelled criminal. I have had countless hours talking strategies with other leaders, and we are ready for further resistance, come what may to our persons. If my exile can save the others and keep the movement alive, then I am willing to make that sacrifice. The Mau is not just a movement; it is our people's hope.

Our people, who have been oppressed so much, one ordinance after another eroding our freedom to movement, meetings, and village practices, we are still battling on for our dignity and right to freedom. I feel pride and sorrow. Pride, for I feel proud that they are true to our cause; sorrow, for I know the struggle yet before us. The colonial administration cannot realise nor conceive that we love Samoa: Samoa mo Samoa. I know they regard me as an agitator, but I am but a mouthpiece for the silent sufferings of our people.

Today, I communicated with the chiefs and exhorted them to hold firm. The Mau symbol has become a serious thing to wear, a personal symbol and declaration of commitment to freedom. But I know it places us in danger; the police grow more aggressive at each peaceful march. Some of the younger men are frustrated; they want instant change, and even retaliation is mentioned. I understand their anger, but I believe the real change will come from stalwart resilience.

Diary Entry Three

Date: December 28, 1929

Dear Diary,

Today is a day of mourning for Samoa. We have lost our loved ones today on this day, now referred to as "Black Saturday." The reports have come in. How brutal it is, to think that at the time of our peaceful march, violence welcomed us- I am unable to forgive or forget it. Our people came onto the streets with only a voice, and the New Zealand forces replied with bullets. I fear this loss will further deepen the gulf between us and the colonial administration. They have even shown us that they will try to use deadly force in attempting to silence us, but they simply don't understand that such gestures strengthen our determination.

I feel helpless stuck in NZ on this enforced banishment. I will continue to write and communicate with Samoan leaders and I will push on with my efforts as I did when I went to protest the mandate in Geneva. Though I was not in Samoa and can do little, their sorrow is my sorrow, and I pledge to them that I will not allow their sacrifice to be in vain. But Black Saturday has only set in concrete my conviction regarding our cause. The world needs to see what New Zealand has done to our people, and I will see that it does.

Diary Entry Four

Date: February 15, 1934

Dear Diary,

As I write tonight, I am overcome with reflections of the path that we have trodden and the route ahead. We shall not accept as our lot an ordained life at the hands of those that do not understand land, custom, or value. I feel proud standing among those who share this vision. For every song sung, every march walked, and every symbol worn-the acts of unity remind me that we are far from defeated. When I finished exile and returned to Samoa in 1933 I immediately rejoined the leadership efforts of the Mau. When General Hart banned me from participating in the fono, I was not deterred. When the authorities raided my home in Tuaeufu, I was not deterred. We must continue to get global awareness of the suffering we face at the hand of this administration. Our international efforts have gained us some momentum. I know that one day the world will see Samoa as we do. Until then, I will continue to lead, to speak, and to stand firm. Let this be my pledge unto Samoa and to generations that will tread this land in peace.

Perspective Two

Key person: [Colonel Sir Stephen Allen]

Diary Entry One

Date: March 15, 1929

Dear Diary,

Today was yet another day spent addressing the mounting unrest in Samoa. The unrest in Samoa is no longer a murmur; it is a movement clothed in navy blue lavalava with a white stripe, the Mau's uniform, worn increasingly openly as a challenge to authority. The Mau movement has grown increasingly bold with more Samoans joining their ranks and openly defying our authority. Nelson and his group have lobbied our government in 1926 seeking Samoan self-rule, and yet have continued to show that are in need of our guidance and experience. My responsibility is plain: New Zealand holds a League of Nations Class C mandate here (confirmed in 1920), and the Samoa Act 1921 vests executive authority in the Administrator to uphold law and order. Progress has been made under our administration, in roads, schooling, and public health infrastructure, but the Mau's civil disobedience threatens stability. I cannot be blind to the audaciousness of Olaf Nelson and his followers, who appear to think they can flout the rule of law without penalty.

I have been in conferences with my advisors, and it is evident that we cannot allow this rebellion to spread further. We are establishing new controls to limit the activities of the Mau and dampen their influence. Some of the chiefs seem to be sympathetic to Nelson's cause, it further complicates our matters. I am willing to arrest them if need be, though I would wish otherwise. Samoa is not ready for independence, and I am convinced that Nelson's rhetoric has blinded their judgments. The movement's motto, "Samoa mo Samoa" ("Samoa for the Samoans"), makes their objective unmistakable, but my charge is equally clear: prevent disorder and protect the mandate. My duty is the welfare and stability of this territory, and I am not going to allow a misled movement to interfere with that.

Diary Entry Two

Date: July 5, 1929

Dear Diary,

It would appear that the Mau's defiance grows more definite, they are determined to demoralise every aspect of our control. Their organisation now spans chiefs, women's committees, and villages, a national movement, not a fringe circle. I see the influence of Nelson in all of this. He does not act content to live under the rule of law but, instead, has filled the Samoan people with unreal expectations of independence. Western Samoa does not have the resources and infrastructure to survive on its own, and the actions of the Mau threaten to unwind the progress we have, up to this point in time, enjoyed.

Today our patrols and presence in those villages known to be Mau strongholds were increased. I know these measures may sound harsh, but they are necessary. If the Mau wishes to test our resolve, they will very shortly find that the administration will not be provoked by them. We have started detaining their leaders, hoping this will break their will. I must confess, however, that I sometimes wonder how history will view this chapter. This approach is consistent with our legal framework and the Administrator's obligation to maintain order under the mandate and the Samoa Act 1921. We are striving to get peace and order, but the continual provocations from the Mau make it hard to see any light on the way of solution. Anyway, I am doing my duty, and the Samoan people will thank us someday for having kept order.

Diary Entry Three

Date: December 30, 1929

Dear Diary,

Yesterday was a day not easy to forget. Events of "Black Saturday" have shaken me to my bones, yet I am also convinced that what we did was needed. A peaceful protest by the Mau degenerated into absolute mayhem, and lives were lost on both sides, including a senior officer. The situation got out of hand, radically beyond anything we could have foreseen, and I am afraid that I find myself strongly irritated at Nelson and his cohorts for pushing their cause with such utter abandon. Samoan casualties included Tupua Tamasese Lealofi III and others, up to 11 Samoans killed, and Constable Abraham was beaten to death. "One Lewis gun... was fired over the heads of the people... No one was struck by machine-gun fire." This was to deter the crowd but panic and rifle fire followed, with tragic effect. They should have known that marching in defiance of the law brought sanctions. Nevertheless, the life that was taken is an abhorrent outcome that leaves much on my mind. This tragedy brings the need for order to be reclaimed in Samoa with no further delay. It is my duty to ensure that peace is maintained and New Zealand's mandate over Samoa respected.

Diary Entry Four

Date: February 20, 1930

Dear Diary,

Mau's resistance puzzles me in spite of our strenuous efforts to keep them in check. In the weeks since Black Saturday, we have moved decisively. On 13 January 1930 I declared the Mau seditious and banned the Mau uniform, after they refused to surrender wanted men or vacate their headquarters. These proceedings followed due process "*The inquest began on Thursday, January 2, and the Mau was declared seditious on Monday, January 13... Thirty witnesses were called.*" Again the Mau continue undeterred. As many as 1,500 Mau withdrew to the bush, aided by villagers with food and intelligence. To restore order, we have deployed 150 marines and seamen from HMS *Dunedin*, supported by 50 military police and a seaplane for reconnaissance. Since that fateful Black Saturday, they have continued unabated.

Today, I ordered increased surveillance of known Mau supporters. I realise this is a sensitive area, but we cannot afford any more disruption. I know my decision will be unpopular among the Samoans, but I sincerely feel it is called for in the best interest of Western Samoa's future. One day, they will, perhaps, understand that our governance did not seek to oppress but to develop and stabilise. Till that day, my mind is made up: if the Mau continues to defy our authority, they shall come to understand that we are more than ready to enforce obedience to the rule of law.

Grade: Merit

For Merit, students must interpret in-depth different perspectives of people in an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders.

This involves interpreting perspectives which show depth of understanding, with relevant supporting evidence.

The student has interpreted the perspectives of both Gandhi and General Dyer on the Rowlatt Act and the passive resistance of Indians against Colonial rule. These are written from the point of view of historians (i.e. in third person), rather than in role-play. They have explained the perspectives in light of the values, attitudes, and experiences of each person. The perspectives are interpreted with consideration of the cultural and political historical context that has shaped them and the related actions.

There are several instances within the response that allow the threshold for an in-depth interpretation of the perspectives to be met. Some examples include:

- Identifying the broader historical context, e.g. *“with growing Indian nationalism”* or *“Indians were increasingly working together.”*
- Tensions being briefly identified, such as the post-war expectations of Indians being at odds with the imperialist/colonial attitudes of the British (further development of this idea may have demonstrated discernment).
- Showing multiple factors that shaped the perspective, e.g. *“Added to this, was the result of the Rowlatt Committee.”*

There is a range of relevant supporting evidence used that helps the response to be ‘in-depth’, as is required by the overall Merit descriptor for the standard. The depth of evidence is consistent across the entire response. This is seen through the use of specific names, dates, statistics, short extracts from primary sources, and specific examples.

For Excellence, a comprehensive interpretation of the perspectives requires students to show depth of understanding and discernment, with significant relevant supporting evidence.

Discernment might involve:

- making developed links to the wider context
- explanations that show a broader or deeper understanding of the factors that shaped the person’s perspective, including why they held those beliefs and how these beliefs influenced their responses
- recognising the tensions, contradictions, or evolution of the perspectives.

For example, the student could explain the British response in relation to other international unrest the British Empire faced after World War I (e.g. in Egypt, Ireland, Kenya, and Iraq).

On the 18th of March 1919, The Rowlatt Act was passed. This allowed police to be able to arrest any person they wanted without needing to have any type of reason for it. Because of this, Gandhi called for a hartal of having every person close their shops and businesses and spend the day fasting and praying instead. This hartal was scheduled to take place on the 6th of April and every single person in India was invited to participate. But the citizens in Delhi got the date wrong and ended up starting a week before the planned time. Some areas were successful and others were not. Gandhi had insisted on non-violence during the hartal, but unfortunately, the police still fired at large crowds in Delhi. On the 8th of April Gandhi was arrested while travelling to Delhi, though the British had hesitated to go through with his arrest as they were afraid that it would make him a martyr (a person who sacrifices something of great value for the sake of principle). But Gandhi's arrest caused protesting, as well as violent outbursts towards the police by the citizens.

On April 13th, about 5000 women, men and children had gathered in the enclosed space known as Jallianwala Bagh. Celebrating the Sikh festival of Vaisakhi, But also to protest against the Rowlatt act and the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi and nationalist leaders Dr Saifuddin kitchelw and Dr Satyapal. And not long later the only exit of Jallianwala bagh was blocked by military soldiers on command of General Dyer. And he ordered his soldiers to take rapid fire at the 5000 people in Jallianwala Bagh. They kept firing until they could no longer, resulting in 379 deaths and 1137 wounded. Now also known as the Amritsar Massacre.

Perspective 1:

Mahatma Gandhi was an Indian lawyer as well as an anti colonial nationalist and political ethicist. He inspired many non violent protests and actions across the world, and also Civil rights and freedom movements. He was a religious man and believed in Hinduism. Two of the rules of Hinduism were truth (satya) and non-violence (ahimsa). But Gandhi also believed that these two were at the heart of every religion. Because of his religious beliefs he deeply valued non-violence and peace, and believed that no good came from violence. "My bent is not political but religious and I take part in politics because I feel that there is no department of life which can be divorced from religion and because politics touch the vital being of India almost at every point". After World War I ended in 1918, Indians had expected more political freedoms because more than one million Indian soldiers had fought for the British war effort. However, instead of granting freedoms, the Montagu–Chelmsford Report (1918) suggested only limited self-government, and instead of easing restrictions, Britain imposed the Rowlatt Acts (1919), which extended wartime emergency powers into peacetime. Gandhi strongly opposed the Rowletts Act because he saw it as denying freedoms that every person deserved, such as the right to a fair trial, freedom of expression, and protection from wrongful imprisonment. The Act allowed the British to jail Indians without trial for up to two years, continue secret trials, and censor the press. It was summed up by the Indian population as "No Dalil, No Vakil, No Appeal!" (No argument, No lawyer, No appeal)" Gandhi believed this was deeply unjust, especially because the war had already ended and therefore these "wartime" measures were no longer justifiable. This felt like a loosely disguised attempt at further colonial oppression. This only strengthened the resolve among many, including

Gandhi that independence was needed. His reaction to the Rowlatt Act led to the first major nationwide Satyagraha, based on peaceful resistance. This was a significant moment in the evolution of Gandhi's political philosophy. He believed political injustice had to be resisted morally—through truth and nonviolence, not armed rebellion. The Rowlatt Act provided the moral trigger for him to launch his first national movement.

Gandhi thought that what happened at Jallianwala was an absolute travesty and that there was no reason for general Dyer to kill and wound so many innocent people. He took notice of the angry mobs and ordered them to go home and called off his hartal. "If satyagraha could not be carried out without violence, it would not be carried out at all". In the wake of the massacre, Gandhi wrote that the British system itself—not just General Dyer—was responsible. This deepened his belief that the colonial structure was unjust. As a result, he concluded that only total non-cooperation with the British government would make them realise the injustice of their rule. He outlined this programme in print soon after the massacre, and by 1920 it became a full national movement. He called Indians to boycott British goods, institutions and told the citizens to resign if they worked government employed jobs. He told them to boycott government schools and courts. The reasons for this action is the desire for systemic change. He famously said "We do not want to punish Dyer. We have no desire for revenge. We want to change the system that produced Dyer." Gandhi also lead a silent march in protest of

the Amritsar massacre and urged the British government to grant India's independence. But because of Gandhi's strong religious beliefs, he forgave general Dyer for his actions, "Who could be more cruel or bloodthirsty than the late general Dyer? Yet the Jallianwala bagh congress inquiry committee on my advice, had refused to ask for his prosecution. I had no trace of ill will against him in my heart. I would have also liked to meet him personally and reach his heart, but that was to remain a mere aspiration." Gandhi's strong Hindu beliefs always had a great impact on his actions such as forgiving general Dyer, but he also knew that it would be wrong of him to simply forget what general Dyer did. "We may forgive Dyer and O'Dwyer for the jallianwala bagh massacre, but we cannot afford to forget it.

Reginald Dyer was an officer of the Bengal army and was later made part of the British Indian army, and made a General. General Dyer was a man who believed in imposing law and order to any extent, and he would do anything to make sure that laws were obeyed. Especially if they were part of the Indian or Muslim race. This is likely a hangover from the violent uprising of 1857 that left a deep psychological impact on British colonial authorities. With growing Indian nationalism, many British officers feared a repeat rebellion and believed that only harsh, decisive force could prevent another uprising. This attitude persisted into the early 20th century and heavily shaped Dyer's worldview. Authorities such as Dyer were increasingly fearful of mass political mobilisation, a fear that had been fueled by growing support for movements such as the Indian National Congress (1885) and the All India Muslim League (1906).

Added to this was the result of the Rowlatt Committee that was set up in December 1917, led by Justice Sidney Rowlatt. The aim of the committee was to conduct a report on anti-colonial revolutionary groups. The committee submitted its report in April 1918. One of its key recommendations was that wartime emergency powers be continued through new, harsher laws. This formed the basis of the Rowlett Act in 1919. Dyer's actions show he supported the

spirit of the Rowlett Act as he often spoke of those opposing the British rule and authority as “Rebels” who needed harsh controls and strong measures.

Because of the unrest, Punjab had been placed under martial law in early April 1919. Dyer believed that the gathering at Jallianwala Bagh on April 13 was a deliberate defiance of his orders prohibiting assemblies. On April 13th 1919, when Dyer arrived at Jallianwala Bagh he saw a man addressing at least what looked like to him, 5000 people. He ordered his soldiers to block the only exit of Jallianwala Bagh, and within ten seconds, he ordered his soldiers to rapid fire until he said stop. It didn't occur to him that many people in the big crowd would not have known of the proclamation happening, or that there were innocent people. He made the order to fire at the crowd because he had felt that the martial law had not been obeyed and that he thought it was his responsibility to disperse the crowd by any means necessary. His actions resulted in 379 murdered, and 1137 wounded. But General Dyer knew that there would've been other ways to disperse the crowd without using their guns. “I think it is quite possible I could have dispersed the crowd without firing, but they would have come back again and laughed, and I should have made what I considered to be a fool of myself. I looked upon the crowd as rebels, and I considered it my duty to fire, and fire well”. His reasons for the actions, as he himself declares in the Hunter Committee inquiries was to produce “sufficient moral effect” and to “teach a lesson” to the population so that they would not protest again. Another reason Dyer likely took this action as he feared the way in which Indians were increasingly working together. This was a trend that displeased the British.

After the massacre, there were many people who praised general Dyer for his actions mostly by people back in England, but also many who were not on Dyer's side. The praise would have resulted in General Dyer truly believing that he was in the right for imposing martial law on the Indians at Jallianwala Bagh. And he had no shame in his actions as shown in the quote above that he said after the incident. His actions were very much impacted by his racial bias towards Indians, which wasn't unusual for the British back then.

Grade: Excellence

Excellence requires students to comprehensively interpret different perspectives of people in an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders.

This involves interpreting perspectives which show depth of understanding and discernment, with significant relevant supporting evidence.

The student has comprehensively interpreted the perspectives of John Minto and Robert Muldoon in relation to the Springbok Tour. The perspectives are examined from the point of view of a historian. Depth of understanding is demonstrated through the thorough explanation of why each perspective is held, the actions and responses taken by each person, how these actions relate to their underlying viewpoints, and the reasons given for the specific actions taken.

The evidence chosen is varied, well-selected, and consistently applied across the response, ensuring that all points made have been fully supported with specific historical evidence.

There are several aspects across the response that reflect the nature of evidence expected for 'discernment'. Some examples include:

- An understanding of the wider historical context and its influence on the perspectives. For example, recognition of the era of activism that the protest occurred within, and the use of significant relevant evidence to support this.
- Nuanced understandings of social, political, and cultural influences on the perspectives. For example, consideration of 'identity' in shaping the perspectives and responses, supported by comprehensive evidence and discussion.
- The sophisticated use of historical evidence throughout.

John Minto (Anti-Tour Perspective)

John Minto was anti-tour because he believed that playing against South Africa would show that New Zealand supports the racial segregation of apartheid in South Africa.

Minto's perspective was shaped by his experiences because he was a part of the younger generation, who were more likely to be pro tour. Minto was in his 20s when he became the leader of the anti-tour group, known as, HART (Halt All Racist Tours). HART was established in 1969 to protest and stop the tours. According to historian Jock Phillips, the younger generation who were made up of university students were more likely to be anti-tour. The younger generation grew up during a period of social activism in the 1970s and the 1980s. This included protests for Māori culture (1972 Language Petition and the 1975 Māori Land March). It also included the Occupation at Bastion Point in 1977-78. New Zealand was a bicultural country, and the younger generation were focussed on protesting for the rights of the indigenous communities. Minority and indigenous groups took part in the 1981 Springbok Tour. The Polynesian Panthers, including members such as Tigilau Ness and Will 'Ilohahia, were both arrested because of their participation in the protests. It took the presence and testimony of Bishop Desmond Tutu to get 'Ilohahia freed without being charged. Additionally, Nga Tamatoa was also involved with the 1981 Springbok Tour with many being a part of the Patu Squad. The social activism of the younger generation, including Minto, can be seen in this quote, *"You would walk down Queen Street on a Saturday night and ask the person next to you what we were protesting about tonight – there was always something to picket"*. Therefore, when the 1981 Springbok Tour happened the younger generation, including Minto, felt they had to stand up against the racist system of apartheid which did not accept coloured or black people.

John Minto's perspective was influenced by his view of apartheid, that it was a racist and violent system. Apartheid separated people based on their colour and favoured white people over others. Races had their separate facilities and inter-racial marriages was not permitted. Several incidents happened in South Africa, because of the system of apartheid, that led to the deaths of many blacks. For example, the Sharpeville Massacre in 1978. Another violent incident that Minto also knew of was the death of Steve Biko while in police custody. Biko's death made international headlines. The anti-tour protestors often held masks with the face of Biko on it as a reminder of the violence and apartheid system in South Africa. Minto's knowledge of these events impacted his perspective.

The most significant action of Minto as chairman and organiser for the Halt All Racist Tours (HART) protest group was the protest organised by Minto to oppose the Waikato vs Springbok match on Saturday the 25th of July 1981 alongside 2000 others in protest. Due to the escalation of the protest causing physical violence between riot police and the anti-tour protesters, the Waikato vs Springbok tour game was cancelled leaving the protesters victorious. The protest went to the extent of protestors surging forward and ripping down the perimeter fence along the field grounds as well as pushing through game spectators to form a human chain on the pitch as a way to repel the police. Minto describes the scale of the protest to be *"the closest New Zealand has got to civil war."*, this is about the violent interchanges between the anti-tour protesters and police.

Minto's reason for taking action was because he believed the anti-tour protestors needed to show support for the South Africans who were suffering under the apartheid regime. Minto said, *"The Springbok Tour represents a clear opportunity for New Zealand to stand against*

apartheid. We must not let this opportunity slip through our fingers.” Minto took this as an opportunity to show support for South Africans. According to sahistory.org protests resisting the laws of apartheid began in the 1950s and early 60s which according to nonviolent-conflict.org consisted of strikes or ‘walkouts’, school and sports boycotts, and mass marches. The use of passive resistance protests apartheid was met with militant violence from police enforced by the government. An example of this is the Soweto Uprising on June 16th 1976, a student-led march with an estimation of 3,000-10,000 students in protest against the Bantu Education Act. However, the protesters were met with police releasing tear gas and live ammunition at the thousands of students leaving more a thousand injured and the death of an estimated 176 yet further reports showcasing an estimated 700 deaths. John Minto's display of solidarity is seen in the stuff.co.nz article as Minto said at the time, “We are here today to prove we care more for the rights of 23 million blacks in Africa than for 80 minutes of rugby,”

Another action made by Minto to show that he was against the Springbok's touring New Zealand was the operation of causing a commotion to disturb the sleep of South African rugby players the morning of their game. On August 8th, 1981, at 5:30 am Minto along with an estimated 30 or more anti-tour protesters rallied outside the Grand Hotel in Invercargill to give the Springboks an alarming wakeup call using whistles and hailers to, as Minto described it, “let them know they were in New Zealand”. In other words, they did this to make it known that things are done differently in New Zealand compared to South Africa where during this time those against apartheid were being faced with militant crackdowns by the ruling government (National Party) leaving thousands dead or imprisoned.

John Minto's motive in his visit to Invercargill was to prevent the Springboks from touring New Zealand by protesting the Springboks vs Southland rugby match on August 8th, 1981. Minto's reason for this action was because the tour was about ensuring that people's human rights, were protected. Minto said, “It's about justice, equality and human rights. We cannot turn a blind eye to the suffering...” This challenged the community norm in Invercargill as reports made in 1981 showed 70% of the people in Invercargill were pro-tour. This was due to many people believing that “the tour was about rugby, and they weren't interested in politics.” By challenging the community's value of rugby Minto was also fulfilling his role as the leader of HART and as an activist as this era was a time of protest in New Zealand.

Robert Muldoon (Pro Tour)

Robert Muldoon was pro-tour and supported New Zealand playing South Africa in 1981. Robert David Muldoon was the elected prime minister of New Zealand from 1975-1984.

Robert Muldoon's perspective was shaped by his own experiences. Robert Muldoon was born in 1921 and was raised in a time of economic uncertainty and war. Muldoon himself was a war veteran, having taken part in World War II, and so were seven members of his government body. According to Jock Philips the pro tour supporters tended to be of the older generation. Robert Muldoon was a part of the older generation that Jock Philips referred to. The older generation also tended to be rugby supporters and saw the sport as being important to New Zealand's identity. One of the defining features and cornerstones of New Zealand's identity, particularly those of Robert Muldoon was the idea that rugby was a part of their culture. The rivalry between New Zealand and South Africa could be traced back to the early 20th century and this had become a part of being a New Zealander. Muldoon was a part of a generation of New Zealanders, along with a lot of the pro tour supporters, who had been involved with World War II. Armed conflict was seen as being a part of a man's identity. Rugby was a key part of a man's identity in New Zealand while Muldoon was growing up and in the 1980s. Physical strength, seen in rugby games, encapsulated a lot of what was seen as masculine at the time. Muldoon, along with 7 members of his cabinet, were war veterans and this would have shaped his perspective. The war veterans saw the anti-tour protestors, such as Minto, as a threat to

the order and unity of the country. This is the context in which Robert Muldoon grew up in and would ultimately influence his own perspective on the 1981 Springbok Tour. This would go onto clash with the perspective of the younger generation, including those of Minto, who were growing up post-World War II and a lot more socially active in their protests and challenges of authority.

Muldoon's perspective was also shaped by his role as the leader of the National Party. Robert Muldoon ran for Prime Minister in 1975. One of the issues that Muldoon campaigned on was that he promised his voters he would not cancel the Springbok Tour between New Zealand and South Africa. Muldoon needed the support of those living in rural towns, often rugby supporters, to get into power in 1975. To maintain their support and ensure that he would win, Muldoon needed to make sure that he allowed the Springbok Tour to continue. This political campaign promise, that he would not cancel the Tour like Prime Minister Norman Kirk did in 1973, is one that influenced and shaped Muldoon's perspective and ultimately his actions during the 1981 Springbok Tour. When Muldoon got into power in 1975, he allowed the 1976 Springbok Tour to go ahead. The Soweto Riots took place in the same year. As a result of these 20 African countries boycotted the Montreal Olympics in response to New Zealand continued sporting contact with South Africa. Muldoon's role as a leader and drive to be the Prime Minister also shaped his perspective and support of the 1981 Springbok Tour. Muldoon's refusal to cancel the 1981 Springbok Tour himself and ultimately giving it to the New Zealand Rugby Football Federation (in charge of rugby) to make the final call shows that he was a politician, refusing to lose voters. Muldoon said on July 6th, 1981 (just less than two weeks before the tour) that, "...The issue now rests with the New Zealand Rugby Union. I say to them, think well before you make this decision." In this way, Muldoon was refusing to completely shut down the tour and being able to step away. Then he could say that it is not his decision for the tour to continue, it is the rugby board. This is what he promoted and would therefore allow him to maintain his supporters. Ultimately, being able to be voted back in for a second term as Prime Minister of New Zealand.

The most significant action of Muldoon was his first and final direct appeal to the NZRFU (New Zealand Rugby Football Union) on July 6, 1981, and was televised live across the nation. This was before the NZFU were indirectly given the green light to invite the Springboks to New Zealand. The entire nation was eagerly tuned, the majority tuning in to hear Muldoon's speech as months prior multiple anti-tour protests that brought an estimated of 65,000 people to the streets of urban cities in New Zealand had occurred. It is said that many New Zealand citizens against the tour were hoping for a change of heart from Muldoon and the government to abolish the tour. However, they underestimated Muldoon's strong belief on the issue of sport and politics and the National Party's importance in securing votes for the general election in 1981 which would be achieved through feeding into New Zealand's rugby super fans as rugby had become a huge part of New Zealand's identity originating in the 1950s. An indirect comment made by Muldoon according to nzgeo.com during his speech was "I say to them [the NZRFU], think well before you make a decision." Muldoon took this action because he believed in the idea of 'bridge building'. This would build a bridge or a connection and show South Africa our system of having a multi racial team (All Blacks). There were also other supporters of Muldoon's idea of bridge building, including those who were his pro tour supporters. Muldoon's idea of bridge building enabled the tour to continue and would keep his supporters on his side. A survey done in 1981 showed that 41% of New Zealanders supported the tour and this would have been a lot of Muldoon's supporters who had voted for him to be Prime Minister in 1975. Robert Muldoon's action of not cancelling the tour but allowing the NZRFU was effective. It allowed him to shift the blame or make it seem like it was up to the rugby union to make the decision and if they did not cancel it, he could not be blamed for it. Muldoon's refusal to cancel the tour himself meant that he did win the 1981 election by a small margin, which would have been in part due to the rural support that he had. If Muldoon had

cancelled the tour he would have lost his supporters in rural areas, who were by and large pro tour supporters.

In August 1981, at the height of the 1981 Springbok Tour, Robert Muldoon released a list of 15 'radicals' and 'subversives'. This was a list put together by Secret Intelligence (SI). The Secret Intelligence Service was a group created because of the Official Secrets Acts in 1951. The act was a result of the worries that people had about communism, there were a lot of trials happening around this in the United States and Britain. Muldoon had sent a request to SI to investigate the anti-tour movement. The report found that the Citizens Opposed to the Springbok Tour (COST, an anti-tour group) was 'greatly influenced' by the Worker's Communist League. SI saw the Worker's Communist League as subversive. In other words, they were oppositional and went against the state. Within its historical context, this would have been a major accusation against the anti-tour group. Muldoon faced a lot of backlashes from anti tour protestors; however, he was not sorry about the release of the list. Muldoon would have viewed the anti-tour protestors as causing division and therefore being problematic to the state. This would have caused further division and fuelled anger from the pro tour supporters against those who were anti tour. Muldoon shifted the focus of the tour, for a moment, onto those mentioned in the list and he could distract New Zealanders from the chaos of the tour. Muldoon played on the fear of New Zealanders and those who against communism by accusing the anti-tour protestors (represented by COST) as communists or being 'influenced' by communism. To be accused of being 'subversive' and 'radical' was seen as a big deal in the context of the 1981 Springbok Tour and it would have also created further division between the anti-tour protestors and Muldoon.