

Name:		Index Number:		Class:	
--------------	--	----------------------	--	---------------	--

Preliminary Examination Secondary 4 (O-Level Programme)

HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1: Extension of European control in Southeast Asia and challenges to European dominance, 1870s-1942

27 August 2025

1 hr 50 mins

Additional Materials: Answer Booklets

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black pen.

You may use a soft pencil for any rough working.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

DO NOT WRITE ON THE MARGINS.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **two** questions.

Write all answers on the Answer Booklets provided.

For examiner's use only:

Section A	/ 30 m
Section B	/ 20 m
Total	/ 50 marks

At the end of the examination, submit Section A and B separately.

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

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

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

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you to answer the questions, in addition to those sources you are 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.

Are you surprised by what Gladstone says? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How similar are the sources? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Source D.

What can you learn from this source about British intervention in the Malay States? Explain your answer. [5]

(d) Study Sources E and F.

How far does what Carnarvon say in Source F prove what Jervois says in Source E wrong? Explain your answer. [6]

(e) Study all sources.

'The British intervened in the Malay States for self-interest'. How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Did the British intervene in the Malay States for self-interest?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

Prior to 1874 the British followed their policy of non-intervention in the Malay States as their interests in these states were commercial and not political. However, by the early 1870s, the political climate was changing in Britain and Europe, where the British saw other European powers seeking foreign colonies especially in Southeast Asia not only for economic but also political objectives. In Malaya, particularly Perak, there was civil unrest that not only made her vulnerable to foreign intervention but also disrupted the very lucrative tin trade and investments there. In the meantime, Sultan Abdullah of Perak appealed to the British for help.

Was British intervention in the Malay States for self-interest or based on the interest of the locals?

Source A: *From a speech by the British Prime Minister, Gladstone, to party members on his government policy with the Malay States, 1872.*

In the early 1870s, the accelerated pace of industrial development in Britain and Europe increased the competition for foreign markets and raw materials. British business in Southeast Asia flourished in the trade boom which followed the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. This is regardless of the possible checks and trade barriers which might result from the expansion of interests from other foreign powers in Southeast Asia, especially the Malay Peninsula. The British government is not alarmed by this, and we are still not in favour of annexation of territory or the imposition of direct rule because we believe more in free trade and economic benefits which is more profitable as compared to acquiring territories and colonies as they would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy.

Source B: *Comments made by Lord Kimberley, British Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the members of British Parliament, 1873.*

It is the duty forced upon the British, as the dominant power, to interfere in the Malay States and put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs. The present state of affairs in the Malay Peninsula is that the richest part of it is in the hands of lawlessness and the turbulent. It is for humanitarian reasons alone that we have to intervene; and though it would be highly beneficial to British interest and British trade, this cannot be the primary reason. It is therefore our hope to save the Malays from themselves and give them the blessings of peace and justice.

Source C: *A Malay historian, writing in 1982 about British action in Perak.*

In the official version of the story, the British heroically intervened in the Chinese dispute at the request of Sultan Abdullah. The rich tin mines of the district of Larut had attracted large numbers of Chinese, whose rival factions were fighting with one another, creating much chaos. Hence, according to the British, the purpose of expansion was to protect and advance the sovereign Malay rulers and their people. This then was the official myth which was to legitimize British interest, expansion and rule right up until *Merdeka in 1957. The truth of the matter was that the British began to follow a policy of Imperialism from 1873 onwards. Thus, the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays. Consequently, this led to the establishment of the Residential system, which was meant to be indirect rule, but in practice, became direct rule in order for the British to fulfil its primary goals.

*Merdeka- independence

Source D: *A description of how the situation in Larut, Perak, led to a petition from the Chinese merchants in Singapore to London in March 1873.*

In the autumn of 1872, the Ghee Hins who had been expelled, and had spent their time in warlike preparations against the Hai Sans, made an effort to regain their position. Arms and ammunition were sent up the Larut River, and at last a desperate attack was made upon the Hai San's for the possession of the mines. Soon, some of the Malay chiefs became involved in this dispute. Moreover, many a times, robbery, murder or any other crimes committed in these places were not investigated and the offenders in most cases escaped punishment. Subsequently, the Straits merchants and the British traders had asked the British to intervene on their behalf.

Source E: *From a report by Sir William Jervois, Governor of the Straits Settlements, to the Earl of Carnarvon, British Colonial Secretary, 10 Feb 1876.*

Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request, it has been found from the very start that such a course has been impossible. There has been no ruler, neither in Perak, Selangor or Sungei Ujong, in each of which states we have had Residents, who has had the power to carry out the advice of the Resident. Under these circumstances the Resident has not only had to give advice but also to render active assistance and take the control of public affairs. When I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned, and I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here.

Source F: *Carnarvon's reply to Jervois' report, 20 May 1876.*

The essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers who would advise and assist them in the governance of the country. It was no doubt expected that such an officer would exercise a very great influence in the country, but the position a Resident was to occupy would be very different from that of a Controller. I am by no means prepared to admit the correctness of your statement that the Pangkor Engagement virtually threw the government of the country into the hands of the Resident. You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of the advice, was really one of direct or actual government.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2** 'The main reason why the Vietnamese were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was due to the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers.' How far do you agree with this statement. Explain your answer. [10]
- 3** 'The greatest injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 4** 'Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

-- End of Paper --

Copyright Acknowledgments

Source A	© Lennox A Mills; <i>Malaya: A Political and Economic Appraisal</i> ; University of Minnesota Press; 1907.
Source B	© Source B: McIntyre W.D. (1967) Intervention in the Malay States, 1871–3. In: <i>The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics, 1865–75</i> . Palgrave Macmillan, London
Source C	© http://asokan63.blogspot.sg/2010/09/hartal-untold-merdeka-story-hartal.html .
Source D	© Donna J Amoroso: <i>Traditionalism and the Ascendancy of the Malay Ruling Class in Malaya</i> ; NUS Press; 2014.
Source E	© Internet Archive https://archive.org/download/britishmalayaac00swet
Source F	© Internet Archive https://archive.org/download/britishmalayaac00swet

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared
clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.