



ST ANDREW'S JUNIOR COLLEGE
Preliminary Examinations
General Certificate of Education Advanced Level
Higher 2

HISTORY

9731/02

Paper 2 History of Southeast Asia c.1900-1997

15 September 2016

3 hours

Additional Materials: Answer Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name and class on all the work you hand in.
 Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the paper.
 You may use a soft pencil for any diagrams, graphs or rough working.
 Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **Question 1**.

Section B

Answer any **three** questions.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.
 All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

This document consists of **4** printed pages.

[Turn Over

Section A

You **must** answer Question 1.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ASEAN REGIONAL FORUM

- 1 Read the sources and then answer the question.

When answering **Question 1** candidates are advised to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources both individually and as a group.

Source A

1. The First Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) was held in Bangkok on 25 July 1994 in accordance with the 1992 Singapore Declaration of the Fourth ASEAN Summit, whereby the ASEAN Heads of State and Government proclaimed their intent to intensify ASEAN's external dialogues in political and security matters as a means of building cooperative ties with states in the Asia-Pacific region.
2. Being the first time ever that high-ranking representatives from the majority of states in the Asia-Pacific region came to specifically discuss political and security cooperation issues, the Meeting was considered a historic event for the region. More importantly, the Meeting signified the opening of a new chapter of peace, stability and cooperation for Southeast Asia.
3. The participants of the Meeting held a productive exchange of views on the current political and security situation in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing that developments in one part of the region could have an impact on the security of the region as whole. It was agreed that, as a high-level consultative forum, the ARF had enabled the countries in the Asia-Pacific region to foster the habit of constructive dialogue and consultation on political and security issues of common interest and concern. In this respect, the ARF would be in a position to make significant contributions to efforts towards confidence-building and preventive diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific region.

An excerpt from the Chairman's Statement of the first ASEAN Regional Forum, 1994.

Source B

In the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, there was considerable pressure on the ASEAN members to re-evaluate their security policies in the context of the changed security environment. Calls to adopt a multilateral approach to regional security led to the establishment of the ARF in 1994. ASEAN's growing influence in global affairs meant that the ARF was able to bring together 18 members, including the US, China, the European Union, Japan and Russia, to discuss to regional security framework for the Asia-Pacific region. For ASEAN's members it was a means of bringing the US and China into the discussions about the region's security in a way that kept control over the agenda in the hands of ASEAN officials. It further provided a meeting ground for the peaceful resolution of regional disputes and it helped to ensure that ASEAN was at the center of any future discussions about regional security arrangements.

A historian's account, 2004.

Source C

The issue of the South China Sea has been addressed in dialogues between ASEAN and China with some strong talking at the initial occasion in April 1995 in the wake of the revelation of the seizure of Mischief Reef but without any practical outcome for conflict resolution. Correspondingly, the issue of the South China Sea has been raised in general terms within the working sessions of the ARF. The ARF, like ASEAN, is not a problem-solving vehicle but is concerned primarily with general confidence-building and has not taken any significant initiative to try to resolve the competing claims to sovereign jurisdiction.

At the second working session of the ARF in 1995, a Concept Paper prepared by officials gave the impression of corporate evolution towards a problem-solving role. The paper incorporated an institutional route-map setting ideal progress in stages from confidence-building through preventive diplomacy ultimately to conflict-resolution mechanisms. Although the ARF has agreed since 1997 to address the subject of preventive diplomacy, the outcome, so far, has not been at all encouraging either for dispute settlement in general or the issue of the South China Sea in particular. In consequence, there is an absence of any regional machinery for addressing the complex contention which is not in itself a failure of institutions but one of political will on the part of the adverse claimants.

Extracted from an academic paper, 1999.

Source D

The 1992 ASEAN Declaration on the South China Sea was a formal agreement in which ASEAN countries recognized the reality of the sensitive questions regarding sovereignty and jurisdiction in the Southeast Asia. The ASEAN Declaration ultimately urged all concerned parties to promote a “balance of influence” strategy by inviting competing great powers to participate in the region. At this time, however, both the United States and China participated in the ARF’s formation passively, thereby excluding the possibility of the ARF making any substantial results in those early years.

For example, during the 1994 ARF forum, the South China Sea conflict was only briefly mentioned and eventually omitted from the chairman’s statements. Subsequently, in 1995 the Mischief Reef Incident occurred off the South China Sea and the ARF proved to be similarly powerless. China sent navy troops and captured 35 Philippine fishermen in response to the Philippine Navy’s removal and capture of both Chinese structures and fishing boats in the area. The ARF made almost no headway in getting both states to engage in peaceable talks. When China and the Philippines engaged in artillery attacks for 90 minutes in January 1996, with China declaring policy shifts towards armed struggles in the sea, the ARF’s role as multilateral institution was extremely restricted.

From a journal article on International Studies, 2014.

Source E

The ARF is quite unlike European security institutions or models. It is characterised by minimal institutionalisation. It functions through consensus decision-making and has an evolutionary approach to achieving objectives. Importantly, the ARF brings together all the countries which have an impact on or are involved in the security of the East Asia/Pacific region. It helps create a sense of strategic community in the region.

I would point out that the ARF has already produced practical results in only three years through what is becoming an established pattern of effective diplomacy. Observers brought up with the tradition of European statecraft sometimes question the value of the ARF because it is not able at this stage to resolve disputes between members and regulate security affairs. My answer is that the ARF was never conceived as the sole means of managing security in the Asia Pacific. As seen in the case of the South China

Sea, the ARF adds a new regional layer to security relationships that helps the management of issues at other levels.

The ARF is a unique body. It is developing in its own way and its own time. It was never intended to become a collective defence arrangement. It was born out of the idea of defence with others, not against others.

Address by the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs to a Dutch audience about Asian regional security issues, in 1997.

Now answer the following question.

How far do Sources A – E support the view that the ASEAN Regional Forum has been effective in resolving security issues in the Asia-Pacific?

Section B

You must answer **three** questions from this section.

You must support your answer with examples drawn from **at least three** countries.

- 2 To what extent do you agree with the claim that 'success remained out of reach for Southeast Asian nationalists before World War Two'?
- 3 How far was the process of decolonisation in post-war Southeast Asia affected by the impact of World War Two?
- 4 To what extent did maximum governments achieve stability in the independent Southeast Asian states?
- 5 Why was government intervention more effective in some economies of post-independence Southeast Asia as compared to others?
- 6 How far do you agree that interstate tensions between independent Southeast Asian states were detrimental to regional cooperation?