“Small strategic hubs naturally welcomed the influence of global economic and military powers, whereas larger/established kingdoms were less welcoming due to concerns over possible interference in regional affairs.” How convincing is this claim given your knowledge of Malay world entanglements with global powers from the rise of Palembang to the dominance of Dutch Batavia?

**1)**  Palembang’s rise to dominance was underpinned by privilleged relations with Tang China

True

False

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Answer :** | True |
| **Correct Answer :** | True |
| **Your Marks :** | 1 out of 1 |

**2)**  Srivijaya started to lose its dominance over the Malay world after (Tutorial 2, lecture 3 full version slide 39)

Sung China progressively liberalized trade practices

Chola India raided its ports

Small rival hubs gained direct access to Chinese trade

Tang China withdrew its direct military support

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Answer :** | Sung China progressively liberalized trade practices  Chola India raided its ports  Small rival hubs gained direct access to Chinese trade |
| **Feedback For Your Answer :** | This eroded its economic dominance and allowed rival hubs to grow in power, strength and size |
| **Correct Answer :** | Sung China progressively liberalized trade practices  Chola India raided its ports  Small rival hubs gained direct access to Chinese trade |
| **Solution :** | Can you see why dominant or established kingdoms might not welcome global power influence? |
| **Your Marks :** | 1 out of 1 |

**3)**  15th century Melaka (Tutorial 2, lecture 3 full version slide 41)

suffered because of Ming China’s restricted official trade regime

would have outcompeted Temasek because of its superior location

could not grow into a great kingdom as long as it relied on Zheng He’s naval protection

thrived despite the threat of larger Siamese and Javanese kingdoms because of Ming China’s policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Answer :** | thrived despite the threat of larger Siamese and Javanese kingdoms because of Ming China’s policies |
| **Correct Answer :** | thrived despite the threat of larger Siamese and Javanese kingdoms because of Ming China’s policies |
| **Solution :** | Can you see why small strategic locations cannot overturn unfavourable regional setups without countervailing global power influence/interference? |
| **Your Marks :** | 1 out of 1 |

**4)**  The mighty Melaka Sultanate

became safer even after Ming China lost naval interest in it after 1435

flourished as the Portuguese introduced significant European presence into the Malay world

did even better by moving to the less exposed location along the Johor River

lost part of its trade to Aceh as a result of the interference of global military powers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Answer :** | lost part of its trade to Aceh as a result of the interference of global military powers |
| **Feedback For Your Answer :** | Portuguese discrimination against Muslim traders after their conquest of Melaka in 1511 led some to trade with Aceh though others followed their Sultan to Johor |
| **Correct Answer :** | lost part of its trade to Aceh as a result of the interference of global military powers |
| **Solution :** | Notice how some interference can be sorely missed (this requires some hard thinking)? |
| **Your Marks :** | 1 out of 1 |

**5)**  Small strategic locations like Temasek (tutorial 2, lecture 3 full version slides 40-42)

gained from the influence of global powers in Srivijaya’s affairs

suffered from the influence of global powers in Palembang’s rise

gained from the influence of Zheng He’s fleet in regional affairs

suffered because of Yuan China’s trade policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Answer :** | gained from the influence of global powers in Srivijaya’s affairs  suffered from the influence of global powers in Palembang’s rise |
| **Correct Answer :** | gained from the influence of global powers in Srivijaya’s affairs  suffered from the influence of global powers in Palembang’s rise |
| **Solution :** | Do all small strategic hubs always benefit from great power influence? |
| **Your Marks :** | 1 out of 1 |

**6)**  Dutch entry into the Malay world eventually (Tutorial 2, lecture 4 slides 22-32)

benefitted fellow European powers in the region

benefitted established kingdoms like Aceh and Johor

favoured small strategic hubs along the Melaka Straits

benefitted a small strategic hub along the Sunda Straits

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Answer :** | benefitted a small strategic hub along the Sunda Straits |
| **Feedback For Your Answer :** | Batavia |
| **Correct Answer :** | benefitted a small strategic hub along the Sunda Straits |
| **Solution :** | Do all small strategic locations/hubs share the similar fortunes from the interference of the same global power? |
| **Your Marks :** | 1 out of 1 |

**7)**  Optional: Use these questions to crystalize your thoughts and structure your final answer

Which type of Malay world entities generally preffered to preserve/overturn the status-quo?

Is the influence of global powers always beneficial to ALL small strategic locations?

Is such influence always detrminetal to the maintenance of a favourable status-quo?

**8)**  Your final answer must be in full sentences and a properly organized paragraph (or two), not point form. Succinct answers will score more than long rambling ones. Start with your final stance/answer and key criterion before providing a short and sharp evidence perusal to show why your answer is better than all its alternatives. Upload your final answer as a word document (no other format accepted for this CA) to the student submission folder in the workbin. Stick strictly to the maximum 500 word limit.

“Small strategic hubs naturally welcomed the influence of global economic and military powers, whereas larger/established kingdoms were less welcoming due to concerns over possible interference in regional affairs.” How convincing is this claim given your knowledge of Malay world entanglements with global powers from the rise of Palembang to the dominance of Dutch Batavia?

Stance

It is plausible that global influence brought opportunities to small strategic hubs and might induce competition to large kingdoms. However, these impacts might be adverse depending on the interests of external forces.

The argument looks convincing because it can be seen from the cases of the rise of small strategic hubs like Palembang and Melaka and the fall of existed kingdoms like Srivijaya. On the other hand,

Evidence

Small strategic hubs sometimes were harmed by monopolistic power in trade from global powers which led to loss of trade. Temasek only rose after the fall of Srivijaya because Palembang dominated the trade in the region with the military force and monopolistic powers provided by Tang China which restricted the growth of other trading hubs.

Even small hubs might even suffer though they had received benefits from global forces due to the interest of external forces. Portuguese brought trade to Melaka but its discrimination against Muslim traders after their conquest of Melaka in 1511 led some to trade with Aceh though others followed their Sultan to Johor.

Undoubtedly, the fortunes of global powers were not given equally to all small trading hubs. Dutch entered Malay World but only benefitted Dutch Batavia and deliberately left Temasek undeveloped.

Large kingdoms sometimes looked for the military support from global forces to fight against their competitors or enemies in the region. The Johor Sultanate built alliance with Dutch to expel Portuguese and retake Melaka and in the end Portuguese was driven out of the Spice islands.

conclusion

Large global forces with solid military or economic powers often broke the balance of power in the region but their impacts were not absolute. It is necessary to look at both sides and range of impacts of interference before concluding whether it was desired by different forces in the region.

Combined

Global influence brought opportunities to small strategic hubs and might induce competition to large kingdoms. However, these impacts might be adverse depending on the interests of external forces. The argument looks convincing because it could be seen from the rise of small strategic hubs like Palembang and Melaka and the fall of existed kingdoms like Srivijaya. On the other hand, small strategic hubs sometimes were harmed by monopolistic power in trade from global powers. Temasek only rose after the fall of Srivijaya because Palembang dominated the trade in the region with the military force and monopolistic powers provided by Tang China which restricted the growth of other trading hubs. Small hubs might even suffer though they had received benefits from global forces due to the interest of them. Portuguese brought trade to Melaka but its discriminative policies against Muslim traders after their conquest of Melaka resulted in loss of trade to Aceh while others followed their Sultan to Johor. Undoubtedly, the fortunes of global powers were not distributed equally to all small trading hubs. Dutch entered Malay World but only benefitted Dutch Batavia and deliberately left Temasek undeveloped. Besides that, large kingdoms sometimes looked for the military support from global forces to fight against their competitors in the region. The Johor Sultanate built alliance with Dutch to repel Portuguese and retake Melaka. In the end Portuguese was driven out of the Spice islands. Large global forces with solid military or economic capabilities often broke the balance of power in the region but the attitudes of small strategic hubs and large kingdoms towards them were undetermined since the impacts of global forces were changing depending on the period and their interests.