



南华中学  
**NAN HUA HIGH SCHOOL**  
**PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2025**

---

**Subject : History**  
**Paper : 2174/01**  
**Level : Secondary Four Express**  
**Date : 29 August 2025**  
**Duration : 1 hour 50 minutes**

**MARK SCHEME**

### Section A: Source-Based Case Study

<b>1</b>	<b>(a)</b>	Study Source A.  What is the cartoonist's attitude towards the British? Using details from the source and your own knowledge, explain your answer.	[5]
<b>Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>		<b>Marks</b>
L1	<b>Misinterpretation / Description of the source</b> <i>Award 1m for misinterpretation</i>  E.g. The cartoon shows that the British used cannons and guns at the signing of the Pangkor Treaty.		1
L2	<b>Message(s)</b> <i>Award higher mark for more developed answers</i>  E.g. The message of the cartoon is that the Malay chiefs were threatened into signing the Pangkor Treaty. This can be seen where the cannon is pointing at the Malay chief and the source states that "with some sabre-rattling and gun-boat diplomacy, the Pangkor Treaty was signed". This shows that the British displayed their military might as a way to force the Malay chiefs into submission and into signing the Treaty.  <i>Alternative acceptable L2 responses:</i> - Author disagreed with how British treated the Malay chiefs - Author was criticising the British - Author was attacking the British <i>*What the author is doing is not equivalent to what the attitude of the author</i>		2-3
L3	<b>Attitude</b> <i>Award the higher mark for answers with contextual knowledge.</i>  E.g. The cartoonist had an attitude of disapproval/critical attitude** towards the British and their methods. This can be seen where the cannon is pointing at the Malay chief and the source states that "with some sabre-rattling and gun-boat diplomacy, the Pangkor Treaty was signed". This shows that the British displayed their military might as a way to force the Malay chiefs into submission and into signing the Treaty. This depiction of military might as well as the words used such as "sabre-rattling" and "Now sign here" implies that the cartoonist views the British tactics poorly that they had bullied the Malay chiefs into signing the Treaty.		4-5

	<b>**Critical attitude is a disposition. But being critical is an action.</b>	
--	---	--

1	(b)	<p>Study Source B.</p> <p>What is the message of this source? Explain your answer.</p>	[5]
Level	Descriptor	Marks	
L1	<p><b>Answers based on Provenance/Lifting</b></p> <p>E.g. The message of the source is that the Pangkor Treaty was not plain sailing.</p>		1
L2	<p><b>Answers based on sub-message</b></p> <p><i>Award 2 marks for sub-message</i></p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for sub-message, supported</i></p> <p>E.g. The message of the source is that the Pangkor Treaty created trouble for the British in Malaya. This can be seen where the source stated that “this new endeavour in 1874 was far from plain sailing” and that there was “loss of many valuable lives”. This means that the Pangkor Treaty created more problems for the British in Malaya.</p>		2-3
L3	<p><b>Answers based on main message</b></p> <p><i>Award 5 marks for better developed responses</i></p> <p>E.g. The message of the source is that while the Pangkor Treaty had created trouble for the British, it was ultimately the right move for the British and that Sir Clarke should be credited for its success. This can be seen where the source states that “success came only after the loss of many valuable lives and much persistence” and “permission was entrusted to the right man, and Sir Clarke straightaway put the key to the lock, opened the door, and left the rest to his able agents and successors to pave the way.” This shows that Clarke was the one who made it possible for British intervention in Malaya to take root, and subsequently enable Malaya to flourish.</p>		4-5

1	(c)	<p>Study Sources C and D.</p> <p>In what ways are Sources C and D different? Explain your answer.</p>	[6]
---	-----	---	-----

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p><b>Comparison based on provenance / Invalid matching</b></p> <p>E.g. Sources C and D are different as one is written by Frank Swettenham, a British official, and the other is written by Sultan Abdullah himself.</p>	1-2
L2	<p><b>Difference in content</b>  <i>Award the higher mark for better developed responses</i></p> <p>E.g. Sources C and D are different in showing how Sultan Abdullah utilised his newfound power after the signing of the Pangkor Treaty. Source C states that "He now enjoyed the declared support of the British government", "and he proceeded to sell land for ready cash to fund his personal indulgences." This shows that Sultan Abdullah abused his power for his own enjoyment. Whereas Source D states "After signing the Treaty", "I can certify that I did my utmost to have the Treaty signed by all those who had previously refused, and that in all my endeavours I have failed." This shows that Sultan Abdullah had used his power to try and convince others to support the British instead.</p>	3-4
L3	<p><b>Difference in portrayal of Sultan Abdullah</b>  <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i></p> <p>E.g. Sources C and D are different in their portrayals of Sultan Abdullah's character. Source C shows Sultan Abdullah to be of a poor character who indulges in vices where it states that "he proceeded to sell land for ready cash to fund his personal indulgences - gambling, opium-smoking and cock-fighting", showing that his priorities as a leader were misplaced, seeking to only benefit himself for his own enjoyment, painting him in a poor light. Source D however, shows that in spite of great political lash back, he still persevered in trying to win over the local leaders to aid the British. This can be seen where the source states "a general ill-feeling and jealousy was awakened throughout all the chiefs, who did their best to overthrow me" and that "I can certify that I did my utmost to have the Treaty further endorsed by all those who had previously refused, and that in all my endeavours I have failed." These being testament to his upstanding character and loyalty towards the British.</p> <p><i>*There are no comparisons for motive in this question as Source C does not have a clear motive to elaborate on</i></p>	5-6

1	(d)	Study Source E.  How far does this source prove that British intervention was welcomed? Explain your answer.	[6]
Level	Descriptor	Marks	
L1	<b>Answers based on undeveloped provenance</b>  E.g. The merchants wrote the letter and thus proves that they wanted British intervention.		1
L2	<b>Prove based on source content</b> <i>Award 2 marks for message, unsupported.</i> <i>Award 3 marks for message, supported</i>  E.g. Source E proves that British intervention was welcomed as it highlights the instability in the state of Perak. This can be seen where the source states that there are "disturbances with authority" and that "if all these dissensions are brought to an end and set right, and the country is restored to peace, we and our great men desire to settle under the protection of the English flag", thus showing that British intervention was not just welcomed, but necessary, desired and requested for because of the unrest in Perak.		2-3
L3	<b>Prove based on cross reference to contextual knowledge</b> <i>Award 5m for more developed cross-referencing.</i>  E.g. L2 + Source E proves that British intervention was welcomed as it is supported by my contextual knowledge that Perak was in a state of upheaval due to the clash between the Ghee Hins and the Hai Sans as well as the succession disputes causing the economy of Malaya to come to a standstill. The merchants mining tin in the area wanted the British to intervene in order to bring back economic stability for their mining industries.  <i>Alternative acceptable cross-reference to Source B to prove that British intervention was not welcomed</i>		4-5
L4	<b>Does not prove based on accurate context and intended outcome</b> <i>Award 5 marks for responses with context OR outcome</i> <i>Award 6 marks for responses with context AND outcome</i>  E.g. Source E does not prove that British intervention was welcomed as the local merchants wrote this letter with the motive to the British Governor to convince [P] the Governor [A] that there was instability in the state of Perak [M]. This can be seen where the source states that there are "disturbances with		5-6

	<p>authority" and that "if all these dissensions are brought to an end and set right, and the country is restored to peace, we and our great men desire to settle under the protection of the English flag", thus showing that British intervention was not just welcomed, but necessary, desired and requested for because of the unrest in Perak. <b>However, this source was published in late 1873 when the Larut Wars had caused severe disruption to the tin industries as there was fighting over the control of the tin mines [C], causing businesses to suffer.</b> Therefore the merchants wanted the Governor to step in and stop the local conflict so that business could continue.[O] Source E thus does not prove the merchants welcomed British intervention, but they needed and desired intervention in Malaya and therefore wrote this source with an ulterior motive, making it less reliable and less able to prove so.</p>	
--	--	--

1	(e)	<p>Study <b>all</b> the sources.  'The signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your view.</p>	[8]
Level	Descriptor	Marks	
L1	<b>Identifies sources that support / do not support the view without valid source use</b>	1	
L2	<p><b>Yes OR No, supported by valid source use</b>  <i>Award 2m for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and additional 1m for each subsequent valid source use (up to a maximum of 4m).</i></p> <p>E.g. Sources B, C and E support the statement that signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved.</p> <p><b>Source B supports</b> that the signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved. This can be seen where the source states that "success came only after the loss of many valuable lives and much persistence" and "permission was entrusted to the right man, and Sir Clarke straightaway put the key to the lock, opened the door, and left the rest to his able agents and successors to pave the way." <b>This means that the British were supportive of the Treaty and had even given Sir Andrew Clarke endorsement to carry it out.</b></p> <p><b>Source C supports</b> that the signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved. This can be seen where</p>	2 – 4	

<p>the source states that "Abdullah, the greatest advocate of the Pangkor Engagement" and "He now enjoyed the declared support...and he proceeded to...fund his personal indulgences – gambling, opium-smoking and cock-fighting." <b>This means that Abdullah supported the Pangkor Treaty as it enabled him to engage in his vices without having to worry about financial constraints.</b></p> <p><b>Source E supports</b> that the signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved. This can be seen where the source states that "we and our great men desire to settle under the protection of the English flag. We ask of our friend, Sir Andrew Clarke, to show us a good system of government for our dominions so that our country may be opened up and bring profit, and increase the revenues as well as peace and justice." <b>This means that merchants not only desired, but requested firmer intervention and expressed their keenness to have the British exercise formal political control over Malaya.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>E.g. Sources A, B and D do not support the statement that the signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved.</p> <p><b>Source A does not support</b> the statement, as it shows that the Malay chiefs had no choice but to sign the Pangkor Treaty. This can be seen where the cannon is pointing at the Malay chief and the source states that "with some sabre-rattling and gun-boat diplomacy, the Pangkor Treaty was signed". <b>This shows that the British displayed their military might as a way to force the Malay chiefs into submission and into signing the Treaty and that the support of the Malay chiefs were not given due consideration.</b></p> <p><b>Source B does not support</b> that the signing of the Pangkor Treaty was well-supported by the parties involved. This can be seen where the source states that "loss of many valuable lives" <b>This shows that the British had encountered resistance from the locals and fell into conflict with them and thus, can be inferred that their presence and intervention was not welcomed.</b></p> <p><b>Source D does not support</b> the statement, instead it shows that several Malay chiefs opposed the Treaty. The source states "After signing the Treaty against the will and wishes of the above-mentioned chiefs, I can certify that I did my utmost to have the Treaty further endorsed by all those who had previously refused, and that in all my endeavours I have failed." This means that there were several chiefs who had <b>rejected the terms of the</b></p>
--

	<p><b>Treaty and continued to show their disapproval long after the British had enforced the treaty.</b></p> <p><b>Note:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>To be awarded L2 or L3, there must be a direct reference to source content.</i></li> <li>- <i>Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues raised by the sources is insufficient.</i></li> </ul>	
L3	<p><b>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use</b></p> <p><i>Both aspects of L2. Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i></p> <p>E.g. When I further examine Source D, it is a source that weakens the argument that the Pangkor Treaty was not well-supported. This source was from Sultan Abdullah while he was in exile in Seychelles. Having been disgraced for his mishandling of Birch's assassination, Sultan Abdullah is not a reliable account of the dire state of affairs in Malaya that he is attempting to convince the Queen of. Sultan Abdullah would likely want to convince the Queen that the circumstances were unfavourable towards him from the start, and that he was a loyal subject to the British interests so that she may reverse the orders for his exile or, to defend himself and clear his name.</p> <p><b>Note:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Award a bonus of up to 2m (+1/+2) for use of contextual knowledge in relation to a source's reliability, sufficiency etc. but the total for this question must not exceed 8m.</i></li> </ul>	<b>5 – 8</b>

### Section B: Structured-Essay Questions

<b>2</b>	'French involvement in Vietnam in the late 1800s was largely driven by the ongoing competition for power among European powers.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
<b>L1</b>	<b>Identifies/Describes reasons for French involvement in Vietnam</b> <i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, 2m maximum for identifying two or more</i> <i>Award 2m for describing one reason, 3m for describing two or more</i>	<b>1 – 3</b>
<b>L2</b>	<b>Explains how competition for power led to French involvement OR other reasons that led to it.</b> <i>Award 4m for an explanation of the competition for power that led to French involvement in Vietnam OR other reasons that led to it.</i> <i>Award additional mark for additional benefit(s) or further supporting details, to a maximum of 5m.</i>  E.g. I agree that French involvement was largely drive by the <b>ongoing competition for power among European powers</b> . The French had been competing with Britain for territories since the 18 <sup>th</sup> century, and when the British brought Burma increasingly under their control, it made the French more concerned as they were wary that the British would try to gain access to China through Burma and possibly extending their control eastward into Siam. Furthermore, the French wanted to restore their national prestige after their defeat in the Franco-Prussian war. This led the French politicians to be increasingly willing to pursue a policy of expansion in Indochina, which started from Vietnam. The policy of expansion was also at a time of instability in northern Vietnam, when rebellions against the Vietnamese court led by the Black Flags were happening. This instability provided an opportunity for the French officials in Cochinchina to expand their influence to northern Vietnam, <u>creating further involvement of the French in the political arena, thereby giving them increased control over Vietnam to facilitate the obstruction of British access to China.</u>	<b>4 – 5</b>
<b>L3</b>	<b>Explains how competition for power led to French involvement AND other reasons that led to it.</b>	<b>6 – 8</b>

<p>Award 6m for an explanation of the competition for power that led to French involvement in Vietnam AND other reasons that led to it.</p> <p>Award additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8m.</p> <p>E.g. Another reason for French involvement in Vietnam was the <b>desire to spread the Catholic faith and civilise Vietnam</b>. Although French Catholic missionaries who had arrived in Vietnam were persecuted during the reigns of various emperors previously, they were still able to continue their activities of spreading the Catholic faith in Vietnam. The missionary impulse was what drove the expansion of French influence and control in Vietnam before the 1870s. At the same time, the French saw themselves as being more modern and advanced than the Vietnamese. They saw themselves as an enlightened civilisation with a moral duty to educate the locals, which is also known as the “civilising mission”. Therefore, the French government believed that the spread of European culture and values would help to civilize the locals, <u>thus encouraging the French to increase their involvement in Vietnam so that their “civilising mission” could be more effective.</u></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>E.g. Another reason for French involvement in Vietnam was the <b>demand for trading bases, raw materials and new markets</b>. Vietnam had valuable mineral resources such as iron, tin, zinc and coal. These raw materials were needed for manufacturing French goods, especially when the Industrial Revolution intensified in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The French especially desired coal as it was needed for the expanding French navy to fuel its steamships. Vietnam also offered the possibility of commercial trading opportunities. The French hoped to gain access to southern China via the Mekong River in southern Vietnam, which was deemed the quickest route and would help extend their trading interests. However, it was not safe for navigation as some sections of the river had high currents, hence making it a necessity to explore another route of entering China. The alternative trading route was via the Red River in northern Vietnam, and this meant that the French would need to establish new trading bases. <u>Thus, French involvement in Vietnam was expanded to allow the French to have access to rich economic resources and more trading opportunities, and the expectation of profits increase their wish to take control of Vietnam before other Western powers do so that they would be able to gain more revenue.</u></p>
--

	<p><b>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different impacts.</b></p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p>e.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that the ongoing competition for power among the European powers was the main driver for French involvement in Vietnam. This is because a sound economic foundation is intricately tied to the concept of power. Access to raw materials in Vietnam ensured that France would have a steady supply of resources to power its economy and therefore its overseas endeavours. The desire to be recognised as a powerhouse provided the impetus for France to seek territories abroad so that it could secure its economic power and a measure of geopolitical strength.</p>	
--	---	--

3	'International stability in the 1920s was due to the League of Nations' successful peacekeeping endeavours.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p><b>Identifies/Describes peacekeeping attempts in 1920s</b></p> <p><i>Award 1m for identifying one reason for maintaining stability, 2m maximum for identifying two or more</i></p> <p><i>Award 2m for describing one reason for maintaining stability, 3m for describing two or more</i></p>	1 – 3
L2	<p><b>Explains how the League's peacekeeping endeavours OR other reasons that led to it</b></p> <p><i>Award 4m for an explanation of the League's peacekeeping endeavours led to maintaining peace OR other reasons that led to it.</i></p> <p><i>Award additional mark for additional benefit(s) or further supporting details, to a maximum of 5m.</i></p> <p>E.g. I agree that the League's peacekeeping endeavours was one reason that contributed to maintaining international stability in 1920s. In October 1925, some Greek soldiers were killed on Greece's border with Bulgaria. When Greek troops invaded, Bulgaria appealed to the League for help. The League demanded both sides to stand down and told Greece to withdraw. Britain and France supported the League's judgement. Greece obeyed. This withdrawal by Greece was seen as a major</p>	4 – 5

	<p>success for the League and it demonstrated the ability of the League to mediate conflict between countries. More importantly, it demonstrated its ability to de-escalate tense armed conflicts, therefore proving that it was an important contributor to maintaining international stability.</p>	
L3	<p><b>Explains how the League's peacekeeping endeavours AND other reasons that led to it</b></p> <p>Award 6m for an explanation of the League's peacekeeping endeavours led to maintaining peace AND other reasons that led to it.</p> <p>Award additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8m.</p> <p>E.g. However, there are other contributing reasons as well, including the <b>Dawes Plan</b>. Represented by the United States, Britain, Italy and France, the Dawes Plan helped Germany's economy recover from hyperinflation and restructure its reparation payments. It ended a crisis in Europe by removing French and Italian troops from the German Ruhr region so that the area could start production to generate money. At the same time, the United States also loaned Germany large sums of money to support its economy. This helped to maintain international stability in the 1920s as it restored economic stability to Germany which was the epicentre of troubles in post-WWI Europe. By convincing France and Italy to withdraw based on the promise of economic reparations, the Dawes Plan had also inadvertently prevented further armed conflict and brought temporary peace to Europe.</p> <p><b>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different impacts.</b></p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p>e.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that while the League's successful peacekeeping endeavours contributed to international stability in the 1920s, I feel that other attempts to keep the peace such as the Dawes Plan were more effective in achieving stability due to the economic element and political will demonstrated in such non-League affiliated treaties. The lack of the political will in League members were often the cause of failed peacekeeping endeavours. Non-League arrangements such as the Dawes Plan had more intrinsic motivation from parties involved and tackled more pressing underlying concerns which increased vested interests, encouraging all parties to see through their agreements with each other. With the power of</p>	6 – 8

	historical hindsight, it is also clear that negotiations involving resolution of economic troubles in Germany were directly related to the (lack of) popularity of the Nazi Party; the main antagonist of WWII. Thus, it is possible to argue that arrangements such as the Dawes Plan had the effect of suppressing the early radical ultranationalist tendencies in Germany, thereby maintaining international stability in the 1920s.	
--	--	--

4	'World War II in Asia-Pacific broke out due to the impacts of Great Depression on Japan.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
---	--	------

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<b>Identifies/Describes reasons for outbreak of WWII in Asia-Pacific</b> <i>Award 1m for identifying one reason for outbreak of WWII in Asia-Pacific, 2m maximum for identifying two or more</i> <i>Award 2m for describing one reason for outbreak of WWII in Asia-Pacific, 3m for describing two or more</i>	1 – 3
L2	<b>Explains how the impacts of Great Depression led to WWII in Asia-Pacific OR other reasons that led to it</b> <i>Award 4m for an explanation of how the impacts of Great Depression led to WWII in Asia-Pacific OR other reasons that led to it.</i> <i>Award additional mark for additional benefit(s) or further supporting details, to a maximum of 5m.</i>  E.g. I agree that one of the reasons WWII in Asia-Pacific broke out was <b>due to the impacts of Great Depression on Japan</b> . In 1929, the Wall Street Crash happened in the United States. The Great Depression damaged Japan's economy due to its heavy reliance on foreign trade. In order to protect USA's economy, the United States introduced tariffs on international goods in the 1930s. These tariffs made Japanese goods more expensive in the United States. Goods such as canned fish and clothing had tariffs of 50% and 70% imposed on them respectively. These tariffs made Japanese goods much more expensive in the United States and resulted in decreased sales of Japanese goods as they were no longer as attractive due to their high prices. These measures hurt Japan's exports badly as it meant that Japan's economy could not profit from international sales to USA. US actions to impose tariffs on Japanese goods further <u>convinced the ultranationalists that other countries could not be relied upon and that Japan needed to be self-sufficient</u> . This set Japan on a path to favour aggression as a means to secure its economic survival and interests as the Japanese associated their economic sufferings with the democratic government,	4 – 5

	<p><u>viewing it to be incapable of solving economic crises, thus making WWII in Asia-Pacific more likely.</u></p>	
L3	<p><b>Explains how the impacts of Great Depression led to WWII in Asia-Pacific AND other reasons that led to it</b></p> <p><i>Award 6m for an explanation of how impacts of Great Depression led to WWII in Asia-Pacific AND other reasons that led to it.</i></p> <p><i>Award additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8m.</i></p> <p>E.g. However, there are other contributing reasons as well, including the <b>inability of the League of Nations to respond effectively to Japan's initial expansion</b>. When Japan invaded Manchuria, China appealed to the League for international support. In 1931, the League's Council passed a resolution calling on Japan to withdraw its troops. In 1932, a full year after the invasion, the League presented the Lytton Report on the incident, concluding that Manchuria should be returned to China. However, in February 1933, instead of withdrawing from Manchuria the Japanese announced they intended to occupy more of China. Furthermore, Japan rejected the Lytton Report and resigned from the League on 27 March 1933. The League could not ban arms sales to Japan because the member countries could not agree on that. They were worried that Japan would retaliate and escalate the situation. Britain and France did not want to risk their navies or armies in a war to stop Japan. <u>This led to the outbreak of WWII in Asia-Pacific as it demonstrated that the League was helpless in the face of aggressor nations. By not acting against Japan in Manchuria or when it left the League, the League effectively encouraged Japan to further expand as it showed that the League could not muster enough armed forces to back their demands made via the Lytton Report. This exposed the weakness of the League, that it would not be able to act on its political will, providing Japan the assurance that further expansion would not be met with any armed retaliation.</u></p> <p><b>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different impacts.</b></p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p>e.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that the League's inability to respond effectively to Japan's initial expansion was a greater contributing factor in leading to the outbreak of WWII. This is because the League's weak response affected Japan on several</p>	6 – 8

<p>levels that set it on the trajectory to war. Firstly, Japan's democratic government had strongly disapproved of the events that transpired in Manchuria. While the League clearly disapproved of it as well, the League's inaction further weakened the democratic government's position in Japan and inadvertently strengthened the opposition in Japan (the Japanese military). This inaction ultimately spelt the death of the democratic government, one of the last bastions that was attempting to redirect Japan away from war. Secondly, their inaction in Manchuria led to Japan being able to acquire the raw materials that could have been used to power their expansionist efforts, effectively enabling the would-be Japanese war machine.</p>	
---	--