

## Assessment Schedule – 2021

### Scholarship History (93403)

Candidate answers THREE questions. Each response is marked out of 8 against the descriptors for the History Scholarship Standard.

#### Schedule 1: Criteria for Question One

|                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <p><b>Outstanding Scholarship</b></p> | <p><b>8</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a high level of understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a substantiated argument integrating a wide range of evidence from sources and own understanding of historical narratives insightfully and coherently</li> <li>• the perceptive and sophisticated evaluation of evidence from several sources, including an understanding of the possible limitations of historical evidence</li> <li>• a thoughtful discussion of how reliability and usefulness can be determined.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>7</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a high level of understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence, <i>but</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the substantiated argument integrates evidence from fewer sources and own understanding of historical narratives, and is less insightful and coherent</li> <li>• the evaluation of evidence from several sources is less perceptive and sophisticated</li> <li>• the understanding of the possible limitations of historical evidence is less developed</li> <li>• the discussion of how reliability and usefulness can be determined is less developed.</li> </ul>                           |
| <p><b>Scholarship</b></p>             | <p><b>6</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a detailed understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a substantiated argument drawing on a range of sources with clarity and consistency</li> <li>• an ability to make valid judgements about several of the sources</li> <li>• an awareness of other historical narratives enabling discussion of the ways in which differing historical narratives allow a historian to appreciate the complexities of past events.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>5</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a detailed understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence, <i>but</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the argument is less substantiated and draws on evidence from fewer sources</li> <li>• the ability to make valid judgements about several of the sources is less developed</li> <li>• an awareness of other historical narratives is less developed</li> <li>• there is a reliance on prior knowledge of historical narratives to shape the argument.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Below Scholarship</b></p>       | <p><b>4</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence through some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development of an argument referring directly to several of the sources, showing an understanding of the complexity of differing views on colonialism and its impact</li> <li>• a comparison / contrast of the sources as a way of supporting the resulting argument</li> <li>• an integration of several of the sources to support the argument</li> <li>• a judgement about the way in which historians agree / disagree</li> <li>• a discussion of the views / opinions of historians using own knowledge</li> <li>• at least one valid and detailed judgement as to the usefulness / limitation / reliability of the sources</li> <li>• an awareness of how historical evidence enables a deeper understanding of past events / ideas / colonialism concepts.</li> </ul> | <p><b>3</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence by attempting some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development of an argument integrating several of the sources, allowing an understanding of the complexity of differing views on colonialism and its impact</li> <li>• the comparison / contrast of the sources does not support the resulting argument</li> <li>• the integration of their own knowledge of historical narratives</li> <li>• a judgement about the way in which historians agree / disagree</li> <li>• a valid judgement of historical evidence.</li> </ul> |
|                                       | <p><b>2</b></p> <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• answers the question in a limited and perfunctory way</li> <li>• uses own knowledge and understanding of historical narratives to comment on their importance in understanding the complexities of colonialism</li> <li>• comments on the sources by comparing one source with another <i>or</i> makes an evaluation of a source</li> <li>• provides a valid judgement about a historical narrative <i>or</i> evaluates a source in terms of historical evidence.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>1</b></p> <p>Response attempts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• answer the question in a very limited and perfunctory way</li> <li>• comment on the sources by comparing one source with another <i>or</i> making an evaluation of a source.</li> </ul>   |

## Examples of possible approaches to Question One

### To what extent do Sources A–F3 enable historians to understand the complexities of colonialism?

#### Evidence

The candidate should identify ideas about the historical force of colonialism, remarking on key ideas that can be discerned in the shaping and impact of colonialism, such as:

- economic exploitation
- race and racism
- the attempts to impose different/opposing cultural notions
- loss of independence
- the attempts to justify colonialism both in the past and the present
- the subjugation of identity.

By identifying the characteristics of colonialism, the candidate should be able to compare and contrast the competing historical narratives that have been established, both in these sources, and through the exploration of this topic in class.

The candidate should also be able to evaluate at least one of the sources in terms of its possible use as historical evidence, such as reliability and / or usefulness, and the possible limitations of a source or source material.

The question implies, using the qualifying phrase “to what extent” that these sources need to be evaluated in terms of what is included in the sources, but equally what is lacking, or what particular historian or historical school could have been profitably included. For example, there is no inclusion of a historian from the Annales tradition, and a source from that school of historical interpretation could possibly help a candidate to appreciate more fully the long-term development and impact of colonialism. Such a source would also allow the candidate to comment on the changing nature of historical narratives and argue that the metanarrative favoured by these historians no longer has the same critical impact it once had.

The candidate could examine and evaluate any one of **Sources A–F3** and comment on:

- possible bias implicit in a source, and its implications regarding reliability as historical evidence
- the limitations of a particular source or the limitations of the source material in the resource booklet
- the lack of source material explaining the mechanics of colonialism – how it became a historical force, and a discussion of the real and actual impact on societal constructs
- the ideological focus of some of the historians and evaluate the possible limitations of any subsequent discussion.

The candidate would be expected to move beyond the simple characterising of a historian like Hobsbawm as a Marxist, or Ferguson as right wing. At Scholarship level, a discussion around the notion of ideology and its impact on a historian’s interpretation of past events should be more nuanced and informed than might be expected for a Level 3 response.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source A:** Fieldhouse attempts to provide an overview of colonialism and some of its characteristics. The candidate could remark on the emphasis on the economic aspect of colonialism, that it is “merely one stage in the evolution of international relationships” and has a direct and important connection to “advanced capitalism”. The candidate familiar with the arguments of Karl Marx could take this opportunity to discuss further the validity of this claim.

**Source B:** Hobsbawm remarks on the global impact of colonialism, noting the emergence of ‘national expansion’ and the “increasingly active and crucial role” of the state. The candidate could compare Hobsbawm’s claim that Lenin did not regard colonialism as having the same significance as heterodox analysts did, and that perhaps Fieldhouse, in claiming the importance of colonialism’s relationship to capitalism, reflected Hobsbawm’s description of heterodox observers assuming that colonialism was a “new phase of capitalist development”.

**Source C:** Thornton makes a number of claims about colonialism notably that “no one admits to the title of colonialist” because of its negative association as the “exploiter”. This source makes the first reference to a concept that should be familiar to the candidate, i.e. the claims of colonisers that their mission was one of “trustees of civilisation” and “to see to it that civilisation was disseminated to as many beneficiaries as could be contrived”; that from a sense of mission, colonisers set out to leave “the world better than they found it”. The candidate would be expected to be familiar with this relationship and connect this source to other sources in the examination, making insightful references to particular contexts they are familiar with.

**Source D1:** Gilley suggests that it is time for a reappraisal of this historical force, i.e. colonialism, claiming that it was “beneficial” and that “anti-colonialism ravaged countries as national elites mobilised illiterate populations”

resulting in “a hundred years of disaster”. This is an argument the candidate could question by using their own knowledge of the negative impacts of colonialism to refute Gilley’s claim, and the candidate could also compare it to Thornton’s argument that no one willingly admits to being in favour of colonialism. They could also note that this extract has been withdrawn from the Third World Quarterly website on the grounds that the author has been threatened with violence, suggesting that colonialism is not a concept that is confined to the distant past, but continues to be very polarising.

**Source D2:** Ozcan (for The Anadolu Agency Turkey) provides a detailed description of the impact of French colonialism that would appear to refute any suggestion that colonialism can be seen as a benevolent force and could be used by the candidate to argue that Gilley’s claims are based more on ideology, that these examples of the destructive forces unleashed by colonialism should suffice to silence any agreement with Gilley’s views.

The candidate could also note that this source is written from a Turkish perspective and that the reference to the destruction of “300 years of Ottoman history” indicates a particular bias, given that Turkey was once a colonising force under the leadership of the Ottomans.

**Source E:** The Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aboriginal Tribes suggests there is a clear and apparent justification for the colonisation of distant lands by the British. The candidate could use this source to not only argue how colonisation was seen as a civilising force in the nineteenth century, but that the arguments for the benign influence of missionaries were of particular significance to Aotearoa New Zealand. Certainly, the candidate could argue that Gilley’s argument would have been met with approval by some.

**Source F1:** Ferguson provides an opportunity for the candidate to acknowledge the continuing pattern in some of the sources of the arguments that continue to be used to justify the imposition of political and cultural forces on diverse peoples around the globe. The candidate could note that this source sees the inclusion of a historian known for his conservative views on colonisation and empire (whose views are almost certainly familiar to a scholarship class). However, the candidate could also note that the source, while taken from Ferguson’s seminal work on Britain’s relationship to the concept of empire, includes a quote from Winston Churchill, whose opinion on the benefits of colonisation can be connected to similar ideas in other sources. In doing so, the astute candidate could comment on the qualifying word “good” used by Ferguson, suggesting that Churchill’s opinions on the benefits of colonisation reflect the author’s own.

**Source F2:** Flood in *The Guardian* makes clear the relationship between race and colonialism is clear. The candidate could use this source to discuss how colonialism was the imposition of structures of power on the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Oceania, resulting in a loss of autonomy, and economic and cultural impoverishment often ignored by historians and politicians who, in other sources, make an argument for the benefits of colonialism. The candidate could also note the continuing approval of colonialism implicit in the criticism directed at a historian of colour and his examination of British imperial history.

**Source F3:** Olusoga’s reminder that colonialism and its impact on Black people is an important part of “mainstream British history” could enable the candidate to use this source as a contrast to those earlier sources where more favourable views of colonialism and its impact are discussed. Both **Source F2** and **Source F3** are reminders that racial superiority, which underpins colonialism, is still very much evident, and a desire to either ignore this aspect (**Source F3**) or attack those who question it (**Source F2**) is a reminder that colonialism is of continuing significance.

**Schedule 2: Criteria for Question Two**

|                                |   |   |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Outstanding Scholarship</b> | <p><b>8</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a high level of analysis of historical relationships through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a clear and developed answer that addresses the question, written authoritatively and convincingly</li> <li>• perceptiveness</li> <li>• an insightful analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- how the historical relationships in the sources are connected</li> <li>- how there are a range of temporal historical relationships</li> <li>- how there are a range of differing perspectives</li> <li>- how these relationships allow a historian to understand more fully the complexities of past events</li> <li>- how another historical context in which an understanding of historical relationships in that context adds depth to the response.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p><b>7</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a high level of analysis of historical relationships, <i>but</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is less authoritative and convincing</li> <li>• the level of perceptiveness is less developed</li> <li>• the insightful analysis is less developed</li> <li>• is less effective in using other historical contexts to support the response.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Scholarship</b>             | <p><b>6</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a detailed analysis of historical relationships through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a clear and developed answer that addresses the question</li> <li>• an understanding of the importance / complexity of historical relationships and the way in which they enable a historian to understand how the significance of past events can change over time</li> <li>• a clear and coherent argument explaining how a number of the sources are interconnected and how there are a range of historical relationships</li> <li>• the use of a range of sources to support the argument</li> <li>• the use of knowledge of historical relationships in another context.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>5</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a detailed analysis of historical relationships, <i>but</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is not as coherent and developed</li> <li>• shows less understanding of the importance / complexity of historical relationships</li> <li>• the argument shows less clarity and consistency</li> <li>• is not able to use knowledge of historical relationships in other contexts as effectively.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Below Scholarship</b>       | <p><b>4</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some analysis of historical relationships through some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a clear but simple answer that addresses the question</li> <li>• the establishment of the importance of historical relationships</li> <li>• the integration of examples from the sources into an argument</li> <li>• the identification of a historical relationship and other examples in one or two sources</li> <li>• an engagement with the sources but without identifying the complexity of the historical relationships</li> <li>• an argument identifying and incorporating examples from the sources, including an attempt to explain their importance.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>3</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some analysis of historical relationships by attempting some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an establishment of the importance of historical relationships</li> <li>• an integration of examples from the sources</li> <li>• the identification of a historical relationship and other examples in one source</li> <li>• an engagement with the sources but with no identification of the complexity of the historical relationships</li> <li>• the identification and integration of examples from the sources but with no understanding of their importance to a historian.</li> </ul> |
|                                | <p><b>2</b></p> <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addresses the question without developing an argument</li> <li>• makes simple points without evidence from the sources</li> <li>• identifies a historical relationship with a limited understanding of its importance <i>or</i> identifies more than one historical relationship without relevant and appropriate examples from the sources.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>1</b></p> <p>Response attempts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• address the question but without developing an argument</li> <li>• make simple points but without evidence from the sources.</li> </ul>   |

## Examples of possible approaches to Question Two

### To what extent do the historical relationships in Sources G1–K2 enable historians to understand colonialism in Africa?

#### Evidence

The candidate should identify and analyse the different range of historical relationships contained in these sources, demonstrating the complexities of the impact of colonialism in Africa, by:

- acknowledging the different forces that helped result in the colonisation of Africa
- acknowledging the impact of colonialism on the countries and people of Africa
- recognising and discussing the temporal relationship between **cause and effect** to differentiate between short-term and long-term cause and effect, and the political / economic and social / cultural forces that shape this particular historical relationship
- discussing the relationship between **past and present**, and how an understanding of modern Africa is predicated on an understanding of the force of colonialism within an African context
- noting the merging **pattern** of particular ideas which implicitly and explicitly are present in many of these sources, i.e. an obvious pattern is that of the recurring idea of “civilisation” and its interpretation and justification for colonialism in Africa
- discussing how a particular example of the **effects** of colonialism can be used to help a historian understand the general impact of this force
- identifying and explaining how **changes** in colonialism are often offset by the continuing legacy of racism, or a particular mind-set shaped by the notion that colonialism in Africa had benefits that outweighed any perceived disadvantages
- arguing that **differing perspectives** add to the complexity of colonialism in Africa; that different people will view colonialism in different ways because such views have been shaped by different experiences and different beliefs.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source G1:** St John’s College Cambridge attempts to provide a simple and straightforward overview of how the process of colonisation in Africa began. The candidate could note how the desire for economic enrichment helped lead to the colonisation of Africa. The implied effect of colonisation is the willingness to “ignore” the richness of cultural traditions, and it could also be noted that the concept of “civilisation” makes an appearance, signalling a pattern that appears through some of the other sources.

**Source G2:** Green develops the “moral justification” for colonisation discussed in **Source G1**, arguing that slavery, in becoming a context in which to argue the causes of colonisation, has led to a narrowing of our focus, and that this same justification for any form of intercession that was used in the past, continues into the present.

**Source G3:** The map of Africa clearly shows the impact / effect of the Berlin Conference and the division of Africa between European powers. This is a simple map, but it does allow the candidate to note that one effect of decisions made in Berlin was the ability of France and Britain to gain significant portions of Africa to exploit. It also allows a clear connection between the desire for economic gains and the impact on Africa.

**Source H:** Hochschild explores the complexities of the relationship between the causes that led to colonisation and its effect on different peoples. The candidate could note the emergence of race as a characteristic of colonialism. While **Source G3** was simple and straightforward in displaying the way in which Africa was divided between competing European powers, **Source H** suggests a more complex effect, and in acknowledging the spread of colonialism into other parts of the globe allows a candidate to argue that what happened in Africa was part of a wider trend. The continuing idea of “civilisation” as a justification for the imposition of colonialism could be connected to the pattern first acknowledged in **Source G1**.

**Source I:** Braudel and his relationship to the Annales school could allow the candidate familiar with him to note that this examination of colonialism is a good example of how an examination of a historical force over an extended period can offer particular insights. The candidate might use the source to identify the relationship between past and present, as a way of understanding the way in which particular events can be connected through the passage of time. Mention could also be made of how the effects of colonisation are tempered with references to possible benefits accruing from colonisation, allowing a further analysis of the complexities of causal relationships.

**Source J:** Puri offers a further examination of the relationship between past and present and cause and effect. Puri argues that migration from Africa to Europe is a direct consequence of colonialism and also suggests that the pattern of migration established by early colonisers has been inverted by young Africans who see in Europe opportunities to enhance their own economic well-being.

**Source K1:** Cooper explores the complexities of the end of colonialism (as does Pakenham in **Source K2**) where various causes for a rationale and impetus to bring colonialism in Africa to a close are discussed. There is much in these two sources that can be used to help further in the construction of an argument.

**Source K2:** Pakenham explores change and continuity, in particular an overview of where there has been change – the emergence of nations celebrating their independence from European rule is especially noted – but the continuity of earlier patterns of economic activity is noted as is the continuance of missionary influence. The candidate could note that it was the missionaries who had helped bring Africa under the “civilising” influence of Europe and that this relationship is continuing into a world that in Pakenham’s descriptor, is “neo-colonialism.”

**Schedule 3: Criteria for Question Three**

|                                |   |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Outstanding Scholarship</b> | <p><b>8</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a high level of analysis and knowledge of significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>convincingly addressing the question authoritatively and perceptively</li> <li>skilful integration of the sources</li> <li>connecting the sources with own understanding and knowledge of the event / context</li> <li>the formation of insightful and persuasive conclusions.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>7</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a high level of analysis and knowledge of significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand, <i>but</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is less consistently authoritative and / or engaging</li> <li>integration of the sources is less skilful</li> <li>the connection of the sources with own understanding and knowledge of the event /context is less apparent</li> <li>conclusions are not as persuasive or insightful.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Scholarship</b>             | <p><b>6</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a detailed analysis of significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a depth of understanding and knowledge</li> <li>the convincing integration of source material</li> <li>the construction of a clear and concise argument addressing the question with breadth and depth that is supported by both knowledge / understanding and source integration.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>5</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a detailed analysis of significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand, <i>but</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows less depth of understanding and knowledge</li> <li>integration of the sources is less convincing</li> <li>the construction of an argument addressing the question is not as detailed in knowledge / understanding and source integration</li> <li>the answer lacks coherence in places.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Below Scholarship</b>       | <p><b>4</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some analysis of significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand through some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a broad understanding and knowledge of the context, using at least two sources to support an argument</li> <li>an understanding of the scope of the question</li> <li>a convincing understanding of the context through reference to a selection of sources and knowledge of the context, which suggests an appreciation of the complexity of the event.</li> </ul> | <p><b>3</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some analysis of significant historical events in Aotearoa New Zealand by attempting some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a broad understanding and knowledge of the context, but is unable to convey the complexity of this historical context</li> <li>an understanding of the scope of the question, but is unable to engage with its demands and its scope</li> <li>a broad understanding and knowledge of the context, but is unable to convey the complexity of this historical context</li> <li>the use of at least one source to support an argument.</li> </ul> |
|                                | <p><b>2</b></p> <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>addresses the question, but without providing evidence suggesting a sound knowledge / understanding of the context</li> <li>does not demonstrate a clear understanding and knowledge of the context <i>or</i> does not demonstrate an ability to write at length.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>1</b></p> <p>Response attempts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>address the question, but without providing any relevant or accurate evidence to support points that are made.</li> </ul>  |

## Examples of possible approaches to Question Three

### Using Sources L1–O2, to what extent had Aotearoa New Zealand been successfully colonised by 1900?

#### Evidence

The candidate should identify and insightfully analyse the Aotearoa New Zealand context, by examining:

- the cultural ties that had been established
- the ways in which they were maintained
- the economic ties that saw a growing dependency on Britain for trade
- the willingness to support Britain in wars in other colonies
- the continuing importance of the British monarchy and the importance of Queen Victoria for both Pākehā and Māori
- the ways in which many Pākehā saw this country as an “improved” version of Britain, suggesting that they increasingly saw themselves as no longer being under the thrall of the colonising power
- the various ways in which the country had established laws that improved the working life of its citizens, e.g. the electoral reforms that enabled women to have a greater say in the power structure of this country
- the various ways in which the political / economic / social power structures of the country continued to reflect the prevailing views of the colonising power
- the discrimination of minority groups such as the Chinese, reflecting the widespread opinion that the “Better Britain” of the South Pacific would be a “white man’s country”, reflecting the attitudes of the colonising power
- the attempts to assimilate Māori through education, e.g. the Native Schools Act (1867) and its consequences
- the emergence of schools, such as Te Aute College, and its impact on Māori
- the continuing presence of religious movements which embodied a Māori response to colonialism.

The key word in this question is “successfully” and this could invite the candidate to question the extent to which the process of colonisation had been carried out.

The candidate could argue that for Pākehā inhabitants of Aotearoa New Zealand, there had been an agreed process in which the bonds between Britain and Aotearoa New Zealand were both maintained and strengthened by internal and external events. However, for Māori the process of colonisation had been challenging, and there was a continuing and purposeful desire to both maintain traditions and to respond to the ongoing attempts to assimilate Māori into the world of the coloniser. “Successfully” then needs to be measured with an analysis of the responses to colonisation by both peoples.



Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source L1:** Pickles discusses the enthusiasm with which some women’s organisations supported the notion of empire. The activities of groups such as the Victoria League could be used to contrast the activities of women such as Kate Sheppard and Harriet Morison, who fought to advance the interests of women, with the willingness of the women in this source, to accept and promote the interests of empire. In working to “foster imperialistic patriotism,” these women happily subscribed to activities that were regarded as “women’s work”. This source could be used to argue that colonisation had been a “success” for these women and the organisations they supported, as their enthusiastic promotion of imperial propaganda suggests a wholehearted embrace of colonialism and all it represented.

**Source L2:** The tourist poster could be used to comment on the role of Māori women at the time. The women in this poster have been used to promote Aotearoa New Zealand as a tourist destination, and the candidate could discuss the way in which Māoritanga is used to attract people to Aotearoa New Zealand, yet Māori are marginalised, their language is under attack, and their culture subverted to serve the interests of others. This source could be used to discuss the ways in which women like Meri Te Tai Mangakāhia fought to advance the interests of Māori women. A comparison of her actions and the actions of other women fighting against the patriarchal attitudes of the colonisers could help advance an argument that the use of the descriptor “successfully” does depend on a particular perspective.

**Source M:** Rose focuses on the importance of language as a means of establishing and maintaining colonialism. This source could provide an opportunity to discuss the attempt by the settler government to assimilate Māori into the European world and so successfully complete the process of colonialism. The source claims that “the dominant language in society can be a tool of colonialism and oppression, an instrument of power,” and this is an idea that the candidate could profitably discuss in the context of the failure of the settler government to eliminate te reo and arrive at a conclusion which suggests that Māori had not, despite attempts by colonial forces, been “successfully” colonised.

**Source N:** The watercolour is a pictorial attempt to demonstrate the process of colonisation through land. It could be used to argue that through the acquisition of land, the colonisers had been “successful”. A knowledge of the Native Land Courts and other attempts to alienate land from the control of Māori would enhance a discussion about how this painting – the progress from forest to an idealised landscape – reflects the relative success of the colonisers in using force and the law to realise their attempts to subjugate and marginalise Māori, as suggested in this painting, where art and tradition are used to decorate its edges.

**Source O1 and Source O2:** The image and text could allow the candidate to argue that the patriotic fervour that emerged because of the Boer War is a clear indication that Aotearoa New Zealand had been successfully colonised. The candidate could comment on the implicit irony in these sources: support for the colonising power of Britain, as it attempts to prevent one of its colonies from exercising independence. The image of Seddon in **Source O1** may encourage the candidate to make a connection to his dreams of a South Seas Empire. Likewise, the language and imagery used by Judd in **Source O2** from Ian McGibbon could also enable the candidate to comment that the source (as Source O1 also does), demonstrates the overt connections to Britain through ties of ‘blood’ and ties of ‘family’ (“bound by a ‘crimson tie’ of unity to their kith and kin”). The quote from Seddon in which he describes Aotearoa New Zealand’s “duty ‘as Englishmen,’” could also encourage the candidate to suggest that national identity was determined by race, and this conclusion might form the basis of a response to Question Three.

## Cut Scores

| Scholarship | Outstanding Scholarship |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| 13 – 16     | 17 – 24                 |