This assessment is based on a now-expired version of the achievement standard and may not accurately reflect the content and practice of external assessments developed for 2024 onwards. No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.



Level 1 History RAS 2023

92027 Demonstrate understanding of perspectives on a historical context

EXEMPLAR

Merit

TOTAL 05

INSTRUCTIONS

The task in this assessment consists of a report that will be submitted digitally as follows:

a written report (PDF)

OR

orally (audio file)

OR

visually (video file).

Choose ONE historical context to respond to the task below. The historical context can be an event, person, place, group of people, or historical movement.

You should aim to write no more than **800 words in total**. (Where an audio/video file is submitted, it should not exceed **4 minutes in total**.)

ASSESSMENT TASK

Historical perspectives may include consideration of an individual or group's historical actions, responses, motivations, experiences, beliefs, values, and concepts.

In what ways do the historical actions of TWO individuals or groups from your chosen historical context demonstrate their perspectives on an event, person, or place?

In your report, you should:

- identify TWO individuals or groups from your chosen historical context
- include historical evidence
- consider the immediate and wider historical context
- explain how the perspectives may differ.

Perspectives on the 1981 Springbok Tour

Introduction:

In the year 1981, the commonly known Springbok tour occurred. It was ongoing for 56 days from July to September and was between the South African rugby team and the New Zealand rugby team. This specifically caused a lot of widespread protests across New Zealand from the rugby supporters and those who opposed the tour. The reason being, pro-tour supporters felt it was their right and freedom to watch rugby, they didn't want other countries laws to become a part of the sport they loved to watch. Others also supported this tour because of the history of sp01ting rivalry between New Zealand and South African teams so why stop the games now? Anti-tour protesters though felt that there should be no reason for South Africa to play New Zealand because of the apaitheid in their country. Apartheid (meaning apartness) was a system of racial segregation put in place by the South African government. This was a policy that was aimed to separate the racial groups, primarily the white minority and the black minority. These new laws meant that each racial group were to live separately and have no contact with each other. Anti-tour protesters felt that New Zealand should not have any involvement with South Africa while this was going on.

Pro tour supporters:

The pro tour supporters were those who felt the 1981 rugby tour should still go ahead. These individuals supported the tour because they felt that sports and politics should have no relation to each other. New Zealand's Prime Minister at the time Robert Muldoon stated that "sports and politics don 't mix". People had opinions such as it was their right and freedom to watch rugby because it was

a game they loved and had been watching for many years and the fact that these New Zealand and South African teams specifically had a sporting history of rivalry so why stop now? Others felt that this could be an opportunity for bridge building. They thought they could show South Africa the good race relation in New Zealand. The main idea of this all leads back to how sports and politics do not mix. Despite the issue that was happening with the South African government, these people wanted to keep their love for watching rugby out of it. This group had even gone to lengths such as organising support matches and gatherings. They also showed their support by physically purchasing tickets for the game and attending them (once the games had been deemed to go ahead). Despite the apartheid in South Africa, these rugby supporters did not show any acceptance of the apartheid but rather just wanted to watch a sport they loved. Cez Blazey, the New Zealand Rugby Union boss stated that "the invitation has got nothing to do with political issues at all and is purely a sporting matter". Proving yet again another pro tour supporter who wanted to keep politics out of sports. These sorts of actions and words this group of people said have proved their perspective and shown their reasoning as to why they think the tour should still go ahead.

Anti-tour protesters:

The anti-tour protesters had a strong opinion on the tour not going ahead. As stated above the main reason was because of the apartheid in South Africa, the new laws put in by the government about racial segregation. Many people were opposing the tour because apartheid was an injustice and our country had a right to protest against it, having our rugby team play there didn't seem like it was proving much of a point. To gain more of an idea regarding the anti-tour protesters' perspectives, there were multiple reports writing about how the Hamilton grounds for the South Africa-Waikato match were invaded. More than 500 police officers were present on the scene and arrested about 50 others present. There was mention of a man named Pat McQuarrie who had gone to the lengths of stealing a plane and with police officers unclear of his intentions, they decided to cancel the game. This cancellation led to the rioting between the tour supporters and protesters. David Sparks, a rugby fan and witness to the Hamilton protest stated "There were groups of people just absolutely laying into one another outside that ground. All those side streets were just littered with people holding their heads, sitting on the curb, heads bashed in or noses broken, it was absolute carnage"We can understand that there were severe amounts of violence caused during the protests against this tour. These protesters' perspectives had caused them to take such strong actions which ended up leading to this unfortunate mayhem. Another factor we can take into consideration was the Gleneagles agreement. This was an agreement made by the Commonwealth Heads of Government in 1977 stating that those who signed would withhold support for and discourage sporting contacts between their countries and South Africa. Muldoon had signed the agreement but ended up leaving the decision for the Springboks to tour New Zealand to the NZRU (New Zealand Rugby Union) which caused even more upset protesters.

Conclusion:

Regarding the anti-tour supporters and pro-tour supporters, we can conclude that both their differing perspectives caused a lot of complications for New Zealand in 1981. Understanding that pro-tour supporters felt that the tour should still go ahead despite the apartheid in South Africa. These tour supporters didn't want politics and sports to be involved with each other and that there is no need for them to be related in any way. The anti-tour supporters on the other hand felt that there should be no rugby tour because of this very reason. Many people didn't want to have any contact with this country until their laws changed, furthermore giving their reasoning for the tour not to go ahead in this country. This had a major impact on New Zealand because of the complications it was causing for our citizens. In a way, this could be viewed as a civil war for our country. Both groups of people had valid and strong reasoning for their opinion on the tour, which unfortunately resulted in chaos during the 1981 Springbok tour.

Merit

Subject: History

Standard: 92027

Total score: 05

Q	Grade score	Marker commentary
One	M5	The candidate clearly identifies two perspectives on the 1981 Springbok Tour and associated actions, giving reasons for both perspectives and actions. The differences between the two perspectives are explained, as per the requirement for Merit. There is some mention of the wider context, but not enough depth is provided and it is not effectively integrated with the responses / actions.