

Study Source 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

(b) How much weight do you give to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into the reasons for the Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1931?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(15)

Plan

~~For~~ Provenance: - Author, Nature, Origin, Date

Context - omissions - Tanaka Memorial, disputes between Tokyo and army
Context agrees to some extent.

There are certain factors which make Source 2 valuable to the historian ~~such as~~ ~~the~~ for such an enquiry such as its author being the Foreign Ministry of Japan, its context ~~discussing~~ the decision to invade Manchuria and its time of writing in 1932. Nevertheless, the historian must consider the various limitations that exist when using this source, preventing the historian from gaining an accurate and reliable insight into the subject of the enquiry.

One factor which gives source 2 weight is the fact that it was written by the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which ^{was officially recognised} ~~was~~ the Japanese government, which decided to invade Manchuria in 1931. ~~For~~ This makes the author credible ~~of~~ giving accurate and reliable information for the enquiry as Japan was most aware of the reasons which led it to ~~invade~~ invade Manchuria. This combines with the fact that ~~Japan~~ the source is a report written in 1932, aiming to give an accurate description ~~of~~ the subject, which is



P 5 0 6 2 5 A 0 5 2 0

"Relations with ~~Japan~~ Manchuria and Mongolia". For this reason the source is likely to contain relevant information to the enquiry which would be useful for the historian. Further adding to its weight. Nevertheless the fact that it was written by Japan ^{itself} at a time when the topic (1931 invasion of Manchuria) was controversial and concerned by organisations such as the League of Nations, which Japan was forced to leave in 1933, ~~it~~ raises the possibility of bias due to Japan's attempt to hide the true causes of the invasions and attempt make its motives seem noble and justified, taking away weight from the source. This attempt to cover up real Japanese intentions, which are known to be a rising population and declining economy as a result of the 1929 Wall Street Crash, makes the source less likely to be reliable and truthful and therefore takes away from its veracity. This could have been done through omissions. One reason for the invasion which appears to have been purposely left out from the source is the lack of control of the Tokyo government over hawkish Japanese militarists and (Imperial) army in ~~the~~ Manchuria, which supported the Tanaka memorial, stating that the invasion of Manchuria by Japan is necessary and inevitable. Furthermore, the source seems to ignore the fact that the Mukden (or Shenyang) incident was caused and provoked by Japanese troops, who bombed a strip of railway and ~~blamed~~ blamed it on Chinese sabotage. These omissions of key information which is needed for a balanced and accurate approach to the enquiry take away weight from the source and leads to questioning of its reliability.



In terms of weight given to Source 2 based on evidence and existing knowledge about the period, the source both agrees and disagrees with contextual knowledge information, leading to a varying amount of weight given. The source's claim that the Mukden incident in 1931 was a main reason for the invasion of Manchuria ~~is~~ can be ~~confirmed~~ confirmed by existing evidence, which states that the Japanese used the stage Mukden incident ~~to~~ as pretext for the invasion of Manchuria. ~~Additionally this~~ ^{gives} ~~more~~ the source some weight due to its authenticity. Nevertheless the source's mentioning of hostile attitudes of Chinese troops and a danger to Japanese lives in Manchuria is exaggerated, as there is no clear evidence that these actually happened. It is only a possible scenario ~~Japan~~ Japan describes in order to justify its decision to infringe and undermine Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria. Additionally, the fact that in 1932, the year of writing of the source, Manchuria was turned into the Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo, ~~with~~ with ~~the~~ previous emperor Pu Yi installed as its official (but not actual) leader, raises the ~~possibility~~ ^{probability} that at the time of writing Japan was trying to make excuses to not provoke severe international disapproval and intervention.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ ~~source~~ While the source does have some value and contains information for the official Japanese reasoning for the invasion, ~~due~~ due to its author, nature and time, it should not be given much weight nor the country as it is likely to be biased and unreliable due to the interest of its author ~~in~~ making the invasion appear



legitimate. This is proven through existing omissions, and lack of agreement with existing knowledge from other sources.

