History Curricula in England and New Zealand: identity, belonging and the case for valuing an historical perspective

Dr Robert Guyver
University College Plymouth St Mark and St John

escalate.ac.uk
History curricula in England and New Zealand:
identity, belonging and the case for valuing an historical perspective

Dr Robert Guyver
University College Plymouth St Mark and St John
rguyver@marjon.ac.uk
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Views of Historians</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historians, Changing Interpretations and Stability</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of ‘Master Narratives’</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature on Culture, Identity, Values and Citizenship</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Solutions</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Pedagogies Matching Suitable Curricula</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterword</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a discussion about the relationship between identity, belonging and historical perspectives in the context of the history curriculum. ‘Historical perspective’ includes the views of historians not only about particular periods or themes but also in the field of historiography (the philosophy behind the meaning of history), and this investigates whether there is an equation between ‘good history’ and effective curriculum structures in history. This leads into a debate about whether it might be possible to define general principles of good practice in this area. It also considers theories of teaching and learning in this context, i.e. suitable pedagogies.

The issue at stake is how criteria are selected to legitimise the various uses of history in the curriculum in England and New Zealand. The two curriculum structures are very different. In England, National Curriculum history starts in Year 1 when children reach the age of 6. For the two years following entry into Key Stage 1, history follows a loose structure with the parallel development of skills (chronology, use of sources, how history is represented and organised) and understanding in four contexts: one’s own history and the history of two generations or so of adults around the child; history in the more distant past; significant people; events. At Key Stage 2 (ages 7/8 – 10/11) there is a more prescriptive structure, with six history studies: local history, three units of British history, Ancient Greece, and a choice of one from a list of seven non-European societies. At Key Stage 3 (11/12 – 14/15), the first three years of secondary education, there is a similarly prescriptive structure which has just been revised, but embeds ‘coverage’ of nominally British but in fact mainly English history from 1066 to the present. Although the primary curriculum is indeed being reviewed both unofficially by Professor Robin Alexander and officially by the government-appointed Sir Jim Rose, the essential structure of the history curriculum since its inception in 1991 has only been subject to three changes: a reduction in content under the Dearing Review in 1994, implemented from September 1995; a suspension of the detail of the content in Key Stage 2 from January 13th 1998 to Sept 2000; and a further but minor set of changes implemented from September 2000.

In New Zealand history does not appear as a subject in its own right until the equivalent of post-Key Stage 3 in England when it is an option. Before that history is part of a curriculum structure known as Social Studies which is underpinned by a commitment to biculturalism in the handling of Maori and Pakeha (non-Maori, mainly European in origin) dimensions. Teachers are more or less free to choose their own content through which the teaching and learning of Social Studies can take place, though the school’s resources often dictate what a new teacher can and cannot teach, so resourcing is an issue. A new Social Studies Curriculum, itself part of a wider New Zealand curriculum, appeared in November 2007, although it should be noted that history is not mandatory within this and there is no national syllabus or programme of topics to be covered. Historians are involved in a debate about the relative merits of New Zealand 19th century history on the one hand and Tudors and Stuarts on the other, but only for pupils in their immediate pre-university phase when history is not only optional but also competes...
with other new subjects. The debate focuses on the apparent anomaly that Tudors and Stuarts has since the 1970s in many schools been in many cases a more popular option than New Zealand history; historian James Belich argues in his Dominion Day address (2007), and elsewhere (Catherall, 2002a; 2002b), that the latter is equally interesting and far more relevant for New Zealanders. There seems to be a move towards greater interest in New Zealand history, but this is attended by a resourcing problem where schools themselves would have to be responsible for new textbooks, though the issue of the appropriateness of textbook use especially in the earlier stages of education revolves around teaching and learning styles and priorities.

At the heart of the debate about history in both countries are the twin issues of identity and belonging. The old-fashioned notion of patriotism implied such an emotional attachment to a country that the patriot would be prepared to go to war and die for that country in an act of sacrifice. Today identity and belonging would apply to enjoying the benefits and rights of citizenship but also being aware of corresponding duties, in the context of a particular place which life-experiences and emotional ties had led to a sense of its being home. In the construction of any country’s history curricula there is an element of metanostalgia (from the Greek word ‘nosta’, meaning home) and the sense of the German words Heimweh (homesickness) and Sehnsucht (yearning). This factor is not entirely rational, and may indeed present difficulties when the meaning of ‘home’ carries with it differing connotations and allegiances. There may indeed be distant horizons and the fusion of these with the closer or more immediate may give rise to tensions (Cadogan, 2008, 2009).

What are the main difficulties that surround the defining of history in the curriculum? There would seem to be agreement on the skills and concepts of history especially as perceived by adapting Turner-Bisset’s (2001) interpretation of Schwab (1964; 1978), Shulman (1986), and Bruner (1960; 1966), i.e. that expert teaching in history is underpinned by a mix or amalgam of knowledge bases, and that the historian’s craft can be taught even to young children. Where there is disagreement is over (a) the selection, quality and nature, quantity and organisation of content in a history curriculum and (b) the potential for the politicisation of content. The issues of identity and belonging lie at the very heart of (b) and are key factors to be considered in any selection of content. The very purpose of school history was challenged by Ball (almost echoing Tom Nairn’s thesis (1988)) following the introduction of the English National Curriculum:

The links between past and present in restorationist history are very different from those of ‘new history’. The ‘past glories’ approach serves the ideology of empire and nationalism. The blood, struggle, pain and mess of history is reworked into a litany of glories and victories, a retrospective and sentimental adjustment of the actual. This is what Foucault calls ‘the struggle over popular memory’. In restorationist history Britain is to be at the centre of history, a benign and progressive influence upon the world, bearer of justice and civilization. The focus, taken up in National Curriculum documentation, is upon political, constitutional and military history rather than social or cultural. School history is envisioned as a poetics of power played out as a soap opera of kings, queens and courtiers, as spectacle and personality. Emotion, identification, remorse and empathy are to be excised and instead we have history as a reconstitutive moral force and as a celebration of oppression and violence (articulated via the reoccurring imperialist referent). (Ball, 1994: 39)
This is rather an unfair criticism which ignores the detail of the early version which included several social themes at Key Stage 2 and cultural dimensions to all of the units. Others like Phillips (1998) had seen the curriculum as a judicious compromise between New History and academically-driven substantive history.

In what ways can historians or an historical view provide the essential ingredient that might lead to a resolution of the seemingly intractable impasses that have plagued the way in which historical content or history itself is perceived within the curriculum? What might be the areas where there could be benefits in a continuing dialogue between teachers and historians over the issues of pedagogy and academic rigour? In societies where identity and belonging are problematic constructs what is the nature of the power that can come in the wake of the historical view? Can historians provide a kind of reconciliatory recontextualisation by acting almost as agents provocateurs challenging dominant ideologies and providing alternative visions and interpretations?

Peter Marshall, a historian who served on the English National Curriculum History Working Group (July 1989 – Jan 1990) recognised that whereas the history of the British empire was potentially a controversial subject, there was a tendency to have a knee-jerk reaction to it rather than to treat it as a historical problem to be examined (e.g. Marshall 1993). Three other historians, Paul Gilroy, Lachy Paterson and Charlotte Macdonald have provided new interpretations and, in the cases of Paterson and Macdonald, sets of edited sources that enable historians, teachers and students to do exactly what Marshall was suggesting.

Paul Gilroy challenges interpretations of slavery and the slave trade by looking at this history from the inside and widening the outside from a narrow nationalistic approach to embrace both sides of the Atlantic. The title of his work saying it all: ‘The Black Atlantic – Modernity and Double Consciousness’ (1993). In his Preface Gilroy draws on the work of W.E.B. Du Bois (e.g. 1986, 1989):

> It questions the location of his work in the emergent canon of African-American cultural history and explores the impact of his Pan-Africanism and anti-imperialism on the elements of his thinking that were configured by a belief in African-American exceptionalism. This chapter is intended to show how black Atlantic political culture changed as it moved out of the early phases that had been dominated by the need to escape slavery and various attempts to acquire meaningful citizenship in post-emancipation societies. (1993: x)

Thus Gilroy’s new perspectives and use of language recontextualise the history in a particularly Bernsteinian way (Bernstein 1996), but nevertheless problematise it and provide the antithesis of a knee-jerk reaction. To balance Gilroy’s thesis however it might be necessary to add the views of two other historians (Jonathan Clark and J.G.A. Pocock) who also write of the Atlantic, but in other contexts. Pocock (1975) sees an ‘Atlantic’ tradition of republicanism, and Clark (2003) envisages the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 as a continuation of struggles begun in England in 1688 – 1690.

Similarly there is an ongoing debate in New Zealand especially in the pages of the New Zealand Journal of History about such matters as the legitimacy of the history produced for Waitangi Tribunal claims (NZJH, 2006), and elsewhere whether biographies show typical or atypical life stories (Fairburn, 1995; Nolan, 2008). Lachy Paterson and Charlotte Macdonald, both New Zealand historians use their professional
historical skills to recontextualise whole periods of
history. Paterson, a specialist in Maori history,
provides a commentary on newspapers (1855 –
1863) written in the Maori language to show that:

For Maori the issue was mana, a concept which
encompasses both land and power. This book
explores the political tensions between the races
through the concept of mana: this is, whether
the newly created mana kawanatanga (the
power, influence, power or prestige of
government) could take precedence over the
already existing mana whenua (the prestige of
the Maori homeland).

Thus the newspapers are seen as evidence of cross-
cultural transactions; but the important point here is
that prior to the inclusion of the Maori perspective,
the colonising view was dominant and normative. So
there is a postcolonial impulse to ‘write’ Maori back
into history.

Charlotte Macdonald, analysing women’s
correspondence in early nineteenth century New
Zealand, devotes 90 pages to the correspondence
(1842-9) of Sarah Selwyn, the wife of the country’s
first bishop, and the rest of the volume to the
correspondence of three other women (Caroline
Abraham 1850-69; Jane Maria Atkinson 1853-71; and
Georgina Bowen 1862-8). She can through the
distance of time view the women’s prejudices in their
historical context:

The legacy of nineteenth-century empire and its
colonial history is very much alive in the post-
colonial present. That present shapes the current
volume. In this context knowledge production is
never without political significance. As a volume
of colonizing women’s letters ‘home’, Maori
women’s voices are not present here. That is not
to suggest that Maori women did not write
letters or travel to England in the nineteenth
century (as some did). Rather, this volume
presents the voices on the other side of the
colonial frontier. But Maori women and men do
appear in the letters, often in ways that are
highly offensive to readers in the early twenty-
first century. Sarah Greenwood remarked in
1846 that ‘our natives are happy and busy’,
while other letters contain references to ‘natives’
or ‘kaffirs’. Judgements which now carry highly
derogatory meaning are made, while overall, the
position from which Maori are viewed illustrates
the starkly different contexts inhabited by these
correspondents as historical subjects. The written
word was a powerful tool in the colonial world.

There is a danger that in reproducing such terms
and language the damaging impact of colonial
power in all its habits of thought and means of
expression might be reinforced. Not to produce
such passages or to excuse for the purpose of
sanitizing or tidying up the past, is to obscure
history, to be untrue to the past as it occurred.
There is no easy solution to this post-colonial
predicament confronted by all scholars of
colonial history. Facing the past squarely in the
hope of greater understanding presents itself as
the preferable option. (Macdonald, 2006: xx)

Teachers need sources on which to base their history
lessons, and both Paterson and Macdonald have
provided not only usable contemporary sources but
justifications for their selection and the
contextualisation based on their specialist knowledge
of these periods. Can this be developed in a
partnership with teachers and teacher educators
engaging in the enterprise of building up a body of
professional knowledge related to history teaching
through research? The key knowledge base that both
need to use in the resulting protocols of teacher education is that of syntactic knowledge (Turner-Bisset, 2001; Guyver, 2003; Guyver and Nichol, 2004).

An examination of a body of literature follows, which touches on epistemological, sociological, philosophical, moral, political and civic issues which fall into the area where history, identity, values, and the curriculum overlap. In increasingly cosmopolitan, globalised communities, the case for the recognition of hybrid identities in curriculum contexts is juxtaposed against drives for mixing history and values-based citizenship studies to achieve a sense of civic or civil belonging through inter-cultural dialogue. But how far can this be meta-ethnic or meta-mythic? The study of hybrid identities has become increasingly important at university level in New Zealand, for example, in the work of Angela Wanhalla at Otago (e.g. Wanhalla, 2008). Can each country’s national history best be seen not in exceptionalist terms but, using the sub-title to Liah Greenfeld’s work (1992), as a distinctive ‘road to modernity’? Exceptionalism is recognised as legitimate territory for historians to examine (e.g. Jonathan Clark, 2003, who looks at the case of the transfer of exceptional distinctiveness from Britain to the USA in the 18th century). In New Zealand Miles Fairburn in his chapter “Is there a Good Case for New Zealand Exceptionalism?” in Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand’s Pasts (2006) investigates how New Zealand far from being unique has borrowed fragments of its culture from Australia and the United States as well as Britain. But the very nature of this selection may be described as a unique blend or synthesis which makes up New Zealand.

Some solutions are suggested which by their nature are compromises, but nevertheless represent shifts from previous positions in the two main focus countries (England and New Zealand). These solutions include comparative histories, overview and focus studies, personalised or family histories, and the idea of treating controversial historical issues or periods as quasi-anthropoligical enquiries rather than opportunities for knee-jerk reactions. If syntactic knowledge is accepted as a key factor and if certain genres of history are agreed areas of good practice at various ages and stages, then in a partnership between representative historians, schools and university-based teacher educators the content problem can be overcome.

However, to the historian’s and history teacher’s knowledge bases, or know that and know how (Ryle, 1949) (expressed as adjectives, substantive, syntactic; see Guyver, 2003), needs to be added know what. Scruton identifies the factor that represents the meta-epistemological ‘virtue’ or ‘wisdom’, as ‘high culture’, which he sees as universalist rather than particularist.

On the view that I am proposing, high culture is not a source of scientific or technical knowledge (knowledge that or knowledge how), but a source of practical wisdom (knowledge what). Its meaning lies in the ethical vision that it perpetuates, and in the order that results in our emotions. On such a view, there can no more be a scientific culture than there can be a scientific religion; culture, like religion, addresses the question which science leaves unanswered: the question what to feel. The knowledge that it bestows on us is a knowledge not of facts nor of means but of ends: the most precious knowledge we have. (Scruton, 2000: 17)

Scruton, to whom we shall return, provides useful analyses of the word ‘culture’, subdividing it into common, popular and high. He also writes, drawing
on the work of Ferdinand Tönnies (1887/2001), of the process of cultural transformation from Gemeinschaft (community and mutual participation) to Gesellschaft (association, often in context of business), as what happened when traditional societies grew into modern societies, with obligations and loyalties being re-written in contractual terms and therefore easier to escape. The story of the Treaty of Waitangi continuing through the two developmental stages of the Tribunal (1975 and 1985) fits well into this theory of how the Enlightenment affected a traditional society such as existed in Aotearoa which became New Zealand. Treaty hermeneutics, like the history curriculum itself, can perhaps best be understood through the Gadamer’s philosophy of a fusion of horizons (Cadogan, 2008, 2009).
When considering the views of historians on the topic of identity, especially in national contexts, there is a considerable conceptual difference between those historians both in Britain and in New Zealand who favour the linked constructs of the national state, national identity and national history and those who challenge this orthodoxy. For example Giselle Byrnes (University of Waikato) in her Dominion Day address on September 26th 2007 at the Houses of Parliament in Wellington, challenged the accepted wisdom that this linked set of three constructs was important. Although much of her message corresponds with a commonsense view by many historians that national history should be studied in wider regional, global and comparative contexts, there was a more subversive message, that the concept of the nation at the heart of the triad of nation state, national identity and national history, remains a colonial construct. New Zealand is seen by Byrnes as a settler nation and a mainly Pakeha state (white, European). Not wishing to give the impression that somehow we ought to downplay the importance of the Treaty – her point was that the Treaty has given rise to a ‘bicultural’ tradition which, in many respects, disguises or papers over the many differences since then and in the present. Byrnes sees the Treaty itself as having had a noble vision, which in her Dominion Day address she had no intention of undermining; but she recommends vigilance when using the terms ‘nation’ and ‘national identity’ (high on the New Zealand Labour government’s list of priorities at present) because they are loaded terms. The modern nation-state came from a nineteenth-century experience of colonisation and New Zealanders cannot divorce themselves from that history. The Pakeha nation (seen by Byrnes as male-dominated and middle-class as well as white and European) is also very exclusive, despite efforts to co-opt ‘others’ into its fold. Thus for many Maori, the nation is meaningless. Some interpretations of the founding document, the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) fail to recognise the gaps between rhetoric and reality. However, Byrnes acknowledges the role of myth in history and recognises that one of the historian’s tasks is the deconstruction of myth-making.

Similarly ‘subversive’ in Britain have been Paul Gilroy on post-colonial perspectives and Raphael Samuel on social history and on diversity in interpretations of national identity. In the Fabian Society ‘Britishness’ conference in London in January 2006 there were many dissonant voices to challenge the central thesis by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (now Prime Minister) Gordon Brown. It was an attempt to recontextualise British history within its wider economic, imperial and post-imperial metanarrative as the best chance to provide a scaffolding for new forms of citizenship based on commonly agreed values of fairness and responsibility, but Brown was defaulting to a mode that looked suspiciously like claiming elements of the old ‘Whig’ exceptionalism for Britain. One counter-argument was that the values he praised as being British were in fact those of any ‘civilised’ society, though Brown seemed to be saying that in many cases the British got there first and gave these

The Views of Historians
values or principles to the world. The abolition of
the slave trade and slavery was an example, though
Gilroy at the conference denounced the fleeting
consideration given by Brown to the slave trade
itself. Raphael Samuel had anticipated many aspects
of the debate when writing in 1990 about national
identity. This piece, unpublished in his lifetime, was

‘Anti-racism’, like ‘anti-sexism’, has the merit of
undermining consensus views of the past, and
putting into question history’s unified totalities —
not only the ‘nation’ and the ‘nation-state’ of the
traditional textbooks but also, as Paul Gilroy
argues in ‘There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack’
(Gilroy, 1987), the alternative terms favoured in
the lexicon of ‘history from below’ — ‘class’,
‘community’, ‘the people’. It not only allows
conceptual space for but positively requires a
central attention to relations of inequality,
exclusion and oppression, and also to the
competition for privileges and space. Above all, it
problematises the word ‘nation’ from the word
go, and if it were used in an analytic rather than
an accusatory sense would drive us back to very
much earlier pasts — e.g. the antique divisions
between Anglo-Saxons and Celts, and remind us
of half-forgotten xenophobias, e.g. hatred of the
French, or fear of the gypsies, Jews and outsiders
(Flora Thompson’s ‘Lark Rise to Candleford’
trilogy, with its riveting memoir of childhood fears
of being kidnapped by the gypsies (Thompson,
1939, 1941, 1943) takes us as close to the
tap-roots of British racism as accounts of the
There is some legitimacy and indeed some intrinsic stability in the deliberate pursuit of an education policy where historians are in dialogue with teachers over the teaching of history in schools to students of all ages. Does this thesis still apply even where historians (as in New Zealand) are questioning the very existence and rationale of the nation state as the centrifugal force in the teaching of history in schools? There are some nuances here because of the universal desirability of civic society, so that the history of the development of any civic society has an authenticity about it that might well have the power to transcend considerations of nationality or national identity. The only problem might be that political history is not always as interesting as biography or the history of other events, especially for younger children.

Writing about the Enlightenment in a vein that contrasts with MacIntyre’s interpretation (see below), New Zealand-born historian J.G.A. Pocock not only confirms beliefs in the exceptionalism examined by Clark (2003) but also seeks to legitimise this as a metanarrative:

*The narrative culminated in civil government, in the establishment of a system of states capable of controlling religion and conducting their own affairs; and in civil society, meaning the formation of a culture of enlightened manners based upon commerce in which Europeans could live without regard to theological dispute and ecclesiastic division, if not to religion itself.*

(Pocock, 1999: 370)

New Zealand as a modern state was created within 150 years of Pocock’s key date of 1690 when English and Dutch Governments, despite retaining features of an ‘ancien régime’ society, combined to forge a new commercial alliance in conjunction with a growth in religious toleration. Set alongside this was a development whereby what Pocock calls ‘the Machiavellian Moment’ of republican polity (1975) becomes an Atlantic phenomenon, with the creation of a new state in North America, a theme also examined by Clark (2003). One of Gordon Brown’s key ‘Britishness’ texts, Linda Colley’s (1992) *Britons – Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837*, is criticised by Clark, especially in its thesis that British nationalism has many features of false consciousness based as it seems to be on anti-French prejudice and Protestantism. Colley’s thesis about trade and the economy reaching global proportions in these years, despite some debate about the causes, coincides with Brown’s attempts to depoliticise or even metapoliticise nationalism.

One associated debate is around the difference between the individual as having rights and obligations, and the rights of a variety of communities within a nation – a theme taken up in New Zealand by Elizabeth Rata and Roger Openshaw (2006), who favour a sense of belonging and identity that is essentially civic rather than ethnic, and individual (in the tradition of liberal democracy) rather than communitarian. The distinguishing of civic and ethnic, and of individual and community reflects the state of debate around nationalism (e.g. Gellner, 1992; and Ignatieff, 1994; and Smith, 1998).
The relationship between nation and narrative is problematic. The historian as the strong arm of nationalism has to be distinguished from the historian with a strong sense of national narrative. The former belongs to a romantic or even Whig school normally associated with the days before the Second World War, probably reaching its climax before 1914 when Britain was at the height of its imperial power; this genre having died by 1970. Falling to some extent within this category are Macaulay, Trevelyan, Henrietta Marshall (Marshall writing for children), Arthur Bryant and even Winston Churchill, though Churchill was keen on comparative histories of ‘the English speaking peoples’, however imperialistic and pro-American that sounds today. He wrote in a genre that has been rare, that of the war-leader writing his own history, as Caesar did. Historians writing at times of world war are more likely to stress national differences, but a strong sense of national narrative does not always imply nationalism. John Tosh in his historiography The Pursuit of History (2002) praises both C. V. Wedgwood and Simon Schama for restoring through their narratives the ‘immediacy of experience’. Historians are less likely to fall into anachronism or the trap of retrospective teleology if chronological sequence shapes their writing.

In New Zealand Keith Sinclair (1922 -1993) was an archetypal nationalist historian who supported moves to create a national identity for New Zealand independent of colonial status (e.g. Sinclair 2000). Since the so-called Maori renaissance of the 1980s, there has been a great deal of Maori history written (e.g. Binney, Salmond and Bellara), as well as a growing literature around the history of the Treaty of Waitangi (Orange, Moon); but there is the need for more Maori history to be written by Maori historians. The work of the Waitangi Tribunal is also changing and challenging the dominance of colonising voices and perspectives (see Byrnes, 2004; and the articles in the New Zealand Journal of History on Tribunal history in 2006). Since Sinclair, among the three most influential historians have been Michael King, James Belich and Ranginui Walker. Walker’s story of Maori history Ka Whawahi Tonu Matou (Struggle without End) (1990, 2004) has had considerable influence in schools,
wananga (educational gatherings to hold in-depth discussion) and universities, including those with a strong Maori representation. King, a journalist by training, wrote the very popular Penguin history (2003), but Belich, a professional historian, presented New Zealand with two serious challenges to the received way of seeing their past (Belich 1986; 1996 and 2001). His re-interpretation of the mid-19th century Maori wars (1986) was followed by a series illustrating this on New Zealand television. Maori were presented not just as warriors but as strategists whose ‘pa’ fortifications and system of entrenchments were difficult for the British armies to breach. His second ‘revisionist’ interpretation was the theory of ‘recolonisation’ (2001), which examines the view that despite the appearance of independence after Dominion status was granted in 1907, successive New Zealand governments in fact continued to follow policies that would be approved by London.

This allegiance was severely tested during and after the Second World War, with 30,000 New Zealand war dead, mostly in the Mediterranean theatre, and New Zealand supplying Britain with food, only to be followed by an apparent snub by Britain when new economic, trade and political orientations seem to represent a move from the Commonwealth towards the USA and Europe, and a corresponding but complex series of re-orientations by New Zealand towards new markets in Asia, and North America. This is explored by James Belich in Paradise Reforged in Part 3 – Better Britain at Bay 1920s – 1960s (2001: 243 – 324).

The Dominion Day speech by historian Giselle Byrnes gives an example of a modern historian seeking a new position on identity which reflects the way the world has changed since the days of Keith Sinclair, whose work is still held in great respect. Sinclair was a cultural nationalist, but there is a need to contextualise him and his ideas. One recent criticism of Sinclair came from Stenhouse (2004) who examines Sinclair’s apparent lack of regard for the religious dimension in the development of New Zealand history.

Byrnes’s sense of the similar, the different and the comparative provides many clues for curriculum designers. On one side is the recognition also that the content of history now embraces global dimensions, all socio-economic groups, local history, women’s history, and the histories of all ethnic groups, much of this reflected in some of the unusual examples in New Zealand of local and biographical studies (the Caversham Project (Olssen et al., 1999); Fairburn, 1994, 1995; Nolan, 2008). On the other side is the historian’s craft, the syntactic template that can be applied to any content choices.
Members of the 28th (Maori) Battalion performing a haka in Egypt, 1941

“So our poor old Empire is alone in the world.”
“Aye, we are—the whole five hundred million of us.”

Second World War cartoon from Imperial War Museum (London) Empire collection
If the Brunerian principle of the spiral curriculum is applied to the discipline of history, then learners of all ages can engage in honest ways with history, so long as the contexts are interesting and challenging and can be imaginatively but faithfully reconstructed (Bruner 1960, 1966; interpreted by Rogers, 1979) getting ‘inside the event’ (Collingwood 1946). This corresponds with the thinking of Dilthey (Rickman, 1976) on Verstehen and understanding from ‘within’.
Mission stations to 1845:
Northern New Zealand from

Mission stations to 1845,
southern North Island
Avoidance of ‘Master Narratives’

A ‘national’ history curriculum might seem to assume that there is some link between a national narrative and a shared sense of belonging coupled with an agreed set of values. It is in the defining of the ‘know what’ element to run alongside the ‘know that’ and ‘know how’ that curriculum designers need to show sensitivity when examining what lies beyond ‘mere’ history. Is the whole idea of narrative an insuperable problem in a society where the resolution of past conflicts seems to be such a live present issue that the possibility of a confluence of interests into an agreed ‘master’ narrative would be regarded as permanently unlikely? The work of Belich and a new generation of academic historians has gone some way to depolarise the debate.

In this process the problem of how to deal with lingering guilt plays a part in defining belonging. In Britain it is post-colonial guilt, and in New Zealand post-colonial ‘Pakeha’ guilt. Post-colonial can be seen as an approach and attitude, rather than an epoch or time period. Also guilt is a common phenomenon across the world where societies readjust to new circumstances. Roger Openshaw has written about Pakeha guilt as a quasi-religious confessional expiation for the wrongs of the past. With such a guilt-laden bi-cultural fracture at the heart, it becomes almost impossible to distil into an objective history curriculum. Pakeha guilt has tended to be more prevalent among the more educated, and there seems to be anecdotal evidence that people are getting over it. Many Pakeha, with rather un-reconstructed world views feel no such guilt, are generally negative about Maori, and object to ‘new’ historical interpretations being taught to their children. Certain historical myths such as the ‘Moriori’ myth (that Maori defeated and replaced an existing indigenous group in New Zealand) are still commonly held by young people, although they stopped being taught in schools forty or more years ago.

Professor James Belich

Dr Lachy Paterson
The development of Pakeha guilt was probably necessary to combat Pakeha racism, but the process tended to objectify Maori as victims, which in itself demeaning to Maori. While this was more prevalent in the 1980s and 90s, some historians now look for Maori agency whilst still acknowledging the powerful pressures of colonisation. Historians can perhaps provide the most effective expiatory mix, especially scholars of Maori history like Lachy Paterson whose recent study (2006) of 19th century Maori language newspapers is significant and provides evidence of Maori participation at that time, even if subject to considerable censorship.

What steps can be taken to promote the redressing of past injustices or inter-cultural understanding? South Africa has used its Truth and Reconciliation Commission which began in 1995 with the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act. The Commission could be compared with the two landmark steps to address the issue of Maori land appropriation (Waitangi Tribunal legislation in 1975 and 1985), the latter making possible claims going back to the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840). Post-apartheid South Africa has been able to recontextualise history in a national curriculum with a balance of process and content set in a mainly African framework but with global and comparative dimensions. Its latent nationalism is a cause of concern for historians, but the new curriculum is nevertheless much fairer than its pre-apartheid equivalent, and the African rather than European macro-context is clear.

National unity is of course one of the concerns of politicians wanting to raise citizenship issues. This is
the force behind Gordon Brown’s ‘Britishness’ agenda and New Zealand Prime Minister Helen Clark’s campaign for a greater sense of national identity. The role of school and university history in this process is a matter for public concern. There has been a recent move within the University of Otago to set up a ‘Centre for Research on National Identity’ within Humanities, partly in response to the government’s campaign. However it does seem to be rather inclusive of a wide variety of research topics, and as yet has not been focused in prescribing what it expects.

‘Master’ narratives are the stuff of state control and Gramscian cultural hegemony. They would have no place in any curriculum debate that involved 21st century academic historians writing in open societies, but they do of course exist in societies where history is taught from a single textbook. The other alternative is an anti-master narrative. In New Zealand, there has been a strong post-colonial analysis of race-relations history which tends to dominate, making it difficult for more nuanced interpretations. This revision, highly critical of past government action, runs parallel with history produced by the Waitangi Tribunal, which history is itself controversial (see below). Tension in Britain emerged during the last outbreak of disquiet from historians between December 2005 and January 2006 around the time of Gordon Brown’s Britishness speech to the Fabian Society. Although historians agree that narratives are all subject to scrutiny and are contestable, a significant group in England believed that the rejection of narrative as a genre and as an organising principle for the curriculum had had a negative effect (Macleod 2006). In New Zealand even Giselle Byrnes (2008) who asks searching questions about how constructs of national identity fashion history, argues that grand narratives make sense. According to Byrnes, in a learning context, they do provide students with the bigger picture onto which they might then map the particular experiences, perspectives and stories. In England, Gordon Marsden, a New Labour MP and previously Chair of the Fabian Society and former editor of History Today, described school history as being like a yo sushi meal, where different dishes pass by and teachers and students are free to pick content at will, with no coherent rationale.

Ironically at that time (late 2005, early 2006) many critics, including historians and journalists, appeared ignorant of or at least apathetic to what was in the then extant curriculum. The Key Stage 3 History curriculum (for ages 11 to 14) was organised around continuous chronological ‘coverage’ from 1066 to the 20th century. The only historian involved in the Fabian Society Britishness conference (London, January 2006) who seemed to have done his homework was Tristram Hunt who in the debate following the Gordon Brown address acknowledged that National Curriculum Key Stage 3 History (for ages 11 – 14) already had a sound sequential narrative structure, and did not require any radical reworking. However, although the 7 – 14 curriculum structure was seen to be more or less satisfactory, as in New Zealand a number of historians seemed more concerned about the courses studied in schools in the two to four years immediately before university entry. In both countries it should be stressed that these are the years when history becomes an optional subject, and falls outside national programmes for every school student. Were historians concerned about the history education of all future citizens or only about those citizens who planned to undertake higher education specialising in history? If only the latter then perhaps historians should ask if they need to extend their professional interest beyond the periods they teach or research to wider issues of school history provision and even the appropriateness of such cross-curricular frameworks as Social Studies for pre-examination stages of education. A structured history education, it could be argued, is needed for future citizens.
What solutions are offered in the literature that touches on epistemological, sociological, philosophical, moral, political and civic issues which fall into the area where history, values and the curriculum overlap? Three themes touched on are:

i) the relationship between cultures in pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial settings;

ii) the validity and parameters of cultural aspirations in relation to civic society;

iii) the relationship between epistemology and culture touching on issues of pluralism and relativism.

These are key discussion areas in modern society and relate to the motivating forces behind different politically motivated groups, including those who resort to acts of terrorism for political ends. For example these might be issues to be discussed before the setting up of a Palestinian State. ‘Arabs’ and ‘Jews’ have ethnic and religious identities, but in a nation-state also civic identities and human rights associated with them. Within the list would be included the political philosophy behind ‘organisations’ such as Al-Qaeda seeking to redress the perceived injustices of the past, but nevertheless seeking to replace existing power structures through the application of various forms of violence.

Modernity would assume a society or state which has frameworks to define and redress injustice through suitable laws which respect and protect individual rights, going beyond mere religious or ethnic identity, and not being run for the sole benefit of an ethnic, religious or political elite. The advantage of such systems, in theory, is that all individuals of whatever age, race, socio-economic status, or ethnicity are treated equally before the law. This is of course the ideal of liberal democracies, one that is sometimes an aspiration rather than a reality, but a worthy aspiration nevertheless.

The three areas above are issues that have to be addressed by those constructing curricula, as decisions have to be made about how far to incorporate the interests of different ethnic or religious/cultural groups in resolving the triple equation between national unity, civic identity and group interests.

Leonie Sandercock in *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century* refers to four major socio-cultural factors which will re-shape cities and regions in the 21st century.

> These socio-cultural forces . . . include international migration (Castles and Miller, 1998) and an accompanying new politics of ‘multicultural citizenship’ (Kymlicka, 1995); the discourse of postcolonialism, and an as yet unresolved postcolonial condition in the West; the resurgence of indigenous peoples and an associated politics of reclaiming their land; and the rise of organized civil society, and the new politics of social movements. (2003: 3)
She also pleads for a redefinition of identity and nation. The new cosmopolitan nation is seen ‘as a space of travelling cultures and peoples with varying degrees and geographies of attachment’.

A more robust sense of identity, as outlined by Yasmin Alibhai-Brown or Salman Rushdie, must be able to embrace cultural autonomy and, at the same time, work to strengthen intercultural solidarity. If one dimension of such a cultural pluralism is a concern with reconciling old and new identities by accepting the inevitability of ‘hybridity’, or ‘mongrelization’, then another is the commitment to actively contest what is to be valued across diverse cultures. Thus Alibhai-Brown feels ‘under no obligation to bring my daughter and son up to drink themselves to death in a pub for a laugh’, nor does she want to see young Asian and Muslim women imprisoned in ‘high-pressure ghettos . . . in the name of “culture”’, a culture that forces obedience to patriarchal authority and arranged marriages’ (Alibhai-Brown, 2001). Negotiating new identities then becomes central to daily social and spatial practices, as newcomers assert their rights to the city, to make a home for themselves, to occupy and transform space. (Sandercock, 2003: 98)

Sandercock, drawing on the work of Amin and Gilroy, continues by recommending the ‘ideals of citizenship, democracy and political community’:

The crucial implication of this discussion is that in order to enable all citizens, regardless of ‘race’ or ethnicity or any other cultural criteria, to become equal members of the nation and contribute to an evolving national identity, ‘the ethnic moorings of national belonging need to be exposed and replaced by criteria that have nothing to do with whiteness’ (Amin, 2002: 22). Or as Gilroy (2000: 328) puts it, ‘the racial ontology of sovereign territory’ needs to be recognized and contested. This requires an imagination that conceives the nation as a space of travelling cultures and peoples with varying degrees and geographies of attachment. Such a move must insist that race and ethnicity are taken out of the definition of national identity and national belonging ‘and replaced by ideals of citizenship, democracy and political community’ (Amin, 2002: 23). (Sandercock, 2003: 100)

Thus, in increasingly globalised communities the case for the recognition of hybrid identities can be applied to curriculum contexts where an intercultural
The problem is to attain a general acceptance of multiple identities that do not conflict. But how many situations in the present world are favourable to such an outcome? The least promising, and most explosive, seems to be that of formerly communist federal states containing peoples with historical enmities at different levels of economic development. The least unpromising, perhaps, are polyethnic societies composed mainly of various immigrant groups who demand the right freely to express their particularity within the economic and political institutions of the dominant culture. (Lukes 2003: 167)

Hilary Pilkington (1998) writing about a situation further explored by Lukes below, examines the plight of young Russians living as minority ethnic groups in the new states on the periphery of what was the Soviet Union, and how they appropriate a very personalised mix of cultural artefacts, including Western, when re-defining their own identities as a set of survival strategies.

Steven Lukes, in an important work, addresses the relationship between pluralism and relativism and about the struggle between egalitarians and communitarians, a theme taken up also by Openshaw and Rata. He traces ways in which egalitarianism can easily transform into communitarianism, citing the French Revolution where fraternité began to imply groups who were the ‘other’. 

Roger Sandall in The Culture Cult (2001) criticises ways in which some cultures have been over-romanticised. He describes a four-stage process: (1) the Captain Cook stage; (2) war and pacification; (3) transfiguration; and (4) disneyfication (2001: 179 – 181). The process of transfiguration has been analysed by Scruton (drawing on Tönnies), and converted into narrative by Belich (for New Zealand). Disneyfication is a simple and rather derogatory term for a complex series of transformations involving ‘kitsching’ as well as iconisation of ‘totems’ which can apply in any society, especially in the context of popular youth culture (see Scruton’s ‘Yoofanasia’, 2000: 105 - 122).
Sandall also (2001: 89) challenges three dogmas:

1. each culture is a semi-sacred creation; 2. all cultures are equally valuable and must never be compared; and 3. the assimilation of cultures (especially the assimilation of primitive cultures by a secular civilization coldly indifferent to spiritual things) is supremely wicked.

Again, it might be helpful to divide these ideas by Scruton’s (2000) analysis of culture into three: common, popular, and high. Is it not possible for an individual of whatever class, gender or ethnicity, to have in the bloodstream all three cultures at the same time, each feeding off the other? It is in the area of common culture that the search for identity occurs, but there are other kinds of culture. Scruton writes of how popular culture is both inherited and acquired. Drawing on the ideas of Humboldt (Cowan, 1963) and Matthew Arnold (Arnold, 1869; Arnold and Collini, 1993), Scruton appeals for high culture and its universalism, the ability to see mankind as a whole, knowing the art and literature of other peoples, and sympathising with human life in all its higher forms and aspirations (2000: 3). Sandall’s sharp critique finds some resonance in Sandercock’s stating of the problem, which recognises that globalisation does not always necessarily take the strain out of conflicts over identity:

At stake here, and across European (or any of the large number of globalizing) cities today, are contested notions of identity and understandings of difference and conflicting ways of belonging and feeling at home in the world.
(Sandercock, 2003: 97)

Rata and Openshaw (2006) write frankly and indeed controversially along similar lines to Lukes about retribalism accompanied by the rise of neo-tribalism and neo-tribal elites. They criticise the New Zealand government for encouraging neo-tribalism in the wake of their biculturalism policy. They warn that this will be counter-productive where the standard unit of citizenship should be the individual (of whatever ethnicity) with equal rights and corresponding responsibilities.

One of the problems associated with the work of Openshaw and Rata is that although the state can and does relate to individuals, these individuals also act within communities and this is unlikely to change. ‘Tribe’ and ‘individual’ are polarities which may be devoid of meaning outside specified contexts. In creating a workable polity and in constructing an acceptable history curriculum the only way ahead may be to use Gadamer’s notion of a fusion of horizons (Cadogan, 2008, 2009). Rüsen (2000), writing about conflicts in Europe draws on tribal metaphors when discussing nation and curriculum. Are Gordon Brown’s drive for Britishness and Helen Clark’s campaign for a clearer New Zealand national identity merely further examples of retribalism? Openshaw and Rata’s criticism of the New Zealand Government is that the status of individuals is diminished when the state becomes communitarian rather than egalitarian. Scruton urges caution:
Debunking theories of culture are popular for two reasons: because they are linked to a political agenda, and because they provide us with an overview. If we are to understand the Enlightenment, then we need such an overview. But ought it to be couched in these external terms? After all, the Enlightenment is part of us; people who have not responded to its appeal are only half awake to their condition. It is not enough to explain the Enlightenment; we must also understand it. (Scruton, 2000: 26)

Nevertheless, Rata (2000) has written about how violence can arise in such situations where cultural particularism in the context of common cultural identity takes precedence over cultural universalism, and gives Rwanda as an example where during the recent genocide, middle-class ‘neo-tribal’ elites had encouraged hatred of other groups. Openshaw and Rata (2007) recently identified three key concepts adherence to which endangered the climate of academic freedom in New Zealand’s universities: cultural essentialism, cultural relativism, and ethnic politicisation.

All these concepts in turn feed back into the culturalist conviction that ethnic groups have a distinctive ‘essence’ not available to those of another ethnicity or race and that an individual’s ethnicity is the primary determinant of a person’s identity (Openshaw and Rata, 2007: 408)

The New Zealand Social Studies curriculum is underpinned by biculturalism, but this ideological stance was criticised by historian Giselle Byrnes in her Dominion Day address (2007):

Many criticisms have been levelled at what we might term the ‘bicultural project’, not the least its insistence on binary difference, contestability and for some, exclusivity. Biculturalism itself is a flawed notion. It has been described as a colonial construct because it posits Maori in a (junior) position with the Crown and assumes that the cultural and political constituencies of Maori and Pakeha are homogeneous. [Byrnes footnote 22] Biculturalism is a seductive concept because it promises liberation by respecting difference – but in reality it can be a sort of ideological straitjacket. Clearly, modern claims to plurality suggest that ‘the nation’ as a composite and singular body is a fiction. At the constitutional level at least, the idea of the nation in New Zealand is up for debate. [Byrnes footnote 23]

Although Byrnes may seem to underplay the role of the civic nation as an arbiter between what Lukes describes as ‘Egalitaria’ and ‘Communitaria’, she is not critical of the Treaty partnership per se, and reflects the spirit of Gilroy’s view about ‘the racial ontology of sovereign territory’ cited by Sandercock above. Sandercock’s strong recommendation that the role of the nation and a number of other groups should include the promotion of intercultural solidarity needs to be re-examined.
Meera Nanda recognises the dangers of epistemologies which denigrate whole ethnic groups and cites Hindu Vedic scientists who promote their epistemology by diminishing those of other cultural or religious groups. The way in which this is being undertaken in parts of India consists of reinterpreting modernity through traditional structures, with very negative results in the absence of religious reformation or intellectual enlightenment. Nanda contrasts her preferred approach and the alternative.

In theory, there are only two ways to bridge the gap, although in practice there will always be a little bit of both. The first way is what de Tocqueville called “educating democracy”, which involves “purifying the mores of a society … changing the laws, customs and mores needed to make democratic revolution profitable” (see chapter 1). This involves a critical engagement with, and modification of, the existing beliefs, even at the cost of discarding some of them altogether, in favour of new mores that are more attuned to a democratic style of thinking and living. Educating democracy requires, at a minimum, accepting the legitimacy of modern ideals and using them as critical vantage points to reform tradition. (Nanda 2003: 263)

The second way is that of “reinterpreting modernity” which is what David Kopf refers to as “pouring the new wine of modern functions into the old bottles of Indian culture” (see chapter 3). This amounts to keeping the modern words, but using them to mean what tradition says they mean. Only the rhetoric becomes modern, while the ideas continue, largely, to resonate with the old meanings. In contrast to the first option in which modern ideas are the standards against which tradition is judged, the second alternative turns the tables and judges modern ideals from the vantage point of traditions. (Nanda 2003: 263)

Rata would ask whether it is possible that something similar is happening in New Zealand. However, there are certainly different ways of viewing the Enlightenment, even within the mainstream of Western culture. MacIntyre’s After Virtue, 1985, a seminal work written in an Aristotelian-Thomist metanarrative framework, contrasts pre-Enlightenment classical and Christian ethical structures and beliefs with what he considers to be the failure of Enlightenment ideas, including liberalism, in the modern age which has retained half-understood, confused, and decontextualised fragments of ‘virtue’. In its turn MacIntyre’s thesis has attracted critics (e.g. Horton and Mendus 1994). Nevertheless MacIntyre’s distaste for managerialism and emotivism as negative aspects of modernity would coincide with many educational and curriculum critiques. One underlying principle which would be acceptable to both critics and supporters of Enlightenment ideas within the academic world would be the use of rigorous historical method as a means of evaluating historical text or situation, though where religion and history seem to demand equal interpretive treatment there are some problems. Karen Armstrong suggests a common hermeneutics across religions based on the principle of charity. Scruton’s ‘know what’ and MacIntyre’s emphasis on virtue would elide. As a further knowledge base, and as a check on the excesses of ‘high culture’ (for it has been noted that many senior Nazis had features of high culture), this could be referred to as ‘aretaic knowledge’, drawing on the Greek word for virtue – arete.
The ‘principle of charity’ accords with the religious ideal of compassion, the duty to ‘feel with’ the other. Some of the greatest exegetes of the past – Hillel, Jesus, Paul, Johanan ben Zakkai, Akiba and Augustine – insisted that charity and loving kindness were essential to biblical interpretation. In our dangerously polarized world, a common hermeneutics among the religions should surely emphasize this tradition. Jews, Christians and Muslims must first examine the flaws of their own scriptures and only then listen, with humility, generosity and charity to the exegesis of others. (Armstrong, 2007: 227 – 228)

This same principle, with as Armstrong later explains, a link to the Golden Rule (‘do unto others as you would have them do unto you’) is needed when examining the difficult issue of what Maori know as ‘taonga’, history seen as much treasured and guarded possession or legacy. This refers to a mainly orally transmitted tradition.

The suspicion with which Maori groups have viewed ‘outsider’ interpretations of their history has a history of its own. Michael King was one who withdrew from Maori history after being challenged by Maori (see his Being Pakeha (1985), and Being Pakeha Now (1999)). In the introduction to his Moriori: A People Rediscovered (2000), he stresses that he was asked to undertake the project by Moriori themselves, and in conjunction with them. There is less resistance from Maori nowadays because Pakeha historians are more willing to collaborate in research, and know what areas are open to them and which are not.

One trusted historian is Claudia Orange, author of the first extended work on the Treaty of Waitangi (1989), who not only learned the Maori language but also used it to write a book telling the story of 85 Maori lives (Orange 1996). Although it is easy to demand a universal standard of epistemology this standard has to be big enough to encompass different ways of seeing things, including the idea that the land owns you rather than the other way around. Although Nanda gives an example of an appropriated epistemology that excludes others, it would be wrong to assume that all indigenous epistemologies are intrinsically antagonistic to other groups or other epistemologies. Taking Armstrong’s advice there should be mutual respect. Michael King (2001) wrote in the introduction to his Nga Iwi O Te Motu (1000 Years of Maori History) that he was disappointed that:

[In spite of promising books by Ranginui Walker, Buddy Mikaere and Lindsay Cox, most Maori history is still being written by Pakeha such as Judith Binney, Anne Salmond and Angela Ballara. I have no complaints about this. The standard of their work is excellent. But I do regret that the resource claim industry, particularly the activities of the Waitangi Tribunal, has swallowed the talents of so many potential Maori authors. I take some comfort from the fact that Tribunal work has generated sufficient research for dozens of books on iwi (tribe) and hapu (sub-tribe) history; and I trust that in due course they will be written and published. (King 2001: 5) (e.g. Ballara, 1998; Binney, 1994; Cox, 1994; Mikaere, 1997; Salmond, 2003; Walker, 2004)

The significance of the work of Angela Ballara for example is that her PhD (1991) and publication Iwi (1998) are both quoted in the proceedings of the Waitangi Tribunal (e.g. The Mohaka ki Ahuriri Report 2004). The problem with all Tribunal history is that it is, by necessity, written through a Treaty paradigm, when there are other ways to write Maori and New Zealand history.
Zealand history. Tribunal history also tends to be more legalistic, more black and white, because often large financial compensation is determined by how the history is written. This could be compared with a situation where all English history was written in terms of how it stacked up against the Magna Carta. There is a cluster of work which examines political dimensions of New Zealand historical writing, including the effects of Tribunal history. For example Howe (2003) compares the more open and less politicised Pacific history with the relatively closed nature of New Zealand history. Peter Gibbons (2003) is also critical but suggests a programme for recontextualisation, reflected by Byrnes (2007) in her Dominion Day address. The abstract of his article makes relevant reading for the current argument:

This paper argues that New Zealand historians should decentre New Zealand as a subject and suggests alternative strategies for the study of New Zealand history. It advocates in the first instance, exploring a world history approach which, in constructing macrohistories of production, trade and consumption, would emphasize the connections and convergences of local experiences with those elsewhere in the world; and, secondly, composing microhistories of individuals, households and neighbourhoods, probing especially matters involving expenditure and the acquisition of goods, and how these activities were bound up with values and relationships. In general, historians might pay less attention to New Zealand’s place in the world, and more to the world’s place in New Zealand. (The New Zealand Journal of History abstract of Gibbons, 2003)

This journal reflects an ongoing and healthy debate about New Zealand history. For example John Stenhouse (2004) is critical of nationalist histories which write out importance of religious developments. Jim McAloon (2006) is concerned about the nature of criticism of the Tribunal (including Byrnes’s) and defends tribunal histories. McAloon argues that the Tribunal’s approach is sufficiently nuanced as to make it historiographically respectable and that law and history can make use of each other. He also asserts that there was never one standard of conduct in the past and the Tribunal, rather than projecting the standards of the present onto the past, is emphasizing those perspectives which in the past did not usually prevail. In the same volume, Giselle Byrnes argues the case against, but Michael Belgrave takes a middle road, with a plea for the examination of Tribunal evidence and how that is handled. (Use has been made here of text from abstracts available on the journal website)

Thus it can be seen that there is a lively debate about New Zealand’s history which has yet to be translated into curriculum material especially for the younger years. Gibbons’s ideas especially would have much mileage in curriculum terms. Significant here is a comparison with the activities surrounding the Historical Association in England. The HA has three arms: primary history, secondary history and academic history and manages to provide facilitation and dialogue between all three. In this respect the HA was very influential in the construction of the national curriculum (1989 – 1990) a process with which I was personally involved as a member of the History Working Group. Although I appreciate that many secondary teachers experienced a deep sense of lost autonomy at this time, I was fortunate enough as a member of the Working Group to witness a creative process in which government, inspectors and historians sustained a dialogue with the two teachers
in the curriculum committee. Although officially outside the Group the Historical Association was consulted on a regular basis.

Writing with experience of Australasia, Windschuttle, like Nanda, has articulated concern about universal standards of historical methodology, and deplores attempts to ethnicise etymology.

Nonetheless, in the postcolonial era it has seemed natural to many brought up on liberal principles to go one step further than simple individual egalitarianism and to argue that it is not just all people that are equal but all cultures or meanings systems as well. This not only puts Western culture in its place but also relativises the whole corpus of Western knowledge. However, this extension of the argument should be recognized as illegitimate. The liberal democratic notion that all people are equal means equal in a legal and political sense. All people should be treated equally before the law and all should have an equal voice in the governance of their society. It has never meant that all people have equality of knowledge, ability or understanding. Similarly, all cultures or meanings systems are demonstrably not equal in terms of knowledge and ability. The inference drawn by ideologues like Edward Said, that the political liberalisation of colonial peoples should be accompanied by their epistemological liberation, does not follow. Indeed, those former colonies who want to expel Western thought in the way that they expelled Western imperialism should recognise that they would be throwing away the most valuable intellectual tools available to them. (Windschuttle 1996: 311)

On a slightly different issue, one conclusion that Windschuttle had reached was that whilst it is impossible for all New Zealanders to be Maori, it is possible for all Maori to be New Zealanders. Nevertheless it is apparent in many circles of New Zealand life, including the academic, that the Maori way of seeing the world has complemented and enriched inter-cultural discourse and Western thought systems.

In South Africa there is now an established place in the history curriculum for understanding of indigenous knowledge systems, though this is interpreted in a number of ways in the classroom.

A very different view to Windschuttle’s can be found in the work of Makere Stewart-Harawira of the University of Alberta in Canada (previously based at the University of Waikato in Hamilton, New Zealand). This approach is certainly in Gadamer’s hermeneutic tradition of a fusion of horizons (Cadogan, 2008, 2009).

If hope is the essence of being human, then nothing is more critical to the project of humanity today than the development of pedagogies of hope. Cultural and ethnic studies programs offer one pathway to the study of Indigenous ontologies of deep interconnectedness. These ontologies provide one model for the development of transformative public pedagogies. They offer a vision for a new eco-humanism that is about global peace, global justice, and the sanctity of collective life.

As educators seeking to develop radical pedagogies of hope and transformation, a critical response and collective responsibility is surely to uncover the truths that are embedded
within these and similar ontologies and pedagogies, and to proclaim them in our schools, our colleges, our universities and public arenas as a response to the rampaging consumerism and rank individualism that dominates our politics, institutions and pedagogical practice, and as a proactive endeavour towards a different future.

If, as critical educators, we believe the statement that ‘a different world is possible’, then surely these truths of the meaning of being human and of our collective purpose must become centred in our educational and public pedagogies. The outcome could well be that the possibility for transformation, the possibility for bringing into being a different world, will be made visible in our private lives, our public action, and in our classrooms. And that ultimately, through the collective efforts of we, the multitude, a new way of being in the world will be achieved – together. (Stewart-Harawira 2005b, pp 160-161)

Can the Treaty of Waitangi be seen as microhistory within a macrohistory? Can it be set in a wider historical, colonial, legal or epistemological context? How far can the ideas embedded in indigenous knowledge systems provide a clue to interpretation? Can Western and indigenous systems be fused in this search for true understanding?

As far as the legal framework goes, the Treaty of Waitangi was just one among several Colonial Office concerns or responsibilities, but it belonged to a ‘species’ of interventions affirmed by the 1837 Select Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and had first been applied as British policy from Spanish models by the 1763 Appalachian Protectorate archetype used by the Board of Trade and Plantations. So the Treaty of Waitangi belongs to a global legal mainframe known as indigenous law and which the civil law jurists of the anciens régimes knew as jus gentium. Contra proferentum rules (translating from the Latin literally to mean ‘against (contra) the one bringing forth (the proferens)’) apply to much of the content of these agreements, i.e. that the understanding of the weaker party prevails and there is no reasonable alternative except that the relationship or partnership with Maori is on the basis of such a founding document.

Gadamer offers a common interpretative process for contending parties. The debate is constituted about the text, and there are even rules. Gadamer in this context is compatible with the Maori concept of tikanga as this idea (approximating to an aspect of an indigenous knowledge system) acknowledges both prejudice and tradition, and in fact can underpin debates about traditional documents. Tikanga (actually used in the Treaty in the sense of ‘the full spirit and meaning’) denotes a number of things, including culture, custom, practice, habit, meaning, reason, rule and method. It has resonances with Gadamer’s ‘fusion of horizons’ theory of interpretation. Ironically enough the Maori word for horizon is ‘pae’, and ‘paepae’ is the bench at the front of a meeting house. The understanding of all New Zealanders, including Maori, of Gadamer’s notion could include something along the lines of: ‘the truth is out there, but our approximations of it are lightning flashes between the past and present horizons, and we are all on horizons especially when at the threshold of meeting’ (Cadogan, 2008, 2009).

It is also necessary to understand two other Maori words that were actually used in the Treaty. They are kawanatanga and taonga. One of the debates about the significance of the Treaty centres around the word kawanatanga, used to convey the English meaning of sovereignty authority and civil
government, but understood by many Maori not to mean an absolute and lasting ‘yielding up’ of authority.

The word taonga means other properties in the sense of other legacies in the Treaty, but it also means treasured possession, including Maori history. In effect the Treaty offers a guarantee that that legacy will be protected, and the work of Maori historians and that of historians in the Waitangi Tribunal continues and sustains that promise.

Thus it is necessary to access indigenous knowledge in order to understand historical situations. A parallel situation in England (and in Britain) would be to access indigenous understandings in other parts of what was the British Empire, especially the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent, so that there can be deeper understanding of communities living in towns in cities. This has not been sufficiently used, especially the possibility that language might be a way in, for example Urdu concepts.
Other Solutions

The New Zealand curriculum differs from the UK history curricula significantly in regard to the earlier years (the equivalent of the English key stages 1, 2, and 3 for pupils aged 5/6 – 14/15) in that it is content-free or unprescriptive in terms of substantive or contextual knowledge, though there is still syntactic prescription (see Appendix). New Zealand history in schools in an optional subject reserved for the over-15s which seems rather absurd to outsiders. History may or may not appear in social studies programmes, but is likely to be cross-curricular, which may indeed be the way in which the curriculum is moving in the UK.

A number of compromise solutions can be suggested, representing shifts from previous positions. These solutions include comparative histories, overview and focus studies, personalised histories, and the idea of treating controversial historical issues like colonialism or imperialism as enquiries or problems to be investigated rather than opportunities for spontaneous and polarized reactions.

Historians, teachers and curriculum designers can work together in order to transform the relatively simple set of solutions into a workable curriculum where different genres of history can be developed through dialogue between teachers, teacher trainers and historians, with history-specialist teacher trainers having an important role as curriculum mediators. New Zealand’s bi-cultural ‘tradition’ only began as a deliberate construct in the 1970s, and may work against attempts to reduce particularism through a common pursuit of high culture and universalism; but despite critiques of how biculturalism works out in policy terms, it would be worthwhile for there to be a sub-tier of the Social Studies curriculum where a number of New Zealand historical contexts were available as units but which had been produced by small intercultural working groups representing
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recognisable communities of identity but working towards New Zealand civic recontextualisation. These groups would ideally consist of historians, teachers and those involved in teacher education. Themes like migration, domestic life, contact, food and farming, communities and public buildings, etc., could be developed alongside chronologically sequenced narrative approaches, but also using microhistories to set against macrohistories (Gibbons, 2003). A curriculum could be recommended that would allow for connected local, national, comparative, biographical, thematic, regional, intercultural and global dimensions.

As children get older they should be encouraged to see the nation and national identity as problems to be examined not as given truths. There are different level statements about the handling of ‘significance’ from level 5 to ‘exceptional performance’ beyond level 8 at Key Stage 3 in the English National Curriculum. In New Zealand two encouraging developments are the Level 2 NZ NCEA unit for 6 credits ‘Explain imperialism and the emergence of national identity in an historical setting’, and the Level 4 NZ NCEA unit ‘Examine a debate among historians’.

It is reassuring that the centenary of Dominion Day on September 26th 2007 was celebrated by inviting two historians, Giselle Byrnes and James Belich to give addresses. Belich used part of his speech to make a plea for 19th century New Zealand and global history instead of Tudors and Stuarts, making the point that the actor Sam Neill would make at least as good a job as George Grey as he had done as Cardinal Wolsey in a recent television production.
But globalization and nationalism can also be used more positively — as rubber gloves for handling each other’s vices, and stimulants for each other’s virtues. It was globalization that generated the migrations, interactions, and encounters that created New Zealand’s cultures. Multiple identities and cultures can be inconvenient and complicated, but they also yield a richer, more diverse, and more innovative country — and a country with more to offer the world. On the other hand, the nation has long been a useful constraint on global homogenization. It has long said to empires and world systems: “we will not be swamped”.

Indeed, the likes of Ernest Gellner and Tom Nairn argue that modern nationalism emerged as an antidote to imperialism and globalization. Ethnic nationalism is a dangerous antidote, but civic nationalism need not be. It could be defined as a point of mediation between the global and the local, the general and the particular. It allows room for multiple cultures within it, which act to restrain and enhance it as it does globalization. Another answer to the question of what happens when you put globalization and nationalism together is simply “New Zealand”. (Belich 2007)
Belich was acknowledging the power of television in history education. Apart from his own series on the New Zealand Wars, another very successful venture has been ‘Frontier of Dreams’ with the accompanying book edited by Dalley and McLean (2005).

Belich’s address could usefully be contrasted with Gordon’s Brown’s 2006 Fabian Society speech. Both refer to Tom Nairn who wrote particularly about the relationship between nation and empire (e.g. Nairn 1988). Both Belich and Brown stress globalisation and internationalism. Both emphasise the importance of civic society, but it falls to a historian like Peter Gibbons to suggest how they can be coherently linked. Brown’s use of the word ‘integration’ in ‘work for integration of minorities into a modern Britain’ may be more controversial if applied in New Zealand. In an earlier passage he too had stressed the importance of national history and

‘...because citizenship is still taught too much in isolation, I suggest in the current review of the curriculum that we look at how we root the teaching of citizenship more closely in history’. (Brown 2006)

Here though is none of the agonising over national identity experienced by Giselle Bymes, or the questioning of the selective nature of some narrative choices, a problem identified by Barton and Levstik, in their case in the USA (2003).

In a strong plea against presentism and for a more chronological approach to the teaching of history Jonathan Clark writes:

Multiculturalism, then, attempts to fragment the grand narratives of history thematically. It also fragments them chronologically. Freed from the difficult task of grappling with a past which is different, intractable, and distant from the present observer, the framers of history syllabuses in schools and colleges are now free to dip into the past for small episodes that might be made to seem antecedents of modern pluralism. (Clark 2003: 26)
Suitable Pedagogies
Matching Suitable Curricula

The translation of all these ideas, from within Britain and from New Zealand, into new curriculum frameworks would not be easy, and Britain (in the context of Sir Jim Rose’s curriculum review) would do well to listen to some of the voices that emerge from New Zealand before making decisions. Correspondingly, in New Zealand, the question needs to be asked by all citizens is whether they are satisfied that there is no compulsory national programme for history in schools. The virtue of involving historians in a partnership with teachers and teacher educators in seeking structured solutions as well as creating researched resourcing for a variety of contexts, is that the outcome would be reflected in the very process of resource construction: the path ahead would involve dialogue and discussion and a recognition that history is not only a contested but also a debated subject. In a Vygotskian sense the resources would be socially constructed, and teachers working with historians could acquire a joint sense of ownership in a set of procedures that match a set of suitable genres. These could be a package of exemplars embedded in situated cognition but arising from a sophisticated substantive knowledge base supported by a corresponding pedagogy that in its promotion of active and experiential learning reflects the view that history is not of necessity fixed or elitist or ‘culturalist’ (in Sandall’s sense) or nationalistic, but an organic and recontextualisable set of constructs rooted in an ongoing debate. Especially relevant, both in New Zealand and not only in England but in all parts of the UK, is Gibbons’s (2003) notion of macrohistories and microhistories telling parallel global, national and local histories.

The emphasis on individuals, households and neighbourhoods, drawing on a rich and, by teachers, largely untapped, archive, provides the clue to the way ahead for school history. The partnership between the University of Otago and a number of secondary teachers in the Dunedin area in the use of the Caversham Project, a local history resource base, is an excellent example of this (see Brooking with Enright 1999).

In Britain and New Zealand today, in their ‘mongrel’ or hybrid towns and cities, the post-colonial world is encountering other worlds, and a tectonic lasagne of historical memory and experience contorts and contends in a struggle to resolve cultural differences by civic means. History and historians provide an agency which brings scrutiny and interpretation to narrative, recontextualising the past in ways which can make sense for the new citizens who are being educated in the schools. Running alongside and underpinning these solutions there is an appeal to move from the particularism of identity history to the universalism of high culture as an appreciation of the histories and cultures of others. The modification of high culture through an appreciation of virtue (aretaic knowledge) would also be necessary. In both New Zealand and the U.K. what is essential is getting the balance right between particularism and universalism on the one hand, and nationalism and internationalism on the other. The renowned
Kenneth Clark (Lord Clark of ‘Civilisation’) in his famous television series and indeed book of that name wrote that ‘nearly all the steps upward in civilisation have been made in periods of internationalism’ (1969: 119).

Finally, one recent example (February 2008) of how an exchange of culture, including both popular and high, can be used to defuse a diplomatic impasse and promote inter-cultural understanding at a deeper emotional level, was the performance in the North Korean capital, Pyongyang, by the New York Philharmonic, the oldest U.S. orchestra, conducted by the Musical Director, Lorin Maazel. The programme included not only a range of American music (e.g., George Gershwin’s *An American in Paris*) but also, and significantly, as the final item, *Arirang*, the Korean folksong. News comments posted on the Internet included descriptions of how the power of music had ‘pierced North Korea’s isolation’. This is a good example of the Gadamerian concept of a fusion of horizons where ethnic, cultural and civic values and aspirations can blend for the common good (Cadogan, 2008, 2009). These principles can be applied to a history curriculum.
Research was undertaken for this article during three consecutive placements at universities in New Zealand in July, August and September 2007: Massey University, Palmerston North, Victoria University of Wellington, and at the University of Auckland. Significantly, during the first placement I attended a hui (meeting) on the campus at Massey to mark the publication of Cheyne, C.M. and Tawhai, V.M.H. (2007) He Wharemoa Te Rakau, Ka Mahue: Maori engagement with local government: knowledge, experiences and recommendations. This was a research project supported by the Royal Society of New Zealand Marsden Fun (MAU-039), (Christine Cheyne and Veronica Tawhai, July 2007). It struck me then that the crucial educational element that relates to citizenship is empowerment for participation, and that whatever the rhetoric the outcome has to be about inclusion and action in this process. The report is written with a light touch and much humour, but analyses obstacles to progress realistically, and suggests many practical ways of involving more young people from Maori communities in various aspects of local government, including voting and engaging in debate about local issues.

While on a two-day visit to the University of Waikato in Hamilton I met Philippa Hunter and Paul Keown. Philippa Hunter’s research into dominant discourses in curriculum debate in New Zealand looks at the relationship between experienced and novice teachers of history in secondary schools, and raises some interesting questions about different concepts of good practice and how these relate to curriculum change. It was in Hamilton that I came across a remarkable report (Keown, P., Parker, L. and Tiakiwai, S. (2005) Values in the New Zealand Curriculum: A Final Report on Values in the New Zealand Curriculum. The University of Waikato School of Education and Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research). This paper discusses the values systems of all ethnic groups living in New Zealand, providing a most useful literature review as well as a discussion of such issues as hybrid and multiple identities. It struck me that such a systematic and academic report on values is badly needed in the U.K.

This writing project would have been impossible without the generous funding provided by my own institution, University College Plymouth St Mark and St John. I would like to thank the Principal, Professor David Baker, the Deputy Principal, Dr Geoff Stoakes, and the Research Committee for the award of a grant.

I would like to express my thanks to Bernard Cadogan, New Zealander and University of Oxford DPhil student (thus bridging the two academic worlds discussed in this paper), for his advice on interpretations of the Treaty of Waitangi and the historical context of the Treaty, as well as for our conversations about the theories of Gadamer and the fusion of horizons and how they apply to New Zealand history and polity. He also introduced me to the work of Makere Stewart-Harawira.

I would also like thank Dr Lachy Paterson and Professor Giselle Byrnes for giving me advice on this article, and I would also like to express my
deep appreciation to my hosts and staff at the other universities I visited: Professor Roger Openshaw, Dr Graham Hucker and Dr Ally Sewell at Massey University, Palmerston North; Mark Sheehan at Victoria University, Wellington; Dr Graeme Aitken at the University of Auckland; and Philippa Hunter at the University of Waikato, Hamilton.

I also enjoyed meeting a number of historians: Dr Geoff Watson at Massey University, Palmerston North; Professor Melanie Nolan and Dr Charlotte Macdonald at Victoria, Wellington; and Professor James Belich at the University of Auckland. At the same site I very much appreciated a discussion with Dr Elizabeth Rata about her work.

I would also like to thank the teachers who hosted me or who have helped me with this article: Paul Dredge at College Street Normal School in Palmerston North, Gregor Fountain at Wellington College, Bruce Taylor at the Correspondence School in Wellington, Paul O’Connor at Burnside School in Christchurch, and Paul Enright, a teacher who uses the Caversham Project and the work of associated academics (e.g. Tom Brooking) in Otago, who explained with great enthusiasm how the sources were used with his students. This is one more example of a fusion of horizons: the fusion of teachers’ horizons with those of their academic colleagues in Higher Education. In fact Paul Enright and Tom Brooking wrote together (1999) Milestones: Turning Points in New Zealand History.
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Footnotes within Byrnes’s address:


[23] Yet the nation has a surprising durability, both in terms of public rhetoric and institutional practice. Antoinette Burton has discussed the inadequacy but indispensability of the nation and laments that obituaries of the nation are premature. Burton, After the Imperial Turn, pp. 1-23.
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## Appendix

### ENGLISH AND NZ history elements in the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English curriculum</th>
<th>NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Y1**             | **Curriculum level 1**  
| KS1                | Year 1-2  
| **Y2**             | Age approx 5-6 yrs  
| **Knowledge skills and understanding** | • Understand how belonging to groups is important for people.  
|                    | • Understand that people have different roles and responsibilities as part of their participation in groups.  
|                    | • Understand how the past is important to people.  
|                    | • Understand how places in New Zealand are significant for individuals and groups.  
|                    | • Understand how the cultures of people in New Zealand are expressed in their daily lives.  
| **Breadth of Study** | • changes in their own lives and the way of life of their family or others around them  
|                    | • the way of life of people in the more distant past, who lived in the local area or elsewhere in Britain  
|                    | • the lives of significant men, women and children drawn from the history of Britain and the wider world  
|                    | • past events from the history of Britain and the wider world.  
|                    | • chronological understanding  
|                    | • knowledge and understanding of events, people and changes in the past  
|                    | • historical interpretation  
|                    | • historical enquiry  
|                    | • organisation and communication.  
|                    | • the way of life of people in the more distant past, who lived in the local area or elsewhere in Britain  
|                    | • the lives of significant men, women and children drawn from the history of Britain and the wider world  
|                    | • past events from the history of Britain and the wider world.  
|                    | • Understand how belonging to groups is important for people.  
|                    | • Understand that people have different roles and responsibilities as part of their participation in groups.  
|                    | • Understand how the past is important to people.  
|                    | • Understand how places in New Zealand are significant for individuals and groups.  
|                    | • Understand how the cultures of people in New Zealand are expressed in their daily lives.  

### ENGLISH curriculum

- **Y1**
  - KS1
  - *Knowledge skills and understanding*
    - chronological understanding
    - knowledge and understanding of events, people and changes in the past
    - historical interpretation
    - historical enquiry
    - organisation and communication.
  - *Breadth of Study*
    - changes in their own lives and the way of life of their family or others around them
    - the way of life of people in the more distant past, who lived in the local area or elsewhere in Britain
    - the lives of significant men, women and children drawn from the history of Britain and the wider world
    - past events from the history of Britain and the wider world.

- **Y2**
  - *Knowledge skills and understanding*
  - *Breadth of Study*
### English curriculum

#### Knowledge skills and understanding
- chronological understanding
- knowledge and understanding of events, people and changes in the past
- historical interpretation
- historical enquiry
- organisation and communication.

#### Breadth of Study
- a local history study
- Romans, Anglo-Saxons and Vikings in Britain
- Britain and the wider world in Tudor times

### NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Curriculum level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>Year 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>Age approx 7-8 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Understand that people have social, cultural, and economic roles, rights, and responsibilities.
- Understand how people make choices to meet their needs and wants.
- Understand how cultural practices reflect and express people’s customs, traditions, and values.
- Understand how time and change affect people’s lives.
- Understand how places influence people and people influence places.
- Understand how people make significant contributions to New Zealand’s society.
- Understand how the status of Māori as tangata whenua is significant for communities in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Curriculum level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>Year 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Age approx 9-10 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Understand how groups make and implement rules and laws.
- Understand how cultural practices vary but reflect similar purposes.
- Understand how people view and use places differently.
- Understand how people make decisions about access to and use of resources.
- Understand how people remember and record the past in different ways.
- Understand how early Polynesian and British migrations to New Zealand have continuing significance for tangata whenua and communities.
- Understand how the movement of people affects cultural diversity and interaction in New Zealand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English curriculum</th>
<th>NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Y7 Y8 | 1. **Key concepts**  
Chronological understanding  
Cultural, ethnic and religious diversity  
Change and continuity  
Cause and consequence  
Significance  
Interpretation  
2. **Key processes**  
Historical enquiry  
Using evidence  
Communicating about the past  
3. **Range and content**  
**British history**  
the development of political power from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century, including changes in the relationship between rulers and ruled over time, the changing relationship between the crown and parliament, and the development of democracy  
the different histories and changing relationships through time of the peoples of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales  
the impact through time of the movement and settlement of diverse peoples to, from and within the British Isles the way in which the lives, beliefs, ideas and attitudes of people in Britain have changed over time and the factors – such as technology, economic development, war, religion and culture – that have driven these changes  
the development of trade, colonisation, industrialisation and technology, the British Empire and its impact on different people in Britain and overseas, pre-colonial civilisations, the nature and effects of the slave trade, and resistance and decolonisation  
| Curriculum level 4  
Year 7-8  
(intermediate school in NZ)  
Age approx 11-12 yrs  |
| | • Understand how the ways in which leadership of groups is acquired and exercised have consequences for communities and societies.  
• Understand how people pass on and sustain culture and heritage for different reasons and that this has consequences for people.  
• Understand how exploration and innovation create opportunities and challenges for people, places, and environments.  
• Understand that events have causes and effects.  
• Understand how producers and consumers exercise their rights and meet their responsibilities.  
• Understand how formal and informal groups make decisions that impact on communities.  
• Understand how people participate individually and collectively in response to community challenges.  
| Curriculum level 5  
Year 9-10  
Age approx 13-15 yrs  |
| | • Understand how systems of government in New Zealand operate and affect people's lives, and how they compare with another system.  
• Understand how the Treaty of Waitangi is responded to differently by people in different times and places.  
• Understand how cultural interaction impacts on cultures and societies.  
• Understand that people move between places and how this has consequences for the people and the places.  
• Understand how economic decisions impact on people, communities, and nations.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English curriculum</th>
<th>NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **European and world history**<br>the impact of significant political, social, cultural, religious, technological and/or economic developments and events on past European and world societies<br>the changing nature of conflict and cooperation between countries and peoples and its lasting impact on national, ethnic, racial, cultural or religious issues, including the nature and impact of the two world wars and the Holocaust, and the role of European and international institutions in resolving conflicts. | • Understand how people’s management of resources impacts on environmental and social sustainability.  
• Understand how the ideas and actions of people in the past have had a significant impact on people’s lives.  
• Understand how people seek and have sought economic growth through business, enterprise, and innovation.  
• Understand how people define and seek human rights. |
| Y10 GCSE year 1 | | |
| Y11 GCSE year 2 | | |
| Curriculum level 6 Year 11 Age approx 15 (Level 1 NCEA) | **Social Studies**<br>• Understand how individuals, groups, and institutions work to promote social justice and human rights.  
• Understand how cultures adapt and change and that this has consequences for society.  
**History**<br>• Understand how the causes and consequences of past events that are of significance to New Zealanders shape the lives of people and society.  
• Understand how people’s perspectives on past events that are of significance to New Zealanders differ.  
**Geography**<br>• Understand that natural and cultural environments have particular characteristics and how environments are shaped by processes that create spatial patterns. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English curriculum</th>
<th>NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how people interact with natural and cultural environments and that this interaction has consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how, as a result of scarcity, consumers, producers, and government make choices that affect New Zealand society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how the different sectors of the New Zealand economy are interdependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how communities and nations meet their responsibilities and exercise their rights in local, national, and global contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how conflicts can arise from different cultural beliefs and ideas and be addressed in different ways with differing outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y12 AS Level</td>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how, as a result of scarcity, consumers, producers, and government make choices that affect New Zealand society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how the different sectors of the New Zealand economy are interdependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum level 7</td>
<td>• Understand how communities and nations meet their responsibilities and exercise their rights in local, national, and global contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>• Understand how conflicts can arise from different cultural beliefs and ideas and be addressed in different ways with differing outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age approx 16</td>
<td><strong>Social Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level 2 NCEA)</td>
<td>• Understand how communities and nations meet their responsibilities and exercise their rights in local, national, and global contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how conflicts can arise from different cultural beliefs and ideas and be addressed in different ways with differing outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how the processes that shape natural and cultural environments change over time, vary in scale and from place to place, and create spatial patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how people’s perceptions of and interactions with natural and cultural environments differ and have changed over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English curriculum</td>
<td>NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how economic concepts and models provide a means of analysing contemporary New Zealand issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how government policies and contemporary issues interact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13 A2 (old A level)</td>
<td><strong>Social Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how policy changes are influenced by and impact on the rights, roles, and responsibilities of individuals and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how ideologies shape society and that individuals and groups respond differently to these beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum level 8</td>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>• Understand that the causes, consequences, and explanations of historical events that are of significance to New Zealanders are complex and how and why they are contested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age approx 17</td>
<td>• Understand how trends over time reflect social, economic, and political forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level 3 NCEA)</td>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how interacting processes shape natural and cultural environments, occur at different rates and on different scales, and create spatial variations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand how people’s diverse values and perceptions influence the environmental, social, and economic decisions and responses that they make.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### English curriculum

### NZ curriculum (Social Studies levels 1 – 5, History from Level 6 leading to NCEA qualifications, but subject is optional)

| Economics |  
| --- | --- |
| • Understand that well-functioning markets are efficient but that governments may need to intervene where markets fail to deliver efficient or equitable outcomes. |  
| • Understand how the nature and size of the New Zealand economy is influenced by interacting internal and external factors. |  

(senior secondary - NCEA exams at levels 6, 7 and 8)

Students can opt to sit scholarship - Level 4.

### Credit Range

| Level 2 credits | 0-20 |
| Level 3 or above credits | 60-80 |
| Minimum total | 80 |
Requirements for Award of Qualification

The National Certificate of Educational Achievement (Level 3) will be awarded to people who are credited with a minimum of 80 credits at level 2 or above, of which a minimum of 60 credits is at level 3 or above, from achievement standards and/or unit standards anywhere on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).

Please note: NQF qualifications have components for which there are automatically transferable credits. Credits gained for the NCEA (Level 2) may be used towards meeting the requirements of the NCEA (Level 3) as well as other qualifications registered on the NQF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>NZ NCEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5808</td>
<td>4 Credits Gather and organise historical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5809</td>
<td>4 Credits Interpret historical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5810</td>
<td>4 Credits Communicate historical information in different modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe the different experiences of people in historical settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe the influence of an historical force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5813</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe perspectives of people in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5814</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe social welfare in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5815</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe race relations in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5816</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe economic development in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5817</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe international relations in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5818</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe revolutionary leadership in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5819</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe social change in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5820</td>
<td>4 Credits Describe conflict in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>NZ NCEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>4 Credits Define and plan an historical investigation under supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822</td>
<td>4 Credits Examine historical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823</td>
<td>4 Credits Communicate historical information in an essay and another mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain the different experiences of people in historical settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain the influence of an historical force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5826</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain perspectives of people in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5827</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain industrialisation and social change in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5828</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain nationalism or international relations or the search for security in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5829</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain government and political change in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5830</td>
<td>4 Credits Explain imperialism and the emergence of national identity in an historical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>NZ NCEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5831</td>
<td>4 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5832</td>
<td>4 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5833</td>
<td>4 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5834</td>
<td>4 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5835</td>
<td>4 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5836</td>
<td>4 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5837</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5839</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>NZ NCEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8130</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8131</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8132</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8133</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8134</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8135</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above from http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/

**Associated websites**

Social Studies Levels 4 and 5: http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/category/tid/22
NCEA Level 1 http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/category/tid/19
NCEA Level 3 http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/ncea-level-3-history/frontier-of-chaos
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