

Paper 8697/2 (South East Asia, From Colonies to Nations 1870-1970)

Question 1, Marking Notes

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES (1-5)

These answers will be about the relationship between Singapore and Malaysia, but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources, but only in producing an account of the different aims of the leaders.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (6-8)

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

e.g. Yes, Source D shows the open threat to UMNO's supremacy in Kuala Lumpur. No, Source C shows the conciliatory tone adopted by UMNO's leader.

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (9-13)

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and challenge it. However, sources are still used at face value.

e.g. There is evidence both for and against the view that UMNO caused the separation. Source D shows PAP's ambitions to capture power at the centre whereas Source E describes UMNO's failure after the 1964 elections to work with Mr. Lee and the PAP.

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT. FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (14-16)

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at their face value.

e.g. I do not think that UMNO was solely responsible for the separation. Source A demonstrates how the political balance was tilted against Singapore (and the Chinese) in favour of a Malay Malaysia and Source C outlines a policy of positive discrimination. Source B is evidence of Singapore's resentment of this imbalance.

L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (17-21)

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting to confirm and challenge the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and challenge are done at this level).

e.g. (L4 example plus). However, some of the sources suggest that responsibility for the break does not lie wholly with UMNO. From Source E we can see that an opportunity was lost to bring in Lee as a federal minister or of having the PAP as a coalition partner. We know from the same Source that UMNO resented Lee's entry into federal politics with the implicit threat

of mobilising the peninsular Chinese. Despite the justification offered in Source D was this the step too far?

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS PREFERRED

(22-25)

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for challenging/supporting is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why other evidence is worse. For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it, e.g. argues that although separation was almost inevitable, it was not deliberately sought by either UMNO or Singapore.

2 This question gives candidates an opportunity to discuss the varied nature of the political structures established by the colonial powers to maintain their control of Southeast Asia. Good candidates will be able to show how colonial political experience varied from one imperial power to another e.g. from the Dutch in Indonesia to the British in Malaya. and again that the mode of control varied from colony to colony and also changed over time. The best candidates will be able to compare, say, Burma with Malaya, or the Philippines with Vietnam, and consider the tentative steps taken by colonial powers towards creating means by which indigenous populations could have a voice in decision-making.

3 Entry into the world market threatened the existence of subsistence economies and the nature of rural life by changes in landholding e.g. in Burma, by increased production for the world market and by the development of major industries such as mining or rubber. Furthermore colonial economies were subject to the vagaries of the international market when demand could slump dramatically as in the Great Depression. Candidates may also consider the consequences of the influx of European entrepreneurs and capital.

4 This question calls for an examination of the impact of migrants, principally Chinese and Indian, on Southeast Asian societies. Good candidates will examine the varied contribution of the Chinese in, say, Malaya and Singapore, and the economic roles they fulfilled in Indonesia or Thailand. Allowance should be made for those who discuss the function of the secret societies or kinship groups. Again, Indian migrants acted as essential labour for rubber plantations in Malaya whereas in Burma they became middle men and moneylenders within the rural economy. Better candidates will go on to discuss how far in the colonial period such migrants were assimilated, what checks, if any, colonial authorities imposed to limit the flow, and how readily the indigenous populations accepted such economic migrants.

5 Candidates are called on to examine the reasons why effective nationalist movements were slow to develop in Southeast Asian countries. Clearly one factor common to all was the watchful eye of the ruling power which was unwilling to see its control challenged. Candidates may choose to exemplify this by reference to the Dutch in Indonesia or the French in Vietnam. Self-government was never contemplated - the best that was on offer was limited participation in the organs of state e.g. the Volksraad or the Federal Council. Good candidates may choose to contrast American encouragement of nationalist movements in the Philippines with the brutal repression of nationalist movements throughout Indo-China. The best candidates will examine other factors

which hindered the development of a united movement such as the fragmentation of nationalist groups eg in Malaya or the role of religion in such colonies as Burma, Indonesia or Malaya.

6 The Japanese invasion of Southeast Asia created a cataclysmic change from which no colonial power was able to recover. Co-Prosperity was the promise and political progress was the reality. Good answers will examine how far Japanese policy differed in Indonesia where nationalism was already a reality with leaders waiting in gaol to Malaya where effective nationalism hardly existed at all. In Malaya, the Japanese occupation strengthened Malay involvement - through local rulers, and the use of Malays in such bodies as the police and para-military forces - all of which was to provide the basis for a new and united Malay nationalism in the post-war world. Reward candidates who assess why Japanese policies ultimately failed in countries such as Burma and why, in Vietnam and the Philippines, the Japanese occupation produced anti-Japanese resistance movements.

7 Candidates may well approach this question by first discussing states which have been markedly successful in dealing with minorities within their borders of which the most significant has been Malaysia with its emphasis on 'communal politics'. There should be some assessment of the importance which its constitution gives to the necessity of safeguarding the interests of the Malays, while allowing Indians and Chinese a role in political decision-making. Again, Singapore itself may be cited as an example where no special privileges are given to the Chinese majority and candidates may well seek to evaluate the position of Malays and Indians within that state. In contrast Indonesia has used extreme force against its Chinese minority and against the East Timorese and Burma has found it difficult to accommodate racial minorities. Better candidates will be concerned to identify what historical factors have produced such marked differences.

8 This question allows candidates to consider the varied threats to democracy from several different standpoints. Most will wish to consider the role of the army and the readiness of many Southeast Asian states to fall back on military rule, using examples from countries such as Burma, Thailand and the Philippines. Good candidates will also seek to assess how far 'Guided Democracy' constitutes a threat to democracy or even what limitations may exist within states where a single party monopolises power. The best answers will go on to examine the threat, both external and internal, of communism and seek to establish how significant this threat actually was. Candidates who limit themselves to this aspect of the question should not be placed in the higher markbands.