

Name: _____ () Class: _____

**PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION
GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION ORDINARY LEVEL**

HISTORY

2174/01

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

22 August 2025

1 hour 50 minutes

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

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

Do not use highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **two questions**.

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

The total number of marks for this paper is 50.

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

You may keep the question paper.

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.



圣尼各拉女校
CHIJ ST. NICHOLAS GIRLS' SCHOOL

Girls of Grace • Women of Strength • Leaders with Heart

[Turn Over]

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

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

Study the sources carefully and then answer **all** the questions. You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources you were 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.

What can you learn from the source about British attitude towards colonialism in the 19th century. Explain your answer.

[5]

- (b) Study Sources B and C.

Having read Source B, are you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer.

[6]

- (c) Study Source D.

How useful is the source in helping you understand the motivation for British intervention in Perak? Explain your answer.

[6]

- (d) Study Source E.

Why do think the journal article was published? Explain your answer.

[5]

- (e) Study all sources.

“British intervention in the Malay states was to protect their own interest.” How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

[8]

British Intervention in the Malay States.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

By 1824, the British had successfully established trading bases in Penang, Melaka and Singapore under a unified administration known as the Straits Settlements. From 1824 to 1873, the British was careful not to interfere in the affairs of the Malay states. In 1867 when the Straits Settlements was transferred from the control of the India Office to the Colonial Office in London, the Straits community hoped to see a more active role of the British in the Malay states. The resource rich Malay states were supposedly to be in decline and in anarchy. However, from 1867 to 1873, the policy of non-intervention was more rigidly maintained. The man who changed the policy to intervention was Andrew Clarke. Clarke was appointed as Governor of the Straits Settlement in 1873. He arrived in Singapore in September 1873 and was actively preparing for the office. He was officially sworn in as the Governor of the Straits Settlements on 4 November 1873.

What caused the British to change their policy?

Source A *A cartoonist's impression of British colonialism in the 19th century.*



Source B

Adapted from Sir Andrew Clarke's letter to Colonial Secretary Lord Kimberley on 10 September 1873.

"The condition of the Malay Peninsula is becoming very serious. It is the old story of misgovernment of the Asiatic States. This might go on without any serious consequences except the stoppage of trade. Consequently, the European and Chinese capitalists stimulated by the great riches in tin mines in some of the Malay States are suggesting to the Native Princes that they should seek the aid of Europeans including us. We are the paramount power on the Peninsula up to the limit of the States tributary to Siam and looking to the vicinity of India and our whole position in the East. However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states."

Source C

Taken from Frank Swettenham's book British Malaya published in 1907.

Lord Kimberley had, however, furnished Sir Andrew Clarke with instructions of the first importance, showing a disposition to make an entirely new departure, and to recognise the duty forced upon England, as the dominant Power, to interfere in the Malay States and put a stop to a disgraceful state of affairs. The duty was imperative from motives of humanity alone; but it was equally certain that to undertake it would be highly beneficial to British interests and British trade, though these pleas had hitherto been dismissed as of no importance.

Source D

*Raja Abdullah's letter to Sir Andrew Clarke dated 30 December 1873.
Raja Abdullah was a claimant to the Perak throne.*

We and our great men request the Governor, who is now our arbitrator and mediator, to aid us by inquiring into these disturbances with authority, so that they may cease, and be settled properly and with justice. And 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 sheltering protection of the English flag.

Source E

Taken from a journal article published in 2012 by a Malay historian.

It is essential to reiterate that there had never been a genuine ‘civil war’ or ‘anarchy’ among the Perak Malays in the 1870s until the involvement of external parties, which had ulterior motives. Conflicts stirred by the external elements, began to surface involving a few select individuals, particularly between Raja Abdullah and Ngah Ibrahim, as the former tried to seize tin-rich Larut from the latter. However, this conflict was more personal in nature and did not involve the majority of the Perak chiefs and the Malay population. There had been neither threat to the citizens of Perak nor major bloodshed and certainly no anarchy that would threaten the political stability of the state. In sum, ‘Malay feudalism’, ‘civil war’ and ‘anarchy’ that had been frequently asserted to prevail in Perak in the 1870s are just terms invented especially by the British colonial officials to justify their intervention.

Source F

An excerpt from the Petition to Governor of the Straits Settlements Harry Ord, dated 28 March 1873, submitted by 243 Chinese traders from the Straits Settlement.

“As subjects of Our Most Gracious Majesty, we ask for protection in the half-civilised states of the Malay Peninsula and a moral intervention and a determined attitude in respect of the affairs of territories now in a state of anarchy.”

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions

2. 'The main reason for the extension of French influence into Vietnam was because of the economic gains.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [10]

3. 'The Treaty of Versailles was an unfair treaty.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [10]

4. 'The main cause of Japan's expansionist policy in the 1930s was because of the failure of the League of Nations.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [10]

End of paper

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A	https://www.slideserve.com/prentice/border-landscape-the-architecture-and-characteristics-of-the-area-between-territories
Source B	MacIntyre, D "Brittain's Intervention: The Origin of Lord Kimberley's Instructions to Sir Andrew Clarke in 1873", Journal of Southeast Asian History Vol 2, No 3, 1961.
Source C	https://archive.org/details/britishmalayaacc00swet/page/174/mode/2up?utm_source=chatgpt.com
Source D	European Dominance & Expansion in Southeast Asia in the late 19 th century, Hodder Education 2020
Source E	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Azmi-Arifin/publication/333081324_AZMI_Arifin_Universiti_Sains_Malaysia_PERAK-DISTURBANCES-1871-75-BRITISH-COLONIALISM-THE-CHINESE-SECRET-SOCIETIES-AND-THE-MALAY-RULERS-1
Source F	academia.edu/68911972/Small_steps_large_outcome_a_historical_institutional_analysis_of_Malaysia_s_political_economy?utm

Answers to SBQ

1a	<p>Study Source A.</p> <p>What can you learn from the source about British attitude towards colonialism in the 19th century. Explain your answer.</p> <p>L1: Sub message [1] I can learn from the source that the British were keen to colonise other states.</p> <p>L2: Message without evidence [2] I can learn from the source that the British attitude towards colonialism was paternalistic. The British saw the locals as uncivilised and less capable , thus they were in need of British guidance.</p> <p>L3: Main message [3-4] with evidence from the source. Award the higher mark for a more well-explained answer. I can learn from the source that the British attitude towards colonialism was paternalistic. The British saw the locals as uncivilised and less capable, thus they were in need of British guidance. This can be seen from the cartoon where a British leader was drawn standing tall and confident which suggests a sense of British dominance and superiority over the locals. The locals were drawn smaller and half-naked which reinforced the mindset that they were backwards and in need of British guidance.</p> <p>L4: Reason based on purpose [5] L3 + The purpose of the cartoon is to criticise the hypocrisy of the British rule. The British believed that they were helping the locals as seen in the big British flag in the background but in fact the British were not there to 'help' the natives of Malaya, but were there to exploit them as seen by the tools held in the hands of the British soldiers in the cartoon.The cartoonist wants to provide a clear understanding to the audience reading the cartoon that the British interference in the state was more for their own interest. Thus, they should not support the British actions in the Malay states.</p>	5
----	--	---

1b	<p>Study Sources B and C.</p> <p>Having read Source B, are you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer [1]</p> <p>Eg I am surprise/not surprise because of the provenance of the 2 sources. Source B is taken from Sir Andrew Clarke's letter to the Colonial Secretary Lord Kimberley while Source C is taken from Frank Swettenham's book.</p> <p>L1: Answers based on provenance/ source type [1]</p> <p>L2: Answers based on difference in content with no common statement [2]</p> <p>L3; Answers based on similarity in content with common statement clearly stated and explained [3-4]</p> <p>Eg Having read Source B, I am surprised by Source C as both sources have different views on the reasons for British intervention in the Malay states. Source B states that the reason for British intervention was the fear of foreign intervention. This can be seen from, "However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states." There was this fear that if the British government refused to intervene, some other foreign power might do so and hence have control of the Malay states. Source C, however believes that it was a sense of duty from the motives of humanity alone that motivates British intervention in the Malay states. This is evident from, "The duty was imperative from motives of humanity alone" This shows that Swettenham believed that the British as the dominant power has the duty to put a stop to the messy affairs in the Malay states and save the locals from themselves.</p> <p>L4: L3 + Answers based on difference in provenance and hence their purpose clearly explained [5-6]</p> <p>L3 + Having read Source B, I am not entirely surprised by Source C as the 2 sources are perspectives of 2 different British officials writing in their different capacity. Source B was Clarke's letter to Lord Kimberley was an appeal for the Colonial Office to change the policy in the Malay states from non-intervention to intervention. Clarke was the new man appointed as Governor of the Straits Settlements. He was writing to Kimberley, the Colonial Secretary. He would have to respond to the appeals of the Straits community because their investments in the Malay states were quite intensive and in danger because of the anarchy in the Malay states. He highlighted concerns over political instability, economic opportunities, and the threat of rival European powers expanding their influence in the Malay states. His letter aimed to convince the Colonial Secretary of the need to change the policy to intervention. Source C, on the other hand is an extract taken from Frank Swettenham's book. Swettenham was a prominent British colonial administrator and held various positions of importance in British Malaya. He played a key role in extending British influence in the Malay states. The book was probably written in his retirement from office. The extract taken from his book was his interpretation of the reason for British intervention. Swettenham was one of the numerous individuals who believed that the Western powers had a moral duty to bring peace and order to the Malay states. Source C aimed to convince the readers of his book that the British intervention was driven purely by a sense of moral responsibility and to bring order to the disgraceful state of affairs in the Malay states. He was trying to defend and justify British intervention in the Malay states. Hence, having read Source B, I am not entirely</p>	6
----	---	---

	surprised by Source C as they were perspective of British officials who had wrote In their different capacity.	
--	--	--

C	<p>Study Source C.</p> <p>How useful is the source in helping you understand the motivation for British intervention in Perak? Explain your answer.</p> <p>L1: Undeveloped provenance [1]</p> <p>L2: Useful/not useful for what it tells about the reason for British intervention in Perak [2 – 3]</p> <p><i>Award 2 marks for one aspect [useful OR not useful] and Award 3 marks for both aspects [ie useful and not useful]</i></p> <p>The source is useful as it tells me that the British intervened in Perak because of a request for help from a native ruler. The source is a letter from Raja Abdullah to appeal to the British for help to restore order and governance in Perak. This is evident from, “..... to aid us by inquiring into these disturbances with authority, so that they may cease, and be settled properly and with justice.” This shows that Abdullah requested the British help to settle the disturbances in the state.</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>The source is limited as it does not tell me that the British intervened in Perak because of other reasons (can draw from contextual knowledge or the view of other source. Choose one)</p> <p>Eg It does not show the view of Source B which is Clarke’s letter to the Colonial Secretary Lord Kimberley. Source B states that the British intervened in Perak because of their fear of other powers coming into the Malay states. Source B states that the British intervened in Perak because of their fear of other powers coming into the Malay states. This is evident from, “However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states.” This shows that the British intervened in Perak because of their fear of another European power coming into the same area. This shows that the British intervened in Perak to safeguard their own interest.</p> <p>Source C - for humanitarian reason (White men’s burden)</p> <p>L3: Answers which argue that the source is not useful based on assertions about Raja Abdullah’s motives [4]</p> <p>The source is limited as it is Raja Abdullah’s letter to ask the British for help. It does not show view the real reason why Abdullah wrote the letter to Sir Andrew Clarke. Abdullah was embroiled in a succession dispute in Perak. He was one of the 3 claimants to the throne. He hoped to get the support of the British to secure the throne. Hence, the letter was motivated by his self-interest. This point can be supported by contextual knowledge.</p>	
---	---	--

<p>L4: Answers which attempt to evaluate what is said by cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge. [5] (Answers which address just reliability and not utility should be given L2: 3 marks)</p>	<p>The source is useful as it tells me that the British intervened in Perak because of a request for help from a native ruler. The source is a letter from Raja Abdullah to appeal to the British for help to restore order and governance in Perak. This is evident from, “..... to aid us by inquiring into these disturbances with authority, so that they may cease, and be settled properly and with justice.” This shows that Abdullah requested the British help to settle the disturbances in the state.</p> <p>Source D’s point can be supported by my contextual knowledge which states that Raja Abdullah wrote to the British for help. His letter brought the British into Perak with the signing of the Pangkor Treaty.</p> <p>(can cross-ref to contextual knowledge to show contradiction)</p> <p>L5: Answers which evaluate the source as in L4 but argue that the source is useful by evaluating Raja Abdullah’s purpose in context. [6]</p> <p>The source is useful to a large extent in helping me understand the reason behind British intervention in Perak. The letter provided the British with a formal invitation to intervene in Perak. In his letter, Raja Abdullah appealed to the British for help to restore order and governance in Perak. He expressed a desire to place Perak under British protection and requested the appointment of a British official to advise him on administrative matters. The purpose of the source was motivated by his own personal ambition, to claim the throne in Perak. To secure his position, bring order to his state and to leverage on British support.</p>	
---	--	--

1d	<p>Study Source E.</p> <p>Why do you think the journal article was published? Explain your answer.</p> <p>L1: Describe the source without addressing the reason [1] The journal article was written by a Malay historian</p> <p>L2: Answers which misinterpreted the source [2] The source was published to show that the British were keen to extend their influence over the Malay states, to bring order to the states.</p> <p>L3: Answers based on the content of the source but not explained. [3] The source was published to criticise the British for intervening in the Malay states to secure their own economic interest.</p> <p>L4: Answers which shows clear understanding and explains the main message. Award 4 marks for one element of the main message, and 5 marks for two elements of the main message.</p> <p>The source was published to criticise the British for intervening in the Malay states to secure their own economic interest. The source claims that British intervention in the Malay states was to secure their own economic stakes. This can be seen from, "It is essential to reiterate that there had never been a genuine 'civil war' or 'anarchy' among the Perak Malays in the 1870s until the involvement of external parties, which had ulterior motives." This shows that the British portrayed the local governance of the Malay rulers as chaotic and ineffective, using this narrative to justify their intervention. However, the source argues that this depiction was exaggerated to legitimize British colonial ambitions.</p>	5
----	--	---

e	<p>Study all sources.</p> <p>'British intervention in the Malay states was to protect their own interest.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>L1: Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use [1]</p> <p>L2: Yes or No, supported by valid source use [2-4] (Award 1 mark for each source use up to a maximum of 4 marks)</p> <p>L3: Yes and No, supported by valid source use [5-8] (Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks.)</p> <p>Eg Source A does not support the view – white men burden</p> <p>Eg Source C does not support the view – for humanitarian reasons/white men's burden.</p> <p>Source C does not support the view. It states, “ The duty was imperative from motives of humanity alone..” This shows that Swettenham believed that the British as the dominant power has the duty to put a stop to the messy affairs in the Malay states and save the locals from themselves. Hence, the source does not support the view as it shows that British intervention in the Malay states was motivated by a sense of duty being the more superior race and not because of their own self-interest.</p> <p>Eg Source D does not support the view – intervene because was asked to bring order to Perak.</p> <p>Eg Source F does not support the view – British intervened because invited by the Straits community to intervene to bring order to the Malay states.</p> <p>Eg Source B supports the view – fear of other European powers from coming into the Malay states, hence it was to protect their own selfish interest. This can be seen from, “However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states.” There was this fear that if the British government refused to intervene, some other foreign power might do so and hence have control of the Malay states. Hence, the source supports the view that British intervention was to protect their own interest.</p> <p>Eg Source E supports the view - British intervention in Perak was primarily driven by economic and strategic interests.</p> <p>Bonus of two marks (ie +1, +1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc but the total for the question must not exceed 8.</p>	8
---	---	---

Answers to Sections B : Essays

2	'The main reason for the extension of French influence into Vietnam was because of the economic gains.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes but without focus on the question. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Eg French extended their influence into Vietnam because of economic gains, and also for the prestige of their country and also to civilize the Vietnamese.	1-3
L2	Explain the given factor OR Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of a factor OR explanation of other factor(s) and an additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	Explain the given factor AND other factor(s) <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of a factor AND an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 mark.</i> Eg The French extended their influence into Vietnam because of the economic gains that they stood to gain from Vietnam. In Europe, there was an increase in the demand for raw materials and cash crops due to the intensification of the Industrial Revolution after the mid 1850s. Vietnam had valuable mineral resources eg zinc, tin and coal. These raw materials were needed for the manufacturing French goods, Beyond raw materials, Vietnam also offered the possibility of trade opportunities. The French hoped to gain access to China via Vietnam. Vietnam's rich resources and trading opportunities would generate more economic gains for France and made the French want to extend their control in Vietnam. AND Eg The French also wanted to extend their influence in Vietnam because of fear of competition from other European powers. Britain had been France's key competitor for territories in SEA. The British occupied Burma and the Malay states. The French became concerned that the British would try to gain access to China through Burma and	6-8

	<p>possibly expand their control into Siam. The French hoped to extend their control into Vietnam and explore alternative trading route into China. Hence, fear that other European powers like Britain would beat them to it pushed the French to extend their influence into Vietnam.</p> <p>Can also accept</p> <p>The French also extended their influence into Vietnam to restore the prestige of France after their defeat in the Franco-Prussian War.</p> <p>The French also extended their influence into Vietnam because of their belief in the 'civilising mission'.</p> <p><i>(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 the different factors.)</i></p> <p><i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks : ie L3/6 +2; L3/8 + 2</i></p>	
--	---	--

3	'The Treaty of Versailles was an unfair treaty.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes but without focus on the question. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Eg The TOV was a unfair treaty because of the harsh reparation sum, the strict military restrictions and the territorial losses imposed on Germany by the Allied Powers.	1-3
L2	Explain the given factor OR Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of a factor OR explanation of other factor(s) and an additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	Explain the given factor AND Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given factor AND an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 mark.</i> Eg The TOV was an unfair treaty. It was an unfair treaty because of the War Guilt Clause. Under Article of 231 of the TOV, Germany had to accept total blame for starting the war. This clause placed full responsibility for World War I on Germany and with it the huge reparation sum, the strict military restrictions and the vast territorial loses that Germany had to accept. The Germans found the treaty unfair as the causes of the war were complex and not solely Germany's fault. It was a complex system of alliance that brought about the war and Germany should not be made to bear the full responsibility for the war. The TOV was an unfair treaty because the Germans were not represented at the Versailles. The terms of the treaty were decided by the Allied powers and were announced to the Germans. The Germans were not part of the negotiation, and they were forced to sign the treaty or face an invasion within 24 hours. The Germans felt that it was unfair and they should have been represented at the Paris Peace Conference as they were not defeated at World War 1, they chose to stop fighting. Hence, the Germans felt that the treaty was unfair, and they should be given the opportunity to be part of the negotiation and should not be forced to sign the treaty. The TOV was an unfair treaty as the military terms of the treaty were harsh. The German forces had to be reduced to well below the pre-war levels. The army was limited to 100,000 men, Conscription was banned.	6-8

There was to be no armoured vehicles, submarines or aircrafts. The navy could only have 6 battleships. Rhineland was to be demilitarized. The Germans felt that the TOV was unfair as no other members of the Allied Powers were disarmed to the same extent and the German military was so severely limited leaving the country very vulnerable to outside attacks.

Can also accept, explain TOV unfair because of the reparation sum or the territorial losses.

AND

The Treaty of Versailles was not unfair. The treaty which the Germans imposed on Russia when Russia wanted to get out of World War One was even harsher. When the Russians wanted to leave World War One, the Germans imposed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on Russia. Under the treaty, the Russians were forced to give the Germans large areas of prime agricultural land, industrial areas and much of its coal mines. It also lost a third of its population and resources such as oil and iron stores. In addition, Russia was required to pay 6 billion marks in reparation to the Germans. Hence, the Treaty of Versailles was not entirely unfair to the German when we look at the terms Germany imposed on the Russians.

The Treaty of Versailles was not unfair. Some terms were not unfair. The return of Alsace-Lorraine to France was not an unfair term as the territory belonged to France. Alsace-Lorraine was given to Germany after the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussia War, The return of Alsace-Lorraine to France was seen as a fair term as it was seen as restoring the territory to the rightful owner. The setting up of the League of Nations, an international body to help countries resolve disputes, was also seen as a not an unfair term. Unlike the other terms, the set up of the League was constructive, offering hope for future peace. It was a term was seen as fair and was a positive term of the Treaty of Versailles for Germany. Hence, not all the terms of the TOV was unfair.

(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 the different factors.)

The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks : ie L3/6 +2; L3/8 + 2

4	'The main cause of Japan's expansionist policy in the 1930s was because of the failure of the League of Nations.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes but without focus on the question. Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more. Japan embarked on her expansionist policy in the 1930s because of the failure of the League of Nations, the economic problems that Japan faced and the unfair attitude of the Western Powers towards Japan.	1-3
L2	Explain the given factor OR Explain 2 other factors Award 4 marks for an explanation of a factor OR explanation of other factor(s) and an additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.	4-5
L3	Explain the given factor AND Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given factor AND an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 mark</i> Japan embarked on the expansionist policy in the 1930s because of the failure of the League of Nations. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, China appealed to the League of Nations for support. The League took no immediate actions to stop Japan. It set up the Lytton Commission to look into China's appeal. A year later, the Lytton Report was presented. It was clear that Japan had acted unlawfully and Manchuria should be returned to China. The Lytton Commission condemned Japan's action and demanded that Japan withdraw from Manchuria. However, instead of withdrawing from Manchuria, Japan announced that they intended to occupy more of China. Japan rejected the Lytton Report and resigned from the League. The League's slow response and the failure to impose sanctions to punish Japan's aggression further emboldened Japan and encouraged the country to pursue its expansionist policy in SEA. AND Japan embarked on the expansionist policy in the 1930s also because of her economic problems. In the 1930s, Japan faced economic problems which were worsened by the Great Depression. Her shrinking export markets crumbled under rising protectionism during the period of the Depression years, triggering widespread unemployment,	6-8

particularly in rural Japan. Japan also lacked essential raw materials such as oil, iron ore, coal, and rubber for her growing industries. These resources were critical for sustaining both Japan's economy and military ambitions. Japan needed to find the raw materials that her industries needed and the markets for her finished products. The invasion of resource-rich Manchuria in 1931 gave Japan access to coal and iron. Hence, Japan saw the expansionist policy was the only viable path to economic survival. It would give her the raw materials and the markets that she badly needed.

Japan also embarked on her expansionist policy because of the unfair attitude of the European powers. Western powers discrimination against her which fuelled Japan's ambitions to build an empire to rival the West. Eg the ratio decided at the Washington Naval Treaty was seen by the Japanese as discriminatory and unfair. Britain's criticism of Japan's invasion of Manchuria seemed hypocritical considering the many colonies that the British had established throughout Asia. All of these were seen as Western powers' unfair attitude towards the Japanese and were used by the militarists to push for an expansionist policy in the 1930s.

Can also accept :

Japan also embarked on her expansionist policy because of the rise of militarism in Japan.

Japan also embarked on her expansionist policy because she wanted to be recognised as a world power.

(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 the different factors.)

The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks : ie L3/6 +2; L3/8 + 2