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| **Part 1: How colonial SG displaced Dutch Batavia as Chief Hub in the Malay world** | | | |
| **Advantageous Location**  **(Common short duree mistakes)** | **Ext Trends Including**  **London’s + EIC’s Powers & Policies** | **Founders’ Efforts: Raffles, Farquhar, Crawfurd, Tengku Hussein, Temenggong Abdul Rahman** | **Trading Networks:**  **Including British Country Traders but not EIC** |
| 1. Natural sheltered harbor  - SG River. *Very common in Malay world + SG River actually very small compared to rival harbours (e.g. Batavia)*  2. On shortest East-West sea route  - Melaka Straits shorter than Sunda Straits route  *Many former hubs on the same route + Dutch discovered Batavia could be accessed all year round. Johor and SG seasonally accessible*  3. Where monsoon winds meet  - NE Monsoon brings Chinese traders, SE monsoon from Eastern Malay archipelago and SW Monsoon from India and beyond. All meet here but at different months of the year. Goods need storage/middlemen while awaiting customers from other zones  *Describes entire Malay world, not SG*  4. Surrounded by resource-rich hinterland (centrality)  Does not matter if island has few resources as long as can get access to them  *Resource-rich territories have sheltered harbours too.*  # Fixed shared factors can never explain dynamic divergent outcomes  # Without correlation, there is no causation: Look for changes that coincide with the replacement of one hub with another | 1. All displacement of hubs begin with decisive shifts in global trends. Pax Britannica vs decline of Dutch ever since Napoleonic Wars. Br empire biggest in world history  - Raffles worked for EIC and traders depended on Br global network to make colonial SG more successful than Dutch Batavia  2. Free trade result of selfish collusion between traders and founders in colonial SG. Cannot possibly become EIC or empire policy as expenses must be supported by revenue.  - Dutch and future threats dared not overrun poorly-fortified SG because of superior Royal Navy but traders refused to pay for protection they needed. British power opened up China’s economy and “encouraged” many Chinese to migrate to Malay world. Free Trade in SG meant rest of empire paid expenses for colonial SG’s success!  3. Vice-funding promotes crime and disorder, not stability and security needed for thriving hub. Traders were exploiters, not protectors of their own people. Community leaders by day, pirates and secret society leaders by night! Only with implementation of Chinese Protectorate and proper law courts long after founders gone was situation brought under control.  4. Favourable trends (e.g. steamships, Suez Canal) would have benefitted other hubs equally if not more, but colonial SG belonged to the biggest, best-protected empire with the most extensive networks. | 1. Empire policy was to support Dutch monopoly in Malay world (ally against Fr in Europe). EIC monopoly, not free trade company. Free trade was key reason why traders left established dominant hub at Batavia for colonial SG. Otherwise, they work for rivals!  - Founders’ initiatives changed Br policies so its power began to work for SG instead of Batavia (game changers)  2. EIC refused to authorize expenditure to build up infrastructure in SG. How to make money without spending it first, especially when free trade required to unseat Dutch Batavia?  - Farquhar sold licenses for opium dens, gambling dens, liquor, prostitution etc. revenue without tax! John Crawfurd’s creative accounting along similar lines allowed reclamation of swamps on southern shore of SG river. Initiative, not rules made colonial SG more strategic than Dutch Batavia!  3. Malay rajas had been waiting for opportunities to work with Br. Came with Raffles and co., not before. Provided legitimacy without which colonial SG could not get started. Founders gave colonial SG first-mover advantage over all future rivals, especially Free Trade, open trade and open migration. Why else would SG benefit more than older Br colonies like Bencoolen and Penang? Legacy outlived founders’ lives!  4. Founders not new to colonies and hubs and knew things would work out themselves over time. Local communities preferred to be led by their own leaders. The empire and traders will solve all initial problems BUT they will do so in colonial SG and not elsewhere because of founders’ initiatives! | 1. Governments spend money, traders make money, but politicians better at writing glorious histories and taking credit. Traders take risks w/o recourse to government compensation should anything go wrong. Trading networks have been around long before rise of Br Empire of coming of Raffles and founders  2. Traders came to SG BEFORE Anglo-Dutch Treaty made colonial SG secure. Knew Raffles’ and co. playing dangerous game but backed their initiative and turned gamble into sustainable success. Risked everything and helped build infrastructure (warehouses, hospitals, shops) at own expense to make SG so successful Br could not give it up. Country traders lobbied parliament and got public opinion behind efforts to keep SG. I.E. traders do not just trade in colonial SG  3. Networks built up by traders, not empire. Cut across lines and borders drawn up by European powers. Bugis and Chinese (especially Peranakan) middlemen continued to extend networks (e.g. marry daughters of local chiefs, extend interest-free loans in exchange for guaranteed supply of commodities) in Dutch zone  4. Leaders of trading communities took care of the people, not the government. Raffles “absent father”!  5. Law and order only achieved with help of Malay chiefs and Chinese towkays (many Justices of the Peace) |

**Part II:** For cartoon analysis, begin with general apparent picture but move on to acute observations and telling conclusions few can see to score.

Cartoon shows colonial SG was a crowded trading settlement centered initially along the banks of the SG River at the foot of Fort Canning Hill (Forbidden Hill where Temasek’s Malay Kings were supposedly buried). A very wide variety of commodities and communities were available here (anyone notice the probably-Jewish man on the right?).

As with Raffles’ Town Plan, the settlement was organized along ethnic and sub-ethnic lines with the Chinese on the Southern bank of the River, the Europeans in the centre (occupying high ground as well) and the Muslim communities concentrated in the East (right side).

However, Morgan Chua did not just draw a stereotypical image of colonial SG based on Furnivall’s ideas that emphasized cultural distinctions. Commodities originating form community homelands were of course ethnically organized, but consumption cut across such lines. The Chinese stallholder and the Arab carpet vendor were not selling to their own countrymen! The Peranakan translator was accosting a European, dressed like a colonial official. He was proof that cultures hybridized across ethnic lines over time in Malay world port cities. Already fluent in Malay and Chinese dialects, many would acquire a British education for their children and become successful middlemen able to cross cultural boundaries. The Chinese towkay on the right employed a Malay servant. An Indian labour and a Sikh, likely a policeman were in the Chinese quarter of the settlement. This is therefore a profound cartoon that acknowledges both distinctions and exchanges between communities found in typical Malay world colonial cities.

The playful UOB logo in the centre can be misleading if one did not know colonial history well. There were no Chinese banks at this time, so Chinese businessmen got their loans from Indian chettiars.

**Was this a continuation or a new beginning in SG’s history in the *longue duree*?**

Archival accounts (e.g. *Sejarah Melayu*) backed up by archaeological digs suggest 14th century Temasek to be bustling, zoned and well-organized too. However, Wang Dayuan’s *Daoyi Zhilue* recorded that the Malay Bendahara (roughly Prime Minister) instructed the locals to live amongst the Chinese immigrant community, so Temasek might have been organized according to function (artifacts recovered showed commercial, warehouse, artisan and royal precincts) rather than ethnicity. The SG River was also the main avenue of trade while the ruler also commanded the high ground (Forbidden Hill). There would have been no Europeans in Temasek and probably less variety of people and goods. The *lingua franca* would probably have been the same (*Bazaar Melayu*) despite the fact that colonial SG was a British-ruled, Chinese majority port city.

We did not discuss this in class, but consider whether British rule and a migrant majority were decisive breaks with the past (can use for CA2). Is this a subjective question of perspective (e.g. what ethnicity you belong to) or an objective issue based on a good command of the facts?