

Name:	Index No:	Class:
-------	-----------	--------



ANGLICAN HIGH SCHOOL **PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2020**

S4

HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1: European Dominance and Challenges (1870s-1945)

28 August 2020

Secondary 4

1 hour 40 minutes

Additional Materials: 5 sheets of writing paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Follow the instructions on the front cover of the Answer Booklet.

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

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

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

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **either** Question 2 or Question 3

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

Hand in the question paper, Section A and Section B separately.

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

Section A		30 marks
Section B		
Qn. No: ()		20 marks
TOTAL:		50 marks

Parent's Name:	
Parent's Signature:	
Date:	

This document consists of 5 printed pages.

[Turn over

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates

Study all the sources carefully and then answer all the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources you are told to use. In answering the questions you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 (a) Study Sources A and B.

How similar are these two sources? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Source C.

How reliable is this source as evidence about British rule in Malaya? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Source D.

Why did Governor Weld make this statement? Explain your answer. [5]

(d) Study Source E and F.

How far does Source E make you surprised about Source F? Explain your answer. [6]

(e) Study **all** the sources.

'The British went too far in the implementation of the Residential System' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

The Residential System in Malaya

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Read this carefully. It may help you to answer some of the questions.

The Residential System was set up in the Protected Malay States of Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan and Pahang from 1874 to 1895. Under the Residential System, the Sultan was the President of the State Council and was in charge of matters affecting Malay customs and religion. The other Malay chiefs were allowed to retain their titles and retained the positions in the State Council. On the other hand, the Resident whose advice had to be followed by the Sultans, exercised control over areas such as revenue collection and administration of justice. There has been much controversy over whether the Residential System led to the Malay States losing their status as independent states. Hence, did the British go too far in the implementation of the Residential System?

Source A: *A comment by Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad, the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia, on the status of Malaya as a British colony before the Japanese Occupation.*

We were technically never colonized. What we did was the sultans decided to invite the British to come and advise them on how to administer the country. We were not conquered in that sense. Just like Penang, we were paid to give them a kind of trading station... But the fact remains that when the British were here, they operated as if we were colonized. In other words, the British did not advise, they gave orders.

Source B: *A statement by the eighth Prime Minister of Malaysia Muhyiddin Yassin, on Malaya's status as a British colony before the Japanese Occupation.*

On the question of whether Malaysia was colonised, the answer is — yes. I take that stand although there are some views stating otherwise. If we study historical facts carefully, we will know that our celebration of Merdeka is not in vain because we were colonised. The Malay Rulers had to accept the advice of the British commissioner or resident and this means we were not free.

Source C: *An extract from an article in the Straits Times on 2 August 1889, summarising the speeches of Sir Hugh Low at the Straits Settlement dinner in London.*

By a policy of guidance instead of force, British influence has extended gradually over Perak, Selangor, Sungei Ujong, and Pahang. Sir Hugh Low also bore witness to the success of dealing kindly and patiently with the natives instead of coercing them. A steady persistence in this sympathetic policy, to convince both Malays and Chinese that the British Government are their true protectors, mean well by them and have their welfare at heart, cannot fail to yield the happiest of results.

[Turn over

Source D: *Extracted from a comment by Governor Frederick Weld on retaining the Residential System, after he became the Governor of the Straits Settlements in May 1880.*

It is my policy to utilise native agencies as much as possible in governing native States. It should be our objective to let the leading men feel that we are there to help them and bring them into cordial co-operation with us in promoting the welfare of States and people, and to show them that we value their assistance, that we respect their position, and consult their views to bring about political stability.

Source E: *An account by Frank Swettenham writing in 1893 as Assistant Resident of Selangor. He was Resident of Perak and Selangor before becoming the first Resident-General of the Federated Malay States in 1896.*

I have spoken of the Residential System, but in reality there was no system; what there is now is grown from the experience gained in trying the untried. A British officer, acting under the instructions of a distant Governor, is sent to 'advise' a Malay ruler and his chiefs. The officer is told he is responsible for everything but he is not to interfere in details. His advice must be followed, but he must not attempt to enforce it. He must keep the peace, see that justice is administered, respect vested interests, abolish abuses, raise revenue, foster British interests, do his best for the State, and obey instructions he receives from Singapore, and with it all he is at his own peril to remember that he is *only* an adviser of the Malay Ruler!

Source F: *Sir Peter Benson Maxwell writing in 1878 about the implementation of the Pankor Treaty. He was the former Chief Justice of the Straits Settlements and a critic of British intervention in Malaya.*

The Malays who imagined they were treating for a guide, had in actual fact accepted a master and signed away their country to foreign rule. Honestly, the treaty could mean no more than the Sultan would give serious attention to the advice offered. To conclude that in agreeing to accept advice, the Ruler surrendered all freedom of action and authorised the Adviser to implement his own advice is utterly unreasonable.

Section B: Essays
Answer two questions

- 2 "The Dutch expansion into the Outer Islands from 1870s onwards was primarily due to political rivalry between European countries." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 3 'Germany's defeat in 1945 was primarily due to Hitler's military leadership.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- End of Paper –

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A : Malaysian Digest, *Tun M.: Malaysia was never colonised by Brits, Sultans had invited Brits to be advisers*, 12 Sept 2011, <http://www.malaysiandigest.com/news/31003-tun-m-malaysia-was-never-colonized-by-brits-sultans-had-invited-brits-to-be-advisers.html>

Source B : The Malaysian Insider, *Putrajaya says Malaysia was colonised, disputes MPN's version of history*, 5 Oct 2011, <http://malaysia-today.net/mtcolumns/newscommentaries/43923-putrajaya-says-malaysia-was-colonised-disputes-mpns-version-of-history>

Source C : http://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/hist/eja/documents_archive/pangkor-treaty.php

Source D : Chew, Ernest. "Swettenham and British Residential Rule in West Malaya." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 5.02 (1974): 166-78.

Source E : Winstedt, R.O. and Wilkinson R.J., "A History of Perak" in the *Journal of the Malayan Branch, Royal Asiatic Society* Volume 12, June 1934.

Source F : P.B. Maxwell, *Our Malay Conquests*, London, King, 1878 cited in Gullick, J.M., *Rulers and Residents, Influence and Power in Malay States 1970-1920*, Oxford University Press, Southeast Asian Historical Monography, Singapore, 1992.

Anglican High School
Preliminary Examinations 2020
Core History Paper 1, 2174/01
Suggest Answer Scheme
Section A: Source-Based Case Study

(a) Study Sources A and B.

How similar are these two sources? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	States the similarities AND/OR differences unsupported by source evidence, without a common criteria or no attempt at answering the question.	1
L2	Explains the Similarity OR Difference, supported with a common criteria and source evidence	2-3
L3	<p>Both aspects of L3</p> <p>e.g. Both sources differ in their judgment of Malaya's legal status as a British colony Both sources differ in perspectives in whether Malaya was colonised by the British. In Source A, Mahathir conceded that "we were technically never colonized". This shows that in his judgment, Malaya was never a former British colony. However, in Source B, Muhyiddin states firmly that when asked whether Malaysia was ever colonised, his answer would be "yes" and that they were "not free" under the British.</p> <p>Both sources are similar in showing that the Malay rulers lost their sovereign right to rule Malaya under the British. In Source A, it states that the British operated "as if we were colonized", where they "did not advise, they gave orders". This shows that the Malay rulers lost their power as they had to follow the British's instructions. Similarly in Source B, it states that "The Malay Rulers had to accept the advice of the British commissioner or resident and this means we were not free." This shows also that the Malay rulers lost their right to rule. Hence, they are both similar in showing that the Malay rulers lost their power during British rule.</p>	4-5

(b) Study Source C.

How reliable is this source as evidence about British rule in Malaya? [6]
Explain your answer.

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Undeveloped Provenance. It is reliable because it is by the Straits Times.	1
L2	Reliable based on content Yes, it is reliable because it shows how British rule in Malaya was beneficial/successful/did not go too far. The source states that they “bore witness to the success of dealing kindly and patiently with the natives instead of coercing them” and intervention had yielded the “happiest of results”. This shows that British rule in Malaya did not go too far as there was positive relationship built and resulted in an improvement in the state of affairs.	2
L3	Reliable/Not reliable based on CR/CK Source C is reliable in showing how British rule in Malaya was beneficial. Contextually, Hugh Low was a successful resident who replaced James Birch.	3-4
L4	Not Reliable based on developed evaluation In my final analysis, the source is unreliable as the newspaper article was published to praise the British’s government’s policy of intervention. It reports on the speeches made during the straits settlement dinner by glorifying British’s achievement and downplaying the negative impacts of British intervention. Hence it is unreliable and biased about how British rule in Malaya was beneficial.	5-6

(c) Study Source D.

Why did Governor Weld make this statement? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Provenance only Governor made this statement as he just assumed governorship.	1
L2	Superficial message Governor wants to ensure that the Residential system is kept in place.	2
L3	Message/Outcome	3-4

	The Governor wanted to convince the local rulers that he would allow the locals to have a greater control. The source states that it is my “policy to utilise native agencies as much as possible in governing native States.” This shows that the British were willing to work with the locals and will rule through the locals. (Message) This is so that the locals will respect and cooperate with him since he just ascended into the position as governor. (Outcome).	
L4	Message + Outcome in Context	5

(d) Study Sources E and F.

How far does Source E make you surprised about Source F? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Surprised due to undeveloped Provenance. Surprised because they are both Colonial officials.	1
L2	Surprised due to differences in message. Yes – Different in showing whether the Residential system went too far to encroach on the Sultan’s right to rule. <u>Source E: No it did not encroach.</u> <u>Source F: Yes it encroached.</u> Source E makes me surprised about Source F as it contradicts F on the extent in which the Residents overstepped their authority. Source E states that the Resident is constantly in a dilemma of needing to produce results while remembering that he is “ <i>only</i> an adviser of the Malay ruler”. This shows that the British residents were constantly striving to advice without any attempt to overstep his boundaries to “enforce” his advice. This makes F surprising as in Source F, it shows that the British went too far as they assumed that by agreeing to the Pangkor Treaty, the Malays who “imagined they were treating for a guide, had in actual fact accepted a master and signed away their country to foreign rule.” This shows that the British were being “unreasonable” and going too far in ensuring that their advice were to be followed by the Sultans.	2-3
L3	Evaluation of E’s reliability Source E cannot make me surprised about F as it is contradicted by Source B. Source B states that when Malaya had a British resident, “The Malay rulers had to accept” their advice and “were not free”. This shows that the British Resident were going beyond merely giving advice as they needed to ensure that the Malay Sultans followed the advice. Hence, Source E cannot make surprised about F as Source B contradicts it. Source E can make me surprised about F as it is supported by Source D. Source D showed that the British Governor who was overseeing the British Residents wanted to ensure that the British “utilise native agencies as much as possible in governing native States” and “respect” and “consult” the views of the Sultans. This shows a need for cooperation with the Malay rulers. In this context, it supports the dilemma that Frank Swettenham presented where he	4

	was not allowed to “enforce” his advice on the rulers and hence E makes me surprised about F.	
L4	<p>Not surprised based on analysis of E’s purpose that differs from F’s purpose.</p> <p>However, Source E cannot make me surprised about F due to the differing purpose. Source E’s purpose is to prove failure of Residential system and push for Federated Malay States. Source F’s purpose however is to prove failure of Residential system and criticise British intervention. Sir Maxwell was a critic of British intervention and he would therefore serve as an advocate for the local rulers so that British can rethink their approach to intervention and allow for more local control instead.</p>	5-6

(e) Study **all** the sources.

‘The British went too far in the implementation of the Residential System’ How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1
L2	<p>Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. <i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>A – Source A supports this view as it shows that the British went beyond what was agreed about intervention. It states that “the British did not advise, they gave orders” even though the Sultans original intention was for them to “advise”. This shows that the British went too far in the implementation as they did more than what was agreed upon.</p> <p>B – Source B supports this view as it shows that the local rulers lost their right to rule. It states that Malaya was “colonised” and “The Malay Rulers had to accept the advice of the British commissioner or resident and this means we were not free.” This shows that the local rulers lost their autonomy to rule which was going beyond merely having to consider the advice of the British.</p> <p>F – Source F supports this view that the British went too far in imposing their wishes on the local rulers. It states in the source that the clause in the treaty was clear where the Malay rulers were to accept a “guide”. However, the British were “utterly unreasonable” “to conclude that in agreeing to accept advice, the Ruler surrendered all freedom of action and authorised the Adviser to implement his own advice”. Hence, Source F showed that the British went beyond the stated rights and enforced their wishes on the local rulers to the point that they lost autonomy to rule.</p> <p>No</p>	2-4

	<p>C – Source C does not support the view as it shows mutual cooperation between the British and the local rulers. It states that “Sir Hugh Low also bore witness to the success of dealing kindly and patiently with the natives instead of coercing them.” This shows that there were mutual understanding and at no point did the local rulers felt that they were forced to follow British rule. Hence, the British cannot be seen as going too far since the locals accepted the relationship.</p> <p>D – Source D does not support the view as it shows the British respecting the local rulers’ autonomy. The source states that “It is my policy to utilise native agencies”. This shows that the British did not encroach too much such that the local rulers lost their right to rule since British were merely there to “help them” and that the locals were still the “leading men” who has not lost control over Malaya.</p> <p>E – Source E does not support the view as the British resident asserted that he was careful in respecting the authority of the ruler. It states in the source that in the discharge of his duty as a resident, “he is at his own peril to remember that he is <i>only</i> an adviser of the Malay Ruler!” This shows that the British did not go too far as they constantly restrain themselves and merely provided advise instead of encroaching on the Malay Sultans’ sovereignty.</p>	
L3	<p>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i></p> <p><i>For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (ie +1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks must not exceed 8.</i></p>	5-8

**Anglican High School
Preliminary Examinations 2020
Core History Paper 1, 2174/01
Suggest Answer Scheme
Section B: Structured Essay Questions**

2 (a) Explain why the local Vietnamese elites lost their power to the French. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Describes French rule without focus on question	1-2
L2	Identifies or describes reasons	3-4
L3	<p>Explains reasons</p> <p>The local Vietnamese elites lost their power to the French because the French centralised the administration of Vietnam. French rule centralised Vietnamese administration which was dominated by French officials. In Cochinchina where direct rule was imposed, the Vietnamese emperor suffered from losing his traditional rights to rule over the people as a French governor was put in place. In Annam and Tonkin where indirect rule was practised, the emperor remained as a figurehead and actual political authority was transferred to a French Superior Resident.</p> <p>Furthermore, they also lost their power due to the French imposing a new tax collection system. Previously, the Vietnamese elites enjoyed the privileges of collecting tax in kind and this gave them authority over the peasants. However, with French rule, the French took over tax collection by standardizing taxation and abolishing payment in kind. The taxes were also collected by the French Resident.</p>	5-8

(b) 'The French expansion into northern Vietnam c.1870s was primarily due to their need to secure French trade with China.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Discusses French expansion, no focus on question.	1-2
L2	Describes given or other factors	3-4
L3	<p>Explains Given Factor/Other Factors</p> <p>French economic interests was also a significant reason for French intervention in Vietnam c.1870s because the French needed to create economic opportunities to boost the French economy. The French originally wanted to establish a trading base in Saigon that could rival Singapore and Hong Kong in funnelling China's trade. However, the Mekong River which flowed from Cochin China into China was unsuitable for trade due to the rapids in the upper parts of the Mekong River. As a result the Red River in Tonkin which ran from into China would provide an alternative entry route into Yunnan instead. As such with the increasing instability in the North brought about by the influx of Black Flags into Northern Vietnam and the possibility that this could provide an avenue for the Chinese or other European powers to intervene in North Vietnam.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I disagree French rivalry with other European powers was a significant reason for French intervention in Vietnam c.1870s because by the late 19th century, the race for colonies heated up in Europe. French politicians who had previously been hesitant about getting involved in international affairs began to accept the idea of conducting colonial conquests for the sake of national interest. The British who were the main rivals of the French were concerned that the British would next try to gain access to China through Burma. The French also wanted to prevent the Germans who were looking for new lands to colonise and rumoured to have designs on northern Vietnam.</p>	5-6
L4	Explains Given Factor and Describes on Other Factor	7
L5	Explains Given and Other Factor/s	8-10
L5	Consideration of relative importance of factors	11 – 12

3a. Explain why Hitler adopted an expansionistic foreign policy in 1930s. [8]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Describes expansionistic foreign policy without focus on question.	1-2
L2	<p>Describes one or more reasons</p> <p><i>Award 3-4m for description of factors</i></p> <p>Eg. Hitler adopted an expansionistic foreign policy in 1930s because he wanted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolish Treaty of Versailles • Greater Germany 	3-4

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lebensraum • Establish a superior Aryan race 	
L3	<p>Explains reasons. Eg. Hitler adopted an expansionistic foreign policy in 1930s because he wanted to return national pride to Germany. After the humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles where Germany had to bear full war guilt and the consequent heavy reparations. Hitler was determined to abolish the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and reverse the effects of the debilitating Treaty. Not only did the Treaty terms contained German military strength, it also led to a curtailment of German territories by almost 13% and stripped Germany of all its overseas territories and colonies. As a result, Hitler embarked on extensive rearmament to build up his military capacity for territorial conquest. By acquiring territories that were lost such as Austria, Sudetenland and Poland, Hitler was able to reverse the humiliation once suffered and bring back national pride to Germany as she grew in power with the acquisitions. Hence, it was due to Hitler's desire to establish a Greater Germany through acquisitions and to gain national pride that prompted his adoption of an expansionistic foreign policy.</p> <p>AND / OR</p> <p>Eg. Hitler adopted an expansionistic foreign policy in 1930s because he was motivated to gain lebensraum for Germany's survival. In mid 1920s, Hitler developed the belief that Germany required <i>lebensraum</i> ('living space') in order to survive. This was the idea of conquering territory in eastern Europe, specifically Russia, and of settling it with German peasants. This would also contribute towards increasing Germany's strength by encouraging migration to Germany's colonies. Hence, his belief shaped his foreign policy after he took power in 1933. As a result, he broke the de-militarization terms of the Treaty of Versailles to rearm Germany in order to equip Germany to advance and conquer to the east. His annexation of Czechoslovakia, Poland and eventual invasion of Soviet Union was evidence that lebensraum was an underlying factor in his aggressive expansion.</p>	5-8

3b. 'Germany's defeat in 1945 was primarily due to Hitler's military leadership.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Writes about topic without addressing question demands	1-2
L2	Describes given or other factors	3-4
L3	<p>Explains given or other factor/s</p> <p>Eg. I agree with the statement because it was Hitler's military leadership that caused Germany to lose her advantage and weakened the German forces towards defeat. Hitler appointed</p>	5-6

himself as Commander-in-Chief of the Nazi troops and did not trust his more experienced generals to make decisions. Hence, the troops did not dare to make timely strategic decisions on their own without Hitler's approval and this caused them to lose key battles that led to a weakening of the German forces. This was evident in him ignoring his generals' better judgment of withdrawing at the Battle of Stalingrad and insisting on his policy of 'not one step back'. His decision to deny the German Army at Stalingrad to withdraw had the *severe repercussion of the Army suffering countless casualties in the close combat conditions that the troops were not familiar with.* **This significantly weakened the German troops and led to a turning point towards German defeat at Stalingrad in 1943.** Another military blunder was Hitler instructing the surprise attack on American lines in Dec 1944 in the Battle of the Bulge **where the battle severely depleted Germany's armoured forces on the western front**, and Germany was largely unable to replace them. German personnel and later *Luftwaffe aircraft also sustained heavy losses which dealt a heavy blow to the remaining might of the German Army.* The Germans' initial edge in battle was also eliminated with Hitler's demand for newly developed hi-tech weapons eg. heavier tanks instead of concentrating on mass production and this left the Germans with a wide array of tanks requiring different spares. *As a result, this severely impaired the German Army's ability to fight efficiently and caused them more setbacks in the war.*

OR

Eg. However, I also disagree with the statement because **it was US direct contribution that contributed to abundant manpower and resources to strengthen the Allied armies.** USA contributed vast resources and manpower against Germany's defeat in WWII. The USA was the world's largest producer of goods at that time and was able to convert its factories for military production at a faster rate than that of the Axis Powers. With their formal entry into the war, the USA was able to send large numbers of American military personnel, such as soldiers and intelligence officers, to aid Allied military campaigns. This was evident in US air force contributing to Allied aerial bombing campaigns starting 1943 of German industrial areas and German synthetic oilfields which **successfully disrupted German production chains, halted replenishment of supplies to the German Army and deprived them of essential war materials to sustain the war against the Allies.** In addition, the Allied faced a shortage of resources and used backward military machinery prior to us entry to war. With the involvement of USA, it solved Allied problems of military shortages like more manpower but also bolstered the Allied war machines. With the superior strength of the Allies, it escalated Germany's defeat in WWII. This was evident in the D-Day landing where US provided both military expertise as well as large amount of military personnel, equipment contributing to the **successful re-capture of Paris and the opening of the western front against the already weakening German forces engaged in the east with the Red Army.** This meant the Germans were effectively boxed in, battling the world's greatest economic powers -- the Soviets from the east and now the other Allies from the west. **German in 1944 simply did not have the resources or the personnel to withstand the assaults.** Hence, it was US entry into the war which provided abundant essential

	resources and war supplies in abundance which bolstered the Allied war machine.	
L4	Explains given factor and describes other factor/s	7
L5	Explains given factor and other factors	8-10
L6	Consideration of relative importance of factors <i>(dependent on what other alternative factors is used in disagree paragraph)</i>	11-12