

Assessment Schedule – 2018

History: Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders (91003)

Evidence

Question One: In your own words, describe the reason(s) for the armed invasion of Maungapohatu in 1916.

	Not Achieved		Achievement		Merit		Excellence	
	N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
			Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Interpret in depth sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Comprehensively interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders	
Is there evidence?	No	No	Yes – Some	Yes – Some	Frequent (though can be oblique)	Frequent (though can be oblique)	Extensive (explicit, though could be oblique in part)	Extensive (explicit, though could be oblique in part)
Is it relevant?	No	No	Sometimes	Sometimes	Usually	Usually	Primarily	Consistently
Is it USED to address the question?	No	Glimmer	Minimal	Minimal	Usually	Usually	Consistently – This doesn't mean always	Consistently – This doesn't mean always
Is the question answered?	No	No	Reasonable attempt	Answered with some detail	In some depth	In depth	Comprehensively	Comprehensively
Interpretation = showing understanding of the material, and selecting appropriate information to answer the question								
	Extracts some material from the sources about the invasion	Extracts some material from the sources about the invasion and may attempt to discuss reasons behind the invasion	Interprets material from the sources relating to why the invasion occurred	Interprets material from the sources, accurately describing why the invasion occurred	Interprets, in depth, material from the sources by explaining why the invasion occurred	Interprets, in depth, material from the sources by explaining why the invasion occurred	Comprehensively interprets the sources by explaining why the invasion occurred	Comprehensively interprets the sources to perceptively explain why the invasion occurred
	May not be directed to the question		Description is weak with limited supporting evidence and/or lacking in depth; this could include extracted and/or paraphrased material. Evidence could be implied.	Description uses relevant evidence, which could include well-selected paraphrased material directed to the question. May only focus on one reason	Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence. Some aspects are discussed in detail. Includes two or more reasons, one of which is in depth	Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence, selected and assessed in detail. A coherent answer directed to the set question.	Uses detailed relevant supporting evidence appropriately and with discrimination. A clear and coherent answer that	Uses detailed relevant supporting evidence with discrimination, linking it effectively to the point(s) made to produce a sophisticated response.

						Includes two or more reasons explained in depth	addresses the question. One reason explained comprehensively	A clear, coherent answer that answers the question. Two or more reasons explained comprehensively, possibly linked/woven together.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---

EVIDENCE NOT NECESSARILY QUOTES

Ideas could include but are not limited to:

- Tuhoe had set themselves apart and resisted “Crown interference” (Intro)
- Along with Waikato and Taranaki, Tuhoe Māori had refused to enlist and fight in WW1 and this angered the government and many settlers in NZ who viewed this as ‘unpatriotic’. Rua Kēnana led this resistance and “his staunch anti-war ideas offended the government and many Pākehā” (Intro)
- Source D discusses how the warrant for Rua’s arrest was issued due to him failing to appear in court on charges of “selling alcohol illegally”. This provided a justification for the later invasion. Source F corroborates this idea referring to Rua as “a sly-grogger”.
- WWI had led to a surge in patriotism and this correlated with increasing intolerance of anyone who was different or did not conform i.e. chose not to fight and separate themselves as Tuhoe did: “People who were regarded as unconventional but harmless before the war became targets for extreme state repression.” (Source A) and in Source C a newspaper clip calls Tuhoe “fanatical natives”
- Many believed that Rua’s influence on Tuhoe was dangerous and he was held responsible for the low numbers of Tuhoe enlisting (Source A). Wild rumours about him were rife including suggestions that he was somehow in allegiance with the German Kaiser and that he was said to “be building up a well armed force to support the Kaiser”. (Source A) Source B reinforces this idea stating that Rua “promised the natives a great time when the country was in the hands of the Germans”.
- In order to remove Rua’s influence on Tuhoe that was considered subversive: “Officials and some Māori leaders regarded him with suspicion and attempted to undermine his position...” Source D
- The formal charge against Rua of “sedition” noted in Source E’s arrest warrant provides the motive behind the warrant i.e the belief that he was encouraging his people to rebel
- Source F suggests that there may have been darker underlying motives in the invasion and Rua’s arrest: “What is less well understood is the planned destruction of the Rohe Pōtae by the government” meaning that an underlying Crown motive was likely to open up and claim more Māori land. (Source F)
- Source H suggests that another underlying motive for the invasion could have been the govt and the church’s desire to suppress and undermine Māori prophetic movements as Mangapōhatu was a stronghold of “tohungism” Source H discusses the “more aggressive action” it hopes the govt will take against this perceived threat

Question Two: Choose 2 groups: The Police, The Crown, The Church, The Media

In your own words, describe how each group's view of Rua Kēnana has changed from 1900 to the present. Use specific evidence from the sources to support your answers.

		Not Achieved		Achievement		Merit		Excellence	
				Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Interpret in depth sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Comprehensively interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders	
		N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Is there evidence?	No	No	Yes – Some	Yes – Some	Frequent (though can be oblique)	Frequent (though can be oblique)	Extensive (explicit, though could be oblique in part)	Extensive (explicit, though could be oblique in part)	
Is it relevant?		Yes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Usually	Usually	Primarily	Consistently	
Is it USED to address the question?		Glimmer	Minimal	Minimal	Usually	Usually	Consistently – This doesn't mean always	Consistently – This doesn't mean always	
Is the question answered?		No	Reasonable attempt	Answered with some detail	In some depth	In depth	Comprehensively	Comprehensively	
Interpretation = showing understanding of the material, and selecting appropriate information to answer the question									
	Identifies one group whose view of Rua changed. Inaccurate or no description.	Identifies two groups whose view of Rua changed. Little description or inaccurate description.	Interprets material from the sources to show some understanding by identifying and describing the changing views of two groups towards Rua. Descriptions are weak with limited supporting evidence and /or are lacking in depth. Two responses – could be accurate but superficial OR only one is supported with relevant evidence and some description.	Interprets material from the sources to show an understanding by identifying and describing the changing views of two groups towards Rua. Descriptions use relevant evidence, but could include irrelevant information. Two accurate responses. Both supported with relevant evidence and some description.	Interprets material from the sources to show an in-depth understanding by identifying and describing changing views of two groups towards Rua. Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence to describe the changing attitudes of two groups. Link between evidence and explanation may be succinct, but must be obvious. One could be stronger than the other.	Accurately interprets material from the sources to show an in-depth understanding by identifying and describing changing views of two groups towards Rua. Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence to describe the changing attitudes of two groups. A coherent answer directed to the set question. Both responses show an in-depth understanding.	Comprehensively interprets the sources to show a thorough understanding by identifying and describing changing views of two groups towards Rua. Evidence is directly linked to changing views of two groups towards Rua. A clear and coherent answer that directly addresses the question. Candidates may speculate on reasons for the changing attitudes and/or ramifications of the changed views. One could be stronger than the other.	Comprehensively interprets the sources to show a perceptive understanding by identifying and describing changing views of two groups towards Rua. Specific evidence is linked A clear, coherent answer that directly answers the question. Candidates may speculate on reasons for the changing attitudes and/or ramifications of the changed views. Both responses show comprehensive understanding.	

EVIDENCE NOT NECESSARILY QUOTES

Ideas could include but not limited to:

The Police

- In 1916 it was the police that led the invasion of Maungapōhatu, an invasion that “some observers claimed (was)... both illegal and excessive” (Source D). This police action resulted in the death of 2 Māori including that of Rua’s son, Toko
- Source C states that the invasion was carried out by a force of 60 police, suggesting that the attitude of the police at the time was an aggressive one; Source I corroborates this idea describing the deplorable conditions the community was subjected to. Source F shows change in the police attitude as “Rob Robinson apologised” for the earlier treatment
- Source G, the photographs from the time of Rua’s arrest in 1916 and the recent 2001 photograph taken at the opening of the Tuhoe exhibition at Te Papa show the changing attitudes of NZ police towards the actions of Rua and the Tuhoe people. In the 1916 photo police pose with their captives, including Rua, following the invasion, suggesting that the arrest of Rua was a cause for celebration and something to be marked for posterity. In the 2001 photograph, however, a reconciliation is suggested between Police and Tuhoe leaders, showing them pictured together in the front row of the audience.
- Excellence candidates could comment on the changing social and political attitudes of the present day as police take a less confrontational approach towards law enforcement and a more respectful attitude towards tangata whenua.

The Crown*

- It was the Auckland Supreme Court that tried Rua’s case in 1916 and saw him accused of “sedition for speaking against conscription and urging his followers to resist the police.” (Source D) Despite the fact that the jury rejected the sedition charge, the Crown judge nevertheless sentenced Rua to the particularly harsh punishment of “one year’s imprisonment with hard labour with another 18 months of ‘reformatory detention’”. (Source D)
- Clearly the Crown view on Rua changed from 1900 to the present day with Source E stating clearly that the Supreme Court ruled subsequently that the 1916 armed assault on Rua and his people at Maungapōhatu was an “illegal assault”.
- Source I notes that the Waitangi Tribunal, a wing of the crown government later termed the Uruwera invasion “one of the most enduring grievances raised by Tūhoe claimants” and that in 2017 Minister Te Ururoa Flavell would sign “a pardon (for Rua) on behalf of the Crown” and that the Crown would “formally apologise”. This clearly shows the Crown changing its view over time from active pursuit of punishing Rua to formally clearing and pardoning him, as well as listening to Tuhoe grievances on the matter.
- Excellence candidates could comment on the changing social and political attitudes of the present day governments towards reconciliation and dealing constructively with historic grievances (such as the Waitangi Tribunal process)

The Church*

- Source H clearly shows the way the Anglican church has changed its stance on Rua and the Maungapōhatu invasion over time. In 1907 the church clearly supported the government's actions during the invasion stating they supported "the recent action of the Government in the direction of the suppression of tohungism and trust that it may be possible for the Church to make more aggressive action among the tribes which are specifically affected by this evil".
- Source H concludes by noting that in 2006 the church "passes a motion apologising for the 1907" clearly showing the way their view had changed in the 100 year period.
- Excellence candidates could comment on the changing social and political attitudes of the present day as the church moves to remain relevant and redress its prior hard line stance against Tohungism

The Media

- Source A states that prior to the invasion the media had been responsible for circulating misinformation about Rua Kēnana concerning his supposed subversive influence: "wild rumours circulated about him in the press. He was said to welcome a German victory in the war and to be building up a well-armed force to support the Kaiser."
- This negative and counter-productive stance of the media prior to the 1916 invasion was further evidenced in Source B, a Jan 1916 article from the *Press* newspaper entitled 'A "Maori Kaiser"' that claimed that "Rua had claimed the title of Kaiser, and promised the Natives a great time when the country was in the hands of the Germans".
- Source C, an April 1916 article from the *Star* shows again the dominant view of the Pakeha from the time of the invasion, labelling Rua's people a "body of fanatical natives under Rua Kenana" and calling him a "troublesome prophet". The *Star* in 1916 clearly endorsed the police's violent and fatal actions in the invasion, saying of the actions of police "we can find nothing but commendation".
- Source I an article from the *NZ Herald* entitled 'Tūhoe Prophet Rua Kēnana pardoned by the Crown' demonstrates the changing view of the media over time as this article is focussed on validating Tūhoe grievances in the present day, calling the Tūhoe invasion "one of the most enduring grievances"
- Source H, an article from *Hawkes Bay Today* (2006) focuses on the Anglican church apology to Tūhoe, a markedly different approach to earlier media articles that clearly supported and condoned the govt action at Maungapōhatu
- Excellence candidates could comment on the presence of a strong bias against Rua in the 1916 articles versus the more sympathetic leaning towards Rua in Source I

Question Three: Describe how the arrest of Rua Kēnana may or may not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today.
Use specific evidence from any of the sources to support your answer.

		Not Achieved		Achievement		Merit		Excellence	
				Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Interpret in depth sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Comprehensively interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders	
		N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Is there evidence?	No	No	No	Yes – Some	Yes – Some	Frequent (though can be oblique)	Frequent (though can be oblique)	Extensive (explicit, though could be oblique in part)	Extensive (explicit, though could be oblique in part)
Is it relevant?		No	Glimmer	Sometimes	Sometimes	Usually	Usually	Primarily	Consistently
Is it USED to address the question?		Glimmer	No	Minimal	Minimal	Usually	Usually	Consistently – This doesn't mean always	Consistently – This doesn't mean always
Is the question answered?		No	Reasonable attempt	Answered with some detail	In some depth	In depth	Comprehensively	Comprehensively	
Interpretation = showing understanding of the material, and selecting appropriate information to answer the question									
	Attempts to describe how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Statement with no or an irrelevant explanation.	Attempts a reasoned explanation.	Describes how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Description is weak, with limited supporting evidence and/or lacking depth.	Describes how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Some development of idea(s) using the supporting evidence	Explains in-depth how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Explanations use a range of appropriate and relevant supporting evidence. At least one aspect is discussed in detail.	Explains in-depth how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Explanations use a range of appropriate and relevant supporting evidence. Multiple aspects of evidence are discussed in detail. A coherent answer directed to the set question	Comprehensively explains how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Explanations have detailed reference to the sources. Explanations are literate, clear, and critically respond to the question in light of the evidence. Demonstrates elements of critical thinking and analysis	Comprehensively explains how the arrest of Rua may or not be considered of significance to New Zealanders today Explanations include specific detailed reference to the sources. Explanations are literate, clear, and critically respond to the question in light of the evidence, linking evidence to context. Includes evidence of historical thinking in comparison of material.	

								Thorough understanding evident	Perceptive understanding evident
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

EVIDENCE NOT NECESSARILY QUOTES**Ideas could include but not limited to:**

- Sources F and I best show how the arrest of Rua Kēnana has continued to be of significance to New Zealanders, in particular Tūhoe Māori, today.
- Source F details how ancestors of Kēnana and Tūhoe affected by the 1916 police raid still feel and suffer its impact today. Kiri Tuia Tumarae-Teka explains in this source that the invasion left a deep desire for justice to be fulfilled and that her people would not rest until their ancestors were properly acknowledged and compensated for the wrong done to them in the past. Tumarae-Teka says “It was for the rangatahi that they must get justice” and that the quest for this justice had been a quest passed onto this present generation from her great-uncle.
- According to Source F the arrest of Rua “left scars that dismantled the 1000 strong community” and that the fight for justice had resulted in severe “financial hardship”.
- The pursuit of justice saw Tuhoe lodge a claim with the crown at the Waitangi Tribunal that is ongoing today and resulted in the Crown and Church apology of recent years.
- In Source F Mr Flavell acknowledged that “the impact of what happened trickled right down through Rua’s descendants.”
- Source I also clearly shows how Rua’s arrest has had significant ongoing impacts for Tūhoe Māori. This source details the 2006 apology that Police Commissioner Rob Robinson offered to Tūhoe elders and explains how in 2005 descendents had “recalled the pain and the difficulty of learning about the police attack from their grandparents.”
- Clearly the recent apologies and claims process is beginning the work of putting right the mistakes of the past, but equally clear is how the event continues to have an impact on the lives of Tūhoe descendants today.

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Merit	Excellence
0 – 7	8 – 13	14 – 19	20 – 24