

Name:	Index No:	Class:
-------	-----------	--------



ANGLICAN HIGH SCHOOL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2025

S4

HISTORY

2174/01

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

Secondary 4

22 August 2025

Additional Materials: 5 sheets of writing paper

1 hour 50 minutes

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your index number and name on all the work you hand in.
Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the paper.
Do not use paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Section A.

Section B

Answer **two** questions.

Start each section on a fresh sheet of paper.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

Hand in the question paper, Section A and Section B separately.

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

Section A		30 marks
Section B Qn. No: () Qn. No: ()		20 marks
TOTAL:		50 marks

Parent's Name:	
Parent's Signature:	
Date:	

This document consists of 5 printed pages.

[Turn over

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

Study the background information and all the sources carefully and then answer **all** the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you 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.

What can you learn about the Pangkor Treaty from Source A? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Source B.

Why do you think William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah? Explain your answer. [5]

(c) Study Sources C and D.

Are you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Sources E and F.

How far does Source F prove that Source E is wrong? Explain your answer. [6]

(e) Study **all** the sources.

'The Pangkor Treaty was a success for the British.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

The Pangkor Treaty

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

On 20 January 1874, Sir Andrew Clarke, the Governor of the Straits Settlements, signed the Pangkor Engagement with the Malay Chiefs of Perak. The treaty represented a major change in British policy, shifting from the previous approach of non-intervention to intervention. Under its terms, the British gained the right to install a Resident in Perak and resolve the succession dispute among the Malay Chiefs and put an end to the Larut Wars. Whilst marking the beginning of the process that would see the British extend their influence over the Malay states, the implementation of the terms of the Pangkor Treaty in Perak proved to be challenging. There were misunderstandings of the treaty's provisions, along with resistance and violence from some of the Malay Chiefs leading to the murder of James Birch and the Perak Wars. Thus, how far was the Pangkor Treaty a success for the British?

Source A: *An extract from a historical journal about the Residential System, published in 1951.*

Later Residents of Perak after the murder of James Birch had to confine their official activities to the offering of "advice" under the same conditions as those which brought Birch to grief. But both sides had learned much from the events of these years and under Hugh Low, great patience and caution from one side was met with growing co-operation from the other. It was therefore eventually possible to work out a system whereby the Resident's actual control could be clothed in the forms of "advice", financial security achieved, and investment and trade encouraged.

Source B: *An extract from a letter from William Jervois to Sultan Abdullah on 27 September 1875.*

We have shown you that there are now two Sultans in Perak, and that you have no authority in Upper Perak. We wish to help you in this matter, for the British Government cannot allow Perak to be disturbed any longer. You have proved that you are unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor, and you are responsible for not having done so. We wish, however, to be kind to you, and to maintain your position as Sultan. Thus, we propose to you that officers of the British Government shall govern the country in your name. If you agree to this, you will still be recognized as Sultan and receive a large allowance. But if you do not agree to this, we will not be able to help you any further.

Source C: *An extract from the journal of Sir William Jervois, who was the Governor of the Straits Settlements from 1875-1877.*

Instead of ruling his people with energy, firmness, and justice, Abdullah has abandoned himself to low pursuits and pleasures; he has 'squeezed' his subjects whenever he has been able to escape the vigilance of the Resident. His conduct has provoked the contempt of the Resident and the ill feeling of his subjects. A sultan in name, a puppet by nature, maintains his position simply by the presence of the Resident whose advice he disregards and whose instructions he does not heed. He only acts when the Resident has held out threats of the Governor's displeasure and the possibility of his being deposed. His extravagance entails expenses far beyond his salary, and he then ekes out a further income by 'squeezing' the people of Perak who are thus doubly taxed.

Source D: *An extract from the Pangkor Treaty, 20 January 1874.*

Whereas a state of anarchy exists in the Kingdom of Perak which lacks effective government and protection for its people and industries. British subjects, with significant tin mining investments, suffered from unprotected mines, piracy, murder, and arson, threatening British trade and nearby settlements. Perak's Chiefs, unable to cope, requested British assistance. Governor Sir Andrew Clarke, bound by treaty to protect Perak, proposed the following:

- That the Rajah Muda Abdullah be recognised as the Sultan of Perak.
- That the Sultan receive and provide a suitable residence for a British Officer to be called Resident, whose advice must be asked and acted upon on all questions other than those touching Malay Religion and Custom.
- That the collection and control of all Revenues and the general administration of the country be regulated under the advice of these Residents.

Source E: *An extract from the Straits Times Overland Journal, 8 July 1876 after the British Government decided to reverse William Jervois' decision to switch to the Queen's Commissioner System.*

It is presumed that the decision for the Residential System to be retained even after the murder of James Birch and the Perak War will cause significant disappointment. Firstly, this backward step may be perceived by native rulers as a sign of British weakness or indifference, hindering the industrial development of the countries by removing the guarantee of justice and property security. While Residents might still exert influence, Chinese capitalists and labourers are unlikely to trust this, ensuring widespread distrust. Secondly, those knowledgeable about the States and the Pangkor Treaty believe this advisory system merely postpones the need for direct rule which would inevitably be necessary after some future action against British subjects or the dignity of British authorities by the natives.

Source F: *An extract from an article in the 'Straits Times Overland Journal' 25 July 1874.*

There is no doubt that there are many in Perak to whom the Pangkor Treaty was unpalatable and whose interests lie in creating disturbances. Any perceived government indecision would be interpreted as a retreat, inevitably leading to renewed riot and disorder. Indeed, certain ill-intentioned individuals are reportedly conspiring to disrupt Perak's peace and incite rebellion against the new Sultan. A small spark could trigger another outbreak of widespread disorder. This is why the only remedy is the intervention of an impartial power in whom all the parties have confidence, and whose word and decision in all matters of dispute will carry authority. This is what the appointment of British Residents representing the British Government would achieve. All of these are urgent reasons why the Residents should be appointed without delay.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2 "The extension of French control in Vietnam c.1870s was the result of the French desire to restore their prestige." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- 3 "Hitler's rise to power in Jan 1933 was the result of the Great Depression." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- 4 "Japan's decision to bomb Pearl Harbour in December 1941 was due to the impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- End of Paper -

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A: D Cowan and Frank A Swettenham, "Sir Frank Swettenham's Perak Journals, 1874-1876", Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, December 1951, Vol.24, No.4(157).

Source B: D Cowan and Frank A Swettenham, "Sir Frank Swettenham's Perak Journals, 1874-1876", Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, December 1951, Vol.24, No.4(157).

Source C: P Burns and W.H Read, "Annexation in the Malay States: The Jervois Papers", Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1999, Vol. 72, No. 1 (276) (1999)

Source D: https://web.archive.org/web/20161125221607/http://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/hist/eia/documents_archive/pangkor-treaty.php

Source E: <https://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/digitised/article/stoverland18760708-1.2.10?qt=pangkor%2c+treaty>

Source F: <https://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/digitised/article/straitstimes18740725-1.2.5?qt=pangkor,%20engagement&q=pangkor%20engagement>

Anglican High School
Secondary 4 Preliminary Examinations
Core History (2174/01)
Source-Based Case Study
Suggested Answer Scheme

1(a) Study Source A

What can learn about the Pangkor Treaty from Source A? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Describes or lifts from the source	1
2	Inference – Sub-Message The Pangkor Treaty was a failure because Source A tells me that the “Residents of Perak after the murder of James Birch had to confine their official duties to the offering of “advice” under the same conditions as those which brought Birch to grief.	2
3	Inference I can learn that the Pangkor Treaty was eventually a success as it led to the consolidation of British control in Perak. This is supported by the source which states “It was therefore eventually possible to work out a system whereby the Resident’s actual control could be clothed in the forms of “advice”, financial security achieved, and investment and trade encouraged.” This shows that the Pangkor Treaty allowed the British to fulfil their objectives of ensuring stability to bring about economic growth in Perak.	3-4
4	Inference in Context L3 + after the Perak War, the British appointed Hugh Low as Resident. Low was able to improve relations with the Sultan and introduce the State Council which dramatically improved the administration of the state, ushering in a period of rapid economic growth in Perak.	5

1(b) Study Source B

Why do you think William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah? [5]

Explain your answer.

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Description of Source	1
2	Context only William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah because of the problems of the Residential System,	2
3	Message / Outcome William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah to warn him about his unwillingness to implement the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. OR William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah to force Abdullah to accept direct rule by the British.	3
4	Message and Outcome	4
5	Message + Outcome in Context William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah to warn him about his unwillingness to implement the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. This is supported by the source which states “You have proved himself unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor, and you are responsible for not having done so.” The letter was written on 27 September 1875 at a time when the Residential System was failing as a result of the resistance by the Malay Chiefs and their unwillingness to comply with Birch’s actions. As a result, Jervois wanted to adopt direct rule in the form of the Queen’s Commissioner system. Thus by threatening Abdullah, Jervois wanted to force Abdullah to adopt the Queen’s Commissioner system or face removal by the British.	5

1(c)

Study Sources C and D.

Are you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Provenance only	1
2	Surprised based on content of Source C I am surprised by Source C because it tells me that Sultan Abdullah did not follow the Pangkor Treaty / treated his subjects badly.	2-3
3	Surprised based on cross-reference to Source D I am surprised by Source C because it tells me that Sultan Abdullah did not follow the advice of the Resident when the Source states “, he maintains his position simply by the presence of the Resident whose advice he disregards and whose instructions he heeds not. He normally does not act upon the advice of the Resident and only acts when the Resident has held out threats of the Governor's displeasure and the possibility of his being deposed.” This is surprising when I cross refer to Source D which clearly states that the Sultan would need to surrender power to the Resident when it states “whose advice must be asked and acted upon on all questions other than those touching Malay Religion and Custom.” Since Abdullah had signed the Pangkor Treaty, he should have been aware of this term of the treaty, thus it is surprising that he did not follow the terms of the Pangkor Engagement.	4-5
4	Not Surprising - Analysis of the context of Source C. In my final analysis, it is not surprising that Abdullah did not follow the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. Given that there was a delay in the appointment of James Birch as Resident, Abdullah would have consolidated his power and would have been used to acting without the advice of the Resident. Thus it would not have been surprising that he would not ignored the Resident and acted on his own authority.	6

1(d)

Study Sources E and F.

How far does Source F prove that Source E is wrong? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Undeveloped Provenance	1
2	Proves due to content difference Source F proves that Source E is wrong as it contradicts the claims made by E. Source F tells me that the terms of the Pangkor Treaty were ultimately beneficial for Perak as the Residential System would have solved many of Perak's problems when the source states "This is why the only remedy is the intervention of an impartial power in whom all the parties have confidence, and whose word and decision in all matters of dispute will carry authority. This is what the appointment of British Residents representing the British Government would achieve." On the other hand, Source E tells me that the terms of the Pangkor Treaty were ineffective when it states "hindering the industrial development of the countries by removing the guarantee of justice and property security."	2-3
3	Prove/Does not prove based on Cross-reference / Contextual Knowledge Source F is unreliable and cannot prove that Source E is wrong as it is challenged by Source B which tells me that the Pangkor Treaty was ineffective as the Sultan was unwilling to follow the terms of the treaty when it states "You have proved himself unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor..."	4-5
4	Not reliable – context of Source F In my final analysis, Source F was written at a time when the Pangkor Treaty had just been signed in January. Thus the newspaper was likely to be more optimistic about the possibilities offered by the Pangkor Treaty. It cannot prove Source E wrong as Source E was written after the end of the Perak Wars after the murder of James Birch where all the failings of the Pangkor Treaty had been laid bare. Thus given the difference in context between the two sources, Source F cannot prove that Source E is wrong.	5-6

(e) Study all the sources.

'The Pangkor Treaty was a success for the British.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. <i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i> Yes Source A – Eventually led to long-term British control Source A supports the statement because it tells me that the Pangkor Treaty was successful in the long-term as it led to British control. This is supported by Source A which states “It was therefore eventually possible to work out a system whereby the Resident’s actual control could be clothed in the forms of “advice”, financial security achieved, and investment and trade encouraged.” This shows that the British were able to make adjustments to the Residential System such that it was eventually acceptable to the Malays and gave them the power to do what they wanted in Malaya. Source D – Led to the installation of British Resident and gave British control over administration Source D supports the statement because it tells me that the Pangkor Treaty helped the British gain control over the administration of Perak. This can be supported by the source which states “ the collection and control of all Revenues and the general administration of the country be regulated under the advice of these Residents” This shows that the British were able to gain control of the administration of the country to make it more efficient and ensure that the British were able to benefit from their control over the state. Source F – Would help to solve Perak’s problems or maintain stability in Perak. Source F supports the statement because it tells me that the Pangkor Treaty would allow the British to install a Resident who would ensure that there was no instability in the Perak. This is supported by the source which tells me” This is why the only remedy is the intervention of an impartial power in whom all the parties have confidence, and whose word and decision in all matters of dispute will carry authority.” Thus by installing a Resident, the British would be able to mediate between parties who had disputes and prevent them from getting out of hand ensuring greater stability in the state of Perak. No Source B – Sultan did not implement terms of the treaty Source B does not support the statement because it tells me that the Sultan did not adhere to the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. This is supported by the source which states “You have proved that you are unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor	2-4

	fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor, and you are responsible for not having done so." This shows that the Treaty failed as it did not allow the British to assert any control over the Sultan. Source C – Resident lacked power to carry out his powers. Source C does not support the statement because it tells me that the Resident was powerless to control the Sultan. This can be supported by the source which states " He only acts when the Resident has held out threats of the Governor's displeasure and the possibility of his being deposed." This shows that the Resident has virtually no power or influence over the Sultan and had to resort to threats to carry out his duties. Source E – lack of confidence in the Residential System Source E does not support the statement because it tells me that the Residential System that was implemented because of the Pangkor Treaty was ineffective. This is supported by the source which states that " those knowledgeable about the States and the Pangkor Treaty believe this advisory system merely postpones the need for direct rule which would inevitably be necessary after some future action against British subjects or the dignity of British authorities by the natives." This shows that the British had little influence over the actions of the locals through the Residential System which would eventually have to be replaced by direct rule.	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> <i>For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (ie +1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks must not exceed 8.</i>	5-8

Section B

2	"The extension of French control in Vietnam c.1870s was the result of the French desire to restore their prestige." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	--	------

L1	Identifies/Describes French desire to restore their prestige or how other reasons led to the extension of French control.	1-3
L2	Explains why French desire to restore their prestige or other reasons led to the extension of French control.	4-5
	I agree with the statement that the extension of French control in Vietnam in the 1870s was the French desire to restore their national prestige. Following a humiliating defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), French national pride was shattered. In the late 19th century, the "race for colonies" had intensified among European powers, and overseas empires were seen as a key measure of a nation's strength. The French government, initially hesitant about colonial conquests, changed its policy to compete. This was heightened by rumours of German designs on Northern Vietnam. The prospect of their Germany, gaining a foothold in a region of French interest was a potential second humiliation that France was determined to avoid. Consequently, France decided to accelerate its expansion into Northern Vietnam. This was a direct response to the need to reassert its status as a great power and was driven by the fear of being outmaneuvered by European rivals like Germany and even Britain, who was expanding its influence in neighbouring Burma. By securing Vietnam, France could project its power globally, demonstrate its recovery from the war, and prevent potential German encroachment into its sphere of influence. Thus, by expanding its empire and preventing German encroachment, the French would be able to regain prestige and restore its reputation as an imperial power.	
L3	Explains why French desire to restore their prestige and other reasons led to the extension of French control.	6-8
	On the other hand, the extension of French control in Vietnam was also driven by the need for new trading bases to access the lucrative China market. Initially, the French aimed to establish a major commercial hub in Vietnam that could rival the British colonial ports of Singapore and Hong Kong, hoping to redirect the profitable China trade through Saigon. They believed that the Mekong River could provide a navigable "back route" into the resource-rich province of Yunnan in Southwest China, which would grant them access to valuable goods like Chinese tea, silk, and textiles. However, expeditions soon revealed that the Mekong was filled with rapids and waterfalls, making it entirely unsuitable for large-scale trade. As a result of this discovery, the French realised that their economic ambitions could not be achieved from their base in Cochin-China alone. Their focus, therefore, shifted northward to the Red River in Tonkin, which was identified as the only viable waterway into China. Consequently, French officials saw the need to adapt to these changing circumstances by seizing control over Northern Vietnam to secure this vital economic lifeline. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.	

	The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).	
--	--	--

2	"Hitler's rise to power in Jan 1933 was the result of the Great Depression." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	---	-------------

L1	Identifies/Describes Great Depression or how other reasons led to Hitler's rise to power.	1-3
L2	Explains why Great Depression or other reasons led to Hitler's rise to power.	4-5
	I agree that Hitler's rise to power was the impact of the Great Depression and so many people losing their jobs. When the Wall Street Crash happened in America in October 1929, it caused huge problems everywhere, including Germany. The US called back its loans and took away its investments from Germany. This plunged Germany into a deep economic crisis, meaning huge numbers of people lost their jobs. By 1932, a shocking 6 million Germans, which was 40% of all workers, had no jobs. This affected almost everyone: factory workers, farmers, and even middle-class families. Small businesses closed down, and what Germans earned dropped. People faced hunger, sickness, and many even lost their homes. The Weimar government, which was made up of different political parties working together, seemed unable to fix these problems and looked weak. This made Germans lose faith in their democratic government and want a stronger leader. Because of all this suffering, more Germans started to support extreme groups like the Nazis and the Communists. This meant the Nazis got a lot more votes, putting them in a powerful position where other politicians in the government were willing to make a deal with Hitler, which then allowed him to become Chancellor.	
L3	Explains why Great Depression and other reasons led to Hitler's rise to power.	6-8
	On the other hand, Adolf Hitler's powerful and convincing personality played a big part in winning over the German people. Hitler was an incredibly good and persuasive speaker. He was charming and knew how to understand what his audience was feeling, making him seem very honest to them. During the 1932 Presidential elections, even though he lost, he travelled all around Germany holding big rallies. He seemed like a strong and modern leader. He appeared to be a regular person who understood people and their problems. With people more willing to listen to new ideas because of the tough times during the Great Depression, Hitler used his speaking skills to convince these people to support the Nazis. This led to the Nazis getting many more votes, making them the biggest party in the German parliament. This strong position then made the right-wing politicians in the Weimar government want to make a deal with the Nazis, which allowed Hitler to become the Chancellor. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).	

3	"Japan's decision to bomb Pearl Harbour in December 1941 was due to the impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	---	------

L1	Identifies/Describes impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers or how other reasons led to the bombing of Pearl Harbour.	1-3
L2	Explains why impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers or other reasons led to the bombing of Pearl Harbour.	4-5
	I agree with the statement. The impact of World War 2 in Europe also created the opportunity for Japan to attack Southeast Asia. Holland and France under German occupation by 1940, leaving its colonies open to Japanese attack and occupation. The British were engaged in a war with Germany and Italy and was not in a position to stop Japan's expansion into Southeast Asia. This left the Southeast Asian colonies lightly defended giving Japan the advantage in its quest to expand its empire and seize the resources that it needed to continue the war in China. Thus Japan sought to exploit this opportunity as it felt that it was able to defeat the weakened forces of the colonial powers. In order to ensure that it could successfully exploit this opportunity, Japan decided to attack Pearl Harbour so as to eliminate the US Pacific Fleet in order to prevent any potential US interference in its attempts to expand its empire.	
L3	Explains why impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers and other reasons led to the bombing of Pearl Harbour.	6-8
	On the other hand, Japan attacked Pearl Harbour as retaliation against USA for its increasingly hostile policies against Japan. In reaction to Japan's invasion of China, USA cancelled the 1911 commercial treaty with Japan in 1939, followed by a partial trade embargo on steel and scrap iron exports which cut off 80% of Japan's supply of materials to build weapons. This was followed up by USA freezing all Japanese assets in the US and imposing a general trade embargo against Japan in July 1941 in response to Japan's occupation of Vietnam. The actions of USA which deprived Japan of the crucial resources it needed to further its aggression in East Asia angered the Japanese who saw these policies as hostile attempts to frustrate its expansionistic plans. This culminated in the breakdown of the relations as USA and Japan entered into negotiations which failed as Japan could not agree with USA's demands for it to give up all its claims and territories in China and Manchuria. Thus, the actions of USA which seemed to be determined to stop Japanese from achieving its expansionistic ambitions provoked Japan into attacking PH in retaliation against USA. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).	