

Question 1. Marking Notes

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES (1-5)
These answers will be about David Marshall, but will ignore the question i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Include in this level answers which give information taken from the sources, but only in producing an account of the events, rather than testing the hypothesis.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (6-8)
These answers use the sources as information rather than evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.
e.g. Yes, as Source A says, he was new to politics. Or No, Source B shows how much the British disliked him.

L3 USES INFORMATION FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (9-13)
These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm or challenge it. However, sources are still used at face value.
e.g. There is evidence for and against the view that it was Marshall's political inexperience which caused the failure of the talks. Source A describes him as 'temperamentally unsuited' to lead a minority government, though on the other hand Source E makes it clear that the talks failed on a major issue: internal security.

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (14-16)
These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.
e.g. I don't think that Marshall was to blame. Source E makes it clear that the British government would not yield over internal security. Within the context of the time, and given the threat of Communism in South-East Asia, Marshall's demands were unrealistic.

L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS (17-21)
These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and challenge the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and challenge are done at this level).
e.g. However some of the sources do suggest that Marshall's political inexperience did play a part. For instance, Source E raises the question of his lack of judgement in not accepting the majority view of the delegation that he should accept the British terms. But is the writer simply wishing to underline his own astuteness? or was it, as Source B suggests, that he was too much of a gentleman to abandon the clear wish of the Legislative Assembly as expressed in Source E. Again, Lennox-Boyd's dislike of Marshall may well have played a part - his reference to his 'almost psychopathic personality' in Source D.

L6 AS L5 PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. (22-25)

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for challenging supporting is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why other evidence is worse. For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it e.g. argues that while Marshall's political inexperience was partly to blame for the failure of the talks, other factors such as the pressure exerted by the PAP also played a part.

ADVANCED LEVEL HISTORY: MARKING BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which marking band best reflects the quality of the answer. They should not expect answers to show all the qualities included within the band description. The choice of mark within the band will depend on the quality of the analysis and the amount of supporting information. Essays in Bands 1-3 will clearly be question-focused, whereas answers in lower bands will show a primary concern with the topic rather than with the specific question asked. However, a question focus is not sufficient in itself to place an essay in Bands 1-3; this must also be accompanied by sufficient accurate, relevant supporting material.

Band **Marks** **Quality of the answer**

- | | | |
|---|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 21-25 | <i>The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections to the answer, but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must achieve 25 marks.</i> |
| 2 | 18-20 | <i>Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided. The writing will be mostly accurate.</i> |
| 3 | 16-17 | <i>Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question, and constitute a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation, but there may be some heavily narrative or descriptive passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance or depth of factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing will be generally accurate.</i> |
| 4 | 14-15 | <i>Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly, though often only implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing will usually be accurate.</i> |
| 5 | 11-13 | <i>Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the demands of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced. The writing may show some accuracy but there will also be frequent errors.</i> |
| 6 | 8-10 | <i>Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries which lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question. The writing will show significant weaknesses.</i> |
| 7 | 0-7 | <i>Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments which do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. The writing will show very significant weakness. Marks at the bottom of this band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.</i> |

2 Answers to this question may draw on the history of several SE countries to illustrate the justice (or otherwise) of this assertion.

i) One familiar line will turn upon the shading off of indirect rule into direct rule in the historical experience of Malaya, running from 1874 to Federation in 1958, to the further encroachments brought about by the 1909 Treaty and the incorporation of the Northern Malay States and the consequent declining power of the traditional authorities.

ii) The contrasting experience of Burma and Thailand: in Burma, the replacement of all traditional authorities - monarch, local headmen, Buddhist monks - by direct rule. In Thailand, an example of indirect rule within a nominally independent state, although some territory was lost, she emerged with her ethnic heartlands intact and unequal treaties cancelled or modified.

iii) In Indonesia, indirect rule was generally maintained but the educational/welfare policies of the Ethical Policy were increasingly intrusive; however, it was a period of great expansion, eg. into Outer Islands and included the annexation of Aceh at the end of a long war.

3 This question gives candidates an opportunity to consider evidence of the impact of colonialism on the region as a whole.

Answers may well identify beneficial results such as:

i) social and political improvement: end of debt slavery, head-hunting, local wars, restriction of power of tyrannical rulers

ii) economic development: massive increase in food production eg. rice in Lower Burma and Indonesia; new crops eg. rubber in Malaya and in Indonesia; improvement in communications; imports of consumer goods; setting-up of health and welfare facilities and consequential increase in populations

iii) efficient, impartial administration established

iv) development of education but varying from English-style public schools for aristocracy in Malaya to wider opportunities in Indonesia and Philippines

v) establishment of a common language eg. Philippines

vi) political borders of post-colonial states replaced patchwork of local rulers and sultanates eg. Indonesia; Malaya

as against that:

i) oppressiveness of European rule: eg. Vietnam, Indonesia

ii) effect on native producers - Burma, Indonesia

iii) loss of cultural heritage eg. Burma

iv) entrenchment of ruling elites eg. Philippines, Thailand

v) effects of immigration on existing societies - Burma, Malaya

vi) racial superiority assumed by European rulers sometimes with explicit racism

4 One fundamental reason for the differing strength of nationalist movements in S E Asian countries can be found in the nature of imperialist control which ran from the relaxed attitude of the British to the severity of the French where in Vietnam the execution of nationalists or communists was not uncommon. Again, another must lie in the strength of the pre-existing institutions: in Malaya, for instance, the traditional authorities and the Muslim religion both militated against major political change; in Vietnam, the mandarin class were unwilling to abandon their customary roles and participate in political activity. However in Java, where the Dutch had long since displaced the traditional rulers, Islam became a political force. In Burma, the dissolution of the monarchy and the replacement of existing institutions allowed the emergence of new political movements, first grouped around Buddhism or displaced peasants, and then, in the 30s, focussing on the new political institutions put in place by the British. Some candidates may choose to examine the democratic structures established in the Philippines by the Americans (with the stated intent of handing over power to the Filipinos) and contrast the situation there with the autocracy of Thailand, still governed by traditional elites. In both Indonesia and Vietnam, the communist party emerged as a nationalist force to challenge the ruling power. In Java and Sumatra, it was crushed after the abortive rising of 1926/7. In Vietnam, during this period it remained the preserve of a metropolitan-educated class and lacked any mass support.

5 This question enables candidates to compare the varying response to the Japanese occupation in differing parts of the region. In particular, there may well be an assessment of the attractiveness of Japan's promise of 'Asia for the Asians', with the removal of European overlordship and the new economic opportunities offered by the 'Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere' which promised to bring Southeast Asia countries a greater stake in the region's wealth, together with membership of a major economic community.

Candidates are likely to consider the contrast between, say, the resistance offered by the Malayan Chinese in the MPAJA or by the Vietminh in Vietnam and the active collaboration of the Indonesian leaders or of Aung San in Burma. Another line which candidates may explore is the co-operation offered by Thailand or by the Filipino elite. The general tactic employed by the Japanese was to win 'hearts and minds' by advancing local staff to the higher posts vacated by imprisoned or refugee Europeans, fostering local languages and by encouraging nationalist movements with the ultimate prospect of self-government, albeit limited, within the Japanese sphere of influence. Burma, for instance, was given independence in 1943.

Again, in some Southeast Asian countries such as the Philippines or Thailand, the ruling elites remained loyal to Japan throughout most of the occupation - rewarded in the case of Thailand by territory belonging to British Malaya and French Indo-China and in the Philippines by the grant of nominal independence in 1943. In others, resistance grew or developed as the promised prosperity failed to materialise, frustrated by Japan's loss of sea power, the consequent blockade and the collapse of trade. This, coupled with Japan's disregard of local sensibilities eg by its cult of the emperor, rapidly soured her relations with the indigenous populations. Despite 'independence' in 1943, Burma changed sides in 1944; Indonesians prepared for independence; the Huk in the Philippines mounted an effective resistance movement and won support for a social revolution there.

Good candidates may try to assess how far ethnic conflicts (eg Malays and Chinese, or Burmans and Karens) affected the local response to the Japanese rather than the changing fortunes of war or the heavy-handedness of the occupier.

6 This question calls for a discussion of the 'new imperialism' of the immediate post-WW2 years when all colonial powers -with the exception of America in the Philippines - prepared for a renewal of their imperial mission. However, the war years had modified imperial ambitions and the restoration of the colonial yoke was linked with the promise of varying degrees of local autonomy. Candidates are being asked to consider how and why this new imperialism failed to take hold.

Answers are likely to focus on:

i) the re-assertion of Dutch power in Indonesia, which led to confrontation with Indonesian nationalists and which ended only after international pressure from the UN, India and the USA

ii) the British blue-print for Burma which was so quickly abandoned.

iii) the British plan for Malaya with the short-lived Malayan Union proposals, the rise of Malayan political parties and eventual independence

iv) the return of the French to Vietnam leading to a prolonged and tragic conflict.

v) As a counter to the general theme, candidates may well instance American policy in the Philippines which by granting independence in 1946 aimed at retaining Manila within her informal empire.

Good candidates may well also wish to consider why the USA pushed Holland towards decolonisation but gave tacit support (and eventually military aid) to the French in Vietnam.

7 Of the three broad aims which independent Southeast Asian states set themselves: economic growth, the fostering of nationalism, and 'equity', the last was the most difficult to define (or achieve). At the minimum, it could be defined as a right to survive. How this right was interpreted varied enormously. Occasional reference was made to 'basic human needs', which in turn was defined as the right to education, employment, health care, and a 'decent' standard of living. Universal free elementary education and the principle of medical care for all were accepted as regional goals but did 'equity' go much beyond that? One major inequality was the gap between rich and poor, reflected in all states in the ownership of land. However, only in the socialist states was this inequality addressed: in Vietnam, land reform and nationalisation removed major inequalities; in Burma, a less comprehensive land reform produced a more equitable sharing of the national wealth. Elsewhere, for instance in Thailand, no redistribution took place and the traditional elites remained in power with wealth still in the same hands.

A different inequality was reflected in the contrast between urban and rural incomes. In Bangkok, urban incomes were three times higher than rural. Similar disparities existed elsewhere - eg. in Philippines. Ethnic differences: in Malaya between Chinese and Malays; positive action by government to correct 'imbalance'.

Gender gap: widened in rural majority; in towns increased opportunities for women in service industries and government employment; average wage of women still below those of men even in Singapore

In general, the rich got richer in capitalist SEA; in Asean countries 30% living in poverty in mid-1970s; near 60% in Indonesia

The major improvements were in education (primary school enrolments approaching 100%; adult literacy rates climbed to 80%) and in life expectancy - 70 in Singapore and Brunei, rather less elsewhere

8 This question requires candidates to discuss and assess the significance of two, often related, pressures which affected SEA states. Candidates may wish to consider in particular the Emergency in Malaya and the liberation movement in Vietnam - and the consequences for each state: the defeat of the communist insurrection, and independence in Malaya; in Vietnam, a prolonged and bitter colonial war. Again, good candidates may seek to show how the onset of the cold war - and the Communist victory in China in 1949 - impinged on SEA: in Vietnam, for instance, where America abandoned its anti-colonialism and gave support to the colonial power before eventually replacing the French; the pressure to establish a regional pact (SEATO) as a SEA equivalent to NATO. The impact on Thailand and the Philippines of economic and military aid from USA: the role of Thailand as an American base during the Vietnam war and as the headquarters of SEATO. There should be some discussion of Soviet and Chinese involvement in Indo-China: the significance of the American drive to create a communist-free zone in SEA; under pressure from the USA, the removal of the communist threat became a major priority of SEA regimes: in the Philippines, in Indonesia, in Malaya and Singapore: the change in American policy with Sino-American rapprochement in 1971/2. Despite American fears of the Soviet Union and China, overt super-power rivalry never really developed in a SEA context. However, SEA states tried to distance themselves from the implicit dangers of this rivalry first by Bandung (1955) and then by the creation of their own regional pact, ASEAN. Established in 1967, its aim was to reduce the threat of communism by social and economic improvement. Its stated aims were: 'to accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region'