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ONE MAN SAVED US FROM THE GREATEST WAR OF ALL

30 September 1938
I remembered how each time that the democracies failed to act, it had encouraged the aggressors to keep going ahead. Communism was acting in Korea just as Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese had acted ten, fifteen and twenty years earlier.... If this was allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war, just as similar incidents had brought on a second world war.

- President Harry Truman

Read more: http://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/The-Munich-Analogy-The-korean-war.html#ixzz4jrUZWQyQ

An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last.
-- Winston Churchill
Overview

• The exam
• The debates
• The ‘content’ of appeasement
• The historiography of appeasement
  • Phases
  • Influences
  • Selecting and using sources
  • An example
• The essay
Question 2 (25 marks)

Source B

Even when people have no motive to bend history in a particular direction, they have difficulty getting it straight.

JOYCE APPLEBY, LYNN HUNT and MARGARET JACOB
Telling the Truth About History, 1994

How relevant is the view expressed in this statement to the historical debates in your case study?

In your response, make explicit references to Source B and at least ONE area of debate in your case study. Identify your case study at the beginning of your answer.
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The debates

1. The origins of appeasement and relationship to earlier policies
2. British and French approaches to appeasement in the 1930s
3. International reactions to appeasement in the 1930s
4. Appeasement and the origins of the Second World War
5. The extent of the successes and/or failures of appeasement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Baldwin</td>
<td>Treaty of Versailles (1919)</td>
<td>A map of Nazi expansion in 1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edvard Benes</td>
<td>Locarno Agreement (1925)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville Chamberlain</td>
<td>Hitler made Chancellor (1930)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Churchill</td>
<td>German rearmament (1930s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edouard Daladier</td>
<td>Abyssinian Crisis (1935-36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony Eden</td>
<td>Reoccupation of Rhine (1936)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Viscount Halifax</td>
<td>Spanish Civil War (1936-38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolph Hitler</td>
<td>Anschluss (1938)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito Mussolini</td>
<td>Sudeten Crisis (1938)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi-Soviet Pact (1939)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invasion of Poland (1939)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Douglas Newton, Germany 1918-1945: from days of hope to years of horror, Addison Wesley Longman, 1990.
Diagram 4.1 Phases of appeasement historiography

1. Orthodox (‘Guilty Men’)
These works dominated thinking about appeasement during the 1940s and 1950s. They were produced by historians, journalists and politicians who lived through inter-war years and, in many cases, participated in the events directly. With limited access to official records they largely relied on their own recollections and private papers. The orthodox view was that British and French policymakers had been wrong to appease Hitler, that the policy stemmed from moral and political ineptitude and that appeasement actually contributed to the outbreak of war. Orthodox works tended to focus and place blame on decisions made by individuals such as Chamberlain.

2. Revisionist:
Research questioning the orthodox view began to appear in the early 1960s; it was stimulated and informed by the release of British government files from the 1930s in 1968. To explain and evaluate the policy of appeasement scholars shifted their attention from individual politicians to the political, economic, strategic and social factors that influenced their decisions, as well as international responses to appeasement. Works during the 1970s-80s tended to focus narrowly on the impact of each of these different factors. Generally speaking, revisionists concluded that the circumstances of the 1920s-30s gave British and French governments little option but to adopt a policy of appeasement.

3. Counter and Post-Revisionist
There has been such a diversity in the scholarship of appeasement since the 1980s that makes it difficult to characterise. On the one hand there are works that might be considered ‘counter-revisionist’ that, also drawing on archival files, have re-affirmed criticisms of the policy and its supporters (albeit for more nuanced and sophisticated reasons than the orthodox literature assumed). At the same time ‘post-revisionist’ works have synthesised the narrowly focused studies of revisionists to develop complex, multi-faceted histories of appeasement that, while acknowledging the influence of structural constraints on policy makers, also contend that they had other options than appeasing Hitler to the extent that they did so.
1. The evidence
The evidence available to scholars of appeasement has grown over time. Milestones include the British parliament’s Public Records Act 1967 which changed the closure on government records from 50 to 30 years; the release of Neville Chamberlain’s private papers in 1975 and the opening of British intelligence service files in 1997. The end of the Cold War also made archives in Eastern Europe and Russia available to western scholars.

2. The historians
The personalities and professional backgrounds of authors are indelibly stamped on the historiography of appeasement. Those who have been influential voices in the debates have included academic and popular historians, journalists, political scientists and politicians – all bring different methodologies and questions to the subject and all have written with contrasting purposes and for various audiences.

3. The social and political context
The social and political context in which appeasement studies have occurred has also influenced the way in which scholars have approached the topic. Contemporary events influence the questions asked and conclusions drawn about the 1930s. The disasters Britain faced in the early part of the Second World War, for example, encouraged a critical and emotive view of ‘the appeasers’. The events of the Cold War had a more complex influence, encouraging some to cite appeasement as a ‘lesson’ against negotiating with aggressors while prompting others to see appeasement as a legitimate and indeed necessary policy for avoiding nuclear war.

Historian Patrick Finney also highlights the influence that changing ideas about British national identity have had on appeasement. Critics of the policy have tended to assume that British leaders should have confronted Hitler because they could have done so given Britain’s dominant place in the world of the 1930s. Revisionists, working in the context of British decolonisation (1945-90s), came to realise that Britain was already in decline as a global power during the 1930s and, thus, had a limited capacity to alter the course of events in Europe.
Selecting and using sources

• How many?

• Do I have to read entire books?


Selecting and using sources

• What types?

• The big names
  • Cato (1940s)
  • Churchill (1940s)
  • AJP Taylor (1960s)
  • RAC Parker (1990s)
  • Frank McDonough (1990s)
  • Richard Overy (1970s-present)
Selecting and using sources

- Less well-known

  - Williamson Murray (1980s)

  - Patrick Finney (2000s)

  - Jack Levy (2000s)
    - Norrin Ripsman and Jack Levy ‘Wishful thinking or buying time? The logic of appeasement in the 1930s’ (2008)

  - Christopher Waters (2000s)
    - Christopher Waters, *Australia and Appeasement: Imperial Foreign Policy and the Origins of World War II* (2011)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bibliographic details of the source (author, title, publisher, year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the source’s main points relating to one of the debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarise the main points of the author’s thesis. Remember to identify how the author contributes to a specific debate in the Appeasement – Peace or War? case study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note some illustrative quotations. Select pithy, telling quotes rather than long, discursive ones that will be difficult to remember in an examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical details of the author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do some research to determine some details about the author’s personal context: their professional qualifications, other work they have done, their political views and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that shaped the author’s perspective and interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has influenced this author’s approach to the topic of appeasement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aspects of their personal background and agenda (noted above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other works they might be writing in response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historiographical theories and trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contemporary events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evidence they used (or did not use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The purpose and readership for which they were writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical evaluation of the source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are this source’s merits as a piece of historical interpretation? What valuable contributions does it make to your chosen area of debate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are this source’s limitations? What are its weaknesses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does this source reflect or challenge historiographical approaches such as empiricism, modernism or post-modernism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does this source complement or contest the views in your other chosen sources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Munich at Fifty

Williamson Murray

It is now fifty years since Adolf Hitler, Neville Chamberlain, Edouard Daladier, and Benito Mussolini met at Munich in September 1938 to sign Czecho-Slovakia of its territory and its destiny. The rationalists for British and French policy ran the gauntlet from strategic reasons: de-Hitler, to a false rejection of the use of force in the international arena, to object fear. The results were catastrophic. The British and the French came close to losing everything in a Nazi tyranny that would, in Winston Churchill's inimitable phrase, have brought a new Dark Age made more horrid, and perhaps more portrayed, by the howls of prevented science. But as is often the case, historians have obscured such moments when the world has turned in new and darker directions. Perhaps it is incommensurate; we all turn our faces from darkness.

To the people who taught me history in the 1960's Munich represented one of those hinges on which history had turned; Munich, of course, had determined their lives over the years that followed, and considerably for the worse. Current historiography, however, suggests that Munich was only a synecdoche of larger trends in the world, prefiguring the collapse of British and French empires and the rise of American and Soviet hegemony (at least for a short period). Munich, so the argument runs, came out of a disengagement by the British to prevent a world war that, whether won or lost, would mean the end of empire. If so, the British failed to grasp that there is a difference between winning a war and losing one's empire and finding a war and losing one's national existence. The alternatives in 1938 were that stark. Nevertheless, whatever revisionists may write, Munich today still symbolizes the blighted fruit of a decade of appeasement and surrender.

What most surprises me, as a military and diplomatic historian, about the wreckage of those years is the speed with which the Germans in the 1920's counseled themselves and the Anglo-American world that peace would come Germans, panicked by their neighbors and everyone else, had made peace in November 1938 on the basis of Wilson's Fourteen Points and then, backed by尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝尝试
The Examination

“[The HIX course]… enable[s] students to develop an understanding of how and why the sources they have accessed have constructed their versions of history. Students will be rewarded for constructing their own coherent argument based on this understanding, not on how much they know and can retell about the specific case study topic.”
The Examination

Issues identified in 2016 marking centre notes

• Identify the ideas presented in the source and engage with them in a sustained manner

• Avoid describing the sources – use them to support an argument

• Addressing the specifics of a debate – don’t just discuss your case study generally
Question 2 (25 marks)

Source B

Even when people have no motive to bend history in a particular direction, they have difficulty getting it straight.

JOYCE APPLEBY, LYNN HUNT and MARGARET JACOB
Telling the Truth About History, 1994

How relevant is the view expressed in this statement to the historical debates in your case study?

In your response, make explicit references to Source B and at least ONE area of debate in your case study. Identify your case study at the beginning of your answer.
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