

<b>Name:</b>		<b>Index Number:</b>		<b>Class:</b>	
--------------	--	----------------------	--	---------------	--



# CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

## Preliminary Examination

### Secondary 4 (O-Level Programme)

## HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1: Extension of European control in Southeast Asia and challenges to European dominance, 1870s-1942

27 August 2025

1 hr 50 mins

Additional Materials: Answer Booklets

### READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black pen.

You may use a soft pencil for any rough working.

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

DO **NOT** WRITE ON THE MARGINS.

### Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

### Section B

Answer **two** questions.

Write all answers on the Answer Booklets provided.

For examiner's use only:

Section A	/ 30 m
Section B	/ 20 m
<b>Total</b>	<b>/ 50 marks</b>

At the end of the examination, submit Section A and B separately.

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

**Section A: Source-Based Case Study**

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

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you to 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 Source A.

Are you surprised by what Gladstone says? Explain your answer. [5]

**(b)** Study Sources B and C.

How similar are the sources? Explain your answer. [6]

**(c)** Study Source D.

What can you learn from this source about British intervention in the Malay States? Explain your answer. [5]

**(d)** Study Sources E and F.

How far does what Carnarvon say in Source F prove what Jervois says in Source E wrong? Explain your answer. [6]

**(e)** Study all sources.

'The British intervened in the Malay States for self-interest'. How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

## Did the British intervene in the Malay States for self-interest?

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

Prior to 1874 the British followed their policy of non-intervention in the Malay States as their interests in these states were commercial and not political. However, by the early 1870s, the political climate was changing in Britain and Europe, where the British saw other European powers seeking foreign colonies especially in Southeast Asia not only for economic but also political objectives. In Malaya, particularly Perak, there was civil unrest that not only made her vulnerable to foreign intervention but also disrupted the very lucrative tin trade and investments there. In the meantime, Sultan Abdullah of Perak appealed to the British for help.

Was British intervention in the Malay States for self-interest or based on the interest of the locals?

**Source A:** *From a speech by the British Prime Minister, Gladstone, to party members on his government policy with the Malay States, 1872.*

In the early 1870s, the accelerated pace of industrial development in Britain and Europe increased the competition for foreign markets and raw materials. British business in Southeast Asia flourished in the trade boom which followed the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. This is regardless of the possible checks and trade barriers which might result from the expansion of interests from other foreign powers in Southeast Asia, especially the Malay Peninsula. The British government is not alarmed by this, and we are still not in favour of annexation of territory or the imposition of direct rule because we believe more in free trade and economic benefits which is more profitable as compared to acquiring territories and colonies as they would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy.

**Source B:** *Comments made by Lord Kimberley, British Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the members of British Parliament, 1873.*

It is the duty forced upon the British, as the dominant power, to interfere in the Malay States and put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs. The present state of affairs in the Malay Peninsula is that the richest part of it is in the hands of lawlessness and the turbulent. It is for humanitarian reasons alone that we have to intervene; and though it would be highly beneficial to British interest and British trade, this cannot be the primary reason. It is therefore our hope to save the Malays from themselves and give them the blessings of peace and justice.

**Source C:** *A Malay historian, writing in 1982 about British action in Perak.*

In the official version of the story, the British heroically intervened in the Chinese dispute at the request of Sultan Abdullah. The rich tin mines of the district of Larut had attracted large numbers of Chinese, whose rival factions were fighting with one another, creating much chaos. Hence, according to the British, the purpose of expansion was to protect and advance the sovereign Malay rulers and their people. This then was the official myth which was to legitimize British interest, expansion and rule right up until \*Merdeka in 1957. The truth of the matter was that the British began to follow a policy of Imperialism from 1873 onwards. Thus, the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays. Consequently, this led to the establishment of the Residential system, which was meant to be indirect rule, but in practice, became direct rule in order for the British to fulfil its primary goals.

\*Merdeka- independence

**[Turn over**

**Source D:** *A description of how the situation in Larut, Perak, led to a petition from the Chinese merchants in Singapore to London in March 1873.*

In the autumn of 1872, the Ghee Hins who had been expelled, and had spent their time in warlike preparations against the Hai Sans, made an effort to regain their position. Arms and ammunition were sent up the Larut River, and at last a desperate attack was made upon the Hai San's for the possession of the mines. Soon, some of the Malay chiefs became involved in this dispute. Moreover, many a times, robbery, murder or any other crimes committed in these places were not investigated and the offenders in most cases escaped punishment. Subsequently, the Straits merchants and the British traders had asked the British to intervene on their behalf.

**Source E:** *From a report by Sir William Jervois, Governor of the Straits Settlements, to the Earl of Carnarvon, British Colonial Secretary, 10 Feb 1876.*

Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request, it has been found from the very start that such a course has been impossible. There has been no ruler, neither in Perak, Selangor or Sungei Ujong, in each of which states we have had Residents, who has had the power to carry out the advice of the Resident. Under these circumstances the Resident has not only had to give advice but also to render active assistance and take the control of public affairs. When I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned, and I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here.

**Source F:** *Carnarvon's reply to Jervois' report, 20 May 1876.*

The essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers who would advise and assist them in the governance of the country. It was no doubt expected that such an officer would exercise a very great influence in the country, but the position a Resident was to occupy would be very different from that of a Controller. I am by no means prepared to admit the correctness of your statement that the Pangkor Engagement virtually threw the government of the country into the hands of the Resident. You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of the advice, was really one of direct or actual government.

## Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2** 'The main reason why the Vietnamese were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was due to the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers.' How far do you agree with this statement. Explain your answer. [10]
- 3** 'The greatest injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 4** 'Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

**-- End of Paper --**

---

### Copyright Acknowledgments

Source A	© Lennox A Mills; <i>Malaya: A Political and Economic Appraisal</i> ; University of Minnesota Press; 1907.
Source B	© Source B: McIntyre W.D. (1967) Intervention in the Malay States, 1871–3. In: <i>The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics, 1865–75</i> . Palgrave Macmillan, London
Source C	© <a href="http://asokan63.blogspot.sg/2010/09/hartal-untold-merdeka-story-hartal.html">http://asokan63.blogspot.sg/2010/09/hartal-untold-merdeka-story-hartal.html</a> .
Source D	© Donna J Amoroso: <i>Traditionalism and the Ascendancy of the Malay Ruling Class in Malaya</i> ; NUS Press; 2014.
Source E	© Internet Archive <a href="https://archive.org/download/britishmalayaac00swet">https://archive.org/download/britishmalayaac00swet</a>
Source F	© Internet Archive <a href="https://archive.org/download/britishmalayaac00swet">https://archive.org/download/britishmalayaac00swet</a>

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (CHS) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

**Prelim History Core Paper 1, 2025**  
**Section A (SBQ): Suggested Answer Scheme**

1 (a) Study Source A.

Are you surprised by what Gladstone says?

[5]

L1	Identifies content which is/is not surprising but no reason given.	1m
L2	Provenance: Not surprised because he is the British Liberal Party leader and therefore dare to speak his mind.	2m
L3	<p><b>*Surprised OR Not surprised, explained based on facts or differences/contradiction then verify by cross-referencing to contextual knowledge/other sources e.g.</b></p> <p>Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answer using contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>I am surprised that in Source A, Gladstone is telling the members of British parliament that they <u>should continue with a policy of non-intervention</u> despite new economic developments which would actually entail them to seek new resources and territory because of foreign competition as he clearly states that, "In the early 1870s, the accelerated pace of Industrial development in Britain and Europe increased the competition for foreign markets and raw materials. British business in Southeast Asia flourished in the trade boom which followed the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 regardless of the possible checks and trade barriers which might result from the expansion of interests from other foreign powers in Southeast Asia, especially the Malay Peninsula." <u>3m</u></i></p> <p><b><u>Cross-reference/Elaborate using CK</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Essentially, with the Industrial Revolution, and the Opening of the Suez Canal</u></b> Britain would thus face competition from European powers, like Germany seeking foreign colonies not only for economic but also political objectives especially in Southeast Asia. As such <b><u>one would expect</u></b> Britain to embark on territorial expansion to obtain raw materials for their industrial programme before other European powers <b><u>could do so as well as to find new markets to sell their manufactured goods.</u></b> Moreover, In Malaya there was civil unrest <b><u>and thus it did not only make Malaya vulnerable to foreign intervention but also disrupted the very lucrative tin trade and investments there.</u></b> Thus, it is surprising that Gladstone goes on to state that, "The British government are not alarmed by this, and we are still not in favour of annexation of territory or the imposition of direct rule because we believed more in free trade and economic benefits which is more profitable <b><u>as compared to acquiring territories and colonies as they would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy.</u></b>" <u>4m</u></p>	3-4m
L4	<p><b>Surprised/Not Surprised based on Historical Context+ Intention +evidence+ target audience intended outcome, explained.</b></p> <p><b><u>I am not surprise by what Gladstone said in Source A based on historical context. Fundamental,</u></b> this speech was made by Liberal Party leader Gladstone in the <b><u>year 1872.</u></b> By the early 1870s, with the "opening of the Sues Canal", the political climate was changing in Britain and Europe, where the British saw other European powers, like Germany seeking foreign colonies not only for economic but also political objectives especially in Southeast Asia. Moreover, In Malaya there was civil unrest and thus it did not only make Malaya vulnerable to foreign intervention but also disrupted the very lucrative tin trade and investments there. However, <b><u>Prior to 1874 the</u></b></p>	4-5m

	<p>British followed their policy of non-intervention in Malay States as their interests in these states were basically commercial and not political. <b><u>Thus despite the above developments in terms of intense rivalry for territory to seek resources/power/prestige, I am not surprised by the Liberal Party leader Gladstone's speech to his party members as he wanted to justify and defend British government policy of non-intervention in the Malay States in order to primarily focus on profitable trade with them.</u></b></p> <p>Essentially, his argument is that they should continue with a policy of non-intervention because <b><u>Interference in local politics and civil wars would mean, "...they would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy". As such I am not surprised</u></b> that Gladstone wanted to convince his party members <b><u>to continue to support</u></b> the government's direction of placing greater emphasis on trade rather than intervention into the Malay States in acquiring more territories.</p>	
--	---	--

1(b) Study Sources B and C.

How similar are the sources? Explain your answer.

[6]

L1	<b>Similar/different in Topic/provenance/ Describes/Lift Source Content</b>	<b>1m</b>
L2	<b>Similar Or Different in content, unsupported</b> <i>Award 2 marks for similar <u>Or</u> different in source content, unsupported.</i> <i>Award 3 marks for agree <u>And</u> different in source unsupported.</i>	<b>2-3m</b>
L3	<b>Similar and Different, supported</b> <i>Award 4 marks for Similar Or different in content, supported</i> <i>Award 5 marks for Similar And different supported</i>  <u><b>Similarity-</b></u> <i>e.g. <b>Both sources B and C are similar in stating that the British intervened in the Malay States because it was in a state of anarchy</b> implying that the Malay rulers were unable to bring about peace and stability (Malay rule being a problem based on unenlightened leadership). Source C states that, "The present state of affairs in the Malay Peninsula is that the richest part of it is in the hands of the lawlessness and the turbulent." Similarly Source B states that, "The rich tin mines of the district of Larut had attracted large numbers of Chinese, whose rival factions were fighting with one another, creating much chaos."</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>AND</b></p> <u><b>Differences:</b></u> <i>e.g. <b>However, both sources B and C are different with regards to the chief reason for British intervention in the Malay States. The Malay Historian states that the main/reason/root cause for British intervention was to gain resources to gain profits and not for humanitarian reasons as Source C states that, "the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays." On the other hand, Source B tells us that the main reason for British intervention was because they were concern about the welfare of the Malays as opposed to economic reasons as Lord Kimberly stated that, "It is for humanitarian reasons alone that we have to intervene; and though it would be highly beneficial to British interest and British trade, this cannot be the primary reason."</b></i>	<b>4-5m</b>
L4	<b>Purpose - based on motive/purpose</b>  <i>e.g. <b>Both Sources B and C are have different intentions/motives. Source B is written from a <b>British official's point of view, and the purpose of the writer was to criticize the Malay rulers for not being able to solve the disorders in their states in order to justify the need for British intervention and as such glorifies the British as saviours in order to justify the need to intervene in the Malay States</b> not for their own selfish economic interest but solely for "<b>humanitarian reasons alone</b>", as "It is our hope to save the Malays from themselves and give them the blessings of peace and justice." In addition, Lord Kimberly has a <b>condescending attitude</b> towards the Malays and portray the Malays as inferior and unable to take care of themselves; <b>thus, is indirectly mocking and looking down on the Malays, as he states that British intervention was to "put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs". Thus, he wanted to convince the British politicians that British intervention in the Malay States was the right thing to do and thus they should be supportive of it.</b></b></i>  <i><b>On the other hand, in Source C it is more historical in nature/ matter of fact. The Malay historian writing in 1982 would have done research and thus the purpose of source C was to debunk British's claims that, " according to the</b></i>	<b>5-6m</b>



	<p><i>British, the purpose of expansion was to protect and advance the sovereign Malay rulers and their people. This then was the official myth which was to legitimize British interest, expansion and rule right up until Merdeka in 1957.” Basically he wanted to enlighten the reader using historical evidence that the British had used humanitarian reasons as an excuse to intervene in the Malay states for the purpose of Empire building when he states that, “The truth of the matter was that the British began to follow a policy of Imperialism from 1873 onwards. Thus, the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays. Consequently, this led to the establishment of the Residential system, which was meant to be indirect rule, but in practice, became direct rule in order for the British to fulfil its primary goals.”</i></p>	
--	--	--

## 1 C) Study Source D.

What can you learn from this source about British intervention in the Malay States?  
Explain your answer. [5]

<b>L1</b>	<b>Inference, Unsupported</b>	<b>1m</b>
<b>L2</b>	<b>Inference, supported</b> Award the higher mark for fully developed answers i.e. elaborating using contextual knowledge.  <u><b>Inference 1</b></u> <i>I can learn from Source D that the British intervened in the Malay states because there was <b>political anarchy in Perak</b>. This was so based on the <b>rivalry between the Secret Societies</b>/The Secret Societies were fighting over the <b>tin mines in Larut which resulted in violence and chaos in Perak</b> because, “arms and ammunition were sent up the Larut River and at last a desperate attack was made upon the faction...” and this ultimately this led to <b>political instability</b> as “some of Malay chiefs became involved in this disputes” while they themselves were fighting over the succession to the throne. Thus, the British wanted to intervene in the Malay States to establish law and order/for humanitarian reason.</i>	<b>2-3m</b>
<b>L3</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> inference, supported</b> Award 4 marks for 2nd inference, supported. Award the higher mark for fully developed answers i.e. the 5 <sup>th</sup> mark for elaborating using contextual knowledge.  <u><b>Inference 2:</b></u> <i>I can also learn from Source D that the British intervened in the Malay states because <b>of the economic instability brough about by the social unrest in Larut, Perak</b>. This is evident as Source D states that, “many a times, robbery , murder or any other crimes committed in these places are not investigated and offenders are not punished,”. Hence because lawlessness and chaos prevailed in Perak, “Subsequently, the Straits merchants and the British traders had asked the British to intervene on their behalf”, as <b>it disrupted their trading activities because of the succession disputes and Chinese Secret Society quarrels</b>.</i>	<b>4-5m</b>

1(d) Study Sources E and F.

How far does what Carnarvon says in Source F prove what Jervois says in Source E wrong? Explain your answer.

L1	<b>Yes it proves or not it does not but gives no reason Or No basis of comparison</b>	1m
L2	<p><b>Yes or/and No explained, supported by source content ONLY without any cross-referencing</b></p> <p>Award 2 marks for showing it can prove by highlighting reliability of source content i.e. similar facts/truths and comparing it with the other source.</p> <p><i>e.g. Finds evidence in Source E to prove Carnarvon's claims in Source F claims is not wrong but actually correct by pointing <u>out reliability of Source E</u>, i.e. has factual information <b>and that this evidence/facts is similar to Source F</b> i.e. they corroborate</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Award 3 marks for pointing that Source F does prove that F is wrong by highlighting and comparing <b>Source E's factual evidence</b> as opposed to the limitations/ false perceptions in Source F's content i.e. <b>inaccurate facts/assumptions or insufficient information and comparing with the other source.</b></p> <p><i>e.g Finds evidence in Source E which <b>contradict Source F</b> because Source F is based on false perceptions/ inaccurate information whereas Source E provides facts about the same issue</i></p>	2-3m
L3	<p><b>Yes And NO – explained &amp; supported by source content + <u>cross contextual knowledge/other sources</u> i.e. Award the higher mark for more developed answers which proves Source E's claims are correct and F's claims are wrong through cross-referencing to contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>Award 4 marks for showing it can prove by highlighting reliability of source content i.e. similar facts/truths and comparing it with the other source + cross-referencing.</p> <p><i>i.e. Finds evidence in Source E to prove Carnarvon's claims in Source F claims is correct by pointing out reliability of Source E, i.e. has factual information and that this evidence is similar to Source F i.e. they corroborate <b>+ cross-contextual knowledge/other sources to verify and validate both are correct</b></i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>Award 5 marks for finding evidence in Source F which prove <b>Source E was wrong + cross-referencing</b></p> <p><i>i.e. Finds evidence /facts in Source F which <b>contradict Source E</b>, showing Source D has limitations based on source content and inaccurate information based on a false/wrong assumption/perception about the same <b>issue + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge to verify and validate Source C's reliability as opposed to Source E's limitation's or/and false perceptions.</b></i></p>	4-5m

**Source F cannot prove Source E is wrong but can prove it is correct based**

**E.g. What Carnarvon says in Source F does not prove that what Jervois says in Source E is wrong but in fact was correct because they provide similar facts/their content match in terms of both acknowledging the fact that the British government's desire** was to intervene in the Malay States in order to set up a Residential system whereby the Resident was **merely to assists the Sultan by giving advise as to the running of the state thus it was meant to be indirect rule.** In Source F, Carnarvon states that, "The essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers who would advise and assist them in the government of the country." This is similarly implied in Source E when Jervois states that, "Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request ..." From my contextual knowledge, I know that one of the terms of the Pangkor Engagement was for the Sultan to accept a British Resident to who would provide advise on all matters accept Malay Customs and Religion.

### **AND**

**Award 5 marks for** showing does not prove by highlighting **limitations and/or false assumptions** of source E content i.e. **missing background information of why the Residents had become very powerful and/or inaccurate information based on own personal perception & judgment of author and contrasting it with Source F which states accurate information based on official British policy.** Then cross –reference to contextual knowledge to verify Source E is inaccurate and Source F is accurate.

**However Source F can prove Source E is wrong:**

**However, what Carnarvon says in Source F does prove that what Jervois said in Source E is wrong because they contradict each other in terms of whether politically, the British government meant in reality to establish indirect rule as opposed to direct rule/the role of the Resident.** For Jervois he claims that the British official stand right from the beginning was to establish direct rule. This is so as Jervois states in Source F that from his observation after visiting 'Perak , Selangor and Sungei Ujong" that it was obvious that in **reality British intervention was more of direct rule** as, "When I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned" **However, the factual description by Jervois is not useful as evidence to show that British rule in Malaya was actually one of direct rule because it is limited in nature as Jervois does not give background details to explain the circumstances that led to this preexisting situation i.e. of the Residence having more powers than the Sultan/Malay chiefs.** Moreover, the subsequent **claims made by Jervois** that "I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here" **is inaccurate and cannot be taken as the general official consensus by the British government as it Jervois own belief/assumption based on what he himself perceived to be true.** This can be proven by Source F, when Carnarvon replies to Jervois in a letter by clarifying and making it very clear that **British stand on intervention was officially not one of direct rule but indirect rule when he states that, "It was no doubt expected that such an officer would exercise very great influence in the country, but the position a Resident was to occupy would be very**

	<p><b>different from that of a Controller.... You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of the advice, was really one of direct or actual government”.</b></p> <p><b>(CR to contextual knowledge)</b>  <b><u>I know that what Carnarvon states is reliable and factually true and what Jervois said is wrong</u></b> because, British colonial rule in Malaya was in reality meant to be one of indirect rule but in practice/in the process, it unintentionally ended up being direct rule because the British Residents were not given proper instructions and directions by the British Colonial office on how to go about governing the states, thus leading them to unintentionally overstepping their boundary as an adviser to the Sultan/Malay Chiefs. Moreover, the Governor of the Straits Settlements was too far away to check on the powers of the Resident, which ultimately lead the Residents to acquire more powers than the Sultan. All these were not explained by Jervois.  <b>Make the Link</b>→ Thus what Carnarvon says in F does prove what Jervois says in E is wrong because it is inaccurate in his claims regarding British official stand in terms of the role of the British resident/ British policy towards the Malay States.</p>	
L4	<p><b>Purpose, supported</b>  <b>(Note here need to elaborate more on historical context + contextual knowledge when for both sources)</b>          Can use Source F’s purpose to prove whether Source E is wrong by explaining Source F’s purpose is an objective view and therefore can be used to prove Source E was biased by comparing Source E and F’s purpose.</p> <p>Note: In this instance, the emphasis is on historical context, explained.</p> <p><b><u>What Carnarvon says in Source F can prove that Jervois was wrong in Source E about whether the establishment of British rule was meant to be direct or indirect based on the motive/purpose of the authors.</u></b>          Source F is a letter from Carnarvon written on 20<sup>th</sup> May in 1876, in response to Jervois report to him on 10<sup>th</sup> Feb 1876. <b><u>Carnarvon basically writes back to Jervois to clarify/present his disagreement towards Jervois’ stand</u></b> as he states that “You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of advice, was really one of direct or actual government. <b>Carnarvon goes on to clarify the initial intent and objective of implementing the Residential System, and to explain the reason as to why British involvement should be kept to the minimum possible as he states that,</b> “the essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers that would assist them in the government of the country,” and that “would be very different from that of a Controller.” Essentially, Carnarvon wanted to enlighten Jervois that he has been wrong/incorrect in his perceptions/assessment that the British official stand had always been one of direct rule; and thus he should not continue to encourage greater British involvement in the affairs of the Malay states but instead change his direction and come in line with the approved British policy of indirect rule/minimal involvement.</p> <p>However, Source E was a <u>subjective report</u> from Jervois to Carnarvon on 10th Feb 1876, 2 months after the murder of Birch and whom Carnarvon was viewed by many as indirectly responsible. This was because in May 1875, Jervois became the new Governor of the Straits Settlement, he wanted the</p>	6m

<p><i>powers of the Sultan and the chiefs be reduced by giving the Sultan the title of Queen's Commissioners and rule the state in the name of the Sultan. Without approval from the Colonial Office, Jervois asked the Malay chiefs to accept his proposal, but they refused. Jervois threatened to depose Abdullah who then had to sign a letter requesting greater British control over Perak. This was drafted by Birch on 1 Oct 1875, which then antagonized Sultan Abdullah and the Malay Chiefs leading to Birch murder.</i></p> <p><b><i>Thus, Source E is a biased source and therefore unreliable because when Jervois writes to Carnarvon, his main intention was to justify and defend in a subjective way that the Residential System was right from the beginning meant to allow the Resident to have absolute powers over the Malay Chiefs/Sultans, but it was never made clear. This is clear when he states that, "When I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned..." and subsequently he makes a sweeping statement based on an unfounded claim (a claim not backed up with official documents/evidence) that, "I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here". Jervois wanted to convince Carnarvon that he was not to be blamed for antagonizing the Malay chiefs by wanting the Resident to have more powers because, as far as he was concerned, the establishment of British rule in Malaya was always intended to be one of direct rule and that they should continue to pursue such a policy.</i></b></p>
--

e) Use **all** the sources.

'The British intervened in the Malay States for on self-interest.' How far do these sources support this statement? Explain your answer.

[8]

L1	<p><b>Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.</b></p> <p><i>Yes, the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p><i>No, the British intervened in the Malay States for other reasons e.g. For humanitarian reason or the locals invited them/ask them to do so/ or they did not want to intervene at all</i></p>	1m
L2	<p><b>Yes Or No, supported by valid source use i.e.</b></p> <p><i>Yes, the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>OR</u></b></p> <p><i>No, the British intervened in the Malay States based on the interest/needs of the locals or they did not want to intervene at all.</i></p> <p><i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge), and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i></p>	2-4m
L3	<p><b>Both sides of L3</b></p> <p><b>Yes <u>AND</u> No, supported by valid source use i.e.</b></p> <p><i>Yes, the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>AND</u></b></p> <p><i>No, the British intervened in the Malay States based on the interest/needs of the locals or they did not want to intervene at all.</i></p> <p><i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and NO supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge) and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use with explanation up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i></p> <p><b><u>Source A- No</u></b></p> <p><i>Source A does not support the statement that the British intervened in the Malay States for self-interest. In fact, it shows that the British <b><u>did not want to intervene in the Malay states because of their self-interest on not wanting to lose money.</u></b> This is so despite being able to justify the need to intervene because, "Britain and Europe in the 1870s were facing a growth in their economic needs which cause competition among the European powers to meet the demands of their manufacturing sectors", including facing an "accelerated pace of Industrial development". Essentially, Gladstone states that they were, "not alarmed by this", because at this period of time i.e. 1872, the British <b><u>needed to continue with its policy of non-intervention in the Malay States</u></b> because they believed more in free trade and economic benefits which is more profitable" and intervention, "would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy." I know that in 1872, there was an increase rivalry among European powers eyeing for territories in SEA to increase their power and prestige but the British realized that there were quarrels within and among the Malay States so there did not want to get involved as it would mean a drain of their own resources to solve their problems.</i></p>	5-8m

**Source B – No but questions reliability/limitations of source**

**Source B does not support the statement that British to intervened in the Malay states based on self-interest but based on the interest of the locals for humanitarian reasons.** “It is the duty of the British government, as the dominant power, to interfere in the Malay States and put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs. The present state of affairs in the Malay Peninsula is that the richest part of it is in the hands of the lawlessness and the turbulent.” He continued to state that, “It is therefore our hope to save the Malays from themselves and give them the blessings of peace and justice.” **This implied that because of the succession disputes and the Chinese Secret society quarrels leading to civil war, there was chaos in the Malay states; and since the Malay rulers were unenlightened leaders who were unable a to restore law and order in order to bring about stability in Perak, Lord Kimberly was proposing that the British intervene in the Malay states based on humanitarian reasons as the British believed in the “White Man’s burden” whereby it was up to the superior white man to interfere in the affairs of the lowly/inferior Asian people in order to help establish law and order for the sake and welfare of the Malays thus implying they were doing the local Malays a favour/ portraying themselves as saviours by intervening on their own accord.**

**Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source**

However, this source cannot be trusted as this is a one-sided view. Lord Kimberly attempts to justify British intervention in the Malay States primarily based on humanitarian reasons but left out crucial detailed information/downplays/does not highlight or place emphasis on the fact that the British at that period of time was embarking on Empire building and hence had the desire for economic exploitation and to gain political prestige by colonizing Southeast Asian countries. Thus, Lord Kimberly fails to explicitly highlight this point as it was the main/chief reason for British wanting to intervene in the Malay States. This is can be inferred when Lord Kimberly states that , “It is the duty forced upon Britain as the dominant power to interfere in the Malay States” and “that the richest part of it is in the hands of the lawlessness and the turbulent”, thus indirectly indicating that British wanted to intervene in the Malay states on their own accord in order to protect their trading interest and compete with other European powers for power and glory through territorial gains as this was the period of intense rivalry with other European powers and hence chanced on the opportunity to do based on the suffering of the Malays people due to the turmoil in the Malay States.

**Source C- To a certain extent (No and Yes)**

Source C supports the view only to a certain extent that the British intervened in the Malay states based on self-interest. This is so as on the one hand, the Malay Historian in Source C states that “according to the British, the purpose of expansion was to protect and advance the sovereign Malay rulers and their people. This then was the official myth which was to legitimize British interest, expansion and rule right up until Merdeka in 1957. The truth of the matter was that the British began to follow a policy of Imperialism from 1973 onwards. Thus, the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays.” **This clearly shows that the Malay Historian challenges and rebuts Britain’s official historical stand that they intervened in and occupied the Malay states until Malaya independence because of humanitarian reasons as this justification is false as it was in reality more for economic gains like obtaining resources like rubber and tin not only for profits but to gain more political power/advantage because of the rivalry among the European powers for territory at the period of time.**

**On the other hand, Source C does not support the view that the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest but rather based on the interest of the**



**locals as they were asked to do by the ruler of Perak, Sultan Abdullah.** Source A states that, "In the official version of the story, the British heroically intervened in the Chinese dispute at the request of Sultan Abdullah. The rich tin mines of the district of Larut had attracted large numbers of Chinese, whose rival factions were fighting with one another, creating much chaos. **This clearly implied that the Chinese Secret Society quarrels between the Ghee Hin and the Hai Sans had caused lawlessness and economic instability resulting in Sultan Abdullah writing to Sir Andrew Clarke to ask for assistance to help restore law and order because of unenlightened leadership.**

#### **Source D- No**

**Source D does not support the view that the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest but rather based on the interest/ of the Straits Chinese merchants and British traders** as they had **appealed to the British to intervene**. Source D states that, "In the autumn of 1872, the Ghee Hins who had been expelled, and had spent their time in warlike preparations against the Hai Sans, made an effort to regain their position." **This implied that there was rivalry between the Secret Societies/The Secret Societies were fighting over the tin mines in Larut which resulted in violence and anarchy in Perak** because, "arms and ammunition were sent up the Larut River and at last a desperate attack was made upon the faction..." and this ultimately this led to **political instability** as "some of Malay chiefs became involved in this dispute" and as such the Malay rulers were unable to maintain law and order hence disrupting trade.

**OR**

Source D also states that "many a times, robbery, murder or any other crimes committed in these places were not investigated and the offenders in most cases escaped punishment" **which implied that lawlessness and chaos prevailed in Perak and subsequently, the social unrest brought about economic instability in Larut as it disrupted the trading activities, thus,** "Subsequently, the Straits Merchants and the British traders had asked the British to intervene on their behalf."

#### **Source E- To a certain extent – (Yes And No)**

On the one hand, Source E does support the view that the British **wanted to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest. I know this as the British officer, Jervois writes to Carnarvon in Source F and states that,** "Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request, it has been found from the very start that such a course has been impossible," because, **"when I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned, and I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here"**. Hence, Jervois is implying that the British government all along planned to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest and took the opportunity to do so when Sultan Abdullah asked them to intervene to solve the succession disputes and Chinese Secret Society quarrels. Jervois is pointing out that the fact of the matter was that, **in theory, the British was supposed to intervened in the Malay States to establish indirect rule through the Residential System, but in reality, this never happened, because, he had seen first-hand/ with this own eyes, that in practice, the British had established direct rule with the ultimate goal of running/governing the Malay states, in order to exploit the rich economic resources of the state.**

On the other hand, Source E does not support the view that the British **wanted to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest but rather based on the interest of the locals living in Perak as it states that ,** "Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving

advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request," it implies that Sultan Abdullah had asked the British to intervene as Raja Abdullah had written a letter to Sir Andrew Clarke asking for a man of sufficient ability to show them a good system of government Or Abdullah had requested British assistance in administering the state so that under peaceful conditions, Perak would be opened to bring in revenue. In 1873, there was further economic instability in the Malay States such as piracy off the coast of the peninsula which was a continuing problem.

**Source F- No but questions reliability/limitations of source**

Source F does not support the view that the British **wanted to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest but based on the interest of the local Malay rulers because** Carnarvon states that, "The essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers who would advise and assist them in the government of the country." **This implied that the Malay rulers had requested for the British to send a British officer who would reside in the state and guide them in running the affairs of the state which was in chaos because of the Chinese Secret Society Quarrels and the Succession disputes which plagued Perak.**

**Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source**

However, this cannot be trusted as Carnarvon is **lying** when he denies Jervois' claims in Source E that the British had knowledge/were aware that the English version of the Pangkor Engagement implied that the Sultans had lost their political powers and were subordinate to the British Resident which further meant that the British government were waiting to intervene in the Malay States on their own accord, for their own self-interest in order to establish direct British colonial rule in Malaya based on their policy of Empire building, **but waited for an excuse to do**. Essentially, what Carnarvon states is **false** when he states that, "but the position a Resident was to occupy would be very different from that of a Controller. I am by no means prepared to admit the correctness of your statement that the Pangkor Engagement virtually threw the government of the country into the hands of the Resident. You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of the advice, was really one of direct or actual government." This is so because in reality, the Resident made all the decisions, and the Sultans became mere figureheads and only in charge of Malay customs and traditions.

For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark must not exceed 8.

**Notes:**

- To score L2/L3 there must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote.
- Simply writing about the issues in the sources is not enough.
- Higher marks in L2/L3 to award on number of sources used.

### Section B (SEQ) Suggested Answer Scheme

2. 'The main reason why the Vietnamese were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was due to the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.[10]

L1	<p><b>Identifies/Describes given or other reasons</b>  <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i>  <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i></p> <p><b>EXAMPLE (1m) – identify:</b>          I agree to a certain extent that the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers and the French people.          AND</p> <p><b>EXAMPLE (2m) – describe:</b>          The country of Vietnam was a very backward and impoverished state based on the tyranny and ignorance of despotism. For example, there was internal instability and chaos in Northern Vietnam as it was affected by events in China. After the collapse of the Taiping Rebellion against the Qing Dynasty in 1864, Chinese refugees fled south to northern Vietnam and organized themselves into mercenary armies.</p>	1-3
L2	<p><b>Explains Yes or No</b>  <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i></p>	4-5m
L3	<p><b>Explains Yes and No</b>  <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i></p> <p>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</p> <p>I agree to a certain extent that the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the <b><u>unenlightened leadership of the local rulers and the Indonesian people</u></b>. The country of Vietnam was a <b><u>very backward and impoverished state</u></b> based on the tyranny and ignorance of despotism. For example, there <b><u>was internal instability and chaos in Northern Vietnam as it was affected by events in China</u></b>. After the collapse of the Taiping Rebellion against the Qing Dynasty in 1864, Chinese refugees fled south to northern Vietnam and organized themselves into mercenary armies. An example would be the Black Flags who attracted a large following. By 1970's they had grown significantly. They were sometimes employed by the Vietnamese court to put down rebellions and rival armies. Backed by the court, they also operated as bandits along the course of the Red River harassing trading vessels for taxes.</p>	6-8m

**ELABORATION:** They became involved in rebellions and the Vietnamese court requested China for help. However, some of the Chinese soldiers joined the bandits.

**Make the Link Now→ This alarmed the French officials in Cochinchina who were afraid that they would lose N. Vietnam to the Chinese. Some officials saw this as an opportunity to intervene.**

**ELABORATION:** The French officials administering the protectorate of Cochinchina in the 1860's and 1870's were idealists who subscribed to new political philosophies such as **Social Darwinism** that was prevalent across Europe at that time, thus they appealed to the government in France to intervene which was at that time following a forward policy of conquering other states.

**ELABORATION:** Essentially, the French officials saw themselves as an 'enlightened civilization' with a duty to conquer inferior societies and bring about law and order and free the local people from unenlightened leaders. Thus, the **Vietnamese were unable to resist French colonization of the** because of the **unenlightened leadership of the local rulers**

**Another reason why the Vietnamese were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the French army was a force not to be reckoned with.** In 1873, the French tried to intervene when a French military expedition was sent to Hanoi however since it was carried out without official approval from the French government, they were forced to withdraw from Tonkin. However, between 1880-1881 and 1883-1885, France had a new Prime Minister Jules Ferry who was an opportunist and strongly advocated colonization. As such France became the second largest European colonial power after Great Britain. After the Second Treaty of Saigon was signed, Emperor Tu Duc went against the terms of the treaty by persecuting the Catholics and encouraging the Black Flags to harass the traders along the Red River. In 1883, Jules Ferry decided that they had faced enough resistance from Vietnam. Giving the reason that piracy along the Red River was endangering the lives of French trader, a second military expedition led by Captain Henty Riviere was sent to Hanoi. **Riviere's army stormed the citadel before moving on to occupy the coals mines in Hon Gai. Vietnam attempted to resist the French by petitioning to China for help. China had learned from experience to enlist the Black Flags to fight the French. The Black Flags proved a strong adversary and in May 1883. However, the French refused to back down and sent a large French army to occupy Tonkin.**

**ELABORATION:** By August 1883, French troops had forced the Black Flags to retreat. It was also around this time that Emperor Tu Duc died. The French army took advantage of the chaos caused by the Emperor's death to send an ultimatum to the Vietnamese court. The Vietnamese officials were to choose between destruction of their country or French protection. The Vietnamese had little choice but to **sign the Treaty of Hue**, also known as the Harmand Treaty, with Dr Françoise Jules Harmand, the French diplomat. China protested the treaty. French authorities in Tonkin attempted to enforce the Harmand treaty by sending reinforcements. China responded by sending troops from Yunnan to support the Vietnamese resistance against the French in Son Tay near Hanoi. **Make the Link Now→** By December 1883, the French defeated the Vietnamese and Chinese forces and proceeded to take over other parts of Vietnam.

	<p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> In June 1884, the Treaty of Protectorate was signed to replace the 1883 Treaty of Hue, and French colonization of Vietnam was effectively complete. <b><u>In 1887, Cochin-China, Annam and Tonkin were combined with Cambodia to become the Union of Indochina. In 1893, the French annexed Laos to be part of Vietnam. The Ministry of Colonies were formed and a Governor-General who had been stationed in Tonkin was now in charge of the Governor in Cochin-China as well as the Resident Superiors in the individual protectorates. Make the Link Now→</u></b> Thus the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule between 1883-1884 because the French army was too strong for them to defeat.</p> <p><b><u>SUGGESTED CONCLUSION:</u></b></p> <p>I agree that the main reason why the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers. This was the root cause which made the country weak and vulnerable to foreign intervention or invasion. With a strong enlightened leader, one would be able to set up a strong and stable political structure which would include a strong military and naval force. Thus, the strength of a country's army would only be possible with an enlightened leader as he would establish good governance. An educated leader would also be able to negotiate with foreign powers and provide concessions such that the foreign powers would not be able to use any excuse to use force or violence to take over the country on the pretext of bringing about the rule of law based on social concerns. This is evident with the enlightened rulers of Thailand such as the likes of King Mongkut and King Chulalongkorn who, having being educated in Switzerland, were able to save their country from foreign intervention but instead invited foreigners to help develop the country without having to colonize it as the heads of state were efficient in running the administration and country at large.</p>	
--	--	--

3. 'The greatest injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Identifies/Describes given or other reasons</b>  <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i>  <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i></p> <p><b>EXAMPLE (1m) – identify:</b>          I agree that one great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause.          AND  <b>EXAMPLE (2m) – describe:</b>          I agree that one great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause This was so as the Guilt Clause had far-reaching negative economic, political and social implications on Germany, and this made the Germans feel that it was an unfair treaty.</p>	1-3
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Explains Yes or No</b>  <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i></p>	4-5m
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Explains Yes and No</b>  <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i></p> <p>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</p> <p><b>I agree that one great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the War Guilt Clause which the</b> Germans deeply resented because the Germans had to <b>accept total blame</b> for the war. However, the Germans believed that the <b>Allies were being unfair. This was so as Germany's ally, Austria-Hungary was the first to invade Serbia and thus should also shoulder some of the blame.</b> (Make the Link→ Thus, the Germans felt that they were being treated <b>extremely unfairly</b>.</p> <p><b>ELABORATION:</b> More importantly, accepting the <b>war guilt clause</b> meant paying heavy <b>war reparations</b> amounting to 6600 million pounds as a means of compensation to the affected countries, especially France <b>OR Historically</b>, it was <b>unfair because the figure of 6600 million pounds was only arrived at in 1921</b> by the Reparations Commission, thus when Germany signed the agreement in 1919, it was like <b>signing a 'blank cheque'</b>.  <b>(Make the Link The huge amount was seen as extremely unfair</b> as it was estimated that Germany would only be able to repay the full sum in about 80 years. <b>This meant economically Germany would be in dire straits for many decades.</b></p> <p><b>ELABORATION:</b>          Moreover, the Germans saw the War Guilt Clause as <b>as too harsh and thus unfair</b> because as <b>further compensation</b>, Germany had to give up large areas of land that contained vital and valuable natural resources. For example, important coal areas such as the Saar from which profits would be given to</p>	6-8m

France for 15 years and **heavy industrial areas such as Alsace-Lorraine, which was rich in iron ore**, were taken from Germany. **Fundamentally, this meant further loss of economic resources. MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, the Germans viewed the treaty as too harsh and thus unfair because economically, it squeezed them dry and led to great economic hardship.**

**ELABORATION:** Moreover, because of the War Guilt Clause, the Allies made Germany hand over Malmedy and Eupen to Belgium, Danzig to the League of Nations, and Upper Silesia and the Polish Corridor were given to Poland. **This effectively split Germany in half and in turn made Germany weaker. MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, the Germans resented paying compensation because they viewed it as unreasonable and thus too harsh as it led to heavy war reparations and territorial losses that would ultimately **cause long-term economic hardship / suffering and poverty**. Hence, they viewed the War Guilt Clause as a great injustice/extremely unfair.**

**ELABORATION:** However, another great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the **military clauses which the Germans viewed as too harsh on Germany as well**. This was so as the curtailing of **Germany's military strength** was justified, but leaving Germany **powerless indefinitely** was seen by the Germans as unfair. The Rhineland was demilitarized and no fortifications or training were allowed. Weapons were to be melted down as well. Military conscription was banned, and Germany could only have 100,000 soldiers. No submarines were allowed, and only 6 battleships and 24 smaller ships were permitted. An air force and tanks were also forbidden. By curtailing Germany's military strength in every way and leaving it without any modern methods of warfare, the treaty **not only greatly reduced Germany's might, but left her defenceless and vulnerable to external threats**.

**ELABORATION:** In addition, no other countries were forced to reduce their building of weapons even though the League of Nations stated that all countries should do so, especially the other countries who were also involved in World War I. **Make the Link Now → The Germans viewed the military clauses imposed by Treaty of Versailles as extremely unfair because of the Allies' double standards and hence viewed it as a great injustice.**

**ELABORATION:** **Under the clause of self-determination**, many smaller states were allowed to vote in or out of Germany. However, the Germans felt that the ***allies*** were not establishing a fair treaty because the **clause of self-determination was not carried out in all the chosen countries**. For example, the Polish Corridor and Alsace-Lorraine were given away without a vote. This meant further ***loss of German citizens*** (population) who were forced to live under foreign rule.

**ELABORATION:** Certain territorial clauses were somewhat ***opportunistic***, especially the signing away of German overseas colonies in Asia and Africa, which were parcelled out under the disguise of League of Nations mandates as spoils of war to the Allies. This was evident because the colonies in Africa, such as Togoland, East Africa, Southwest Africa and the Cameroons, and in Asia, though taken away from Germany, were ***not given their independence***. Instead, they were to become mandate territories to Britain and France. **MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, the actions were not based on legal issues, but more on squeezing Germany dry as well as for the vested economic interest of the allies. Thus, the Germans felt that the Treaty was an extremely unfair one.**

**ELABORATION:** Another great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles **that it was a dictated peace treaty**. The Germans called the

	<p>treaty a 'diktat' because it was <b><i>imposed upon them without them having any say</i></b>. Moreover, Germany was <b><i>not allowed any representatives during the negotiations</i></b>. <b>MAKE THE LINK NOW</b> → Thus, a feeling developed in Germany that since they were not involved in the negotiations, they were under no moral obligation to obey the terms, and they resented the Treaty of Versailles very deeply.</p> <p><b><u>Suggested Conclusion: (Students need to address the “greatest” injustice)</u></b></p> <p>I agree that the greatest injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt because the German <b>economy took the hardest blow as it caused unemployment and poverty and affected the daily social and economic lives</b> (material needs) of the Germans citizens as a whole, not only in the short run, but also in the long run. For many years to come, the Germans not only had to succumb to inflation and subsequently further poverty but also had to resort to borrowing from other countries, such as the USA. Thus, when the Great Depression hit Germany in 1929, Germany was in dire straits again because of situation created by the reparation clauses. On the other hand, even though the other specific terms of the Treaty of Versailles such as the territorial clauses, the clauses of self-determination and the military clauses were also extremely harsh and had far-reaching economic, political and social <b>implications for Germany</b>, it can be argued that they were <b>not the greatest injustices imposed on Germany because firstly</b> it essentially only hurt <b>German pride as it took away German power and glory but more significantly, these clauses were imposed as a result of Germany having to accept total blame for World War I as thus they were an offshoot of the root cause which is the War Guilt Clause.</b></p> <p>(Accept any logical/plausible answers)</p>	
--	---	--



4. 'Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1	<p><b>Identifies/Describes given or other reasons</b>  <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i>  <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i></p> <p><b>EXAMPLE (1m) – identify:</b>          I agree to a certain extent that Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p><b>EXAMPLE (2m) – describe:</b>          I agree to a certain extent that <u>Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake for several reasons.</u> Neville <u>Chamberlain</u> seemed to have <u>misjudged Hitler</u> as being a rational politician who would demand the bare minimum.</p>	1-3
L2	<p><b>Explains Yes or No</b></p> <p><i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i></p>	4-5m
L3	<p><b>Explains Yes and No</b>  <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i></p> <p>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</p> <p><b>I agree to a certain extent that <u>Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake for several reasons.</u></b> Neville <b><u>Chamberlain</u></b> <b><u>seemed to have misjudged Hitler</u></b> as being a rational politician who would demand the bare minimum. However, Hitler turned out to be an unscrupulous tyrant who saw Appeasement (any concession) as a sign of weakness and the more Britain and France gave him, the more he demanded. This can be seen during the Sudetenland Crisis whereby Hitler had promised that this was his last territorial claim and threatened that if the Allies did not give in to his demands, war would break out in Europe. However, when the Allies gave in easily to his demands during the Munich Conference in 1938, Hitler showed himself to be an unreasonable man who took a bold step in March 1939 and invaded the whole of Czechoslovakia. <b><u>Make the Link NOW→ Thus the policy was not justified because it placed too much faith in Hitler's promises, and these promises ultimately proved to be empty.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> Britain's policy of <b><u>appeasement in the 1930's was also a mistake because it was morally wrong.</u></b> If Hitler was using <b><u>bullying tactics</u></b>, it was up to Britain to oppose him especially during the Sudetenland/Munich Crisis. However, Britain and France were so afraid of another war that they allowed Germany to break international agreements without punishment and finally abandoned Czechoslovakia to its <b><u>fate in return for meaningless</u></b></p>	6-8m

	<p><b><u>promises</u></b> <b><u>Make the Link NOW</u></b>→ Fundamentally, Appeasement was not justified as it promised world peace at the expense of Czechoslovakia.</p> <p>However, Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was not a mistake because Britain and France were facing many problems. Firstly, because of the <b><u>Great Depression</u></b> between 1929-1935, Britain could not afford to spend money on another war as their economy was in the doldrums as it had to concentrate on bringing their country out of the poor economic situation.</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> Secondly, because of the economic situation, a re-armament programme could only begin in 1936 and was not planned for completion until 1940.</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> Thirdly, Britain was not ready to go to war as it had to concentrate on dealing with problems in her colonies such as India that had begun to agitate for independence. <b><u>Make the Link NOW</u></b>→ Thus, since India was a source of economic revenue, adopting a policy of appeasement would not only allow Britain to avoid double trouble, but also simultaneously allow Britain to buy more time to build up its military strength.</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> Moreover, the policy of appeasement was not a mistake because Britain's attitude towards Germany was one of sympathy as many Britons viewed the Versailles Treaty as too harsh and therefore Germany should be allowed to re-arm and get back German speaking territory which rightfully belonged to them. There was not a lot of public support among British citizens for another war against Germany, and thus taken in the context of the time, appeasement was right in the eyes of many, but certainly not all, of the British public. Thus in 1935, the British were happy to make the a) <b><u>Anglo-German Naval Agreement</u></b>, which ignored the terms of the Versailles Treaty as it allowed Germany to build 30% of warships thus keeping the peace with Hitler and strengthening their friendship.</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> b) When Hitler demilitarized the Rhineland, there was a feeling that this was just 'marching into his own backyard'</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> And when the Anschluss occurred in 1938, the Austrians were simply achieving self-determination denied to them at Versailles.</p> <p><b><u>**Make the Link NOW</u></b>→ Thus each single step that Hitler took could be justified based on the mistreatment of Germany during the Treaty of Versailles hence it was not a mistake.</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> In addition, the memories of the horrors of the 1<sup>st</sup> World War where many lives were lost as well as the enormous physical devastation justified the policy of appeasement in the eyes of many across Europe. The Allies wanted to find peaceful solutions to Germany's problems and to avoid another destructive war at all cost. Thus Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was not a mistake.</p> <p><b><u>ELABORATION:</u></b> The policy of appeasement was also not a mistake because Communism was seen as a greater evil compared to Nazism. Although the Allies, including Czechoslovakia and Poland hated the aggressive nature of Nazi policies in central Europe and Eastern Europe, they saw the spread of Communism as a greater threat. <b><u>Make the Link NOW</u></b>→ Thus the Allies viewed the policy of Appeasement as not a mistake/justified because giving in to German demands would ensure Germany's friendship and support against the Soviet Aggression.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b><u>Suggested Conclusion:</u></b></p> <p><b>In the short run</b>, Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was not a mistake as it had prevented a war from erupting in Europe between 1936-1938. Essentially, it brought peace to the world at all costs. However, <b>in the long run</b>, appeasement was a mistake because it led to the outbreak of World War II in 1939. Ultimately, the policy of appeasement put Britain in a bad light and showed them <b>to be weak as it gave Hitler the confidence to step up his demands</b> until he invaded Poland after taking over Czechoslovakia in 1939. Hitler's invasion of these 2 countries was not justified, as both these countries did not have a majority German-speaking population. <b>Fundamentally, Appeasement was not justified because it was a policy that did not act as a deterrent against aggressors, but rather was a policy that tended to encourage an aggressive foreign policy.</b></p> <p><b>*Accept any plausible answer</b></p>	
--	--	--