

# NEW ZEALAND SCHOLARSHIP 2004

## HISTORY

### Sample of assessed candidate work - Performance Descriptor 2

#### TOPIC ONE: ENGLAND 1558 - 1667

Elizabeth I was much praised by historians, both contemporary and modern. The 'Golden Age', the mystique and majesty of Gloriana, success in foreign policy and stability at home, all contributed to the perceived greatness of the Queen. By comparison, James I has suffered much more from historians; he was the drunk, the homosexual and the spendthrift. It is only in the last few decades that the pendulum of judgement has begun to swing in James's favour. The view expressed here has been proven very true. Revisionism has changed previous views held on these two monarchs. Elizabeth was successful in establishing her Anglican settlement and in eliminating the major Catholic threat to herself and to her Protestant Settlement however, her idolised image needed revising and now historians are much more critical of a conservative Queen who was very good at promoting images of herself as a young, virgin Queen. Elizabeth's policies were more effective than that of James I in that they brought about change. James may have been an intellectual but Elizabeth's hard work with the establishment of her religious settlement meant he could take a course of religious toleration. James's reputation was tainted by Early English historians views. A Scottish King in an English country who surrounded himself with those 'vulgar' Scots was going to influence views on his political and religious rule. Historians are now praising James for his intellect, policy of religious toleration and his handling of multiple kingdoms.

Elizabeth's previous idolised image particularly portrayed in Neal's views of her was in dire need of an overhaul. Elizabeth was politically astute and worked hard to portray her image. She spent hours getting ready for paintings, which she rarely allowed. She was often painted with an ermine to symbolise her purity and spent time covering her face in a concoction consisting of eggshell to give her the fashionably white face. She was drawn as haughty and regal, and with her royal red hair that was (at least later on) undoubtedly a wig. C. Haigh clarifies this view, 'She had aimed for popularity and political security by projecting herself as the ever-young and every-beautiful virgin mother of her people.' However he goes on to say that 'her reign had been 30 years of illusion followed by 15 years of disillusion'. His book 'Elizabeth I' was published in 1988 suggesting a lack of up-to-date research and a contemporary understanding of Elizabeth. Often young historians make bold comments with only slivers of truth in them in order to make their mark in history. Haigh has certainly embellished the truth in that second phrase which would make a historian wary to accept the first comment at face value. In 'A Tudor Painting' the family of Henry VIII is painted in about 1572 and Elizabeth is accompanied by symbols of peace and prosperity. The probability that it has been painted in Elizabeth's reign suggests that Elizabeth was good at promoting her image. One must be careful in analysing the information portrayed in paintings. They are useful as visual sources to depict an overall feeling and to portray the painter's viewpoint but they are bias to the painter's viewpoint.

Elizabeth established her religious settlement in 1559 with the Act of Uniformity and the Act of Supremacy. She was 'Supreme governor' rather than 'supreme head' as her male counterpart would have been. In this way

Elizabeth faced a challenge that James did not have to. A female ruler in a male-dominated society meant her personality had to be strong enough to lead her male court. She was under pressure to marry and to therefore produce an heir that would ensure England's stability. She was unwilling to let advisors touch her royal Prerogative and was unwilling for England to be ruled by a foreign power.

Catholicism had been the 'grassroots' religion of England and it had gathered authority simply by the weight of tradition. Catholicism went along the same lines as popular culture. It provided reassurance in an unsettling world and provided warmth and colourful images to a largely illiterate populace. To a congregation sitting in a cold church on uncomfortable seats devoid of images surrounding them, Catholicism seemed inviting. Richard Baxter noted that people were just as 'zealous for candles, altars, crucifix, processions ...' as they had been before the English reformation. Elizabeth had the challenge of establishing her Protestant church on a population that cherished Catholicism. Beliefs are slow to change but Elizabeth dealt with reluctance through charging recusancy fines, not making 'windows into men's souls', in promoting that her settlement was final and in finally having Mary, Queen of Scots executed.

Mary, Queen of Scots posed a threat to Elizabeth. James did not have to deal with threats to his divine authority. Mary's claim to the throne was based on her being the great granddaughter of the First English monarch – Henry VII. She was involved in foreign-backed conspiracies to assassinate Elizabeth and the Ridolfi, Throckmorton, Babington plots and the Northern Rebellion were warnings that some would commit treason to see the Catholic symbol of hope – Mary, Queen of Scots on the throne. Elizabeth was reluctant to execute Mary as she was her cousin and of royal blood. But in 1587, acting on the advice of her councilors, Mary was executed. The fact that Elizabeth was conservative as expressed in her delay of nearly two decades in the decision to execute Mary is expressed by P. Williams who writes 'she procrastinated over matters of foreign policy and military strategy ... She was a relatively inactive ruler'. Elizabeth is increasingly compared to her mother Anne in the phrase 'Sempre Eadeam' which means no change, in other words Elizabeth was unprepared to act and to make decisions that would bring about change. P. Williams writes 'The recipe was successful, even if her kingdom did not much resemble the Elizabethan England of later myth'. This highlights that she was an effective ruler even though aspects of her reign are later to be criticised. The book P. Williams view is expressed in seems to be fairly relevant however we do not know if the date given is when it was first published, so we must be careful. P. Williams view is backed by R. Sloan who states that 'For most of the reign, the system provided stable and effective government'. Sloan also says that 'she owed a great deal to the Privy Council' which is evidenced by the appropriate decision to finally execute Mary which was made on advice from her Privy Council.

Neal's idolised view of Elizabeth displays certain qualities of 'puppy love' and S. Basnett is true in stating that 'historians writing about her have been male'. Neal's view of Elizabeth does not take into account Elizabeth's lack of control over finance. Elizabeth was lacking in this area, which tarnishes the view of the 'Golden Age'. The monarch could no longer be adequately financed by semi-feudal methods yet Elizabeth did nothing to change them. In a short-term decision she sold off Crown land, which was to provide the Crown with quick cash, but was to stop the long-term benefits of rent. The Exchequer used primitive accounting methods and merely kept a check on revenue but never looked at ways to increase it. Customs duties were never revised to keep up with inflation and very little money went into the royal coffers, instead it went

into the pockets of the men running it. Elizabeth was frugal, however she should have decided to put in place methods of raising revenue instead of trying to squeeze the most out of a system that was well passed it's used by date.

Michael Graves criticizes Elizabeth for her policies in Ireland, which taints the 'Golden Age' image. He has called it a 'dark stain' and 'the darkest page in her reign'. The Nine Year's war that was fought there cost Elizabeth two million pounds and was characterised by atrocities on both sides. Elizabeth derived her knowledge of Ireland from second-hand sources, as she never visited Ireland suggesting a lack of understanding. Elizabeth wore the Irish Crown but the Irish were to become increasingly incensed due to discrimination.

I do not think her failed policies in Ireland can be classed as 'success in foreign policy', rather it attributes to the 'perceived greatness of the Queen,' which when researched unearths feelings of resentment towards Elizabeth I.

James I was not as an effective ruler in England as Elizabeth I was. He did nothing to actively change religion. He pursued a policy of religious toleration, which coincided, with his character. James would listen to everybody's ideas, he just would not act on them. He was very intellectual shown by the authorised King James version of the bible and learned evidenced by his book 'Basilikon Doron' first published in 1599 in which James advised his son Prince Henry on the duties and divine right of kings. B. Coward summarises James's policies, 'he used political skills of flexibility and compromise' which highlights James's broad toleration of religion. The Gunpowder Plot of 1605 shocked James as his personal safety had been threatened and it tainted his 'peace-maker king' policies because as a result he toughened up anti-Catholic laws. James's policy of religious toleration was the easy diplomatic solution. Elizabeth had done the hard work in establishing the church and dealing with plots and rebellions in this way Elizabeth was a more effective ruler in that she established and maintained her settlement.

'James I has suffered much ... from historians; he was the drunk, the homosexual and the spendthrift'. One of the reasons for his previous sorry reputation was the general dislike of his favourites. P. Croft explains 'Two key figures, Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, received scholarly biographical treatment for the first time ... In both cases their hitherto low reputations were significantly upgraded. Both were far more than idle courtiers: they devoted much effort to administrative reform and achieved some improvements.' Not only does this highlight the short-sighted perhaps jealous negative view of his favourites but it suggests it was untrue. Could this be English resentment of a Scottish king who surrounded himself with the despised Scots? Certainly Arthur Wilson and Francis Osborne 'works perpetuated the negative stereotype'.

James's closed court meant that aristocratic circles were alienated from the court highlights P. Croft in an up-to-date book published in 2003. 'While Osborne shared Weldon's loathing of the Scots, who he described as leeches sucking at the English body politic. The composite picture of James derived from three hostile Englishmen ...'. Englishmen did not like the Scottish and James surrounded himself with them, so of course James's reputation will be tainted by jealous gentry who felt isolated by the sudden close of James's court. These three Englishmen that P. Croft describes were emotionally attached as they were ousted so of course their views will be negative. It shows how people's views of the time led to the generalised view that James was a 'drunk, the homosexual and the spendthrift'.

James has been known for his unhygienic behaviour in that he only rubbed his fingertips together instead of washing his hands, but this is speculation and his personal hygiene should not reflect his intellect. K. Sharpe writes 'where James was informal to the point of familiarity, at times unkempt and (by English standards) undignified, a lover of debate and wit even descending to vulgarity and irreverence' highlight his personal failings. However this book was published in 1989 suggesting a lack of up-to-date research, which could result in narrow-minded views that are not entirely correct. Certainly there is an element of sarcasm in the words 'by English standards', which implies that the Scottish had different standards that were not considered just by the English. James's court did indulge in revelry, which tainted James's image, but this by no means should undermine him as a monarch. P. Croft praises James 'as a serious and intelligent ruler'.

James did have shortcomings, which highlight how Elizabeth can be seen as the more effective ruler. He was extravagant with his spending. C. Russell exclaims 'There was certainly no justification for the fact that his average level of spending was nearly twice' Elizabeth's. This view is also highlighted by the published date of the book of 1974.

James had three households to support, his own, the Queen's and in Wales. Even if he had stuck to Elizabeth's frugal economies he would have needed about 80 000 pounds more than Elizabeth per annum. Also C. Russell's readiness to generalise James as homosexual makes the information dubious. True, James did like beautiful men and formed strong attachments but he had an unhappy childhood often beaten into submission. He formed a strong attachment to Buckingham as a child and this can be seen as a factor in his like of good-looking men, and the reason he promoted Buckingham as his minister.

James lavished patronage on his favourites. This can be seen as politically wise, 'a foreign king in a new country had to be generous enough to make friends'. However it aroused suspicion and made Parliament reluctant to grant subsidies. James went crazy with titles, 'he made more knights in four months than Queen Elizabeth had done in forty-five years' writes C. Russell. Russell exclaims he was clearly overdoing it' but James needed the loyalty of his subjects and their suspicion of a Scottish King who some saw as a 'buffoon' may have prompted him to be excessive in his generosity.

These shortcomings contrast to Elizabeth who although was criticised for her meanness, indecisiveness and conservatism was more effective in gaining support of the general populace without spending extravagant amounts of money on it. The general populace must have grown wary of James's spending and it was only the gentry benefiting.

In comparing and contrasting Elizabeth and James's leadership styles one can see Elizabeth was the more effective ruler. Yes, James listened to everyone which was diplomatic of him but he did not act. Elizabeth did not listen to all views and regarded her Elizabethan Settlement as final but it was this that established the national Protestant church and succeeded in severely reducing the Catholic threat to England. Elizabeth's rule from 1558–1603 was praised and it has been right to mention her shortcomings as her 'gloriana' image is modified however James cannot live up to Elizabeth's downgraded

image even though his has been upgraded from 'the drunk, the homosexual and the spendthrift'. This view came about from three jealous Englishmen and James is now viewed as an intellectual whose policy of religious toleration in his reign from 1603–1625 did not cause problems. His policy was certainly better than his son, Charles who during his reign created so many issues that he became the biggest issue and by 1642 had plunged England into civil war and created a 'British Crisis'.

### **General Comments**

Skill 1 = 4 Argument clearly established and reiterated in places throughout

Skill 2 = 3 Good use of evidence, although a wider range of evidence needed, strong on only 2 main areas, religions and Elizabeth's personality; more depth in own evidence as well

Skill 3 = 4 Several lots of evidence criticised as well.

Skill 4 = 4 Several Historians' work considered - just reaches top level.

Skill 5 = 3 Conclusion is sound, maybe could have been longer, addressed more forcefully the argument established at the outset

Skill 6 = 4 Strong structure, high level of literacy

*This candidate meets all the criteria in Performance Descriptor 2 (although skills 1, 3, 4 and 6 are at the Performance Descriptor 1 level)*

The total = 22, therefore this candidate is in the Performance Category 2

## Sample of assessed candidate work - Performance Descriptor 2

### TOPIC TWO: NEW ZEALAND IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Miles Fairburn's 'Atomisation' thesis caused profound shock amongst the History community in 1989. It undermined not only the held view of the development of Pakeha community, but also possibly the whole of Pakeha social history. Hence, many historians were quick to jump up in arms against this divisive thesis, and though they could not completely deny it, they managed to dull its initial significance. When any member of any society uproots and relocates, there are always frustrations and cultural shocks. However, this does not necessarily mean that the individual must accept a dire fate, instead the individual has the ability to adapt to his or her new environment and integrate into society. Although some aspects of New Zealand society indicate a state of wandering atomisation, it is not possible to generalise that all of New Zealand was atomised – this article will argue that New Zealand society not only had structure and community, but also incorporated the minority of atomised individuals.

Miles Fairburn and a few other historians used the sex ratio between 1861 and 1901 to argue that New Zealand was not only male, but also transient. From the statistics it can be surmised that men significantly outnumbered women across the whole of New Zealand – from the total New Zealand population statistics, it can be seen that 52.3% of the total population was male. Now, this alone is not enough to support the 'transience' ideal, but many historians (including Fairburn) have made this dubious claim – the logic? If there were more men, then there would be increased loneliness, which without the 'restraining' influence of the fairer sex, would cause transience: "Among its fundamental symptoms were irresistible feelings of restlessness, displacement and rootlessness". However, these few historians are a minority that refuse to accept any explanation except that of face value. As Jock Phillips explains: "colonial mateship was founded upon the needs of the work situation". What Fairburn and others neglect is that the early New Zealand society was masculine and it was the loneliness of the frontier that forced them to embrace mateship. On the frontier, men depended on other men for protection, conversation and help with the work: "frontier conditions often forced them into a close comradeship". This is the key to the undermining of Fairburn's thesis – if men formed friendships, then a masculine society must have formed in order to fill the void left by the lack of women. Furthermore these men worked together and thus relied on one another – a transient individual would have been a liability. Thus a community formed between men – initially atomised individuals became a community.

Fairburn is also very quick to utilise case studies in order to support his thesis. For instance, Fairburn wrote a convincing article on 'Cox', who in his detachment, "meandered around and around the Gladstone-Tinui-Tauweru area". In addition these men, like Cox, were very dependent on others for food as "tramps like himself did not expect to cook for themselves". Consequently, Fairburn claims that these meandering, detached, unloved individuals that not only defined New Zealand society, but also caused most of its problems. However, Fairburn's argument is also his defeat. Like Fairburn, J. Hirst wrote an article on atomisation, but in Australia. Although much of the information is parallel to Fairburn's claims, there is one big difference. J. Hirst found that in Castlemaine (a goldmining town in Australia) in 1870 there was much

transience, but there existed a “core of persisters” who “remained members [of the community] for 15 years or more”. This is critical as it undermines Fairburn’s thesis – of course, there were many atomised individuals, but Fairburn turns a blind eye to those that remained present. Fairburn is shortsighted in that he examines case studies that are isolated and not representative of the entire country. Fairburn trips himself up when commenting that the likes of Cox needed the support of established people – these people were immobile (as they owned land) and can be considered ‘persisters’ – a community of people that remained in one area, giving charity to transients. For instance, Cox himself traversed the same routes and returned to the same towns, where he presumably received charity – thus, the community accepted these transients and by providing charity (as Fairburn suggests), they accepted them into their community.

Many modern and more impartial historians believe that not only was New Zealand society community-based, but also family-based. Before proceeding it is necessary to define a family – a family is either a group of kin or blood relatives or an extended group of intimate relations (friends). For instance, W.H. Oliver made a case study of East coast settlements to find that they were “stratified community from the outset with recognisable leaders and followers”. In addition, Oliver adds that ‘such conditions are likely to increase cohesion and interdependence’. However, one could argue that this is a case study and thus, it does not represent the whole of the country. Consequently it is worthwhile looking at other case studies aimed at undermining the Fairburn thesis. One such is D. MacKay’s article on ‘Kauri bushmen’. D. MacKay agrees that Fairburn is correct in stating that “there was some turnover amongst bushmen”, but like J. Hirst, MacKay asserts that there was a core of ‘stayers’: ‘Some men had been with his employer for 15 and 20 years’. Furthermore, Mackay explains that often small groups of bushmen stayed together ‘as they moved from job to job’ – MacKay further emphasises this with a case study on the Poyner and Gibbens brothers – who worked an entire lifetime with each other.

This point on family is also crucial to undermining Fairburn. The Kauri gangs formed a relationship that bound them in a masculine brotherhood, cemented by a ‘god-like’ unity. But, it was not only the men that maintained community. For instance, C. Daley investigates a case study of James Rindle, who was surrounded by a close-knit family group. Furthermore even illegitimate babies were given care by their extended family: “Edith Cattanach turned to her mother to register her “new-granddaughter”. Now this is one of the most important ideas in the argument against atomisation – illegitimate children have never prospered, yet in New Zealand society, even they were accepted and cared for. If illegitimate children could be accepted, then so could transients and vagabonds. Although these are all case studies, and thus isolated events, it must be understood that when many case-studies indicate the same trend, then a generalisation can be made about the whole population – New Zealand society was community and family orientated.

If more proof is needed to deny the claims of ‘atomisation’, then we need to look no further than the composition of New Zealand society. Fairburn considered only vagrants without looking at the family-man or the woman. Some sources assert that about 85% of goldfield women, 75% of rural woman and 65% of urban woman, were married – hence (using the total population of New Zealand) about 35,000 women were married in 1861 and about 81,000 women were married in 1871 (all over New Zealand). This means that in 1861, about 35,000 men were married and 81,000 married in 1871. What does this tell us? That just under half the population of New Zealand (in 1861) was in wedlock. This is a clear evidence that atomisation is not representative of the whole of New Zealand society –

assuming the majority of married men were faithful, they could not physically meander. Of course there are the exceptions who do, but the majority of married men in New Zealand had to support their spouse. This is a clear indication of an inter-personal relationship, and thus, much of New Zealand society could not be atomised.

Another key consideration is the presence of women. Apart from marriage, women served a very important role in society. Victorian society was dictated by the fundamental value of the woman – women were the moral creatures, restraining influences and helped to settle society. Furthermore, all historians agree that there were women in New Zealand – if so, then no matter the setting, they played an important role in male life. Women ran households, fed men, provided sex (prostitution), marriage, and in effect, ran a community. Women were the foundations of Victorian society and their presence in New Zealand indicates that yes, there was at least some community or social structure – whether it be marriage or prostitution or household maintenance, women interacted with men, forming relationships and thus community. This in itself, is what Fairburn inadvertently explains – women had a positive affect on society and their presence induced and encouraged community and family values and thus, it was not Atomisation that “contributed to the colonial’s powerful attachment to family life”, but the increasing population of women – more women meant more men married, copulated and had children, all of which build community.

The final nail in the coffin of atomisation is the topic of migration. Many historians have argued over why migrants arrived, but generally agree it was due to two reasons: work and chain migration. Now, work as an immigrant ‘magnet’ is an important aspect of atomisation – men arrived for work, finished or lost work and became vagrant. However, many of these migrants (such as many goldminers) simply moved on from New Zealand when work was sparse – consequently, they cannot be considered part of a ‘vagrant’ New Zealand population. The more interesting aspect of migration is that of chain migration and it is chain migration that finishes off the anti-atomisation argument. Why did many people emigrate from their homelands? Because of chain migration – where ‘word of mouth’ from a migrant draws more immigrants. For instance, Emigration agents in Britain claimed that New Zealand was “superior to any country in the world” and this, coupled with immigrant’s letters home, caused many; like the Harding family to emigrate. This is important – as it reflects the nature of migration – families and individuals migrated to better their social status, on the positive feedback of friends or neighbours who immigrated. This meant that people immigrated to New Zealand to find an already established society (friends, neighbours and family). Obviously individuals did not just ‘stumble’ across New Zealand one day in a boat (!), - people came to New Zealand expecting an established community in which they could advance from their previous social status. It is the nature of human development.

In conclusion, the ultimate result of all this evidence is the clear acceptance of the community-based model provided by many modern historians. Everything from colonisation to development depended on the formation and maintenance of society – the imperial juggernaut of Britain would otherwise be rather lame. As a consequence of both human nature and greed, early settlers arrived in New Zealand not only to escape industrial England, but also to become wealthy. Considering this, it could be said that wealth and class structure are relative- without human greed or capitalism, people could not become wealthy and better off. Consequently, society and community were critical for the settlers, and thus, the Pakeha of New Zealand. As James Belich eloquently notes, of course there

were atomised individuals, (simple law of averages) but the vast majority of people attempted and “struggled to build communal sandcastles”. And however harsh the struggles there ‘were enough [settled people] to maintain community life-support systems”. Consequently, New Zealand was communally-based and those that were ‘atomised’ attempted to form communal bonds– how else could they survive?

### **General Comments**

Skill 1 = 4 Very strong throughout – the best feature.

Skill 2 = 3 A worry that this did not have more depth, especially from candidates own knowledge, but gets through on very good use of relevant evidence to support argument.

Skill 3 = 3 Should this candidate fail on this point? Very weak at a scholarship level. Pass with a very big push.

Skill 4 = 3 Very good at rubbishing Fairburn. One or two others could have been more strongly challenged, but ok.

Skill 5 = 4 Strong on argument throughout. Strong conclusion, finishes the argument well.

Skill 6 = 4 No problem.

*This candidate meets all the criteria in Performance Descriptor 2 (although skills 1, 5, and 6 are at the Performance Descriptor 1 level)*

The total =21, therefore this candidate is in the Performance Category 2