

Question	“Nationalist movements have only themselves to blame for the lack of achievements in the pre-war period.” How far do you agree with this statement?
Question Topic	Origins, nature and development of pre-World War II nationalism.
Question Focus	Successes and limitations of pre-war nationalist movements.
Definitions	<p>“Themselves to blame”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates should reference this phrase to the internal failings of the pre-war nationalist movements. • Such internal failings could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Factionalism (ii) Over-ambition/radicalization (must be seen in the context of far superior politico-military colonial strength and resolve). (iii) Over-reliance on individual nationalist leaders/lack of sound party and mobilisational structures. (iv) Narrow scope and support (must be linked to physical size and capability of nationalist groups against colonial powers). • Candidates who wish to argue against the given factor can do so by highlighting the overwhelming quality of colonial resolve to hold on to their colonies, backed up by superior military and police forces deployed for effective suppression. <p>“Lack of achievements”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates should highlight that none of the nationalist groups in the pre-war period achieved the ultimate aim of independence and the overthrow of the colonial powers, and go about accounting for that (internal failings Vs external suppression). • Candidates can also choose to question the assumption behind this phrase as a form of (final) higher evaluation. For this, they would have to identify and explain developmental aspects that could be considered as successes. These could be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Expansion of membership numbers and proliferation of nationalist groups. (ii) Intensified nationalist agitation against colonial powers, eliciting a greater military response from the latter (“small successes”). (iii) Politicisation of the masses (at least for the urban masses). (iv) Growth of a “national” mindset (greater inclusiveness).
Possible Arguments	<p>Candidates can argue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Agree. In this argument, candidates will have to focus on the structural weaknesses of the nationalist movements. They will have to highlight points of internal weaknesses, such as factionalism, over-

	<p>reliance on leaders, over-ambition and lack of politico-military capability, and show that these issues devastated the groups to that point that they never stood a chance against the colonial powers, even before the colonial suppression came in. Colonial suppression, under this argument, then becomes the final nail in the coffin, though not the underlying reason for the lack of achievements.</p> <p>(ii) Disagree. In this argument, candidates have a dual task in showing that the nationalist groups were decently organised, and their lack of achievements were instead due to overwhelming colonial superiority. In this argument, candidates can acknowledge that there were some weaknesses on the part of the nationalist groups, but did not amount to structural decay. What was a more important factor was the colonial resolve and military suppressive capability that led to the failure of groups.</p>
--	--

Question	“Confrontation was the most viable path towards independence in the post-war era.” Discuss.
Question Topic	End of colonial rule.
Question Focus	Different routes taken by Southeast Asian countries to achieve independence.
Definitions	<p>“Confrontation”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates should equate the term to hostile, physical and violent agitation against the colonial powers. The terms does allow for connotations of illegality. Such agitation could come in the form of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Prolonged open war (e.g. Vietnam). (ii) Limited war (e.g. Indonesia). (iii) Street demonstrations/protests/strikes (e.g. Indonesia and Burma). • For candidates who wish to argue against the given factor, a possible alternative strategy that the nationalists adopted with that of reform and negotiation with the colonial powers. This would also connote legality and constitutionalism. <p>“Most viable path”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates should tie the term with a connotation of practicality/workability, and must be seen in the context of colonial attitudes based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Post-war domestic (Europe) conditions. (ii) Attitudes towards imperialism and empire (colonial retention). (iii) The Cold War. • Candidates can also judge the issue from the perspective of the nationalists through an assessment of their

	movements' politico-military strength and legitimacy.
Possible Arguments	<p>Candidates can argue:</p> <p>(i) Confrontation was the most viable path. In this argument, candidates will have to focus on the fact that most of the colonial rulers were still uncompromising in holding on to their colonies in the post-war period (provide context). As such, in order for the fulfillment of the ultimate aim of independence, nationalist groups had to force the issue through hostile action. The resultant effect could be in the form of immediate independence or an accelerated decolonisation timetable. Philippines would be the exception case study in this argument as the decolonisation process there was overwhelmingly constitutional, based on negotiation and peaceful.</p> <p>(ii) Reform and negotiation was the most viable path. In this argument, candidates will have to focus on the fact that international circumstances, and in some cases even the colonial powers, were already forcing the issue of decolonisation. Nationalist forces recognised this global shift and maneuvered their way through legal and constitutional means (through negotiation) towards the achievement of their aims of independence. While it can be acknowledged that some acts of violence were involved, these paled in comparison to the diplomatic and political efforts in securing independence. Vietnam would be the exception case study in this argument as the decolonisation process there was overwhelmingly confrontational and violent.</p>

Question	"The rise of authoritarian regimes was largely due to historical, rather than circumstantial, reasons." How valid is this statement in relation to independent Southeast Asia?
Question Topic	Search for political structures.
Question Focus	Rise of authoritarian regimes.
Definitions	<p>"Rise of authoritarian regimes"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authoritarian regimes would refer to any one of the following (candidates should seek to deal with all): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Military governments. (ii) Maximum governments (heavy military involvement). (iii) Illiberal/paternalistic democracy. • The time period of focus would be in the years of democratic experimentation leading to the collapse of initial democratic governments. <p>"Historical"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connotes a more long-term factor accounting for the rise

	<p>of authoritarianism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the context of Southeast Asia, this would refer to the persistence and permeation of traditional political culture, such as patrimonialism, with its authoritarian slants. Candidates should show the resurfacing of such authoritarian tendencies during the democratic experimentation phase through the role and action of key governmental leaders in subverting and dismantling democracy and maneuvering an authoritarian-styled government into power. <p>“Circumstantial”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connotes more short-term, immediate factors accounting for the rise of authoritarianism. • This would mostly refer to the failures of democratic governments and the incompatibility of democracy in meeting the needs of independent Southeast Asia, thus further discrediting the political ideology and system of governance.
Possible Arguments	<p>Candidates can argue:</p> <p>(i) Valid. In this argument, students would have to focus on traditional political culture, how it affected both the elites and masses (the authoritarian slant), and how key governmental leaders always had a preference for it (did not believe in democracy) and set about working towards the establishment of authoritarian states. In this sense, the democratic failings in the post-independent period was more of the final nail in the coffin, and provided more justification for the set up of authoritarianism that was agreeable to both the elites and masses.</p> <p>(ii) Invalid. In this argument, students would have to focus on the failings of the democratic governments in the post-independent period, and how that led to a discrediting of democracy and concurrently, a rise in authoritarianism. Traditional political culture like patrimonialism also does play a role, but under this argument, it would be more of a contextual factor.</p>

Question	To what extent was the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis caused by unsound governmental practices?
Question Topic	Economic development and consequences.
Question Focus	Causes of the Asian Financial Crisis.
Definitions	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Mostly due to Southeast Asian government economic management, directives and policies.</p> <p>(i) Poor regulatory regimes and economic practices.</p> <p>(ii) Risky economic practices.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (iii) Lack of proper management and supervision of the financial sector by the respective governments (iv) Foreign investors speculative trading. (v) Investor panic and capital flight.
Possible Arguments	<p>For the judging criteria, students should evaluate between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Immediate/short term causes. (ii) Long-term, structural causes. <p>Students can argue for the statement using the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Governments committed to the process of financial liberalization and deregulation, and this often included large amounts of foreign borrowing, thereby leading to ballooning debts. (ii) Mismanagement of financial institutions and structural decay (lack of good banking practices). (iii) Overinvestment in infrastructure and property projects, leading to saturation and oversupply, causing the property bubble to burst. (iv) The actions of foreign investors can be ascribed as the trigger to the crisis, however, it was due to the abovementioned government blindspots that were more significant in leading to the crisis. <p>Major case studies would be Indonesia, Thailand and Malaysia. Singapore could be used as a case-in-point to evidence sound governmental practices to stem the tide of the crisis.</p>

Question	“Interstate tensions have hindered regional integration.” How accurate is this statement in relation to the period 1945 – 1997?
Question Topic	Interstate tensions in Southeast Asia.
Question Focus	Effects of inter-state tensions on the region.
Definitions	<p>“Interstate tensions”</p> <p>Could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Bilateral tensions and conflict. (ii) Regional tensions and conflict. <p>derived from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Dispute over territorial sovereignty. (ii) Issues of national security. (iii) Economic competition. (iv) Historical animosity. (v) Spillover of intra-state minorities insurgencies. <p>“Hindered regional integration”</p> <p>To retard or hinder the progress towards regional integration and cooperation. Could come in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Open hostility. (ii) Diplomatic action and verbal statements of disagreement. (iii) Diplomatic isolation or retreat (refusal of multilateralism).

<p>Possible Arguments</p>	<p>Students should apply a timeframe for their judging criteria. Inter-state tensions did impeded regional integration and cooperation in the immediate aftermath/period, but over the long term (entirety of the time period in question), made considerable strides towards regional integration and cooperation.</p> <p>Students can point towards the failures of the earlier regional organisations, like ASA, SEATO and Maphilindo and how inter-state tensions served as severe impediments towards regional cooperation. However, with ASEAN (inter-state tensions leading to the proposal and set up of regional organisations targeted at regional norms setting), and in consideration of the entirety of the time period, there is evidence of sizeable progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Willingness to subscribe to the ASEAN Way as an overarching code of conduct for dispute/conflict management. (ii) Willingness to participate in forums, engagement in dialogue and consultation towards the peaceful management and resolution of tensions/conflicts. (iii) Regional integration not solely through the security dimension, but also underpinned by economic and cultural links and relationships.
----------------------------------	--

How far do Sources A – E support the view that ASEAN was inadequate in dealing with regional security issues between the period 1975 – 1997?

Support	Challenge
<p><u>Source B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARF as a continuation of ASEAN-related problems. Central issue lies with the fundamental weakness of the 'ASEAN Way' principles, based on a process of consultation, dialogue and consensus-seeking. • The cumbersome process results in the ARF being an ineffective platform for security management and conflict resolution. • ASEAN overwhelmed and superseded by larger powers within the ARF. Suggests that ASEAN lost the driving seat in the regional platform. 	<p><u>Source A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly speaking, ASEAN remained united on their founding principles (elements of the 'ASEAN Way', as well as the principle of non-interference) despite harboring smaller points of disagreement and conflict. • Achievements in terms of the creation and initiation of conflict management platforms, as well as united declarations of intent and condemnation on the international stage.
<p><u>Source E</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASEAN's united response to the Vietnam invasion of Cambodia was not so much reflective of a sense of regional integration and unity, but individual national interests aligning. In this sense, the source reveals that ASEAN members, while agreeing on the broad principles of ASEAN, are still acting upon individual national interests of self-preservation and/or gains and are hence, divergent and disunited on their priorities and strategic outlook. This undermined regional and organizational unity. • The success of conflict management and resolution was due more to the role of external powers and their influence (as reflected by their strategic priorities). 	<p><u>Source C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASEAN created security platforms for mediation and dialogue (both at the bilateral and multilateral levels). • Norms setting for security management based on ASEAN principles (ASEAN Way). Such norms also applied and translated to the bilateral level. • ASEAN initiated the engagement of larger powers to be included in security-related dialogue of the region. • Possibility of questioning provenance.
	<p><u>Source D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilateral and multilateral approach to the South China Sea dispute guided by ASEAN norms (relevance of the ASEAN Way principles). • Provenance shows the prevailing mood at that point in time, but does the source being set in 1994 pose certain limitations?