

- 1. Foreign Policy of the 1930s (pp. 806–809)** This first section stresses that, early in the Depression decade of the 1930s, even Roosevelt was an “isolationist,” effectively scuttling the London \_\_\_\_\_ Conference of 19\_\_\_\_. He preferred to deal with U.S. problems in isolation rather than to cooperate with other countries in attacking the Depression on a global basis. With the Tydings - \_\_\_\_\_ Act of 1934, the U.S. signaled further withdrawal from Asia by promising the Philippines their independence in \_\_\_\_\_ years. Also, in 1933, the U.S. finally recognized formally the sixteen year-old Bolshevik regime in the \_\_\_\_\_ Union. Withdrawal from Europe and Asia was balanced by a much friendlier attitude toward Latin America, called the “Good \_\_\_\_\_” Policy. Paving the way for a boom in post–World War II international trade, FDR and his Secretary of State Cordell \_\_\_\_\_ began drastically reducing tariff rates (if other countries would do the same) under the \_\_\_\_\_ Agreements Act of 1934.
- 2. Dictators and Neutrality (pp. 809–811)** Remember how, before U.S. entry into World War I, some were critical of Wilson for allowing U.S. ships and people into the war zone and thus increasing the danger of getting sucked into that conflict? Notice how the country tried to learn this lesson in order to avoid another conflict brewing in Europe in the late 1930s—and notice also how the authors brand this isolationist approach as a “tragically shortsighted,” “head-in-the-sand” policy which was “one war too late.” **(See how useful it is to study history!!!)**
- a. \*\*\* To the best of your ability, define the following terms:
- (1) Totalitarianism:
  
  - (2) Communism:
  
  - (3) Fascism:
- b. List two reasons cited by the authors for the rise of communist “totalitarianism” in the USSR under Joseph \_\_\_\_\_ and noncommunist “fascist” dictatorships in Italy under Benito \_\_\_\_\_ and in Germany under Adolf \_\_\_\_\_.
- (1)
  
  - (2)
- c. As the dictators pushed for expansion in Europe and Asia, Americans tried to avoid involvement at all costs. List two reasons why most Americans were isolationist, as reflected in such things as the 1934 report of a committee under Sen. Gerald \_\_\_\_\_ about causes of U.S. entry into World War I and passage of the \_\_\_\_\_ Acts of 1935, 1936, and 1937. \*\*\* Given what was known at the time, would you have been an isolationist or would you have favored a more interventionist, or aggressive, American effort to stop totalitarian expansionism?
- (1)
  
  - (2)
  
  - (3) Your view:

**3. March Toward War (pp. 811–814)**

a. The authors list a stream of aggressive acts which were met with timid responses from America and the Western European democracies. In \_\_\_\_\_ (country), they failed to support the duly elected left-leaning government in its civil war with the forces of General Francisco \_\_\_\_\_, who was receiving aid from Germany and Italy. In the Far East, they failed to oppose the full-scale invasion of China by \_\_\_\_\_ (country), which had controlled Manchuria since 1931. In Europe, Germany built up its military forces; adopted a plan to exterminate its \_\_\_\_\_ population; occupied the \_\_\_\_\_ area of Germany, which was demilitarized under the Treaty of Versailles; took over German-speaking \_\_\_\_\_ (Hitler’s birthplace); and moved on the German-inhabited \_\_\_\_\_ region of Czechoslovakia. Finally, in a move that proved to be folly but appeared promising at the time, British Prime Minister Chamberlain met with Hitler in \_\_\_\_\_ (German city) in September 1938. He got Hitler to agree to take no more territory and declared on his return to Britain that he had arranged for “peace in our time.” Hitler then proceeded to swallow up all of \_\_\_\_\_ six months later. This “lesson” has often been used by those who argue that one should never “appease” or attempt to compromise with an “aggressor.” \*\*\* Do you agree with this “lesson”? If so, who is to decide when a country or leader is to be labeled an “aggressor”? If not, how are future Hitlers to be stopped before they wreak havoc?

b. War was virtually assured in 1939 when two arch-enemies, Hitler and Stalin, signed a nonaggression treaty. What were the rather cynical objectives of both parties?

(1) Objective of Hitler:

(2) Objective of Stalin:

c. Hitler then felt free to attack and take over \_\_\_\_\_ (country), thus bringing in Britain and France and launching World War II. Supposedly learning the lessons of WW I, America responded by passing the \_\_\_\_\_ Act of 1939, which was designed to keep Americans out of the war zone by requiring that all warring parties (basically Britain and France) buying goods in America pay cash and carry those goods out on their own ships.

**4. Holocaust (pp. 818–819)** List three main reasons advanced by the authors in this section as to why America, which selectively admitted some 150,000 Jewish refugees, did not do substantially more to aid the Jewish people being targeted by Hitler. \*\*\* What would your policy have been?

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4) Your policy:

**5. Aiding the Allies (pp. 814–817, 820–824)**

a. After a period of inaction over the winter of 1939–1940, called the “\_\_\_\_\_ war,” Hitler invaded and conquered \_\_\_\_\_ (through Scandinavia, Netherlands, and Belgium). The British successfully evacuated their troops from the French port of \_\_\_\_\_. Prime Minister Winston \_\_\_\_\_ then rallied his country to resist massive German air bombardment in the so-called Battle of \_\_\_\_\_. Alarmed, Congress approved a huge military buildup and the first peacetime military draft. Although the population was much more anti-German (or anti-Hitler) than it had been before World War I, there was no political will for direct intervention. The domestic debate was between the Committee to \_\_\_\_\_ America by Aiding the Allies and the pure isolationist America \_\_\_\_\_ Committee, whose chief spokesman was the aviator Charles A. \_\_\_\_\_. Roosevelt, an interventionist, responded by selling fifty \_\_\_\_\_ (type of naval vessel) to Britain—clearly against the recognized obligations of “neutrals.” In the election of 1940, Roosevelt ignored the “\_\_\_\_\_ -term tradition” and beat the able Republican challenger Wendell \_\_\_\_\_. He then expanded on his concept of massive military aid to the Allies by securing passage of the hugely important \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ Bill. America ultimately sent over \$\_\_\_\_\_ billion of military equipment to the Allies, under the dubious “condition” that the equipment be “returned to America after the war.” This was a clear abandonment of neutrality (short of actual direct military involvement), and a transparent excuse for using America’s industrial might to aid countries that could not afford to pay for the equipment. It also once again exposed American ships to German \_\_\_\_\_ -boat attacks. In a major and ultimately fateful change of tactics, Hitler called off his planned invasion of Britain and, in the summer of 1941, attacked his erstwhile ally in the East, \_\_\_\_\_. Both sides ultimately racked up massive numbers of casualties in this epic confrontation. The German attack threw the Russian dictator \_\_\_\_\_ “into bed” with Churchill and Roosevelt. In August of 1941, Churchill and Roosevelt met secretly on a destroyer off the coast of \_\_\_\_\_. They got along famously and issued what came to be known as the \_\_\_\_\_ Charter, a statement of war aims not unlike Wilson’s \_\_\_\_\_. Immediately thereafter, the U.S. navy began to escort Lend-Lease shipments to Britain, exposing itself to German attack. The first U.S. ship to be hit by the U-boats in September of 1941 was the destroyer \_\_\_\_\_. The Neutrality Acts were repealed, but the United States still refrained from war.

b. \*\*\* Comment on ONE aspect that you found interesting in this story of the lead-up to American involvement in World War II. For example, what do you think of the way the country inched its way toward involvement on the side of the Allies—from selling destroyers to Lend-Lease to escorting convoys, etc.? Or do you think it appropriate that Roosevelt would meet with Churchill and agree on the aims and strategies for a war in which the United States was not yet involved?

**6. Attack and Declaration of War (pp. 824–825)**

a. As the authors state concisely on p. 825, the United States faced a “devil’s dilemma” after war started in Europe—“to keep Britain from collapsing, the Roosevelt administration felt compelled to extend the un-neutral aid that invited attacks from German submarines. To keep Japan from expanding (referring to its continuing aggression in China), Washington undertook to cut off vital Japanese supplies (gas, oil, metal, etc., essential to the resource-poor nation) and invite possible retaliation.” That Japan would opt for war was not surprising—but that a U.S. target would be on the hit-list appears to have been unexpected. The blow that brought the United States into the war came on Sunday, December 7, \_\_\_\_\_ at the naval base of \_\_\_\_\_ in Hawaii. From the Japanese point of view, what actions had the United States taken that “forced” them to initiate a Pacific-wide war? What do the authors see as both the short- and long-term consequences for Japan of its decision to directly attack a U.S. target at Pearl Harbor?

(1) U.S. provocation:

(2) Short-term Consequences:

(3) Long-term Consequences:

b. After World War I, people thought they had learned the lesson of how to stay out of European conflicts by sticking firmly to isolationist policies. \*\*\* After reviewing the lead-up to U.S. involvement in World War II, do you feel there are any lessons to be learned from that experience (especially as America decides whether to “police the world” as its only “superpower”)? Should America be a leader in promoting democracy and free markets worldwide and take aggressive stands when dictators attempt to impose their wills on others? Or do you feel that absolute proof should be required that this country’s real and immediate interests are threatened before the United States enters any foreign conflict?