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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Boundary: Low Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For Excellence, the student needs to demonstrate comprehensive understanding of different perspectives of people in an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This involves including insightful and perceptive understandings of people’s perspectives (with reasons), and related actions (with relevant supporting evidence).

In this student’s evidence about the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand, comprehensive understanding of different perspectives is shown in the communication of perspectives, sometimes with reasons (2) (3) (4), examples of description of actions taken (7) (9), and examples of understanding that can be regarded as insightful and perceptive for this context (1) (5) (8) (10).

To reach Excellence more securely, the student could provide more specific historical detail to:

- support explanations for perspectives. For example, the rugby player’s explanation that he only wanted to play rugby (2) (3) (4) might be supported with details of the importance of the rugby tradition to South Africans
- describe actions taken by those whose perspectives are being communicated. For example, reference to police using ‘a lot of force’ (6) could be expanded by providing details about the ways in which the police used force and with what results.
Dear Editor,

I would wish to remain anonymous as it could affect my future as a rugby coach or co-ordinator. I was a part of the South African Springbok rugby team that was selected to tour New Zealand in 1981 with the Springboks. Before we left South Africa, we had no idea of what to expect to be able to play against New Zealand in 1981. Just to be selected to tour, that was a dream come true. At the start of the plane ride over to New Zealand and before the tour had started, I recall thinking back to when New Zealand had in the past toured Africa in defiance of the United Nations. This caused many countries to boycott the Montreal Olympics in 1976. Many African countries did everything in their power to exclude New Zealand from the Olympics but the International Olympic Committee could find no reason to. It seemed to me therefore that sport between the All Blacks and the Springboks was not something terrible. Our first match was set to be in Gisborne on the 22nd of July against Poverty Bay. As I was a part of the South African rugby team, I saw no controversy in coming to New Zealand to play the sport I love, and that I play best.

We as a rugby team were not prepared for that we saw when we arrived. When we arrived in Gisborne and we saw the protestors and when they showed their fury against us so clearly, we realised that it was going to be tough. To our relief we won that game 24-6. I remember lying in bed that night thanking New Zealand, well half of it anyway, for realising that the South African apartheid had no relation to the Springbok tour and that they respected that the Springboks just wanted to play rugby and that New Zealanders just wanted to watch the rugby. I personally could not see a problem with the tour and I still can’t now. My fellow teammate and captain of the Springboks in 1981, Wynand Claasan, had the same idea and could also not see a problem in the tour. My job was a rugby player so when New Zealand was protesting all I could do was play rugby because I had not just come to New Zealand for a little vacation with the rest of my teammates.

I think that I started to comprehend that New Zealand’s protestors really meant business when we played our next game in Hamilton against Waikato on the 25 of July. A whole bunch of demonstrators came out the back of pavilion and overturned one of the big trailers. We couldn’t believe that they then managed to get on to the ground, then couldn’t believe they succeeded in getting the game cancelled before it started. That wouldn’t have happened in South Africa, that’s for sure. We realised that they wanted to come in and have a go at us. That was very scary. I think New Zealand went overboard in trying to make us leave, especially when my fellow teammate, Nass Botha, was nearly run over by a wild eyed woman when he was walking down the street with a few other teammates. We all still just wanted to play our rugby games.

We came to fear the next game. All round New Zealand rugby pavilions were torched in protest against our tour. We had to be sneaked into grounds before the game so no one could get us. Before the test in Christchurch we went to Lancaster Park the night before the game and slept there. We knew that there were terrible demonstrations going on every time we played. It was an awful situation for us to be in.

Yours sincerely,
Ex-Springbok.

Dear Editor

Today is the day after the game in Palmerston North. The Springboks won against the Manawatu with a score of 31-19. I am Police Officer Smith; I am a part of the Manawatu Police force, which worked hand in hand with the riot squad, protecting yesterday’s game. I am very appalled with the way I was treated.
The morning of yesterday's game, we were all given strict instructions in what to do and how to deal with the protesters. It was my job and I was unable to back out of it, but the sheer thrill kept me going, as I wanted to experience for myself first hand what other police officers in other centres kept going on about. As I was a police officer, I had no choice in what my opinion about the tour was. I had to be neutral so that the Springboks and the opposing team could play the game of rugby that they came to play. Personally I was not neutral at all, I was for the tour. When our unit of police officers got down to the stadium, we were all surprised at the outrage and the stance that most of the protesters held. I don't think intimidation is quite the right word to use but I surely felt like they had a better job in trying to prevent the game than we had in trying to keep them out. As we took our places and the nervousness kicked it, the riot squad took their places behind us. The protesters took no time in starting to push through us all. Their toughness took me by surprise and I had to find that inner strength to push them back.

As I took a look around me, I saw some of my fellow officers using a lot of force to keep the protesters away. In my view this was use of too much force and was potentially injuring the protesters and this was not our goal. The goal was to keep them out of the stadium. There's violence and then there's violence. I came across this one protester, who was determined to get past us, nothing was going to stop him from trying to get onto the field. He was also trying to open the gates so that there would be an easy run for the protesters onto the field. I arrested him and a few of his followers for not moving back when asked, and for obstruction and damaging the stadium grounds.

To think back to it, I cannot believe this was just yesterday, as it seems like it only happened a couple of minutes ago. The surreal feeling of keeping the game in progress makes me smile while just writing this letter. Although my opinion on the tour broke up friendships that I had gained over the years because they opposed of the tour, I was not about to change my opinion for someone who let politics get in the way of friendship. I remember one of my friends telling me about how the tour was affecting her family. Things were far from perfect between me and my parents, but for her the Springbok tour caused such tension and stress that she and her family could not live together in the same house and function as a family unit.

My commanding officer, Ross Meurant, says the Red Squad, armed with long batons, "smashed, bashed and ploughed through thousands of protesters, passive and volatile alike, to make sure the games went ahead." I think that that the police had no choice in what we did and how we defended the games. Meurant said, "We were the meat in the sandwich – fail, and the institutions of the State would have been emasculated by a competing brute force." He was right.

I am just interested in how the rest of the games pan out and how the police cope with the rest of the protesters. I can just visualize what some of the test matches are going to be like as I experienced just a normal match first hand. The experience of being an officer at yesterday's game will stick with me for life. Tomorrow I go back to normal police duties. I hope to be able to go and be a supporter of another rugby game instead of being an officer. I hope that this letter has changed the way some of the protesters would like to act around police officers.

Yours sincerely,
[Name withheld] – NZ Police
Grade Boundary: High Merit

2. For Merit, the student needs to demonstrate in-depth understanding of different perspectives of people in an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.

   This involves including perspectives which show convincing understanding, with relevant supporting evidence.

   In this student’s evidence about the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand in-depth understanding is demonstrated by providing a wide number of perspectives that show convincing understanding (1) (2) (3) (5).

   An explanation of these perspectives is generally provided (4) (7) (8) (11). There is a description of some actions that have been taken as a result of the perspectives held (9) (10) (12). The student begins to provide insightful comment (6).

   To reach Excellence, the student could:

   • provide some more comments that are insightful and perceptive. For example, the student, role-playing as a policeman, might comment on the difficulty of maintaining a neutral stance when provoked by protesters who assume he is not neutral (1)
   • ensure that more detailed explanations for perspectives are provided, for example, further details about how and why black people in South Africa are forced to live separately (4), and how people’s freedom was denied in South Africa (7)
   • include some more detail in descriptions of actions taken by people as a result of their perspectives, for example, further description of the ground invasion in Hamilton (10).
Dear Editor

I am writing in response to your article "Are Police Going Too Far?" published on August 3rd in the New Zealand Herald. The writer of the article Simon Suiter wrote that "Police are using their own opinions of the tour and taking those opinions out on the protestors". I believe this statement is wrong. I am a police officer who was at the clash on Molesworth Street on July 29th. As a police officer I cannot allow my personal opinion to affect the decisions I make and I believe that myself and every other officer I work with keep their personal opinions at home.

My personal opinion of the tour is neutral as I am against the idea of Apartheid and the allowance of racists into the country but I am also all for a game of rugby. The reason behind my neutral opinion is because of the treatment of black people in South Africa. I have visited the country of South Africa and have seen the way black people have been treated. The treatment of black people is horrible and unfair. I have seen how black people are forced to live in poverty away from white areas. My travels to South Africa were the reason behind me joining the police force in the first place - so I could help make fairness and equality between all races in our country of New Zealand. I am also a true believer of the game of rugby and I also believe that politics and sport don't mix. As a police officer I respect that protestors had the right to conduct peaceful protest, but I also expected their right to allow me the right to watch rugby on a Saturday afternoon in the comfort of my own home. That is why I am neutral.

I have written elsewhere that when I arrived at Molesworth Street all you could see was "a solid line... 40 people wide... and they were determined to run you over. The front row of protestors were literally pushed into us and we had no choice... we weren't going to move, we weren't going to budge at all". I was completely terrified. It was my first protest and I wasn't sure how to act. I was nervous all the time but I do believe I was in the right at all times. Yes we did react with force to the protestors and many people were injured. I even personally hit protestors with my own baton. Batons were only used after police were pushed more than 100 metres up Molesworth Street. The reason behind our force and the use of our batons was to reinstate the authority of the New Zealand police after the game cancellation in Hamilton. We weren't going to let people control us and overrun us again. Yes we did hurt many people but we did that in protection to ourselves. It may not seem like it but we were protecting ourselves against the many protestors forcing us back. The clash that evening I believe was the "greatest eruption of violence this country has ever known". Many people were injured and hurt. It was the first time we as police used batons. We believed "the 'rule of law' and 'public safety' had to be maintained and at some point no had to mean no." The protestors believed that we "were the enemy when in fact we are saving them from serious injury. Since this protest we got given longer batons so now we can push protesters back instead of hitting them with the shorter ones.

The opinion of one that the police are using their personal views against the protestors is wrong. I have personally proven that wrong by explaining what happened on Molesworth Street for me and other officers on the squad. We all fall into the same category and have shown neutralism between protestors and supporters.

Police Officer, Blue Squad

Dear Editor

My name is John Smith and I am an anti-tour protestors. I protested at the Springboks game in Hamilton on July 25th. I am writing in response to your article "Chaos in Hamilton" in Monday's New Zealand Herald. I was shocked that you could write such a hurtful piece in the national paper. Being
called a "rabble of trendy-lefty communist radicals" is downright ridiculous. **We are a group of people with one thing in common, the right for freedom of all.**

I am sick and tired of the way people are hurting and calling us out when in fact we are standing up for equality and equal rights among all human beings on this planet. A few years ago while at university I began to get involved in the political views of other countries especially South Africa. I began to learn about Apartheid and the wrong doing of the leaders in South Africa. The black people are treated like scum. **South Africa's apartheid is about laws that force black South Africans to be apart from whites and apart from sharing in the wealth of the country.** I feel that everyone should be treated equally, so when the opportunity to protest against the tour came about I volunteered myself. I took this opportunity in both hands and did the best I could. John Minto stated that "New Zealand could have a really positive effect on what is a crime against humanity" and I believe that he is right. I believe that this crime needs to stop. I will do whatever I can, no matter how slight, to stop Apartheid. We all believe that if we stop the games we will stop the tour.

When I was volunteering I found out the idea for the Hamilton game was to get the game cancelled and doing so was a success. **We ran under the goal posts into the middle. I recall the police trying to snatch one or two people but the protestors just sat down, linked arms and it was clear it would take several hours to clear us off that way so they gave up.**

I understand that the anonymous writer of the article does not like the actions of protestors but we are in the right. I believe that the actions I took and the actions of all protesters on July 25th explain themselves. **We tried to show the government that we do not stand for racist people coming into our country and dictating over whether or not black people could play in a rugby team. If the government had any pity or respect for the black people in South Africa they would send the South African government a message by sending the Springboks back to South Africa and not allow them to remain in our country.**

Dear Editor

My name is Ray Jones, I am 17 years old and I am an avid rugby supporter. After reading your article "Are Rugby and Politics Really Separate?" in Friday's issue of the New Zealand Herald, as a witness to the events I felt I needed to write in response to your article. I am a New Zealand rugby fan born and bred and I remember growing up with rugby constantly on the television and the radio. Whenever they could my parents would take me to watch games enjoying the atmosphere and experience. I never once considered that a game of rugby had anything to do with politics, for me rugby was rugby. I believe that "politics and sport do not mix". I was in Hamilton on July 25th at the game in question. I witnessed the events that occurred, the protestors entering the stadium and the protestors holding their ground.

Not many of my friends feel the way I do, as most of them protested at the Hamilton game. A lot of us enraged rugby spectators were lashing out at them. I do not understand how people can get so caught up in the politics of a game of rugby because I feel that politics had nothing to do with sport and that the two areas should remain separate. Rugby in New Zealand is a famous pastime and the protestors are ruining that pastime. Don't get me wrong, I am concerned with Apartheid in South Africa but I believe it has nothing to do with a sport. Rugby is a game of competition to unite countries and people not bring them apart. My beliefs on the tour are that Apartheid seems a bigger issue of freedom than a couple of rugby games so the way people are acting and protesting annoys me. I don't understand why people can't just watch a game of rugby instead of thinking about the politics within. I know the writer of this article is questioning the idea that rugby and politics are separate but I believe they are. By protesting the protestors are trying to impose their point of view and making everyone support their way.
Grade Boundary: Low Merit

3. For Merit, the student needs to demonstrate in-depth understanding of different perspectives of people in an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.

This involves including perspectives which show convincing understanding, with relevant supporting evidence.

In this student’s evidence about the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand, some in-depth understanding is demonstrated through the variety of relevant perspectives which are raised, for example government actions (1) and Gleneagles Agreement (2). Using the names of the specific people involved, and detailing their actions, helps to provide evidence of in-depth understanding.

For a more secure Merit, the student could provide:

- more in-depth explanation to support some of the matters that are raised, for example the politics of people like Talboys and Blazey, the Gleneagles Agreement and what happened to Steve Biko
- more detail in supporting evidence in some places.
To whom it may concern,

I'm writing in regard to the latest sport column you chose to print in your newspaper regarding the first game of the South African tour of New Zealand on 22nd of July vs. Poverty Bay at Gisborne. In the article you stated "...it was a godsend that the government has allowed the S.A. team to New Zealand and has chosen not to interfere with sporting fixtures. This allows New Zealand to send the message to the rest of the world that in New Zealand sport will not be mixed with politics or with other countries' problems ". But you know as well as the rest of the country that the government doesn’t support apartheid and did everything in its power, short of banning the Springboks, to halt the tour. Brian Tallboys wrote to Ces Blazey, the NZRU chairman, expressing concern the tour was even been considered. He spoke regarding concern about how New Zealand may be seen as supporting S.A. policy on apartheid and how the consequences of this tour could affect "how New Zealand is judged in the international arena". The government did this because the Gleneagles Agreement said they had to try to stop racial sport and that’s what they did. So know this, your tour may go ahead but do not believe for an instant the whole country is in favour of it, especially the government.

You stupidly wrote that "sport will not mix with politics and other countries problems in New Zealand". How can you write such a thing when you know and see with your heart and eyes that by allowing this racist S.A. (who, by law, does not allow "black" people into their team) team to play and tour in New Zealand you are condoning the apartheid law of South Africa that was begun in 1948? And by doing this you are in fact ignoring the problems of apartheid in South Africa. Do you believe honestly that we should ignore things like Steve Biko dying in police custody in South Africa? That his death was an honest mistake? That is what is going on in South Africa all the time with apartheid. Your article sums up the message this tour is sending the rest of the world: We accept apartheid and choose to ignore rather than fight it. We open our arms up to the racists of the world.

If you do not believe in such things open your eyes and see with HART, CARE and NAAC. And join us 23rd at 7 p.m. at the wharf for another tour meeting and join us in protest at the next game day: 25th July at Hamilton.

Yours faithfully
Apartheid protestor

To whom it may concern,

I am writing regarding your recent editorial where you spoke of the disruption and utter disrespect of the anti-South African tour protestor. I could not agree more! I was with my boy at the game on 25th of July in Hamilton, well what would have been a game had it not been for the hippy do-gooders who saw fit to disrupt and cancel what would have been a winning game for Waikato. The protesters took the field in mass and chanted vigorously "the whole world is watching." We know that already! We are not completely blind to the apartheid problems in S.A. We do not condone these laws. We simply want to watch the game of rugby and enjoy a good beer. We do have the finest race relations in the world so I do not see how Brian Tallboys can be as ruthless as to state that the tour would affect New Zealand and "how New Zealand is judged in the international arena". Every rugby supporter knows that rugby is just that, rugby. So the whole world can continue to watch as we correctly do not mix our politics with sport! So all the perennial protesters can go back to their green houses and back to ballet classes. Because the tour is a blessing, it is tradition, it is our culture!

Yours faithfully
John Smith
To whom it may concern,

I am writing in regard to the editorial article you published on the 15th August. You spoke of how wrong it is of us players not to stand up and refuse to play a racially chosen team from a country that has been apartheid since 1948. Let me make this clear it was not I or the rest of my team mates that chose to get involved with the law of apartheid and racially segregated South Africa. I have a moral objection to the apartheid system and, like most sportsman, I want less political influence in sport. I don't wish to mix every country's problem into rugby, I simply want to play. Every player of ours may stand up to apartheid but we do not see how one can say playing S.A. on our home turf is favouring apartheid. To us playing rugby against South Africa is consistent with New Zealand's traditional identity (a rugby society].

Take Ben Couch for example, he was a former All Black and Maori and is currently serving as Minister of Police. He believes strongly in rugby ties with South Africa. His attitude to apartheid is that it was a political policy of South Africa and therefore their business. He even argues that rugby ties with S.A could be a way of helping apartheid in S.A. My team mate Doug Rollerson also agrees with me that the tour should go ahead and agrees with Ben Couch. He stated to me the other day "to get them over her and show them a multi-racial society living in relative harmony. And above all, it is important to beat them, almost as a way of confirming apartheid is wrong." And he is correct; this tour should be seen as an exhibition to S.A. of what their country should be like. So instead of protesting, storming the matches, talk of stealing planes, come and support us, support your national icon. Come support us so in way by winning we show as country we oppose apartheid. But do not continue to go on as you have - it will achieve nothing. By supporting us you stand by our team's view of anti-apartheid in a peaceful way.

Yours faithfully

All Black (Name withheld – Ed.)
Grade Boundary: High Achieved

4. For Achieved, the student needs to demonstrate understanding of different perspectives of people in an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.

This involves giving historically accurate accounts from the perspectives of different named people in an identified historical context, with relevant supporting evidence.

In this student’s evidence about the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand, the student demonstrates understanding by covering a number of aspects of the tour from the perspectives of three people. Aspects covered include apartheid, racially selected teams, anti-tour organisations, anti-tour protests in Auckland, Hamilton and Wellington. The student provides breadth of coverage, clear communication of understanding and use of relevant supporting evidence (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6). There is some detail in places (4) (5) (6), which means that, holistically, the student is at a high Achieved standard.

To reach Merit the student could provide greater detail throughout the examples used. For example, an explanation of ‘honorary whites’ (1), who it was applied to, why and with what results would be useful in demonstrating more in-depth understanding.
Dear Editor

I am of the opinion that the springbok tour scheduled for 1981 should be cancelled and all sporting contact with South Africa should cease. This is because in South Africa there is an apartheid which is segregating the whites from the blacks and the rugby team that is playing rugby against us is a racially selected team and has no black people in it because of the whites not wanting anything to do with the blacks in South Africa. Black people are forced to live and work separately from whites just because of the colour of their skin. I also think that having the games is not fair to the Maoris when the South Africans think it is wrong to be playing with a black person. Just think back to 1970 where the South Africans let the Maoris be "Honorary Whites". What an insult. I think that we have to stand up for South Africa's black population because no one else will and if the games do go on you can expect members from organisations such as CARE (Citizen’s Association for Racial Equality) and HART (Halt All Racist Tours) to be there. I also do not want a mini civil war in New Zealand tearing up our social structure and putting New Zealand into turmoil. The Springboks have to go. I got involved by handed out pamphlets to people in Queen Street in Auckland and you will not believe how much disrespect I was treated with and how much average people hate organisations like HART. What does that say about some New Zealanders? I think that what happened at the Hamilton game on the 25th July 1981 was a huge win for the anti-apartheid movement because the game that was scheduled there was cancelled due to the protestors invading the field and all the hard work that we have been working towards was accomplished. I am hugely supportive to what they also want to achieve. I think that this was perfectly reasonable and not unjustified because not only do the protestors think that what the government is doing is wrong but most of the other first world countries think it is bad that the New Zealand government should be having anything to do with South Africa at its time of apartheid. I think that John Minto is doing a very great thing by leading the anti-tour group of HART (formed 1969) because it takes a very great man to be doing something of such impact and not be afraid to stand up for what you want even though it means going against the government which holds most of the power of New Zealand. In the end I am against the rugby tour of 1981 and I think it should be stopped. "We have to stop this injustice".

Yours sincerely
Sally White

Dear Editor

I am a policeman and part of the blue squad and I am neither for or against the springbok tour but I am against the masses of violence spreading out between the anti-tour protestors and the rugby supporters causing unrest around the country. I remember at the 1st test at Wellington on August 15th. I saw rugby supporters pelt the protestors with concrete blocks and full beer bottles almost hit them but one police officer stopped them. I am of the opinion that the police are not the bad guys we are just trying to stop violence in our country. I personally am for the protests against the tour because the apartheid that is going on in South Africa is very disastrous for its population of blacks. But it is tearing up our country. We police had to use force towards the protestors so that no one can get through and get bashed by the rugby supporters behind us showing that we are just trying to help the population. I was also present at the Molesworth street protest. I highly regret having to baton down all of the protestors trying to force their way through but it was necessary because the marchers wouldn’t obey our orders and we had to stop then getting into parliament grounds. I also think that it was incredibly stupid of the protestors to try and march against the police force. I think that the actions the Muldoon government took supporting the tour just because it made them seem a very strong party was wrong because by doing that it also made it seem like NZ supports apartheid. I also think that we should not ban protests all together because it would be a restriction of human rights and also make us not seem like a free country.
Dear Editor

I am a very strong supporter for the rugby to go ahead against all of the ridiculous protests that the anti-tour organisations have been holding on our rugby field where we only want to see a good game and eat a pie. I have been a huge supporter of rugby ever since the first tours started going to South Africa and I think that even though apartheid is going on in South Africa we should still have sporting ties towards South Africa. Maybe the Springboks can come here and see that we can live with Maori people ok so they can live with black people in their country too. I also think that politics and rugby should not mix. For instance I went to the Hamilton game and I had to push through and shove a few protestors to get to buy my tickets and I saw the 350 protestors on the field. So I grabbed an empty beer bottle from the grandstand and threw it at the protestors hoping to get them off the field so I could enjoy a good game of rugby without any of the shenanigans that the protestors are pulling out trying to stop a good game in progress. And if the country gets torn up in the process who cares? In the end they cancelled the game. Why let the protesters win? There were just a few hundred of them, but tens of thousands who want to see the game go ahead. It turned out that the game couldn’t have gone ahead anyway because they had dropped tacks all over the field. Why weren’t they stopped? Who runs this country – the protesters? I was also at the Auckland game where the protestors dropped the flour bombs onto the pitch. It was unbelievable that a plane was able to fly over Eden Park time after time throwing flour bombs. Someone could easily have been killed. I was disgusted that people would go to that length to disrupt the game that our country loves. So after the game I decided to charge the protester’s lines with my friends but got held back by the police and I was really annoyed. I did this because all I want is a good game of rugby without any politics getting in my way. I think it is really stupid that our country is being torn up over just a game of rugby.

Yours sincerely

Rugby supporter
### Grade Boundary: Low Achieved

5. For Achieved, the student needs to demonstrate understanding of different perspectives of people in an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.

This involves giving historically accurate accounts from the perspectives of different named people in an identified historical context, with relevant supporting evidence.

In this student’s evidence about the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand some demonstration of understanding of different perspectives is provided in descriptions and explanations of perspectives of three people. For example the evidence includes perspectives on issues for police when maintaining law and order (1), provocation of the police (2), apartheid in practice with regard to Biko and Soweto riots (3) and political aspects Olympic games (4), Gleneagles Agreement (5).

For a more secure Achieved, the student could:

- support each of the matters raised in more detail. For example, discussion of the wider context of the Lancaster Park clashes could be provided
- avoid providing historical fiction (6) (7) (8) by communicating explanations and actions which relate to real people and actual events as one way of avoiding the problem.
Dear Sir

I was forced to confront protesters at Lancaster Park on the 15th of August as well as at Wellington being part of the red squadron. I found that particular clash very stressful seeming that I agreed largely with the protest action which made me feel aggrieved at having to impede it. I realise though that actions on the part of the police to prevent access to the stadium was necessary in order to save the protesters from any harm. Which after seeing the response of the spectators at Hamilton, who threw bear bottles at the protesters, would definitely have turned violent. The confrontation was also made stressful for me due to the manner in which we inhibited the crowds from moving forward, which was done by beating them with our batons. Many people at the front of the lines, which consisted of the more aggressive people as well as older people not seeking to be aggressive who we could see ourselves associating with it seemed distressing to have to manage them in such a fashion as well. It seemed that lots of the stress for the police force came from the fact that they couldn’t see the games as well considering we were "either working or sleeping".

Many of the protesters seemed to be over expressing themselves. The crowds seemed to be a haven for gang members or anybody who seemed particularly aggrieved with the police. I found it irritating when I was outside the springbok player’s hotel and they offered to buy us drinks. It seemed offensive we weren’t the 'king’s guard'. I think it might have been a cultural difference but the police didn't want to be seen as taking sides”.

We knew there would be violence. At Wellington some protesters were carrying batons up their sleeves and telling fake stories of police brutality in order to enrage the protesters. Lots of them seemed very believing.

Ron James

Dear Sir

I disagree largely with the policy of apartheid enforced in South Africa. After hearing about Beko’s murder and how the police had tried to hide the incident as well as the Soweto riots I feel sympathetic towards those who are trying to be free from this policy. I also feel embarrassed to be affiliated with rugby supporters as well as the pacifists.

It was wrong that the government let the tour go ahead. Not even with the All Blacks tour of South Africa which culminated in twenty one African countries boycotting the Olympic Games did they decide that all future tours would be halted. It was directly against the Gleneagles agreement, which arose partly as a result of the boycott and which we signed in Scotland in 1977, where we promised to foster human dignity which extended to sport. How could the rest of the Commonwealth now trust us to uphold any further agreements?

I was at the Hamilton game where me and about 350 other protesters stormed the field after we managed to tear down a fence. I felt that I was dealt with harshly in protesting that day. They tore at me from the crowd and thrust me down then dragged me momentarily not letting me walk although I was willing to go with them anyway. I suppose this was because many protesters resisted arrest, some of them that were torn away continued chanting, one two three four we don’t want your racist tour.

The tour caused major arguments in our family; it split our family apart. I come from Hamilton were over 50% of protesters opposed the tour so it made sense that at least one member of our family of
eight supported the tour. We would have dinner together and when we did we would shout at each other until one of us would lash out causing a civil war over dinner.

Gerald Williams

Dear Sir

I’m a rugby fan in favour of the tour. I think politics and sport should not mix particularly politics rugby in our country. I don’t agree with the policy of apartheid but I don’t think that we should stop our sporting contacts with South Africa as a stand against it. Rugby reaches at the very heart of New Zealand culture as it is a way of showing that although we are a small country we can still compete with the mother Britain and that we can be the best in the world champion at the sport. So we would never get a chance to prove ourselves to be the best at rugby if we are not willing to face South Africa one of the greatest rugby nations. Also we would never get a chance of redeeming ourselves after the 1976 defeat where we lost three out of four games.

I was at the Hamilton game where a hijacked plane was used to drop flour bombs, injuring one of the players, and were they stormed the field, screaming and waving their pickets about. I as well as many other protesters were enraged by their actions, we’d paid to see the game. I and many others tried throwing things at the crowd in frustration.

Frank Findlay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Boundary: High Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. For Achieved, the student needs to demonstrate understanding of different perspectives of people in an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This involves giving historically accurate accounts from the perspectives of different named people in an identified historical context, with relevant supporting evidence.

In this student’s evidence about the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand some demonstration of understanding of different perspectives is provided, for example through the identification of perspectives about protesters (1) (3) (4) (6), apartheid (5) (8) and social effects (7).

To reach Achieved, the student could provide:

- more detail to demonstrate clear understanding. For example, explanations for perspectives about protesters (2) could include specific detail about flour bombing, petitions and the New Zealand-South Africa rugby tradition
- explanations for the perspective about apartheid (9) by citing some specific laws and specific people’s experiences that resulted from the laws.
Dear Editor,

[1] I am a big fan of rugby and these bloody protesters are trying to ruin the sport. All of these flour bombings at games, petitions outside of stores around town. They are trying to stop legendary games against South Africa. Awesome that they are standing up for the black folk over in South Africa but what does that have to do with our rugby games? Politics should not be involved and us New Zealanders deserve our chance at kicking South Africa's butt without biased referees interfering. I am frankly disgusted that about 350 or so protesters charged the field at the Hamilton game and it was cancelled. The bloody protesters had taken down a fence and had run onto the pitch; you cannot blame the spectators for lashing out! We were frustrated our game was interrupted. There was a full stadium that had paid to see this game and we were not getting what we paid for! Our police needs to step up and stop this nonsense and the protesters need to show some respect.

Frustrated Spectator.

Dear editor,

I am a police officer in New Zealand and I am writing to give my view on everything going on with the Springbok tour and protesters. I have a neutral position on the protesters making a stand against the Springbok tour happening because of apartheid happening in South Africa. In my opinion Apartheid is not okay but neither are violent protests. So many people were injured during the violent protests, mainly protesters. I think people got too carried away, there's violence and then there's violence. Police officers were very violent towards protesters with batons and protesters were violent towards police officers with all sorts of different types of things. There were measures police officers were taking such as riot squads which means six months training away from home, but protesters were not stopping. The Springbok tour has also harmed my social life, some people do not understand why I have to stop the protesters from standing up for the black people in South Africa and some think stricter measures should be used. I do not agree or disagree with the Springbok tour but I have seen the effect it has had on my country and I do not like it.

Anne Stone

Dear editor,

I am involved in protesting against the Springbok tour happening. I believe that it should not happen as black people's rights are being taken away from them by dividing them from other racial groups. Muldoon says that by letting South Africa come and play rugby against us means that it would be 'bridge building' for us two countries and he also hoped it would help change their ways. We disagree because we think they would more likely change their ways if they thought people disagree with them and standing up against what they are doing. I strongly agree with what we are doing. We are making a stand against cowardliness and we are showing that it is not okay and we do not want that in our country. We have gathered petitions, made flour bombs, had a march through streets and clogged up highways. We are doing everything in our power to stop this and we have already stopped one game and there are more. New Zealand should not allow people into this country that are so economically racist to others and we will not allow it.

Alan Jones