

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 answer the questions, in addition to those 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 from Source A about Britain's attitudes towards Germany in 1919? Explain your answer. [6]

(b) Study Source B.

How useful is this source as evidence of Britain's appeasement of Germany? Explain your answer. [7]

(c) Study Source C.

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

(d) Study Sources D and E.

How far would the cartoonists who drew these two cartoons have agreed with each other? Explain your answer. [7]

(e) Study Source F.

Why do you think Stalin said this in March 1939? Explain your answer. [6]

(f) Study all sources.

'Britain was justified to pursue a policy of appeasement.' How far do the sources support this statement. Explain your answer [8]

Appeasement of Nazi Germany

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

Instituted in the hope of avoiding war, appeasement was the name given to Britain's policy towards Nazi Germany in the 1930s. It is most closely associated with British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and involved the use of negotiation and diplomacy to secure Hitler's cooperation. The most prominent example of appeasement would be the remilitarisation of Rhineland, Anschluss and Munich Agreement – a settlement reached by Germany, France, Britain and Italy that permitted German annexation of Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland. At the time, it was a popular and seemingly a pragmatic policy.

However, some see it as allowing Hitler to expand German territory unchecked and view it as a sign of Britain's weakness. In addition, as a major power and a key member of the League, Britain also had a moral duty to uphold the principle of collective security and stand against aggression.

Thus, was it justifiable for Britain to pursue a policy of appeasement?

Source A: *From David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Britain, March 1919 during the Paris Peace Conference.*

You may strip Germany of her colonies, reduce her armaments to a mere police force and her navy to that of a fifth rate power, all the same, in the end, if she feels she has been unjustly treated in the peace of 1919, she will find means to address the injustice of the treaty. I cannot imagine any greater cause of future war than that the German people, who have proved themselves one of the most powerful and vigorous races in the world, should be surrounded by a number of small states, many of them consisting of peoples who have never previously set up a stable government for themselves, but each of them containing large masses of Germans hoping and fighting for reunion with their native land.

Source B *A British cartoon about the reoccupation of the Rhineland, 1936. Pax Germanica is Latin and means 'Peace, German style.' The goose-step refers to the manner in which the Nazi troops marched. The torn paper on the feet of the goose reads 'Locarno'.*



The Goose Step

*'Goosey Goosey Gander, Whither dost thou wander?'
 'Only through the Rhineland, Pray excuse my blunder!'*

Source C: *From a speech by Chamberlain about British policy in the aftermath of the union between Germany and Austria, March 1938.*

His Majesty's Government have expressed the view that recent events in Austria have created a profound disturbance in international confidence. As such, it is our urgent duty to direct our attention to restore this shaken confidence and to maintain the rule of law. So far as Czechoslovakia is concerned, it seems to His Majesty's Government that now is the time when all the resources of diplomacy should be enlisted in the cause of peace. In the meantime, there is no need to assume the use of force, or, indeed, to talk about it. Such talk is to be strongly discouraged. Not only can it do no good; it is bound to do harm. It will interfere with the progress of diplomacy, and it must increase feelings of insecurity and uncertainty.

Source D: *A cartoon published in a British newspaper in September 1938. Chamberlain is seen pushing a globe on a plank with the word 'Czech Crisis'.*



Source E: A cartoon published in a British newspaper in September 1938. Chamberlain is seen talking to representatives from Czechoslovakia saying, 'Horrible and Fantastic, that a quarrel in a faraway country between two peoples of whom we know nothing ...ho hum!'



Source F: An extract of Stalin's speech to the Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, March 1939.

Take Germany, for example. They ceded Austria to it, despite commitments to protect its independence, ceded the Sudetenland, and left Czechoslovakia to its fate, violating absolutely all commitments, and then began to spread vociferous lies in the press about the 'weakness of the Russian army', the 'disintegration of Russian aviation', and the 'turmoil' in the Soviet Union, egging the Germans farther east, promising them easy prey, and constantly repeating, 'Just begin a war with the Bolsheviks, and everything will go just fine.' Isn't this the abetment and encouragement of aggression? This big and dangerous political game may deal a major blow to the supporters of the non-aggression policy.

SECTION B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

2. 'Hitler's rise to power in 1933 was good for German economy and society.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

3. 'The militarists' rise to power in Japan was helped by the economic crises that Japan faced in the late 1920s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

4. 'Tensions with the USA was the cause of Japan's decision to strike against the USA in the Pacific in 1941.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Copyright Acknowledgements:

	Source A McDonough, Frank <u>Hitler, Chamberlain and Appeasement</u> , 2002. Cambridge, UK.
Source B	https://subjecttoformt.wordpress.com/2015/05/26/source-analysis/
	Source C McDonough, Frank <u>Hitler, Chamberlain and Appeasement</u> , 2002. Cambridge, UK.
Source D	https://studylib.net/doc/5351690/was-chamberlain-brave-or-a-coward%3F
Source E	https://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/today/galleries/1306/11/
Source F	https://www.prlib.ru/en/section/1298154

End of Paper

This document is intended for internal circulation in Victoria School only. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the Victoria School Internal Exams Committee.

HISTORY Yr 3 EYE SUGGESTED ANSWERS

SBCS Suggested Answers

1a) Study Source A.

What can you learn from Source A about British attitudes towards Germany in 1919? [6]
Explain your answer.

L1 Details of source & invalid inference [1-2]

Answers referencing Policy of Appeasement [1]

L2 Misinterpretation [2]

Britain is confident Germany will recover/ start another war/ feels that Germany is an aggressive country

Britain is blaming Germany/ critical of Germany

Answers claiming Britain wants harsh treatment of Germany/wants Germany to be punished

L3 Literal interpretation [3-4]

Concern/Worry [3] + reason [4]

British attitude towards Germany is cautious/careful/worried/fearful of the threats that Germany will start another war/is a source of danger [3]

Hence should not be treated too harshly [4]

L4 Valid Interpretation [5-6]

Britain is sympathy/understanding [5]

Hence not in favour of harsh treatment of Germany [6]

1b) How useful is this source as evidence about Britain's appeasement of Germany?
Explain your answer.

[7]

L1 Undeveloped provenance & [1]

It is not useful because it is a cartoon. [1]

L2 Not useful based on assertions about the nature of the source [2]

Source B is not useful because it a British cartoon commenting on Germany's action on

L3 Not useful on the grounds that these show two different things [3]

It did not tell me what Britain did, only what Germany did [3]

L4 Useful based on what the source tells about remilitarisation and beginning of British appeasement of Germany [4-5]

Purpose: Source B is useful about appeasement because it tells me that the remilitarisation of Rhineland was unacceptable. In the source, the cartoonist condemns the Nazi for their actions. The source is useful in warning countries about appeasing Germany. [3]

Implications: Source B is useful because it tells me that the remilitarisation of Rhineland by Germany was due to the inaction of the British and the French. Thus, the source is useful in illustrating the beginning of the failure of appeasement by not doing anything to stop Germany while it was weak. It was this attitude of appeasement that led to an emboldened actions of Germany to seek more lands and oppose the Treaty of Versailles. [4]

L5 L4 + Answers which attempt to evaluate the reliability of what is said by cross-reference to other sources or CK [6]

Useful because it is reliable about the consequences:

B shows Germany armed and arrogant stepping over Locarno shows attitude of appeasement that led to an emboldened actions of Germany to seek more lands and oppose the Treaty of Versailles > X-REF > Source C: Hitler emboldened would go on to carry out Anschluss which "created profound disturbance."

L6 L3 + Answers evaluating reliability using context of the source [7]

Not useful about appeasement because at that time this was an isolated event, there was still no pattern of Britain giving in to Hitler that made Hitler demand more territories. Rhineland remilitarisation was Hitler's first attempt to regain territories lost at TOV and it came after Saarlanders voted 98% to be restored to Germany in a plebiscite permitted under the TOV. Besides, the demilitarisation of the Rhineland also came to an end after 15 years. Given that Italy had taken Abyssinia the year before with Britain and France acquiescing, it did not feel like Hitler was doing anything wrong as Rhineland as rightfully German. Taking back its own territories given away by TOV which Britain felt was too harsh anyway felt reasonable.

Useful about appeasement because this was an escalation of Hitler's insidious plans to overturn TOV. He had already rejected disarmament during the 1933 World Disarmament Conference refusing to commit to further disarmament until France did the same, made the English sign the Anglo-German Naval Agreement to appease him, taking over the Rhineland when Britain and France was busy with the fallout after the Abyssinian crisis was opportunistic and Britain allowing it to slip was a sign of continuation of appeasement.

(c)	Study Source C. Are you surprised by Source C?	[6]
-----	---	-----

L1 Misinterpretation/ Does not answer qn on surprised or not [1]

L2 Surprised/not surprised based on provenance explained/ typicality undeveloped/ time without evidence [2]

Not surprised as Chamberlain was PM, he was the champion of appeasement. [2]

L3 Surprised/not surprised based on content of C [3-4]

Not surprised that Britain would only consider diplomacy as a means of dealing with Hitler with regards to Czechoslovakia because he did not want a war with Germany over a country not related to it. This can be seen in 'of diplomacy should be enlisted in the cause of peace'. [3-4]

Surprised that Britain was still counting on using diplomacy, and “strongly discouraged” the “use of force” despite Anschluss having created “profound disturbance in international confidence.” Despite wanting to “restore shaken confidence” he still relied on methods of diplomacy that had proven ineffective. [3-4]

L4 Surprised/not surprised based on x-reference [5]

Not surprised that Britain would only consider diplomacy as a means of dealing with Hitler with regards to Czechoslovakia. This can be seen in ‘of diplomacy should be enlisted in the cause of peace’. I not surprised that peace and diplomacy was preferred in 1938. [4]
OR > X-ref > to Source D: Chamberlain solving Czech crisis bringing the world to peace.

Surprised that Britain decided not to do anything despite Anschluss was against the Treaty of Versailles and Germany was allowed to get away with it. When I cross refer to the Background info, I am surprised as Britain was known to be a powerful nation and key member of the League and it had a moral and strategic obligation to uphold the principle of collective security and stand against aggression. [5]

L5 L4 + Not surprised/ surprised because expected based on context properly explained [6]

Not surprised as he was trying to convince the people and government of Britain that diplomacy was the way to go so that they would support him as there was Churchill and the Labour opposition who were critical of his approach. Lastly, it was also to serve as a warning to Czechoslovakia that Britain would not go to war with Germany over the Czech issue so that they would be prepared to compromise and negotiate with Hitler. Besides all these attempts by Hitler to reunify Germans outside of the Reich seemed legitimate based on self-determination and this was an issue the British already acknowledged as seen in Source A. Now that it's reality and here to haunt them, they resolved not to be taken down by it.

(d)	Study Sources D and E. How far would the cartoonists who drew these two cartoons have agreed with each other? Explain your answer.	[7]
-----	---	-----

L1 Misinterpret [1]

L2 Provenance / mismatch [2]

L3 Agree or disagree based on content [3-4]

L4 Agree and disagree based on content [5-6]

Agree that mishandling of the Czech crisis could have dire consequences.

Disagree in terms of whether Chamberlain was a coward or a hero in the handling of the crisis.

L5 Disagree based on perspectives and purpose [7]

The cartoonist in Source D praises and thinks highly of Chamberlain's effort to secure peace and to resolve the Czech crisis. His selfless stance in saving the world from another war was clearly laudable. Whereas in E, the cartoonist is E clearly mocks and criticises him for his cowardice despite his awareness of the danger of Germany to peace and security in Europe.

1e) Study Source F.

Why do you think Stalin said this in March 1939? Explain your answer. [6]

L1 Repeats source details/Misinterpretation [1]

OR Generic statements about Stalin [2]

Stalin distrusted Britain and was afraid of Germany.

L2 Message [3]

To criticise Britain and France for intentionally encouraging Germany to expand eastward, toward the Soviet Union.

L3 Reasons based on specific events prior to this speech [4]

Stalin said this because the Munich Agreement which was just signed encouraging Germany aggression, Germany was on the verge of annexing Czechoslovakia, likelihood of war had increased.

OR Purpose for saying this to the Congress of the Communist Party [5]

To get the Soviet Communists Party members to get accept possible cooperation with Nazi Germany as a necessary defensive measure.

To prepare the people for war.

This explanation of western appeasement.

L4 Answers considering the sum of events at that point of the time [6]

Stalin was desperate, he needs to maintain support at a time when he was vulnerable after the Purges, many in positions of leadership were new, the USSR was still not ready for war after the purge of the Red Army. At the same time, Hitler was getting more confident and aggressive, has always talked of Lebensraum of Russian land while Britain and France are not open to any form of alliance with Stalin.

(e) Study all sources.

'Britain was justified to pursue the policy of appeasement.' How far do the sources support this statement. Explain your answer

[8]

L1 Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use [1]

L2 Yes OR No, supported by valid source use [2-4]

(Award 1 mark for each source use up to a maximum of 4 marks)

L3 Yes AND No, supported by valid source use [5-8]

(Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks)

A – A supports Britain was justified because it shows Britain been aware of the problems associated with TOV and these injustices as the “cause of future war” especially when TOV created these “small states” with “large masses of Germans hoping and fighting for reunion with their native land.” This sympathy Britain has for Germany, in the eyes of British leaders justified her willing to give in to Hitler’s demand to bring these small states back to unite with

Germany because in the first place, France was too harsh on Germany, and it was only right that Britain give in to Hitler's demands where it was reasonable.

B – B does not support because B showed that Britain's appeasement of Germany has created a dangerous Germany (strapped with arms and ammunition and going back on Locarno) while pretending to be peaceful. By letting him get away from marching into Rhineland, Hitler became emboldened and decided on a course of actions that would spell troubles for its neighbours such as Austria and Czechoslovakia.

C – C supports appeasement was justified as Chamberlain believed peace could only be achieved through diplomacy. Chamberlain is aware of the Anschluss debacle, is determined to "restore this shaken confidence" where the problem with Czechoslovakia is concerned. He was determined to use "all the resources of diplomacy should be enlisted in the cause of peace" and not entertain the "use of force" because to be fair, any talk or war would only make the situation worse when they could try for a chance at peace and not risk another world war.

C – C is unreliable and does not support because it was hard to believe Chamberlain truly belief that peace and diplomacy would work on Hitler in the Czech crisis where it did not previously in the Rhineland and Austria incident. He must be naïve or simply playing to the gallery knowing no one in Britain would support a war but neither could he get off without responding to the crisis. He was merely trying to buy time for Britain to rearm, without saying so, and yet hoping against hope diplomacy will work another miracle because he didn't have many options either ways.

D – D supports that appeasement was justified because D shows that Chamberlain's valiant effort to save the world with his handling of the Czech crisis. Chamberlain was carefully trying to guide the world to peace despite the perils of the Czech crisis plunging the world into another chaos and war.

D – D does not support appeasement was justified because the cartoonist shows Chamberlain endangering the world by trying to handle the Czech crisis diplomatically. The source show the Czech crisis as a plank about to break over the chasm of chaos while Chamberlain is still trying to get guide it towards a peaceful conclusion. The message of the cartoonist is to criticise Chamberlain's actions as wishful thinking likely to lead the world to a disaster instead of peace. Historically Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler thinking he is reasonable emboldened Hitler to invade Czech and Poland eventually leading to a declaration of war from France and Britain.

E – E does not support appeasement was justified because E shows Chamberlain behaving like a coward and ignoring the threat of Germany by telling the Czech leaders that the Sudeten crisis was a ho hum problem of people far away that had nothing to do with the British. However his actions was merely inviting trouble from the German army waiting at the door. Historically, as a major power and a key member of the League, Britain also had a moral and strategic obligation to uphold the principle of collective security and stand against aggression. By appeasing Hitler, it would only prove to Hitler that no one would stop him.

F – F does not support appeasement was justified because all it did was to make war even more likely. F is a speech by Stalin accusing Britain of feeding Hitler's appetite by giving him Austria, Sudetenland and cajoling Hitler to attack the Soviet Union. Stalin claimed that Britain's action was "abetting aggression" and more likely to end up in war. Historically, USSR was alarmed by the policy of appeasement. First, they were not invited. Second, it showed USSR that Britain and France would not stand in Hitler's way if he decided to go

east. This was a major mistake with hindsight as it led to the signing of the Nazi Soviet Pact and eventually the invasion of Poland.

2	'Hitler's rise to power in 1933 was good for German economy and society.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
---	---	------

L1 Identifies/Describes how Hitler's rise to power was good or not for German economy and society [1-3]

L2 Explains the positive or negative impact of Hitler's rise to power [4-5]

L3 Explains positive or negative impact of Hitler's rise to power [6-8]

Award an additional 2 marks (Up to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative significance of different reasons.

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

Hitler's rise to power in 1933 was good for German economy and society because the economy grew and society became more stable. In 1933, he implemented a system of economic and political dictatorship that eliminated political rivals (such as the Communists, Social Democrats and the SA) and abolished trade unions. German workers joined the **Deutsche Arbeitsfront (DAF)** or German Workers' Front. The DAF supported **job creation** through public works such as building autobahns and working in rearmament projects. The DAF promoted the idea of "**work for all Germans**" and the "beauty of labour," where working conditions were improved through factory regulations physical workplace improvements. Hitler's dictatorship also saw the introduction of Nazi program for German workers called **Strength Through Joy (KdF)** under the DAF that offered **subsidized holidays**, cruises, and ski trips, **theatre tickets**, concerts, and sporting events and access to **cheap radios (Volksempfänger)** and car purchase (**Volkswagen**) **schemes**. With the economy under the control of the Nazi state, workers had work and salary, faced less strikes making production supply consistent, and more price stability and better livelihoods. Unemployment fell from 6 million in 1933 to 2.5 million in 1935, and below 1 million in 1939. With increased employment and pay to afford basic necessities, the economy recovered from the recession caused by the Great Depression and the German people enjoying social stability and economic security.

However, it can be argued that after Hitler came to power, German society declined as the people had to live with Nazi dictatorship. Hitler established a **one-party state** through elimination, **fear and terror**. Non-Nazi political parties were sent to **concentration camps**, while top jobs in the police force and law courts were given to high-ranking Nazis. The Nazis ran a **police state** controlling all apparatus of law and order and even the **judiciary was pro-Nazi**. Nazi dictatorship was entrenched through the SS using terror tactics to intimidate the German people, and through the **Gestapo** and their informers to arrest and eliminate suspected opponents. This created an **atmosphere of fear** in a society where Germans turned on each other and targeted Jews and other people deemed deviant and dangerous to Nazi society.

The German economy was also in a worse state in some ways as workers needs were overlooked when **independent trade unions were banned** in May 1933. Workers could **no longer negotiate for better wages** or be represented. All decisions were made by the Nazi state with **Nazi ideology** at the workplace. Participation in Nazi-led events and programs was compulsory and loyalty to the Führer was unquestioned. Workers had to increase productivity without rise in pay or compensation which often led **worker exploitation** to meet rearmament and production goals. German works had to work long hours under tight discipline, and strict surveillance to ensure worker loyalty and conformity. Workers were expected to report on each other, creating further climate of **fear and distrust** in the workplace in additional to close Nazi **political policing**.

In conclusion, Hitler's dictatorship was only good on paper and in the short term while there was still some unemployment. As Hitler became more openly aggressive in his foreign policy, more government spending went too was directed to create military jobs and prepare for war, more fear and terror griped German economy and society.

3	'The militarists' rise to power was helped by the economic crises that Japan faced in the late 1920s' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
---	--	------

L1 Identifies /Describes economic crises or other factors [1-3]

L2 Explains economic crises or other factor [4-5]

L3 Economic crises and other factor explained [6-8]

L4 L3 + Conclusion [10]

The militarists' rise to power was helped by the economic crises that Japan faced in the late 1920s because it made Japanese people contemptuous of democratic capitalism and made them more inclined to support a strong government who is able to assert control over private enterprises like banks and businesses. In the 1920s, Japanese banks and businesses were mainly small and rural with small loan and customer base. Borrowers and buyers were mostly from the same industry and neighbourhood with low creditworthiness and low purchasing power. When banks and businesses face bad debts and demands from creditors, peoples' confidence in banks were easily shaken. This led to several run on the bank where investors and depositors rushed to withdraw deposits. A bank run affected over 20 banks led to a Banking Crisis in 1927 resulting in widespread unhappiness with the Taisho government and its failure to pass regulations and exercise oversight to ensure systemic stability to guard the peoples' livelihood. This crisis of confidence in the banking system was worsened by the Great Depression after 1929. Demand for Japanese exports like silk fell drastically in an era of protectionism especially in the USA. Japan's economy fell by 20 per cent between 1929 and 1931 leading to even more intense public resentment towards the Taisho government grew. Not only was international trade hit, farmers' income plummeted by an average of 43 per cent between 1929 and 1931. Tenant farmers tried unsuccessfully to get landowners to reduce their rent. Small businesses closed down dealing multiplier effects on suppliers and saddling banks with more bad debts. Many of these tenant farmers driven off their land and business owners facing bankruptcy joined protest movements led by the Imperial Middle Class Federated Alliance to use violence to show their unhappiness. Ordinary Japanese distrusted then government and civilian politicians for looking after the elites and zaibatsu or were receiving money and benefits from them. Such was the disdain for politicians that patriotic societies even had the confidence to carry out the assassination attempts on PM Inukai in 1932. **Economic failures of the capitalist system led ordinary**

Japanese demand for a stronger and more nationalistic government such as one led by the military who were popular due to their successes in Manchuria.

The militarists' rise to power was helped by the political crises in the 1920s Japan because it made the politician look incompetent and unable to protect Japan's national interest. Emperor Yoshihito was sickly and too weak to exercise authority over Japan's government dominated by divisions and rivalry between the two political parties in the Diet, the Seiyukai and Minseito. This situation made the government look weak to its citizens and helpless to other nations as politicians mainly followed a pacifist approach of diplomacy and agreed to disarmament terms that western powers imposed on Japan to limit Japan's military and industrial development. Faced with an inept government, the military, particularly the Kwan Tung Army based in China, acted on their own to initiate a forward policy in Manchuria by creating the Manchurian incident in 1932. The Tokyo government's refusal to support the Kwantung Army but instead cut the military's budget was the final blow. **Political ineptness gave radical elements and patriotic societies the excuse to carry out the May 15 assassination of PM Inukai, attempting a coup and attacked the Seiyukai party HQ. Faced with a grave political crisis, the Emperor appointed a Navy admiral Saiko Makoto as the PM in a cabinet dominated by military personnel.**

In conclusion, it was the political challenges in the Japanese government that made them to weak and divided to deal with economic failures. Since the Japanese government was incapable and had caused the people and military to lose support in them, the economic failures only highlighted their incapability and further enabled the military to take over the government.

4	'Tensions with the United States was the cause of Japan's decision to strike against the USA in the Pacific in 1941.'	[10]
---	---	------

L1 Identifies /Describes Japan's tension with the USA or other factors [1-3]

L2 Explains Japan's tension with the USA or other factors [4-5]

L3 Japan's tension with the USA and other factors explained [6-8]

L4 L3 + Conclusion [10]

Relations between Japan and USA has not been good since the Washington Naval Conference limited Japan's shipping tonnage. This made Japan feel that that the USA is determined to curb Japan's growth and development as an international power. Relations further deteriorated after the Great Depression due to the USA's imposition of protectionist tariffs on Japanese exports. This made Japan turn to conquest in China to ensure a captive market and source of supplies. Japan's invasion of China in turn triggered US condemnation and economic sanctions to curb Japan's ability to continue its war in China. The USA also stepped-up support for China by providing financial and military aid to Chiang Kai Shek. These actions by the USA angered the Japanese military leadership as acts to deliberately hinder Japan's aims to be a regional power. USA's economic embargo on Japan pushed Japan into occupying French Indochina in 1940 in an arrangement with Vichy France, to ensure her supply of coal and rubber to feed her war operations in China. When diplomatic negotiations failed, the USA placed more restrictions on steel and iron in October 1940 and eventually an embargo on oil in 1941. Roosevelt also enacted the Trading with the Enemy Act to seize Japanese assets in the USA making it impossible for Japan to access 90% of crucial raw materials needed to supply her war in China and her occupation of French Indochina. Japan considered the prohibitive measures by the USA to strangle her military tantamount to an act of war. The military leadership in Japan regarded USA's action as unacceptable and was determined not to be bullied into submission by the USA. Hence they

decided it was necessary to launch a pre-emptive attack on the USA at Pearl Harbour in 1941 to remove the USA as an obstacle to Japan's plans for conquest of Asia.

Japan's ideological motivation was also a cause of Japan's decision to strike against the US in 1941 as she wanted to boot out the western powers to create an Asia for the Asiatics, a Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. Japan believed in its ultra-nationalism that Japan is a great nation and an industrial power deserving to lead and control Asia in place of the western colonialists. Having already taken over Manchuria in 1931 and invaded China in 1937, the military government under Hideki Tojo use ideological messages to influence the Japanese people into supporting the military's plans to liberate Asia by first getting rid of the French in Indochina, the British in Malaya, and eventually the Americans in the Philippines and in the Pacific.

USA's considerable presence at Pearl Harbour with 8 battleships, 3 cruisers, more than 30 destroyers, submarines and 390 aircrafts posed a formidable obstacle to Japan's ambition. As Japan's expansion in China already caused a deterioration of Japan-US relations, any attempt to take over Southeast Asia would invite a stronger response from the US due to its presence in the Philippines and Pearl Harbour. In order to fulfil its ideological mandate of leadership in the Asia Pacific, Japan needed to strike against the US at Pearl Harbour before the latter intervened.

Japan's alliance with the Fascist powers of Italy and Germany via the Anti-Comintern Pact (1937) and the Tripartite Pact (1940) gave Japan a free hand to strike at the US in the Pacific without any worry of France and British intervention since they were already engaged in a war in Europe after Sept 1939. Japan's strike on the US in the Pacific was also to fulfil its obligation to Germany to keep the US bogged down in the Pacific to prevent the US from becoming involving in the war in Europe on the side of Britain and France.

Eventually, Japanese decision to strike at the USA at Pearl Harbour in 1941 was due to the threat that the US's presence in Asia posed to Japanese imperial plan of conquest. Deteriorating relations made it inevitable that Japan to hit back at the USA but USA's strong military presence was also the obstacle that had to be removed.

Table of Specifications

Objective 1: Deploy Knowledge

- select, organise and use relevant historical knowledge in context.

Objective 2: Construct Explanation and Communicate Historical Knowledge

- analyse and explain historical events and periods studied using key historical concepts (causation and consequence, change and continuity, significance) in order to arrive at a reasoned conclusion.

Objective 3: Interpret and Evaluate Source Materials

- interpret, evaluate and use a range of sources as evidence in their historical context through:
 - comprehending and extracting relevant information
 - drawing inferences from given information
 - comparing and contrasting different views
 - distinguishing between facts, opinion and judgement
 - recognising values and detecting bias
 - establishing utility of given information
 - drawing conclusions based on a reasoned consideration of evidence and arguments.

For reference:

Assessment Specification Grid

Assessment Objectives	Weighting
AO1 + AO2	20%
AO1 + AO3	30%
Total	50%

Note: AO1 forms part of the testing of AO2 and AO3.

Assessment Format The examination consists of one paper and the duration of the paper is 1 hour 50 minutes. This paper is assessed by a source-based case study and essay questions.

For reference:

The Making of the 20th Century Modern World, 1910s–1991
Section A: Source-Based Case Study (30%)

- Maximum of 6 sources
- Q1(a)–(e): source-based questions (AO1 + AO3)

30m

Section B: Essay Questions (20%)

- Answer 2 out of 3 questions set (AO1 + AO2)
- The questions require candidates to analyse, evaluate and make judgement on historical events and/or issues
- Each question carries 10 marks

20m

Total marks for Paper

50m

Section A		Assessment Objectives		
<u>Section A: Source Base Case Study (40 marks) 66.6 %</u>		AO1	AO2	AO3
Topic:				
The Policy of Appeasement				
(a) Skills: <u>Inference</u>	Marks : <u>6</u>	✓		✓
(b) Skills: <u>Utility</u>	Marks : <u>7</u>	✓		✓
(c) Skills: <u>Surprise</u>	Marks : <u>6</u>	✓		✓
(d) Skills: <u>Comparison</u>	Marks : <u>7</u>	✓		✓
(e) Skills: <u>Inference of purpose</u>	Marks <u>6</u>	✓	—	✓
(f) Skills: <u>Assertion</u>	Marks: <u>8</u>	✓	—	✓

Section B		Assessment Objectives		
<u>Section B : Structured Essay Question (20 marks) 33.3 %</u>		AO1	AO2	AO3
2	Rise of Hitler			
3	Rise of Japan	✓	✓	
4	War in Asia Pacific			

--	--	--	--