

## SECTION B: Questions 2-8

### ESSAY MARK SCHEDULE

#### Question 2

Candidates may convincingly argue either for or against the mooted view. Those arguing that benefits outweighed problems will stress the process of adoption and adaptation while those arguing the problems outweighed benefits will stress dislocation and depopulation. From an historiographic point of view recent historians have emphasised the former and older historians the latter.

- Examples of benefits could include:
  - acquisition of Pakeha technology that saved labour and increased productivity e.g. metal tools such as spades, axes, nails etc.
  - adoption of Pakeha animals and plants e.g. pork and potatoes (potatoes especially significant as Maori could, for the first time produce significant food surpluses and potatoes could be cultivated in other regions; compare the kumara, leading to changes in population distribution).
  - a decline in cultural practices such as polygamy, cannibalism, infanticide et al ( although, it could be argued that this is a biased/Eurocentric view.
  - the spread of literacy and Christianity (see qualifying statement above).
- Examples of problems could include:
  - depopulation due to disease and intertribal warfare.
  - major dislocation and redistribution of population due to warfare.
  - loss of culture e.g. tapu and chiefly mana undermined, cultural practices abandoned
- Whichever way they argue they should acknowledge evidence for the counter view and argue why this is outweighed by evidence for the position that they have taken e.g. those arguing that benefits outweighed problems could cite Belich on depopulation viz., that the impact of contact was barely 'crippling' let alone fatal.
- Astute candidates will likely argue that it is difficult (if impossible) to draw conclusions re. The impact of contact on 'Maori' because Maori lived as distinct whanau, hapu and iwi and the experience of individual kin groups varied markedly across time and space. For instance, some hapu/iwi in direct contact for several decades experienced dramatic depopulation and cultural dislocation, the problems clearly outweighing the benefits. Other iwi, in inland areas like the Wanganui had not been in direct contact and arguably benefited from the acquisition of items of Pakeha technology or food crops with few if any attendant problems. They will also acknowledge that some impacts were essentially neutral e.g. establishing new settlements to engage in trade (if not at the expense of other hapu) or because of the availability of new food crops. Also, while some changes resulted in a loss of mana, others offered new opportunities in the pursuit of mana.

#### Question 3

- The short answer is that basically government policies after 1843 did not reflect the principles of the Treaty. Perceptive candidates will address the issue of which Treaty (and this requires brief analysis of the wording and meaning of the two versions) ? Government policies almost completely contravened the Maori version. The same is largely true of the English version other than those policies deriving from the British assumption of sovereignty under Article 1 of the English version.
- Pakeha understood Hobson's statement at Waitangi - "we are one people" - as meaning NZ was now British. They believed Europeans, as the superior race, would occupy the land and make NZ a "Better or Greater Britain". There was no room for the Maori in this vision. It was assumed that they would be amalgamated (ie assimilated) by the superior British race. These assumptions shaped Government policies and European attitudes/demands re "Native policy".
- As the century progressed most Pakeha in NZ, including government officials, came to regard the Treaty as irrelevant, at best an historical footnote. It was never ratified by either the imperial or colonial government.
- Specific examples of the failure to uphold the Treaty could include:
  - assumption of British sovereignty led to effective denial of rangatiratanga (Article 1) and war in the 1860s

- certainly lands, forests, & fisheries etc. received little protection; a series of laws effectively dispossessed the Maori of much of their resources (Article 2)
- part 2 of article 2 was abandoned briefly in the 1840s and permanently in the 1860s; enactment of this principle contradicted the promise made in Article 3.
- applying British law as under Art. 3 of the English version denied rangatiratanga guaranteed in Art. 1 of the Maori version
- Maori were not treated equally under the law; Maori given 4 seats only in Parliament (effectively disenfranchised before this) and subject to imprisonment without trial in 1860s & 1880s.
- 1852 Constitution removed protection of gubernatorial system & est. settler govt. i.e. govt. by and for settler interests; determined to assert substantive sovereignty and gain the bulk of Maori ("waste") land for Pakeha settlement.
- pursued policies which breached both the spirit and the letter of the Treaty of Waitangi
- Maori resistance, especially the Kingitanga, resulted in war; policy of confiscation extended/prolonged the conflict 1865-1872
- Wars and laws, esp. 1863 Land for Settlement Act, 1865 Native Land Act, Native Schools Act of 1860s (threatened language and transmission of culture), and a raft of subsequent laws denied Maori sovereignty and dispossessed Maori of resource base, marginalising them politically and economically
- Maori and Pakeha lived increasingly separate existences; any further Maori resistance smashed forcefully by Govt. (eg Parihaka, Dog Tax war)
- Maori sense of grievance; sought redress in a number of ways; although Maori granted 4 seats in Parliament, there was no possibility of equitable representation and NZ Govt. resisted/refused all Maori claims for limited autonomy and redress

#### Question 4

- Candidates will need to survey the outcomes of the various campaigns (Taranaki 1860-1861, Waikato 1863 - 1865, the wars against Pai Marirre, Te Kooti and Titikowaru, 1865 - 1872) and establish the degree/scope of the European victory in each of the major campaigns and overall. The fighting finally ended in 1872. The daring and skill of the Maori warriors combined with the organisation and strategy of leaders such as Rewi Maniapoto, Rawiri Puhirake, Titikowaru, and Te Kooti denied the British and Colonial forces outright military victory. In the end however the Maori could not overcome the massive European superiority in troops and firepower. During the Waikato War up to 18,000 men fought for the New Zealand government. This was more than the entire adult male Maori population. In nearly every battle the Maori were heavily outnumbered. The Maori were also outgunned. They had little or no artillery and had very limited ammunition. Although Maori forces were able to win individual battles it was difficult for them to wage war over long periods of time. Maori warriors could only be part-time soldiers. They had to plant crops and gather food for their people. This often meant that they had to break off from the fighting. Despite their remarkable opposition Maori resistance throughout much of the North Island was broken. The question of sovereignty had been decided. New Zealand would be a country based on British law and institutions.
- Thus, those Maori who fought were defeated militarily in the 1860s. "The British victory was limited but real, and it was a turning point in New Zealand history" (Belich). However, because the European victory was limited, Maori retained a latent military capacity/potential especially in the King Country; few dared cross the aukati before the mid-1880s and.
- Although the Maori were pacified, conflict was close to the surface. Any Maori resistance prompted a forceful Pakeha response e.g. Parihaka 1881 and Dog Tax War 1898. This overreaction, Belich argues, was due to the demonstration of Maori military capacity in the 1860s and the failure to completely defeat the Maori.

#### Question 5

- NZ faced several economic difficulties involving dependence:
  - NZ did not have the population base, resources, and infrastructure to develop heavy industry or manufacturing on any large scale

- economy depended heavily on exports
- depended on a narrow range of exports; wool was the staple export 1850 - 1900
- depended on exports derived from depletable resources and therefore were not sustainable in the long term  
e.g.  
gold, gum, seals/whales, kauri...
- depended on a small number of markets and sources of imports, mainly Australia initially and, after the 1870s, Britain
- depended on overseas sources of capital for development, again Australia and Britain and led to a high level of indebtedness
- provinces effectively bankrupt by end of 1860s.
- All of this made the NZ economy extremely vulnerable: drop in demand or price for NZ's key exports led to economic recession/depression e.g. late 1860s and 'Long Depression' (1879 - 1896). NZ's economy recovered when the British economy and thus the price for NZ exports recovered.
- Efforts to broaden the export base met with limited success in the 19th century but laid the basis for new staples in the 20th century
  - in the 1850s exports of agricultural produce to the Australian goldfields offered short-lived opportunities
  - in the 1870s NZ enjoyed the grain bonanza but couldn't compete with Australia and North America in the long run.
  - development of manufacturing mainly geared toward income replacement
  - 1882 invention of refrigeration was a key development; led to establishment of dairy coops and meat-processing plants; production and exports grew rapidly from the latter half of the 1890s; the real pay-off came in the C20th.
- Nevertheless NZ still had a dependent economy in 1900:
  - depended on one principal market (Britain) for its exports and as a source of imports
  - still relied on a very limited range of exports to that market
  - relied on Britain as the source of development capital

#### Question 6

- Geography (ie where people lived) was more important than class in NZ politics at least up until the mid-1880s.
- A number of factors precluded the development of national parties before 1890:
  - in the first decades after the Treaty NZ was a number of scattered settlements (really several colonies rather than a colony)
  - peoples' interests and loyalties were local/regional.
  - this was institutionalized by the 1852 constitution which established a dual system of provincial and central government. From the beginning the provinces took the lead precluding the development of national, sectional politics.
  - even after the abolition of the provinces in 1876, provincialism remained strong.
  - voter participation remained low throughout the century and it took decades before a universal franchise was established.
  - the nature of politics and politicians: they were dominated by the social-economic elite
  - ministries formed by shifting alignments of similar personnel eg Continuous Ministry. Because of the nature of political organisation - no parties etc - politics was very much a product of what happened in parliament, not what happened in the electorate
- An important shift occurred in NZ politics in the 1880s. The social consequences of Long Depression repression, especially the development of sweating and evidence of poverty, and the question of the availability of land for settlement became important political issues; the predecessors of the Liberals were discredited as they failed to respond effectively to the social and economic problems of the day.
  - saw the emergence of sectional interests on a national scale (rural vs urban, labour vs. capital ...) which transcended local/provincial interests and identity
  - national politics and the Liberal Party which appealed to the rural and urban "small men"; the first national political party in the modern sense

- The Liberal Govt. differed from its predecessors in important respects: supporters of party and composition of government differed significantly; represented the "small man" and NOT the colonial elite. Although they lacked a party organisation and campaign in the modern sense they were identified with a platform.

### Question 7

- Candidates will be required to establish and explain several important demographic patterns/trends including national/ethnic composition, age-sex ratios, geographic distribution (coastal/inland, urban/rural, North Island/South Island). Generalizations offered and explained could include:
  - NZ Pakeha population grew exponentially - massive increase in the 1860s and 1870s especially.
  - Auckland had already emerged as the prime city and province by the turn of the century - it was outstripped by Otago in the 1870s and 1880s but re-emerged as the leading city/province by the turn of the century.
  - The "Big 4" cities/provinces emerged early on.
  - At mid-century NZ was very much a rural nation although already 1/3 of the population was urban. Urbanization continued in the latter half of the century and by 1900 society was approaching a rural-urban equilibrium.
  - The NZ population mid-century was an extremely young one and was still relatively youthful by 1900. However by then there were a significant number of older people.
  - Men outnumbered women throughout the century and the sexual imbalance was extreme for 25 - 50s age group. The ratio was approaching parity by 1900.
- A major determining factor was the pattern of 19th century migration to NZ. Up to the 1830s most Europeans coming to NZ did not intend to stay and were here to exploit one resource or another. After 1840 migration (& thus settlement) was continuous. However there were 3 key phases of migration:
  1. 1840 - NZ Co. brought nearly 10,000 settlers (unplanned Auckland also attracted several thousand).
  2. 1860s - gold rushes; approx. 200,000
  3. 1870s - Vogel/Govt. immigration schemes, 190,000

Migration then slowed and in fact there was a net outflow in that decade (1886 -91)
- Organised immigration played a very important role in the pattern of settlement in and the structure of the population NZ.
  - NZ Co. & their 'offshoots' in Canterbury and Otago established settlements which became 'capitals' of 6 of NZ's provinces
  - provincial and national governments recruited working settlers; people with skills needed to develop the young nation.
  - perhaps the most important phase of organised settlement came in the 1870s with Vogel's scheme: resulted in a bigger population base necessary for development; brought married couples and single women which reduced the sex imbalance; brought settlers who tackled the last great pioneering task viz., clearing the central North Island bush (although at the expense of the Maori)

BUT unplanned settlement was extremely important too

  - Auckland was the fastest growing and most prosperous of the early settlements
  - the gold rushes brought the single biggest influx of migrants to NZ
  - chain migration important throughout the period
- For much of the century there was a significant imbalance of the sexes due to the pioneer nature of society and the reasons why people migrated to NZ.
  - the 19th century saw large-scale migration of young men in particular from metropolitan Europe (Britain) to frontier societies of the empire
  - gold in particular attracted a huge influx of men; created a serious imbalance which took a half century to right
  - it was unacceptable for single women to migrate/travel unaccompanied; there were no such restrictions for men
- NZ society in the 19th century was relatively homogenous. This was due to the types of migrants who came to NZ:
  - vast majority were British; predominantly English but also Scottish & Irish; significant numbers migrated from other colonial societies, principally Australia (very similar in origin)
  - proportions reflected in religious affiliations: Anglicans, Presbyterians, Catholics
  - came from Britain's cities, towns, and countryside

- some small non-British groups migrated; Chinese, North American miners, Scandinavians & Germans
- more men than women migrated esp. in the 1860s and they tended to be young people
- majority of assisted migrants came as married couples
- vast majority came from the working classes (mechanics, artisans, tradesmen, agricultural labourers etc); few who came were rich by English standards.

### Question 8

- Candidates will need to establish the aspirations/expectations that motivated Europeans to migrate to NZ in order to assess the extent to which these were fulfilled. They should consider various groupings: national/ethnic, gender, class. They may show an awareness of the work of Belich (the desire to create "Better Britain" or "Greater Britain") and Fairburn (pursuit of Arcadian and utopian ideals).
- Most people who migrated to NZ came in the hope that they could improve their lives (and the lives of their children). NZ offered opportunities unavailable in Europe.
  - Most (true of working, middle classes and lesser gentry) hoped for a better material standard of living; C19th British economic life was uncertain; significant unemployment and underemployment
  - many working class people aspired to become men & women of property; to own their own land
  - some, especially the middle classes, sought to escape the status anxieties & pressures of Britain
  - they came to free themselves from the power/control of landlords, factory bosses
  - some came specifically to improve their health
  - single women came to find husbands
  - miners were an international itinerant work-force, following gold strikes
- Life in NZ probably fulfilled the expectations of most migrants, although it could take several years, even decades for them to achieve their aspirations.
  - how people fared depended on factors like when & where they landed, how adaptable they were, and what skills and capital they had
  - if we accept the legend that a (the) main goal of working men was to become farmers than migrants to NZ failed in this goal - only 8% of Pakeha men were farmers by 1880 BUT Belich argues that this was a legend and that many who came to NZ looked and/or settled for "enhancement or adoption rather than promotion"
  - up until the 1880s, after the early setbacks and disappointments of the 1840s, there was plenty of work and wages were good
  - working people had the highest std of living anywhere in the world in the 1870s
  - NZ fell short of a working mans paradise but compared to Britain provided much more opportunity for enhancement, adoption and promotion; houses ,although primitive at first, were comfortable and detached units; ordinary working people could realistically hope to own their own home; food/diet was much better than in Britain
  - women worked hard but single women could make good marriages (marriage was the key to "getting on "). Women did get on but often at a price (pregnancy, drudgery, loneliness ...)
  - and NZ women had one of the highest rates of property ownership in the world.
  - classes existed but people were not subservient; there was a strong egalitarian spirit.
  - perhaps, in general terms, those who most/best fulfilled their expectations in the medium to long term were the respectable classes and the gentry.

HOWEVER: experience of the 1880s proved NZ was not paradise on earth. Some of the evils of the old world existed and the work of Fairburn reminds us that there were problems of drunkenness, violence, isolation and danger. These were disappearing by the end of the century.