

2. "The driving force behind the development of nationalist movements could be attributed to the political alienation that the locals felt, as a result of colonial rule." How far do you agree with this view?

Tutor's comments:

- Essay requirements:

- o Examine the factors leading to the rise of nationalist movements
 - **Driving force:** External or internal **impetus**? Set something into motion and this has the effect of being sustained. Creation of a momentum. (// to Question in Paper 1: Question 4. "set into motion")
 - Question assumes that it was a reaction against political alienation. Must be able to identify other grievances that became a driving force:
 - Reaction against social dislocation.
 - Reaction against economic exploitation
 - But should also examine other impetus: nationalists who were **INSPIRED** (not just reacting against) by western ideologies and by external events.
 - **Clear end points:** 'development of nationalist movements' in what sense?
 - Development from anti-colonial to nationalist movement?
 - Increase in mass appeal?
 - Development of nationalist movements in terms of their change in aims from cultural to political aims?
 - Development from an exclusive to a more inclusive movement?
- o Better answers will:
 - Have **scope**:
 - Time scope: Examine movements from 1900 - 1940s: Early/'traditional'; Early Modern and Modern phases, with more emphasis on the latter two.
 - Dimensions: Political, economic, social aspects; internal (to colonies) and external (outside of colonies).
 - Establish a relationship between the factors, and to **prioritise + craft an argument**:
 - E.g. Not just reaction against PES grievances, but more importantly, how agents (nationalists) were able to be inspired by ideologies and external events to conceptualise an answer to these grievances. (Agency + context)

Possible points of discussion:

1. **Political alienation** was a driving force behind the development of nationalist movements in terms of provoking the natives to first mobilise themselves against the colonialist in defence of their previous political order (early phase of nationalism - traditional), and subsequently also provided the impetus for the development of nationalist movements from cultural to having more overt political aims (modern movements).
 - Early movements: Vietnam; Burma; Indonesia (where more direct colonial rule provoked natives to mobilise themselves in reaction against political alienation brought about by the new political order under the colonialists)
 - More modern movements: Continued lack of genuine political representation and empowerment, despite some token political concessions (elections in Burma + Volksraad in Indonesia), led to the change in aims of nationalist groups from more cultural to more overtly political aims. E.g. Case studies: Burma (YMBA > GCBA); Indonesia (Sarekat Islam > PNI)
 - More indirect colonial rule (e.g. Malaya - Sultan remained prominent figureheads) tended to mitigate this. Slow development of nationalist movements in Malaya.
2. **Social dislocation** (disruptive changes to way of life + belief systems + social networks), which coincided with earlier forms of nationalistic mobilisation - groups that sought to safeguard cultural integrity of locals, especially in 1910s - 1920s.
 - Groups that were focused on cultural nationalism (e.g. revival of Buddhism / Islam) in reaction to the destabilising social changes introduced by colonial powers. E.g. Burma, Indonesia, Malaya.
3. **Economic exploitation** (extractive industries: selling cash crops to metropolis + wider market; vulnerability to changes in global demand affecting the prices of goods, and the income of farmers; high taxes) as a key rhetoric that increases the relevance of nationalism to the people, led to increased mass appeal of nationalist movements, especially those that were inspired by the Communist rhetoric of exploitation.
 - Rise of more radical movements in the mid 1920s - 1930s that arose as a result of economic grievances: E.g. Indonesia: PKI revolt in 1926; Burma: Saya San Rebellion in 1930 - 1932; Vietnam: ICP May Day Uprising 1930 etc.
 - Lack of economic exploitation of Malays in Malaya may explain the slow development of nationalist movements in Malaya.
4. **Agency of local elites** in being the driving force in the development of nationalist movements; inspired by western ideologies + external events.
 - Conceptualised answers to the above grievances: importance of local elites in adapting western ideologies and applying it to the local context.
 - Siam: Western-educated royalty initiated the nationalist movement of self-strengthening. Inspired by western ideologies and development. Especially inspired by Japan + Germany and their own paths of building up a strong and modern nation-state.

**3. “The international climate, rather than the local situation, was more responsible for the Southeast Asian nationalist movements gaining independence after 1945.”
Assess the validity of this view.**

Tutor's comments:

- Essay requirements:

- o Comparison question that requires the establishment of criterion of comparison when weighing the two sides: external vs. internal. Only essays which have established criteria will be able to access Band 3.
- o International climate: Cold War + Decolonisation
- o Local situation: Willingness of colonial powers to grant independence + strength of nationalist movements/leaders.

- o Better answers will:
 - Have **balance**:
 - Examine both perspectives substantially.

 - Have **scope**:
 - Should be able to bring in impact of Japanese Occupation in contributing to the 'local situation'. Either strengthened the nationalist movements by equipping them with military training and capabilities; or in creating the mass appeal for nationalism, which made them a credible force against the return of colonial powers.

 - Provide a relationship between the two perspectives / establish a **criterion** of comparison between the two perspectives to argue for why one is more valid than another:

Possible points of discussion:

1. Valid: International climate of decolonisation and Cold War context had provided the conducive context for some countries to gain independence.

- Demonstrate that local situation was not conducive (lack of genuine mass participation in politics in Philippines; ethnic disunity in Burma), but that international climate had a more direct impact on whether nationalist movements gained independence.
- E.g. Climate of decolonisation: Favourable positions held by colonial powers (e.g. USA in Philippines + UK in Burma - due to India's earlier independence, and the reduced importance of Burma)
- E.g. Cold War context: allowed others nationalist groups, which were initially struggling to resist the reimposition of colonial rule, to obtain the necessary external support to prevent the reimposition of colonial rule (e.g. US + UN in Indonesia; China and USSR in Vietnam).

2. Not valid: The local situation, rather than the international climate, provided the more pressing considerations that shaped the decisions of the colonial powers. The local situation, with its considerations of unnecessary cost of maintaining colonies, convinced the colonial powers to pull out, and grant independence.

- Partly due to the fact that the nationalist movements were better equipped with military capabilities + had greater mass appeal resulting from JO. E.g. Presence of mass-based nationalist movements which had the ability to pressure their reluctant colonial masters to grant independence (e.g. AFPFL), as Britain, even though it had signed the Atlantic Charter, was reluctant to relinquish its colonies so quickly.
- It was the local situation, which made the prospect of staying on costly, which convinced the colonial masters that they had to pull out. E.g. French in Vietnam - Military defeat at Dien Bien Phu in 1954; E.g. Britain in Malaya - Cost of maintaining bureaucracy + military incurring unnecessary expenditure, especially when given the good relationship between British and the Malay nationalist leaders of UMNO, British interests in the region would continue to be safeguarded. Practical considerations of cost (testament to strength of nationalist movements in the local setting - able to compel or convince colonial masters), rather than being influenced by the international context.

4. Why were maximum governments able to establish a foothold in newly independent Southeast Asian states?

Tutor's comments:

- Essay requirements:

- o Identify reasons for the rise and continuity of maximum government in SEA
- o "establish a foothold": to gain a strong position.
- o Better answers will:
 - Have **clarity of end point**:
 - Establish a foothold: how they were able to gain and maintain a strong position.
 - Gain:
 - Maintain: Use of hard + soft methods to consolidate foothold. E.g. Punitive laws + military force; provision of socio-economic well-being for people (performance legitimacy) + using democratic forms/structures to ensure continuation of their rule.
 - Have **good conceptual understanding**:
 - Bring in the concept of legitimacy in explaining why maximum governments were able to establish a strong position in these states. E.g. political, economic, historical legitimacy.
 - Bring in the concept of the past and present context that allowed for the rise and continuity of maximum governments.
 - Have **scope**:
 - Examine different types of maximum governments: civilian, military, communist.
 - Provide a **prioritisation** of factors:
 - E.g. Present context > past context in explaining why max. governments were able to establish a foothold in newly independent SEAn states. Past context may account for why they were able to GAIN a strong position (historical legitimacy), but cannot explain how max. governments were able to MAINTAIN a strong position, even in the midst of changing context.

Possible points of discussion:

1. Past context/Historical legacy: Mindset shaped by colonial experience - autocratic rather than democratic. Formation of civilian max. govt. Civilian max. governments able to perpetuate strong position through good socio-economic provision for the people (e.g. Singapore + Malaysia) + made use of the political process to perpetuate their rule.

2. Historical legacy: Prominence of military in fighting for independence (e.g. Indonesia, Burma) / in the nation-building process (e.g. Thailand). Provides them with justification for political role. Formation of maximum military government - able to gain power due to the prevailing instability in newly independent SEAn states which had been experimenting with democracy. Use threat of military force to establish strong position, may also use some forms of 'democratic' rule to provide it with greater credibility and claims to political power (e.g. formation of political parties as a front for the military's involvement in politics/governance - Golkar in Indonesia, BSPP in Burma)

3. Present context: Failure of democratic experiments to cater to the needs of newly independent SEAn states - led to political instability, which was not conducive for economic growth. Provided the opportunity for advocates of authoritarianism to gain and cement their power. Max. governments were seen as acceptable to the populace as they were able to provide greater economic and political stability compared to the more democratic ones before them.

3. Agency of leaders: Local leaders who felt that democracy was not working, and made changes to the political structure. Civilian leaders within the governments who adopted more authoritarian means after gaining power through democratic process. Since they were already in power, were able to adopt punitive laws to remove threats to their political authority/co-opt the opposition, and to ensure their political continuity. E.g. Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore, Tun Razak in Malaysia and Sukarno in Indonesia.

4. International context also allowed for there to be a rise and continuity of strong-handed governments in order to resist the communist threat (US helped to shore up max. governments in Thailand + Indonesia)

5. Assess the effectiveness of government policies in the economic development of Southeast Asian states from 1945 - 2000.

Tutor's comments:

- Essay requirements:

- o Examine where government policies were effective / ineffective in the economic development of SEAn states. Government policies = indirect intervention.
- o Wide time period: 1945 - 2000. Initial / subsequent government policies.
- o Better answers will:
 - Have **clarity of end point**:-
 - Economic development in terms of rapid economic growth through export-oriented industrialisation; economic modernisation - "green revolution" and use of technology in industries; growing diversity in economy: primary, secondary and tertiary sectors.
 - Have **scope**:-
 - Examine economic development in the various economic sectors: primary/agriculture, secondary/manufacturing, tertiary/services and financial.
 - Distinguish between government policies (indirect role) vs. government's direct role in economy; and to establish a link between them.
 - Recognise that the effectiveness of the policies may be **dependent on the intentions of the policies**. E.g. If the policies are intended to achieve political objectives, it may end up compromising economic growth, although it may achieve greater economic equity. E.g. New Economic Policies in Malaysia.
 - Be able to discern that the effectiveness of government policies over time would be due to government's ability to:
 - Respond to the changing context. What had worked earlier may become a stumbling block later. E.g. policies that led to more openness to the global economy may lead to increased investments and technological transfer which may be necessary in promoting economic growth, but may also make SEA more vulnerable to capital flights and financial shocks, as seen in the AFC.
 - Mitigate any unintended outcomes.

- Appeal to other economic players (local entrepreneurial classes; foreign investors) to prevent over reliance on state.

6. "Conflicts that were political in nature, rather than economically-motivated, were more difficult to resolve." Assess the validity of this statement in relation to inter-state tensions in Southeast Asia from 1945 - 2000.

Tutor's comments:

- **Essay requirements:**

- o **Comparison question.** Examine whether the different natures of conflicts make it more or less difficult to resolve.
 - Political in nature: related to physical security and sovereignty.
 - Economically-motivated: related to dispute over resources e.g. water, fishing, potential oil reserves.
 - Provide a criterion for comparison / establish relationship.
- o Wide time period: 1945 - 2000.
- o Better answers will:
 - Have **clarity of end point. More difficult to resolve - in what sense?**
 - Inability to be resolved bilaterally/regionally? Hence need to turn to external mediators?
 - Still unresolved?
 - Have **scope:-**
 - Examine conflicts across the period in question.
 - Provide an argument for WHY conflicts of a particular nature were more difficult to resolve or to challenge the premise of the question:
 - Political vs. economic - but in reality this may be a **false dichotomy**. Because the economic survival and interests may also be related to issues of sovereignty.
 - Whether a conflict was more difficult to resolve is less due to its nature per se (political or economic), but more to do with the **political will of the leaders**.
 - Additional insight: Perhaps it depends on not so much on the nature of the conflict per se, but on **who is involved?** E.g. Conflicts between countries with similar power positions may be easier to resolve; as opposed to conflicts between countries with varying power positions, which may be more difficult to resolve, as the stronger power may not see the need to turn to an external mediator. E.g. China in Spratly Archipelago dispute does not see need to turn to external parties e.g. ICJ for intervention, as it suits its purpose to.

Possible points of discussion:

1. Previously more political disputes, due to the formation of newly independent states, and the contestation of territories for national boundaries. But as these become increasingly resolved partly due to the less belligerent political international climate (end of Cold War), there has been a resurgence of disputes which are more economic in nature. Partly due to the absence of a common political threat?
2. Political - impinging on national sovereignty, historical disputes, competing ideologies stemming from political leadership, secessionist movements. May lead to the breakdown of political organisations, which further deprive countries of a platform to resolve political disputes, hence making it more difficult to resolve.
3. Economic - largely to do with competing claims over valuable territories (Spratly Archipelago); economic interests and survival (e.g. fishing stock; water issue). Becoming more important in light of the end of the Cold War, and these may be more difficult to resolve due to the fact that there are tangible economic benefits involved - Zero sum game mentality at work? But economically-motivated conflicts