



DUNMAN SECONDARY SCHOOL

Where..... Discernment, Discipline, Daring, Determination & Duty become a part of life.

**CANDIDATE
NAME**

CLASS

**INDEX
NUMBER**

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2019 SECONDARY 4 EXPRESS 5 NORMAL ACADEMIC

HUMANITIES (SOCIAL STUDIES)

2272/2273

Paper 1 Social Studies

30 Aug 2019

1 hour 45 minutes

Additional Materials: Writing Paper
Strings

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name, class and index number 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, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1

Section B

Answer **both parts** of Question 2

At the end of the examination, submit the following SEPARATELY:

- Section A Question a), b) and c)
- Section A Question d) and e)
- Section B

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

The total marks for this paper is 50.

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

1 Living in a Diverse Society

Study the Background Information and 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 issue to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 (a) Study Source A.

Is the cartoonist a supporter or opponent of Aung San Suu Kyi? Explain your answer, using details of the cartoon. [5]

(b) Study Source B.

Why was this speech delivered in 2018? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Sources C and D.

How far are the two sources different? Explain your answer. [7]

(d) Study Sources E and F.

Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer. [7]

(e) 'Myanmar's government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis.'
Using the sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement? [10]

How did Myanmar's government respond to the Rohingya Crisis?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

Rohingya Muslims are an ethnic minority group of 1.1 million people living in Rakhine state, Myanmar (formerly known as Burma). Though Myanmar is a dominantly Buddhist country, Rohingya Muslims have their own culture. In 1982, Myanmar government passed a citizenship law that left the Rohingya stateless and limited their rights to work, travel and practice their religion.

In 2015, Aung San Suu Kyi was elected head of Myanmar, sharing power with military leaders to govern the country. Since then, violence against the Rohingya became more rampant in Rakhine state. The Myanmar government blamed the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA), a terrorist group for the violence.

The violence forced 700,000 Rohingya Muslims to escape into the neighbouring country of Bangladesh to live in dangerous refugee camps. Despite international efforts for repatriation*, the return of Rohingya refugees back to Myanmar was slow. United Nations (UN) had accused the Myanmar government of ethnic cleansing** and crimes against humanity, but the Myanmar government rejected all the accusations.

Repatriation*: the voluntary return of refugees back to their home country

Ethnic cleansing**: the mass killing and expulsion of members of an ethnic group by another group

Map of Myanmar-Bangladesh border



Study the following sources to assess how Myanmar's government responded to the Rohingya Crisis.

Source A: A cartoon drawn to show Aung San Suu Kyi's response to developments in Rakhine state, Myanmar in September 2017.



Peace Prize*

*Aung San Suu Kyi was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991 for her efforts to introduce democracy and human rights in Myanmar.

Source B: Adapted from a speech delivered by Aung San Suu Kyi at the 43rd Singapore Lecture, organized by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS)-Yusof Ishak Institute in August 2018.

We have formed a committee to ensure the return of peace and stability in Rakhine. We approached former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for advice on lasting solutions. Myanmar has implemented 82 out of its 88 recommendations but there are multiple challenges.

Similarly, we hope to work with Bangladesh to effect the voluntary, safe and dignified return of displaced persons from northern Rakhine. Potential resettlement sites have been mapped out and Myanmar was ready to receive Rohingya returnees since 23 Jan 2017.

Source C: *Adapted from a press statement on the official Myanmar government website in late 2017.*

Recently, there has been news releases based on false accusations over Myanmar made by some international countries and foreign media. Actually, the violence was caused by 4,000 ARSA extremist terrorists who attacked 30 official police outposts and a military camp in Rakhine state.

At the time of outbreak of the terrorist attacks, government security forces helped local residents evacuate to safer places, regardless of their race and religion. And those displaced people were supported with provisions and given medical treatments by mobile health teams. Provisions and humanitarian aid donated by people and communities across the nation were delivered by Myanmar military forces' helicopters, vessels and motor vehicles.

Source D: *Adapted from a twitter feed update by ARSA in 2018.*

Although Aung San Suu Kyi blatantly lied to the international community that 'clearance' operations against Rohingya has stopped since 2017, the Myanmar terrorist government and Buddhist terrorist army have never stopped committing acts of attacking Rohingya villages, raping women, looting their lands and domestic animals. Thousands of Rohingya are still fleeing to escape from endless inhumane persecution.

The Myanmar government is further blocking and delaying international organisations including non-government organizations (NGO), foreign media and UN from entering Rakhine state with the ill-intention not to witness the actual situation on the ground.

It is evident that the Myanmar terrorist government is not a bit interested in Rohingya repatriation but just playing dirty politics with the international community, including Bangladesh.

Source E: *From a statement made by Kyaw Tint Swe, a senior Myanmar Minister at the 25th International Conference of the Future of Asia, in Japan in May 2019.*

Myanmar and Bangladesh have a diplomatic arrangement in November 2017 to aid the repatriation* of Rohingya who fled ethnic violence in Rakhine. The Myanmar government is ready to grant all who come back with a 'certificate of residence' and help those eligible to apply for citizenship. But they are still trapped across the border and have not been released by Bangladesh despite official requests from Myanmar.

Bangladesh has not honored the agreement and is not cooperating with Myanmar's efforts to repatriate or provide residence cards to Rohingya refugees. We urge Bangladesh to allow, without delay the return of verified persons under voluntary and safe conditions.

Source F: *From an online article by a Bangladeshi university lecturer published in The Diplomat, an international current affairs magazine in 2018.*

Myanmar's statements regarding the repatriation of Rohingya refugees indicate deceitfully, that Myanmar has always been ready to welcome back the Rohingyas from Bangladesh.

Yet, Myanmar refuses to call them by their ethnic name. At the order of Myanmar, Bangladesh has agreed to change the terminology used to describe Rohingya refugees on the identity cards they are issued from 'Myanmar nationals' to 'displaced persons from Rakhine State.' This alteration, though seemingly minor, indicates Myanmar does not intend to recognize the Rohingyas as citizens nor does it intend on granting them citizenship rights.

Also, Human Rights Watch recently published a report alleging that recent Rohingya returnees to Myanmar have been tortured and forced to confess that they are members of ARSA.

SECTION B (Structured-Response Question)

Question 2 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

2 Being Part of a Globalised World

Study the extracts carefully, and then answer the questions.

Extract 1

The Ministry of Home Affairs reported that in the past two years, 8 Singaporeans were self-radicalised and have been dealt with under the Internal Security Act (ISA). Not all 8 cases were ISIS-related; 3 were influenced by other terrorist teachings and wanted to participate in armed violence in conflict zones in other parts of the world. In one case in 2018, the individual did not support ISIS but was deeply influenced by radical teachings he had read online.

This brings the total number of Singaporeans dealt with under the ISA since 2015 to 22. In contrast, between 2007 and 2014, we dealt with only 11 radicalised Singaporeans. This suggests that the terrorism threat to Singapore remains high, and continues to grow.

Extract 2

Cyber security threats are a growing concern internationally. Governments have been taking very drastic measures to make sure gaps in national cyber security are not exploited.

Extract 3

The cyber security industry is rapidly expanding as attackers are becoming more sophisticated and there is increasing scope for cybercriminals to attack a person's life from work to home. Individuals have to be vigilant to ensure that they are not targets of cyber-attacks.

- (a) Extract 1 highlights the rise of self-radicalised individuals in Singapore.

In your opinion, what can Singapore do to reduce the growing trend of self-radicalisation among Singaporeans? Explain your answer using **two** ways. [7]

- (b) Extract 2 and Extract 3 reflect the roles of governments and individuals in managing cybersecurity challenges.

Do you think the government has a more important role in managing cyber security challenges than individuals? Explain your answer. [8]

Acknowledgements:

Source A: <https://www.cartooningforpeace.org/en/editos/the-painful-exodus-of-the-rohingyas/>

Source B: <https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/suu-kyi-outlines-myanmars-efforts-to-resolve-rohingya-crisis-help-refugees-return>

Source C: <https://www.statecounsellor.gov.mm/en/node/1178>

Source D: https://twitter.com/arsa_official?lang=en

Source E: <https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/The-Future-of-Asia-2019/Myanmar-says-Bangladesh-not-helping-refugee-return>

Source F: <https://thediplomat.com/2018/08/myanmar-remains-disingenuous-when-it-comes-to-rohingya-repatriation/>

Dunman Secondary School
4E5NA Social Studies Preliminary Examinations 2019
Section A: Source-Based Question
Suggested Answer Scheme

a)	Study Source A. Is the cartoonist a supporter or opponent of Aung San Suu Kyi? Explain your answer, using details of the cartoon.	5
L1	Description /Lifting <i>E.g. The cartoon shows Aung San Suu Kyi wearing a medal and holding a torch of democracy, freedom and human rights. This was because she won the Nobel Peace Prize.</i>	1
L2	Answers cartoonist is a supporter: misinterprets source <i>E.g. The cartoonist is a supporter of Aung San Suu Kyi. This is because I can infer Aung San Suu Kyi is doing her best to bring the “torch of democracy, freedom and human rights” into Myanmar in 2017 after winning the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991. Moreover, she has a worried look on her face which means she is concerned about the suffering of the Rohingya Muslim minority in the background.</i>	2
L3	Answers cartoonist is an opponent: sub-message. <i>e.g. The cartoonist is an opponent of Aung San Suu Kyi. This is because I can infer that Aung San Suu Kyi is a poor / weak/ terrible leader. This is evident in the source where the Rohingya Muslim minority villages are burning in the background. But she is more interested in using her torch to lit the structure “torch of democracy, freedom and human rights”. This means that she failed to help the Rohingyas.</i>	3
L4	Answer cartoonist is an opponent: valid inference <i>Award 3 marks for inference, unsupported. Award 4 marks for inference, supported.</i> <i>e.g. The cartoonist is an opponent of Aung San Suu Kyi. This is because I can infer that <u>Aung San Suu Kyi is a hypocrite / liar / insincere/ irresponsible leader</u> . This is evident in the source which shows Aung San Suu Kyi looking away and turning her back on the Rohingya Muslim minority villages burning in the background. Also, she is carrying a torch and has not yet lit the structure-representing Myanmar- to establish “democracy, freedom and human rights in Myanmar”. This means despite the expectations placed on her as a Nobel Peace Prize winner and democratically elected political leader of the country, she was unwilling to help burning villages of the Rohingya Muslims .</i>	3-4
L5	L4+ Detecting Author’s Attitude towards issue <i>The cartoonist is an opponent of Aung San Suu Kyi. This is because I can infer that <u>Aung San Suu Kyi is a hypocrite / liar / insincere /irresponsible leader</u>. This is evident in the source where Aung San Suu Kyi was looking away and turning her back on the Rohingya Muslim minority villages burning in the background. Also, she was carrying a torch but has not yet lit the structure - representing Myanmar- to establish “democracy, freedom and human rights in Myanmar”. This means that despite the expectations placed on her as a Nobel Peace Prize winner and democratically elected political leader of the country, she is unwilling to help the burning villages of the Rohingya Muslims. The cartoonist is critical about how she handled the crisis. The chain, “Nobel</i>	5

	<i>Peace Prize” around her neck was awarded to her for bringing peace to her country but ironically she only brought death and destruction to the Rohingya Muslims in her country / Aung San Suu Kyi was supposed to use the torch to lit up the monument of Myanmar’s democracy. Ironically, Aung San Suu Kyi inflamed the Rohingya crisis further by using the fiery torch behind her back to burn the Rohingya Muslim villages instead.</i>	
--	--	--

b)	Study Source B. Why was this speech delivered at that time? Explain your answer.	6
L1	Answers based on provenance / lifting/paraphrasing <i>e.g. The speech was delivered to address Singapore and the international community at the 43rd Singapore Lecture organized by ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute, Aug 2018.</i> <i>or</i> <i>e.g. The speech was delivered to say that Myanmar had approached former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for advice on lasting solutions.</i> <i>or</i> <i>e.g. The speech was delivered to tell that Myanmar government is improving conditions in Rakhine state</i>	1
L2	Answers based on context <i>e.g. The speech was delivered because the United Nations (UN), non-government organisations (NGO) and human rights watch groups had accused Aung San Suu Kyi’s Myanmar government of ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity in Rakhine state.</i>	2
L3	Answers based on message/ impact without message <i>e.g. The speech was delivered by Aung San Suu Kyi because she wanted to say that the Myanmar government had proactively taken sufficient and timely measures to resolve the Rohingya crisis. This is evident in the phrase, “We approached former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for advice on lasting solutions. Myanmar has implemented 82 out of its 88 recommendations”. This means that the Myanmar government was responsive to the UN’s suggestions and committed to fully co-operating with the international community to resolve the Rohingya crisis and restore order in Rakhine state.</i> or <i>e.g. The speech was delivered by Aung San Suu Kyi because she wanted Singapore and the international community to feel more understanding / relieved / pacified/ placated / appeased towards the Myanmar government’s role in the Rohingya crisis and so tone down their condemnation and accusations towards Myanmar.</i>	3
L4	L3+ Action Word and Audience	4

	<p>Award a higher mark for more developed answer.</p> <p><i>e.g. The speech was delivered by Aung San Suu Kyi because she wanted to convince/persuade/justify to Singapore and the international community that the Myanmar government had proactively taken sufficient and timely measures to resolve the Rohingya crisis. This is evident in the phrase, "We approached former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for advice on lasting solutions. Myanmar has implemented 82 out of its 88 recommendations". This means that the Myanmar government was responsive to the UN's suggestions and committed to fully co-operating with the international community to resolve the Rohingya crisis and restore order in Rakhine state.</i></p>	
L5	<p>L4 + Impact and context</p> <p>Award 5 marks for L4+impact only Award 6 marks for L4+impact and context</p> <p><i>e.g. The speech was delivered by Aung San Suu Kyi because she wanted to convince/persuade/justify to Singapore and the international community that the Myanmar government had proactively taken sufficient and timely measures to resolve the Rohingya crisis . She hopes Singapore and international community would feel more understanding / relieved /pacified/ placated / appeased towards the Myanmar government's role in the Rohingya crisis and so tone down their condemnation and accusations towards Myanmar. This was because the United Nations (UN) has accused Aung San Suu Kyi's Myanmar government of ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity in Rakhine state.</i></p> <p>Other acceptable impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Singapore and the international community would be convinced of the Myanmar government's sincerity in resolving the crisis</i> • <i>Singapore and the international community would provide humanitarian aid, material resources, financial contributions to help the Myanmar government restore order in Rakhine state, Myanmar.</i> 	5-6

c)	<p>Study Sources C and D.</p> <p>How far are the two sources different? Explain your answer.</p>	7
L1	<p>Difference: Provenance</p> <p><i>e.g. Sources C and D are different. Source C is a press release on official Myanmar government website but Source D is a twitter feed update by Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA) on Jan 2018.</i></p>	1
L2	<p>Difference: False matching / Superficial comparison</p> <p><i>e.g. Sources C and D are different because Source C tells me the Myanmar government was not responsible for the Rohingya Crisis but Source D does not tell me that.</i> <i>or</i></p>	2

	e.g. Source C and D are different because both sources tell me there are terrorist attacks taking place against Rohingya Muslims in Rakhine state.	
L3	<p>Difference or Similarity: Content</p> <p>Award 3m for similar/difference: content, unsupported Award 4m for similar/difference: content, supported</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are similar in showing how the violence in Rakhine state led to the Rohingyas escaping from Rakhine to settle elsewhere as refugees. This is evident in Source C, "At the time of outbreak of the terrorist attacks, government security forces helped local residents evacuate to safer places" which means that the Myanmar government helped the Rohingya to flee from the violence and move elsewhere. Similarly, this is evident in Source D, "Thousands of Rohingya are still fleeing to escape from endless inhumane persecution" which means the Rohingyas were forced out of fear of persecution to leave their homes.</p> <p>Other accepted similarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources C and D are similar in showing how Rohingya Muslims are suffering / experiencing destruction in Rakhine state, Myanmar. <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are different in showing the role of the Myanmar military forces during the outbreak of violence in Rakhine state in 2017. Source C tells me that the Myanmar military forces played a caring / altruistic/ helpful role but Source D tells me that the Myanmar military forces played a destructive / aggressive role in the violence in Rakhine state in 2017. Source C tells me the Myanmar military forces played a kind role for all the people involved in the violence which is evident in, "government security forces helped local residents evacuate to safer places, regardless of their race and religion. And those displaced people were supported with provisions and given medical treatments by mobile health teams". This means the Myanmar military discharged their duty with fairness and compassion in an attempt to restore order and stability. But Source D tells me the Myanmar military forces played an aggressive role that caused the crisis in Rakhine which is evident in "the Myanmar terrorist government and Buddhist terrorist army have never stopped committing acts of attacking Rohingya villages, raping women, looting their lands and domestic animals". This means the Myanmar military acted inhumanely against Rohingya Muslims because of their biased religious prejudices.</p> <p>Other accepted difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources C and D are different in showing what caused the violence in Rakhine state in 2017. Source C tells me that Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA)'s violent anti-government actions was to be blamed for triggering the violence but Source D tells me it was the Myanmar military forces' brutality that was responsible for the eruption and escalation of the conflict. 	3-4
L4	<p>Difference and Similarity: Content</p> <p>Award 5m for similar and difference: content, unsupported Award 6m for similar and difference: content, supported</p>	5-6
L5	Difference: Tone	6

	<p>e.g. Sources C and D are different in tone towards the Myanmar military forces' role in the Rohingya Crisis. Source C has a supportive tone towards the Myanmar military forces' role but Source D instead has a critical tone towards the Myanmar military forces' role during the violence in Rakhine state in 2017. Source C is supportive of the Myanmar military forces' kind and altruistic care demonstrated for all the people involved in the violence which is evident in, "government security forces helped local residents evacuate to safer places, regardless of their race and religion. And those displaced people were supported with provisions and given medical treatments by mobile health teams" which meant the Myanmar military discharged their duty with fairness and compassion to restore order and stability. But Source D is critical towards the Myanmar military forces for being unnecessarily aggressive and so, guilty for causing the crisis in Rakhine. This is illustrated through the author's admonishment of the Myanmar government with emotionally charged, loaded language when it pejoratively labeled Aung San Suu Kyi as a "liar" and demonized Myanmar's security forces as "Myanmar terrorist government and Buddhist terrorist army".</p>	
L6	<p>Difference: Purpose</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are different in purpose. In Source C, the Myanmar government released the statement because it wanted to convince the international community that ARSA's initial anti-government actions had provoked the start of the crisis. The Myanmar ministry hopes that the United Nations and international community reduce its criticism on the Myanmar government and instead collaborate with the Myanmar government to eradicate terrorism and restore order in Rakhine state by supplying the Myanmar government with finance, resources and training.</p> <p>But in Source D, ARSA tweeted the press statement because it wanted to persuade the international community that it was the Myanmar military force who were aggressive and so, guilty for the crisis in Rakhine. ARSA hoped the international community would feel outraged at the Myanmar government for defying the United Nations' humanitarian efforts and so, punish guilty Myanmar officials in the UN's International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity / hopes the international community put pressure on Myanmar's government to stop the ethnic cleansing of Rohingya Muslims in Rakhine state / hopes the international community feel more sympathetic towards ARSA whose terrorist actions were actually defensive, necessary counter-measures.</p>	7

d)	<p>Study Sources E and F.</p> <p>Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer.</p>	7
L1	<p>Based on source content; without addressing element of surprise</p> <p>e.g. Sources E and F are different on showing me who was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state. Source E tells me it was Bangladesh government who was responsible but Source F tells me it was the Myanmar government who was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees. Source E tells me it was the Bangladeshi government's inaction/indecision/administrative issues that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine as evident in, "Bangladesh has not honored the agreement and is not cooperating with Myanmar's efforts to repatriate or provide residence cards to Rohingya refugees" which means it was Bangladeshi unwillingness to enforce the terms of the 2017 agreement that delayed the Rohingyas' repatriation. But Source F tells me that it was Myanmar government's</p>	1

	<p><i>unwillingness to accept Rohingya as citizens that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state as evident in, "This alteration, though seemingly minor, indicates Myanmar does not intend to recognize the Rohingyas as citizens nor does it intend on granting them citizenship rights" which means that Myanmar government's reluctance at Rohingya returning as Myanmar citizens that prevented the return of the Rohingya to their homelands.</i></p> <p>Or</p> <p>Not surprised based on provenance, unexplained</p> <p><i>e.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F. This is because Source E was written by Kyaw Tint Swe, a senior Myanmar Minister, who is naturally biased towards Myanmar's government in the Rohingya crisis as he is the minister of Myanmar. But Source F as written by a Bangladeshi university lecturer, who is understandably biased towards Bangladesh in the Rohingya crisis as it is his own country.</i></p>	
L2	<p>Not surprised based only from one source</p> <p><i>e.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F on who prevented the return of Rohingya refugees. Source F tells me that it was Myanmar government's deception that prevented the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state; and this is supported by Source D which is evident in, "the Myanmar terrorist government is bit interested at all in Rohingya repatriation but just playing dirty politics with the international community, including Bangladesh" which means the Myanmar government was merely playing tricks with the international community without intending for genuine repatriation. Since Source D supports Source F in telling me the Myanmar government's deception that prevented the return of Rohingya refugees, I am not surprised by Source F.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>e.g. Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F on who prevented the return of Rohingya refugees. Source F tells me that it was Myanmar government's deception that prevented the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state; but this was contradicted by Source B which instead tells me that Aung San Suu Kyi and the Myanmar government was genuine in taking active measures and seeking international co-operation to overcome challenges that had prevented the return of Rohingya refugees. This is evident in "Potential resettlement sites have been mapped out and Myanmar was ready to receive Rohingya returnees since 23 Jan 2017. Similarly, we hope to work with Bangladesh to effect the voluntary, safe and dignified return of displaced persons from northern Rakhine" which means Myanmar was preparing suitable conditions and spaces in Rakhine state to inspire confidence for Rohingya refugees to return. Since Source B source B contradicts Source F, I am surprised by Source F after reading Source E.</i></p> <p>Selection of x-referencing sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source A not accepted (because source does not explicitly discuss the return of refugees from Bangladesh back to Rakhine state) • Source B accepted (because source tells us Myanmar government was genuine / willing in solving the Rohingya crisis by planning for future return of Rohingya refugees) 	2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source C not accepted (because source does not explicitly discuss the return of refugees from Bangladesh back to Rakhine state) • Source D accepted (because source tells us Myanmar government was not genuine/not willing in solving the Rohingya crisis by sabotaging international efforts at repatriation) 	
L3	<p>Surprised based on content difference</p> <p>Award higher marks for answers with supporting evidence</p> <p><i>E.g. Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F because they are different in telling me who was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state. Source E tells me it was Bangladesh government who was responsible but Source F tells me it was the Myanmar government who was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees. Source E tells me it was the Bangladeshi government's inaction/indecision/administrative issues that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine as evident in, "Bangladesh has not honored the agreement and is not cooperating with Myanmar's efforts to repatriate or provide residence cards to Rohingya refugees" which means it was Bangladeshi unwillingness to enforce the terms of the 2017 agreement that delayed the Rohingyas' repatriation. But Source F tells me that it was actually Myanmar government's unwillingness to accept Rohingya as citizens that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state as evident in, "This alteration, though seemingly minor, indicates Myanmar does not intend to recognize the Rohingyas as citizens nor does it intend on granting them citizenship rights" which means that Myanmar government's reluctance at Rohingya returning as Myanmar citizens that prevented the return of the Rohingya to their homelands. Hence, after reading Source E, I am surprised by Source F because they are different on who was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees to Rakhine state.</i></p> <p>Other accepted comparison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F on because they are different in telling me whether Myanmar government was sincere in trying to overcome challenges preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state. Source E tells me the Myanmar government was sincere in helping Rohingya refugees overcome their challenges but Source F tells me the Myanmar government was not sincere in helping Rohingya refugees overcome the challenges in returning.</i> • <i>Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F because they are different in telling me whether the Myanmar government was genuine in trying to solve the Rohingya crisis. Source E tells me the Myanmar government was genuine in trying to solve the Rohingya crisis but Source F tells me the Myanmar government was not genuine in trying to solve the Rohingya crisis.</i> • <i>Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F because they are different in whether the Myanmar government was sincere in giving Rohingyas Myanmar citizenship status. Source E tells me Myanmar government was sincere in giving Rohingyas citizenship status but Source F tells me Myanmar government was insincere in giving Rohingyas citizenship status.</i> • <i>Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F because they are similar in telling me the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh are finding it difficult to return to their Rohingya homeland.</i> • <i>Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F because they are similar in telling me how Myanmar and Bangladesh are quarrelling over how to repatriate the Rohingya refugees back to their homeland.</i> 	3-4

	<p>Unaccepted comparison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F because they are different in telling me who caused/started/triggered the problems in the Rohingya crisis.</i> 	
L4	<p>Not surprised based on provenance explained</p> <p><u>Expected difference based on provenance</u></p> <p><i>E.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F because both authors come from different organisations and so, their perspectives are guided by their respective organisational aims, beliefs and practices. Hence, it is not surprising that Sources E and F have different views on who to blame for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees to Rakhine state. Source E is from Kyaw Tint Swe, a senior Myanmar Minister who being part of Myanmar's government, was likely to shield his country from accusations of being an obstacle to the Rohingya refugees' return home. This was evident in Source E, "Bangladesh has not honored the agreement and is not cooperating with Myanmar's efforts to repatriate or provide residence cards to Rohingya refugees" which means Bangladeshi unwillingness to enforce the terms of the 2017 agreement delayed the Rohingyas' repatriation. Hence, due to his provenance as chief apologist for Myanmar's government, I am not surprised, deflected blame by conveniently faulting Bangladeshi inaction as an obstacle preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, Source F is from a Bangladeshi university lecturer contributing to a current affairs magazine. As an academic expert on current affairs as well as a being Bangladeshi national, it is expected that he maintain his country-Bangladesh's international reputation from being tainted by misleading claims. So, the Bangladeshi lecturer carefully analyzed the gap between Myanmar government's rhetorical public statements vis-à-vis the reality of its actual policies on the ground that fell short. This was evident in Source F, "At the behest of Myanmar, Bangladesh has agreed to change the terminology used to describe Rohingya refugees on the identity cards they are issued from "Myanmar nationals" to "displaced persons from Rakhine State." This alteration, though seemingly minor, indicates Myanmar does not intend to recognize the Rohingyas as citizens nor does it intend on granting them citizenship rights" which means that Myanmar government was actually not keen at the prospects of Rohingya returning and gaining Myanmar citizenship, despite publicly pretending to be keen on helping Rohingyas. Hence, due to his natural loyalty to Bangladeshi homeland, I am not surprised he published an exposé of the Myanmar government's deception that prevented the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine.</i></p>	5
L5	<p>Not surprised based on purpose / L3 + critical analysis of both sources</p> <p>Award higher marks for more developed answers.</p> <p><u>Expected difference based on purpose</u></p>	6-7

e.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F on challenges preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state. This is because the purposes of Sources E and F are expected to be different based on the speakers whose roots are from different national backgrounds and different organisations.

In Source E, it is expected of Kyaw Tint Swe, as a senior Myanmar minister who personally shaped the country's foreign policies and thus directly accountable to criticism from the regional community, to be apologetically defensive towards accusations directed towards the Myanmar government in order to restore Myanmar's international credibility. On deeper critical analysis, the purpose of Source E was indeed because Kyaw Tint Swe wanted to persuade Asian foreign ministers that it was the Bangladeshi government's inaction/indecision/administrative issues that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine. Kyaw hoped the Asian foreign ministers redirect their hostility towards the Bangladeshi government for its ineffective implementation of the repatriation process and instead feel reassured/more confident of the Myanmar government's commitment towards facilitating the repatriation of Rohingya refugees. The context was because the frustrated regional community was still awaiting an explanation as to why the Rohingya refugees were still not repatriated back to their Rakhine homelands despite diplomatic agreements affirming all relevant countries' commitment towards the cause.

In Source F, it is expected of the Bangladeshi university lecturer, as an academic expert on current affairs as well as a being Bangladeshi national, to preserve his country-Bangladesh's international reputation- from being tainted by misleading claims of his country's guilt in the failed Rohingya refugee repatriation process. On deeper critical analysis, the purpose of Source F was indeed because the Bangladeshi university lecturer wanted to convince the international community that it was actually the Myanmar government's unwillingness to accept Rohingya as citizens that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state. The lecturer hopes the international community do not get hoodwinked by the Myanmar government's deceptive claims about Bangladeshi culpability for the failed Rohingya refugee repatriation and instead pressure the Myanmar government to start fulfilling their promises to facilitate the Rohingya repatriation process. The context was because the Myanmar government was merely paying lip service on its commitment to Rohingya refugees and instead deceptively blaming the Bangladeshi government to cover-up their own irresponsibility.

As I expected their purposes to differ based on their provenance, and their purposes did indeed differ in order to shield their own country's international reputation, I am not surprised by Source F, having read Source E.

Or

L3 + based on critical analysis of both sources

e.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F because Source F is supported by Source D. Source F tells me the Myanmar government was unwilling to accept the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine state and this is supported by Source D which also tells me the Rohingya government was unwilling to accept the return of Rohingya refugees. This is evident in Source D," the Myanmar government is not a bit interested in Rohingya repatriation but just playing dirty politics

	<p><i>with the international community including Bangladesh” which means the Myanmar government was putting up a false front to the international community while not caring for the Rohingyas in truth.</i></p> <p><i>Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source E because it is a biased, flawed source. Kyaw Tint Swe delivered the statement to the international ministers to convince them that Bangladeshi government’s inaction that was responsible for preventing the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine. Kyaw hoped the Asian foreign ministers redirect their hostility towards the Bangladeshi government for its ineffective implementation of the repatriation process and instead feel reassured of the Myanmar government’s commitment towards facilitating the repatriation of Rohingya refugees. In turn, this will shore up and benefit Myanmar government’s international reputation who will also gain sympathy from its neighbouring countries. The context was because the frustrated regional community was still awaiting an explanation as to why the Rohingya refugees were still not repatriated back to their Rakhine homelands despite diplomatic agreements affirming all relevant countries’ commitment towards the cause. As Source E has a hidden political agenda, it is a flawed source and so having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F.</i></p>	
--	--	--

e)	‘Myanmar’s government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis.’ Using the sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement?	10								
L1	Writes about statement, no valid source use <i>e.g. The sources show that the Myanmar government was not sincere in their efforts to solve the Rohingya Crisis because their own military took aggressive actions in the Rohingya villages.</i>	1								
L2	Yes/No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 2 marks for use of one source. Award 3-4 marks for use of two sources. Award 4 marks for use of three sources.</i> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Agree</th><th>Disagree</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>B</td><td>A</td></tr><tr><td>C</td><td>D</td></tr><tr><td>E</td><td>F</td></tr></tbody></table> <u>Agree</u> <i>I agree with the statement that Myanmar’s government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis as Source B tells me that the Myanmar government <u>took initiative to seek international assistance and then actively undertook a wide-range of measures</u>. This is evident in “We approached former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for advice on lasting solutions. Myanmar has implemented 82 out of its 88 recommendations”. This means the Myanmar government’s collaboration with United Nations resulted in the government undertaking concrete, effective strategies to restore order and stability in Rakhine state. In turn, this will attract Rohingyas to move back home and live peacefully in the long-run. Hence, the Myanmar government’s dedication and thorough planning for Rakhine state suggests the Myanmar government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis.</i>	Agree	Disagree	B	A	C	D	E	F	2-4
Agree	Disagree									
B	A									
C	D									
E	F									

*I agree with the statement that Myanmar's government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis as **Source C** tells me the Myanmar military played a helpful, neutral role in protecting Rohingyas' lives and property during the violence. This is evident in "At the time of outbreak of the terrorist attacks, government security forces helped local residents evacuate to safer places, regardless of their race and religion. And those displaced people were supported with provisions and they were given medical treatments by mobile health teams." This means the military was genuinely concerned for the plight of Rohingyas during the ordeal. Hence, the Myanmar military's helpful role in rendering immediate first aid and assistance to Rohingyas suggests the Myanmar government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis.*

*I agree with the statement that Myanmar's government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis as **Source E** tells me the Myanmar senior minister was keen to speed up the return of Rohingya refugees back to Rakhine and even promised to legally empower Rohingya with citizenship. This is evident in "The Myanmar government is ready to grant all who come back with a 'certificate of residence' and help those eligible to apply for citizenship" and "We urge Bangladesh to allow, without delay the return of verified persons under voluntary and safe conditions". These diplomatic and legal promises meant that the Rohingyas would feel more assured about the prospects of returning home and enjoying all the rights as a citizen of Myanmar. Hence, the Myanmar government's preparations for setting a conducive environment for the Rohingyas suggests the Myanmar government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis.*

Disagree

*I disagree with the statement that Myanmar's government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis as **Source A** tells me Aung San Suu Kyi was unwilling/ ignoring/irresponsible/disinterested in helping the Rohingya despite being an international symbol of human rights and democracy. This is evident in the cartoon which depicts Aung San Suu Kyi facing away from the troubled hotspot of burning Rohingya Muslim minority villages in the background. Also, she has not yet lit the structure that represents 'democracy, freedom and human rights in Myanmar. This means Aung San Suu Kyi blatantly abandoned her duty as a national political leader to be inclusive and protect vulnerable minority groups like the Rohingyas. In fact, the cartoonist hinted at Aung San Suu Kyi's guilt at exacerbating the Rohingya Crisis by using her torch to burn down Rohingya villages; revealing her insincerity for solving the Rohingya Crisis.*

*I disagree with the statement that Myanmar's government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis as **Source D** tells me the Myanmar government only pretended to end the violence in Rakhine through public statements but in reality, the Myanmar government was obstructing international humanitarian efforts in Rakhine state. This is evident in, "Aung San Suu Kyi blatantly lied to the international community that 'clearance' operations against Rohingya has stopped since 2017" and "The Myanmar government is further blocking and delaying international organisations including NGO, foreign media and UN from entering Rakhine state with the ill-intention not to witness the actual situation on the ground". This meant that the Myanmar government frustrated and denied international organisations accessing and helping the Rohingya, which only prolonged the Rohingyas misery in Rakhine at the hands of the Myanmar government. Since the Myanmar government's actions contradicted their own aims, they were insincere about solving the Rohingya Crisis.*

	<p><i>I disagree with the statement that Myanmar's government was sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis as Source F tells me the <u>Myanmar government was only faking goodwill in encouraging Rohingya refugees to return to Rakhine where they will be conferred full citizenship status and rights</u>. This is evident in, "Myanmar's statements regarding the repatriation of Rohingya refugees indicate, albeit misleadingly, that Myanmar has always been ready to welcome back the Rohingyas from Bangladesh" and "This alteration, though seemingly minor, indicates Myanmar does not intend to recognize the Rohingyas as citizens nor does it intend on granting them citizenship rights". This means Myanmar government's administrative changes was cunningly designed to disqualify all Rohingya refugees from getting full-citizenship rights. Hence, such administrative tricks would disincentive them from returning; revealing Myanmar government's insincerity in solving the refugee crisis.</i></p>	
L3	<p>Yes + No, supported by valid source use i.e. Both elements of L2</p> <p><i>Award 5 marks for use of 2 sources. Award 6 marks for use of 3 sources. Award 7-8 marks for use of 4 sources. Award 8 marks for use of 5 sources.</i></p>	5-8
	<p>Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency</p> <p>By reliability</p> <p><i>E.g. Source C is not reliable in telling me that Myanmar's government is sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis. The Myanmar government published the press statement because it wanted to persuade the international community that the <u>Myanmar military played a helpful, neutral role in protecting Rohingyas' lives and property during the violence</u>. It hoped the international community reduce its criticism on the Myanmar government. Since the Myanmar government has a hidden agenda of restoring its international credibility and possibly benefit from UN financial, material assistance to restore order in Rakhine. This was because the UN was accusing Aung San Suu Kyi's government for ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The government's biased agenda diminishes Source C's reliability in telling me the Myanmar government was sincere in solving the crisis.</i></p> <p>By sufficiency</p> <p><i>E.g. Although Source E tells me the Myanmar government is sincere in solving the Rohingya Crisis, it is not sufficient as evidence to do so. It is insufficient as evidence as it is glaringly silent on information on Myanmar government's own actions and steps to prepare for the return of the Rohingya refugees from Bangladesh. While Source E exaggeratingly blaming Bangladesh, it has conveniently omitted vital details such as whether the Myanmar government has reconstructed the Rohingya Muslims' villages and restored stability in Rakhine state in order to restore confidence and willingness of Rohingyas to return. Hence, Source E cannot be fully used as evidence to support the statement.</i></p>	+2

Dunman Secondary School
4E5NA Social Studies Preliminary Examinations 2019
Section B Structured Response Question
Suggested Answer Scheme

(a)	<p>Extract 1 highlights the rise of self-radicalised individuals in Singapore.</p> <p>In your opinion, what can Singapore do to reduce the growing trend of self-radicalisation among Singaporeans? Explain your answer using two ways.</p>	[7]
L1	<p>Describes the topic i.e. self-radicalisation / terrorism in Singapore</p> <p><i>E.g. Despite Singapore's high security and low crime rates due to our harsh and strict laws, terrorism remains a huge concern as we see an increase in homegrown self-radicalised individuals.</i></p>	1
L2	<p>Identify/Describe ways</p> <p>Award 2 marks for identifying one way and 3 marks for identifying two ways. Award 3 marks for describing one way and 4 marks for describing two ways.</p> <p><i>E.g. One way to reduce the growing trend of self-radicalisation among Singaporeans is to <u>introduce / impose stricter censorship on social media platforms and the Internet</u>. This can counter the self-radicalised lone wolf threat. There is a significant concern posed by lone wolves who are radicalised by what they see and read on the Internet in the privacy of their homes or through their smartphones.</i></p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p><i>E.g. One way to reduce the growing trend of self-radicalisation among Singaporeans is to <u>place greater emphasis on national education about the dangers of extremism</u>. The authorities need to undertake out-reach programmes in order to educate and inform the society of what is right and wrong, and more importantly, of the dangers that lurk in cyberspace and misinterpreted religions.</i></p> <p><i>Other accepted way(s):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Singapore government to work more closely with religious leaders/groups to denounce radicalisation and extremism more resolutely. 	2 – 4
L3	<p>L2 + Explains ways</p> <p>Award 5 – 6 marks for explaining one way Award 6 – 7 marks for explaining two ways</p> <p><i>E.g. One way to reduce the growing trend of self-radicalisation among Singaporeans is to <u>introduce / impose stricter censorship on social media platforms and the Internet</u>. This can counter the self-radicalised lone wolf threat. There is a significant concern posed by lone wolves who are radicalised by what they see and read on the Internet in the privacy of their homes or through their smartphones . As a result, Singapore created Singapore Infocomm Technology Security Authority (SITSA), an agency in the Ministry of Home Affairs under the Internal Security Department to monitor radical websites, and if necessary, to take action against them. Therefore, this helps prevent self-radicalisation among Singaporeans because it reduces the chances of individuals being exposed</i></p>	5 – 7

to extremist propaganda and the decreases the possibility of negative influences to be spread and networks to be created. In the long run, less people are likely to be self-radicalised.

OR/AND

E.g. One way to reduce the growing trend of self-radicalisation among Singaporeans is to place greater emphasis on national education about the dangers of extremism. The authorities need to undertake out-reach programmes in order to educate and inform the society of what is right and wrong, and more importantly, of the dangers that lurk in cyberspace and misinterpreted religions. Various avenues and forums such as the Inter-Religious Confidence Circles (IRCC) and Presidential Council of Religious Harmony (PCRH) are utilised to sensitise people to the dangers of radicalism, including self-radicalisation. Therefore, this prevents self-radicalisation as education will continue to play a critical role in ensuring that self-radicalisation does not succeed as more people will be more aware of the crimes that radicalised individuals commit. They will also be able to act as regulators to advise any relatives or friends who are suspected or have an inclination to extremist ideas to reconsider their actions. In the long run, it will be less likely for people to accept and be influenced by extremist views, and will not become self-radicalised.

2(b)	<p>Extract 2 and Extract 3 reflect the roles of governments and individuals in managing cybersecurity challenges.</p> <p>Do you think the government has a more important role in managing cyber security challenges than individuals? Explain your answer.</p>	[8]
L1	<p>Writes about the topic (managing cyber security challenges) but without addressing the question</p> <p><i>e.g. To ensure cyber security, everyone must do their part so that cybercriminals / no one will be able to steal any sensitive data.</i></p>	1 – 2
L2	<p>Describes the government and individuals roles in managing cyber security challenges</p> <p>Award 3m for describing the role of the government OR individuals. Award 4m for describing the role of the government AND individuals.</p> <p><i>The government plays an important role in managing cyber security challenges. Many governments are placing the emphasis on strengthening cyber security defences as one of their key defence strategies to manage cyber security challenges. Singapore's government adopts a strong stance against cybercrimes and cybercriminals are severely dealt with by the law. For example, in 2013, a spate of cyber-attacks occurred which included the hacking of government websites such as the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and the Istana's. Individuals behind these attacks were arrested and charged.</i></p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p><i>Individuals play an important role in managing cyber security challenges. Although there are efforts by the government and companies to deal with cyber security challenges, individual users must also continue to remain vigilant in ensuring their own cyber security. For example, they are able to do so through the following measures: by ensuring that their computers and devices are defended against technological threats, by creating strong passwords that are changed regularly to not be complacent about maintaining online privacy.</i></p>	3 – 4

L3	<p>Explain the government and individuals roles in managing cyber security challenges Award 5-6m for explaining the role of the government OR individuals. Award 6-7m for explaining the role of the government AND individuals.</p> <p><i>The government plays an important role in managing cyber security challenges. Many governments are placing the emphasis on strengthening cyber security defences as one of their key defence strategies to manage cyber security challenges. Singapore's government adopts a strong stance against cybercrimes and cybercriminals are severely dealt with by the law. For example, in 2013, a spate of cyber-attacks occurred which included the hacking of government websites such as the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and the Istana's. Individuals behind these attacks were arrested and charged. Another example is the upgrading of the Cyber Watch Centre, which allows the tracking of malicious activities so as to allow for swift response to security threats. These measures are part of Singapore's 5 year National Cyber Security Masterplan 2018. This helps to manage cyber security challenges because by strengthening cyber security practices and creating agencies to safeguard security in Singapore, the possibility and ability of cybercriminals carrying out malicious activity is significantly reduced. This is because cybercriminals are aware of the severe consequences they might face if they are caught, and thus this might deter them from doing so. With the management of cyber security challenges, Singapore's critical infrastructure is protected, and the country will be able to function more effectively. Therefore, this helps to manage cyber security challenges because it enables the country to continue functioning normally by deterring the attacks of cybercriminals.</i></p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p><i>Individuals play an important role in managing cyber security challenges. Although there are efforts by the government and companies to deal with cyber security challenges, individual users must also continue to remain vigilant in ensuring their own cyber security. For example, they are able to do so through the following measures: by ensuring that their computers and devices are defended against technological threats, by creating strong passwords that are changed regularly to not be complacent about maintaining online privacy. This helps to manage cyber security challenges because when individuals are more vigilant and alert, they are more likely to take measures to safeguard themselves against potential cyber security threats. This will lead to a reduction in probability of being a victim of threats and suffering unnecessarily consequences. Therefore, this helps to manage cyber security challenges because by being constantly vigilant, individuals are preventing cyber security attacks from happening in the first place.</i></p>	5 – 7
L4	<p>Both aspects in L3 plus explains the relative importance of government and individual roles in managing cyber security challenges</p> <p>Greater Impact (because of more resources available) <i>E.g. While both roles are important in managing cyber security challenges, I believe that the government plays the more important role. This is because there are limits to what individuals can achieve. For instance, if there are highly sophisticated cyber criminals, individuals may not have the resources to deal with these cyber criminals. Having more resources at their disposal and being able to engage the use of certain infrastructure and access to appropriate equipment and required manpower will allow the government to be in a better position to deal with these sophisticated cyber security challenges.</i></p>	8

OR

Long-term Impact

E.g. While both are important in managing cyber security challenges, I believe that individuals play the more important role. This is because the government can only act from a centralised location, while most cyberattacks are decentralised and often sporadic. As a result, it is important for individuals to personally be responsible for their own cyber security, since in the long-run, cyberattacks may eventually bypass detection from large, centralised organisations like the government completely. It is more efficient and sustainable if individual users can be vigilant and but the first cut to prevent themselves from being victims of cyberattacks in the first place.