



TEMASEK JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC2 Preliminary Examinations
HIGHER 2



HISTORY

Paper 2 The Making of Independent Southeast Asia (Independence-2000)

9752/2

Tuesday, 12 Sep 2017
3 Hours

No Additional Materials are required.

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name and CG on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the paper.

Start each answer on a fresh piece of writing paper.

You may use an HB pencil for any diagrams, graphs or rough working.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **Question 1**.

Section B

Answer **two** questions.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together, with the cover sheet on top.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for good English and clear handwriting in your answer.

This question paper consists of **5** printed pages.

SECTION A

You **must** answer Question 1.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1 Read the sources and then answer the questions which follow.

Source A

The existing level of intra-ASEAN trade has always been the rallying point for the 'regionalists', who strongly advocate a rapid growth of intra-regional trade in order to diversify the region's market base and to reduce its overdependence on the industrialised countries. However, the intra-ASEAN trade since 1976 has simply failed to take off in real terms and remains stagnant at around 15 percent level, despite the implementation of some regional trade liberalisation measures. In a sense, the sluggish expansion of intra-regional trade in ASEAN brings to the fore the inefficiency of the technique of trade cooperation adopted by ASEAN.

A UN Industrial Development Organisation report on ASEAN published in 1983.

Source B

ASEAN has made remarkable strides in economic cooperation since its very humble beginnings. Starting with bold and innovative approaches in the late 1980s and early 1990s, ASEAN leaders began to develop more ambitious means of economic cooperation in the creation of an ASEAN Free trade Area at the Fourth Summit in 1992. Since then, ASEAN has expanded coverage of AFTA, expedited the liberalisation process and has embarked on deeper regional economic integration accords. While many of these latter initiatives are only now being developed, they are indicative of the intentions of the ASEAN leaders to create a unified marketplace in a wider Southeast Asian region.

ASEAN Economic Bulletin, 'Economic Cooperation after 30 years', November 1997.

Source C

Growth of ASEAN Export to ASEAN members and to the world, 1989-2003
(Amount quoted are in US\$ billions)

		1989	1992	1995	1998	2001
Indonesia	ASEAN-5	2.39	4.33	6.04	8.72	9.02
	The world	22.02	33.96	45.41	48.84	56.31
Malaysia	ASEAN-5	6.3	11.85	19.53	16.91	21.12
	The world	25.04	40.76	73.77	73.25	88.0
Philippines	ASEAN-5	0.53	0.51	2.23	3.71	4.9
	The world	7.82	9.82	17.44	29.49	32.14
Singapore	ASEAN-5	9.24	12.70	31.43	23.41	29.49
	The world	44.8	63.46	118.26	109.9	121.75
Thailand	ASEAN-5	2.27	4.10	10.69	8.25	10.53
	The world	20.05	32.47	56.43	53.58	65.11
ASEAN-5	ASEAN-5	20.74	33.51	69.95	61.03	75.08
	The world	119.64	180.49	311.34	315.08	363.33

Figures quoted in an academic report published by a regional think-tank working with a UN agency 2006.

Source D

With the expansion of ASEAN membership in the 1990s, ASEAN encompasses high-, middle-, and low-income countries. Substantial economic disparities persist between the original and new members. There is a vast gap between the wealthiest and poorest ASEAN members. The new ASEAN members also tend to possess few diplomats and officials capable of participating fully in ASEAN meetings, or other meetings in Asia, which normally take place in English. Vietnam, the wealthiest and most proactive of the four new members, has quickly trained a new generation of foreign service diplomats and officials overseas. It had also been catching up to the original ASEAN members in economic development, thus essentially raising it to equal status with the original member states. The other three poorer, new ASEAN states, however, are far from equals. Since ASEAN still operates by consensus, they will retard progress. Indeed, such economic inequality poses obvious barriers for integration. Weak domestic infrastructure among low-income members has made it more difficult for them to implement necessary changes. In addition, the vast differences in the openness of member states' economies have arguably retarded the progress of AFTA. These newer members have lagged far behind the original members in reducing tariffs, and the continual delays in the full AFTA have disappointed foreign and local investors and generally undermined ASEAN's credibility on trade issues.

Adapted from a 2012 report by an American think-tank.

Source E

The new member states and the original members of ASEAN converge on the capacity of market-based systems to deliver growth and social stability as well as the necessity for economic reforms. In addition, the accession of these states to AFTA was eased in a number of ways. First, extra time is given to implement their tariff reduction obligations, which is governed by the Common Effective Preferential Tariff Scheme. Second, the new members were also offered preferential tariff free access to the markets of the original members from January 2002 under the ASEAN Integrated System of Preferences. These various measures and programmes contribute to the economic sustainability of their participation in ASEAN economic regionalism.

Moreover, enlargement was beneficial to the AFTA project. It offered investors a potential market size of about 533 million people compared to the 385 million people in the original ASEAN-6. Market size is an important selling point of AFTA, which the ASEAN governments employed as a means to help them counter the perceived diversion of FDI to China attracted to that country's large market. This threat serves to urge all the states of Southeast Asia into advancing the next phase of regional economic integration.

Adapted from a 2013 report by a Singapore think-tank.

Source F

After more than four decades of conscious efforts for greater integration of their economies, the five original members find their economies no closer to each other than in 1967. Conflicting national strategies, similar export product lines, and moves away from integration pose serious obstacles to economic integration.

ASEAN's economic integration is weakened by a strong aversion for a diminished national sovereignty for the sake of deeper economic integration. National strategies clash with ASEAN's internal goals. Several members refuse to lower tariffs on certain critical products. Trade disputes still take place. ASEAN economies have also been trading more with non-ASEAN economies than with themselves by a

ratio of three to one. ASEAN's record pales in comparison to other regional organisations. The European Union has an intra-trade level of 67.3 percent while the North American Free Trade Association registers an intra-trade record of 48.7 percent. In addition, developments over the years have actually pre-empted and/or undermined collective efforts. Various bilateral agreements entered into by member countries are examples of this. ASEAN has also been moving away from integration by developing organizational linkages with non-ASEAN countries.

Adapted from an article in a Filipino newspaper, May 4, 2014.

Now answer the following questions.

- a) Compare and contrast the evidence provided by Sources D and E on the effects of ASEAN membership enlargement on regional economic integration. [10]
- b) How far do Sources A – F support the view that ASEAN's regional economic cooperation was a dismal failure? [30]

SECTION B

You must answer **two** questions.

EITHER

- 2** “The authoritarian leader was successful in maintaining political stability in independent Southeast Asia.” Evaluate this claim. [30]

OR

- 3** Why were some governments more successful than others in addressing the minority problem in independent Southeast Asia? [30]

AND EITHER

- 4** Assess the view that government intervention in the economies of independent Southeast Asian states was a necessity. [30]

OR

- 5** Who was more effective in addressing the effects of the Asian Financial Crisis: state or non-state actors? [30]