

JERIA'S DEFINITIVE PAPER 1 NOTES

HISTORY

PAPER 1: PRESCRIBED SUBJECTS

Peacemaking, Peacekeeping: International Relations 1918-36

Syllabus

- Aims of the participants and the peacemakers: Wilson and the Fourteen Points
- **Terms of the Paris Peace Treaties 1919-20: Versailles, St Germain, Trianon, Neuilly, Sevres/Lausanne 1923**
- The geopolitical and economic impact of the treaties on Europe; **the establishment and impact of the mandate system**
- Enforcement of the provisions of the treaties: US Isolationism – the retreat from the Anglo-American guarantee; disarmament – **Washington**, London and Geneva conferences
- The League of Nations: effects of the absence of major powers; the principle of collective security and early attempts at peacekeeping (1920-25)
- The Ruhr Crisis (1923); Locarno and the “Locarno Spring” (1925)
- Depression and threats to international peace and collective security: Manchuria (1931-33) and Abyssinia (1935-36)

Timeline of key events

Date	Event			
Apr. 1915	Treaty of London between the Allies and Italy	●	Jul. 1924	Dawes Plan
Jan. 1918	Woodrow Wilson announces his Fourteen Points		1925	Greco-Bulgarian War
Nov. 1918	End of WWI		Oct. 1925	Locarno Treaty
Jan. 1919	Paris Peace Conference commences	●	Oct. 1926	Germany joins the League of Nations
Jun. 1919	Creation of the League of Nations	●	Jun. 1927	Geneva Naval Conference
	Establishment of the Mandate System		Aug. 1928	Kellogg-Briand pact
	Treaty of Versailles signed with Germany	●	Aug. 1929	Young Plan
	Anglo-American Guarantee (proposal and rejection)	●	Oct. 1929	The Wall Street Crash
Sep. 1919	Treaty of St Germain signed with Austria	●	1930	London Naval Conference
Nov. 1919	Treaty of Neuilly signed with Bulgaria	●	1931-33	Manchurian crisis
Mar. 1920	US Senate fails to ratify Treaty of Versailles		1932-33	World Disarmament Conference (Geneva)
Jun. 1920	Treaty of Trianon signed with Hungary	●	Mar. 1933	Japan leaves the League of Nations
Aug. 1920	Treaty of Sèvres signed with Turkey	●	Sep. 1933	Germany leaves the League of Nations
1920	Vilna incident	●	Sep. 1934	The USSR joins the League of Nations
1920-21	Aaland Islands dispute	●	1935-36	Second London Naval Conference
1921	The Little Entente	●		Abyssinian crisis
Mar. 1921	Upper Silesia incident	●	Apr. 1935	Stresa Front between Italy, Britain and France
1921-22	Washington Naval Conference	●	Mar. 1936	Germany remilitarises the Rhineland
Apr. 1922	Treaty of Rapallo signed with Germany and the USSR	●	Oct. 1936	Rome-Berlin Axis
Jan. 1923	Ruhr crisis	●	Dec. 1937	Italy leaves the League of Nations
Jul. 1923	Treaty of Lausanne signed with Turkey	●	Sep. 1939	WWII begins
Aug. 1923	Corfu incident	●		
1924	Mosul conflict	●	Legend	
	Memel conflict	●	Treaty/Alliance/Agreement	●
			League of Nations/Early Attempts at Peacekeeping	●
			Efforts at Disarmament	●

Aims of the participants and the peacemakers: Wilson and the Fourteen Points

Major points of contention

- Treatment of Germany (reparations, borders, demilitarisation, war guilt, colonies)
- European balance of power
- Containment of Communism
- Self-determination
- French alliance with USA and Great Britain
- The League of Nations
- French territorial concessions
- Racial equality (Japan)

Basis of comparison	USA (Woodrow Wilson)	Great Britain (David Lloyd George)	France (Georges Clemenceau)
Primary stance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lenient peace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle-ground: less severe settlement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punitive peace
Post-war situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerged from WWI as the world's leading economy • Industries remained intact; was free from fighting on home soil • American industry and trade had prospered as American food, raw materials, ammunition <i>etc.</i> were sent to Europe • Took over overseas markets • Wilson hoped that the USA would now play a major role in international affairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic crisis • Financed the war through borrowing – by 1918 Britain and France had borrowed \$2 billion from the USA • Spent between 1/3 and 1/2 of their total public expenditure on debt charges and repayments • Never regained pre-war international economic dominance • Deep fear that Communism would engulf Western Europe if stability was not restored quickly • Strong public opinion that Germany be punished severely for damage caused in WWI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suffered over 2 million dead and wounded over the war • Major battle zone during WWI • Severe infrastructural devastation of land, railway and industry • Loss of trade and foreign investments • Economic and military rift between France and Germany was widening • Germany possessed a larger population and greater industrial potential; intimidated France
Aims	A new world order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a new political and international world order based on Wilson's Fourteen Points Treatment of Germany <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact some punishment on Germany as the instigator of WWI and establish a period of probation before joining the League 	Treatment of Germany <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination of the German Empire as a potential source of conflict; limit the German Navy • Germany to pay reparations and accept war guilt, but achieve rapid economic recovery by promoting trade 	Treatment of Germany <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed Wilson's Fourteen Points as it did not guarantee French security • Secure France's security by eliminating the German threat for good • Cripple Germany's economy by demanding extensive reparations

	<p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish democracy and self-determination: impartial adjustment of territorial and colonial claims <p>Disarmament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work towards universal disarmament Overturn all secret alliances – have open negotiations; establish an atmosphere of transparency and cooperation <p>League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the League of Nations as an international body of states to work towards resolving conflicts through collective security All international disputes to be submitted to the League for arbitration <p>Trade and Access to sea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote strong international free trade Freedom of access to the sea <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return of Alsace-Lorraine to France 	<p>European balance of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed the best way to maintain balance of power in Europe was through reconciliation and the normalisation of European relations Promote overall European recovery Independence and strengthening of Belgium <p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed European self-determination and dismemberment of Germany <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not favour French territorial ambitions in Europe beyond the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine <p>Access to sea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed freedom of access to the sea <p>Alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed involvement in any alliance or guarantee in Europe on behalf of any specific country 	<p>European balance of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed the best way to maintain balance of power in Europe was by containing Germany <p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported Eastern European self-determination <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Territorial concessions through the return of Alsace-Lorraine, with control over Belgium, Luxembourg, and the west Rhine as a French puppet state <p>German demilitarisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demilitarisation of the Rhineland and the setting up of an independent state – “Rhineland Republic” <p>League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uninterested in the idea of a forum for the open resolution of disputes <p>Alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wanted a firm alliance with Britain and the USA as guarantee against future German aggression (Anglo-American Guarantee)
Rationale for aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilson believed in achieving a global environment of generosity wherein permanent peace might be assured A peaceful world could be created through the removal of the causes of war: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional secret, closed-door diplomacy between nations Oppression of ethnic minorities by dominant nationalities Military build-up Monarchical, autocratic regimes led by ruling Elites Believed the League would become a forum for the reasonable and rational settlement of international disputes The League could ensure mutual guarantees of political interdependence and territorial integrity Wilson was idealistic; assumed the inherently peaceful and rational nature of human society 	<p>Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feared the threat posed by the German navy during WWI – by June 1917 the German U-boat campaign had reduced London to 6 weeks’ worth of food Prevent Germany from having ports and bases for a future navy Wanted fair treatment of Germany and avoid revenge <p>European balance of power & Self determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> German recovery was essential for British recovery and European economic reconstruction – Germany was a major consumer of British exports Wanted a strong, united Germany as a barrier against Communism Concerned of annexation of German minorities by Poland or France, which might spark war 	<p>Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> France had been invaded 5 times by Germany since 1814 Did not want Germany to return to its pre-war strength Impair Germany economically and militarily such that it would no longer threaten French frontiers Britain and the USA refused to cancel French war debts; needed reparations to repay loans and rebuild damaged infrastructure <p>European balance of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed that a weak Germany would prevent a future European war by removing its greatest threat <p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> France shared a long border with Germany; borne the brunt of the fighting in WWI The creation of a strong and independent Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia would

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free trade would allow the US economy to prosper 	<p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not want France to be the dominant power in Europe Might upset European balance of power Britain and France had a long history of rivalry <p>Access to sea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried that freedom of the seas would affect trade <p>Alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed in freedom of action Wanted to avoid long-term continental commitments and being drawn into another European war British interests lay in intervening only when directly threatened unlike in WWI 	<p>put pressure on Germany's eastern borders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> France could no longer rely on Russia to contain Germany <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Territorial gains would complete a natural French boundary and increase security <p>German demilitarisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Rhineland to be a buffer zone Limit the German military threat at the frontier closest to France <p>League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imagined the League as a military alliance Enforce peace treaties and ensure French security <p>Alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would provide a further guarantee of security in the future Help rebuild France's damaged economy through continued Allied economic cooperation
Successes	<p>A new world order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fourteen Points laid the framework for the negotiation of treaty settlements <p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paris Peace Treaties favoured self-determination, which led to the creation of new nation states <p>League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed to establish the League of Nations in 1919 <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alsace-Lorraine returned to France 	<p>Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieved a compromise with France; Germany was punished to some extent German navy had been eliminated; scuttled its fleet upon signing the Treaty of Versailles <p>European balance of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevented break-up of Germany, which would have left France as the dominant European power Freedom for Belgium <p>Access to sea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintained control of the seas 	<p>Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany had to pay 132 billion gold marks in reparations <p>European balance of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany heavily weakened <p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia under Paris Peace Treaties <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive German territorial secessions France recovered Alsace-Lorraine <p>German demilitarisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rhineland demilitarized
Failures	<p>A new world order & Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idealism was received with disapproval from the major powers Came into conflict with the aims of Britain and France Overlooked the need to treat the victorious and defeated countries differently Ignored national/domestic political and 	<p>Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> France felt that Britain was too lenient on Germany; wanted tougher punishments Lloyd George had to be accountable to his electorate, which had demanded extensive reparations Worried about the harshness of terms imposed on Germany, which were most severe than 	<p>Treatment of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Felt the Treaty of Versailles did not incapacitate Germany's economy sufficiently Security remained threatened <p>French territorial concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failed to gain all territorial concessions <p>Alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anglo-American Guarantee broke down; France

	<p>economic concerns of major powers– did not offer the protection and guarantees they had hoped for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forced to compromise on many of Wilson's ideals <p>Self-determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Britain saw self-determination as an attack on imperialism, would leave behind a power vacuum; wanted a strong Germany Formation of nation states posed problems eg. territorial disputes, culturally mixed, difficulty in drawing borders Defeated nations eg. Germany, Austria, Bulgaria were denied self-determination <p>League of Nations & Alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> US Senate vetoed League membership; did not sign the Treaty of Versailles Deep American domestic opposition for guaranteeing and financing European peace and reconstruction 	originally intended	<p>did not have a guarantee of security from the Allies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Britain did not want French domination of Europe while the USA retreated into isolationism
Effect on international relations (see "enforcement of treaties" below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The USA would retreat into isolationism for the rest of the inter-war period due to lack of domestic support for involvement in European affairs Having failed to sign the Treaty of Versailles, its role in the supervision and enforcement of the treaty thus evaporated during the inter-war years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Britain would therefore be reluctant to enforce harsh peace terms on Germany during the 1920s or acquiesce to France's unilateral attempts to enforce collective security Adopted a pacifist approach to inter-war period conflicts Would become a source of tension between Britain and France 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Britain and the USA were unwilling to commit to European affairs; reluctant to give France the necessary assurance that Germany will be kept in check French foreign policy would thus focus on preventing German recovery and resorting to unilateral actions to forcefully ensure its security from Germany and repay war debts

Expectations of Germany, Italy and Japan			
Basis of comparison	Germany (Friedrich Ebert)	Italy (Vittorio Orlando)	Japan (Makino Nobuaki)
Expectations	Involvement in negotiations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed that Germany would play a key role in the Peace Treaties Peace terms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimistic; expected lenient peace based on Wilson's Fourteen Points Anxious to avoid a declaration of war guilt and high reparations 	Territorial claims <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed the Allies would honour their promises of Italian territorial gains in the Dalmatian coast, Trieste and South Tyrol Was not in favour of self-determination 	Territorial claims <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wanted recognition of its claims in Shandong and German-held islands in the Pacific Racial equality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demanded a clause for racial equality in the League of Nations to protect Japanese immigrants in the West
Reasons for expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany had not been defeated or invaded at the time the armistice was requested Only agreed on a ceasefire to end hostilities Defeated Russia in March 1918 Allied powers had not occupied German territory; hence it was not a situation of total defeat Expected a more lenient negotiation through its movement towards democracy Would not be expected to be treated as a defeated nation and be severely punished Wilson's Fourteen Points were a set of proposals for peace, wherein there was no mention of punishment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promised to Italy under the 1915 Treaty of London as a condition for its entry into WWI on the side of the Allies Needed territory as the war had strained the Italian economy greatly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Captured these territories during WWI and saw them as a reward for contributing to the war effort Japan wanted to take its place among the major powers through acquiring an empire
Result	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany was shut out from peace negotiations Revulsion for terms of the Treaty of Versailles – war guilt, reparations, disarmament and territorial losses Was left resentful and vindictive The German population was united by a gnawing sense of injustice and anger Treaty of Versailles was rejected as a <i>diktat</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfairly treated during the negotiation process; Italy was previously a German ally and only joined the Allies after April 1915 Believed the land gained by peace treaties was not adequate compensation for its contribution to the war effort or the effect of the war on Italy Territorial ambitions rejected; walked out of negotiations when it failed to get Fiume Led to the rise of Mussolini and Fascism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were able to retain Pacific colonies as mandates 21 Demands to China to recognise Japanese claims in Shandong were dropped after American and British opposition Peace treaties left Japan as a second-rate power Walked out of negotiations when racial equality clause was rejected

Terms of the Paris Peace Treaties 1919-20: Versailles, St Germain, Trianon, Neuilly, Sevres/Lausanne 1923

Issues arising from the terms of the Treaties

- Germany expected the Treaty of Versailles to incorporate the spirit of Wilson's Fourteen Points; would not suffer excessive punishment (see "German expectations" above)
- None of the defeated countries or Russia took part in the negotiation process
- There was strong public opinion in Europe that Germany had to suffer for the outbreak of WWI; Entente leaders to consolidate their gains after human and material sacrifices
- Treaties were the result of compromises in the contradictory aims of the major powers
- Difficulty in ensuring fair territorial division for concessions and new nation states

Basis of comparison	Terms of treaty	Impact of treaty
Versailles, 1919 (Germany)	<p>War guilt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany and its allies was forced to accept full responsibility for the outbreak of WWI in Clause 231 of the Treaty of Versailles <p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reparations fixed at 132 billion gold marks, decided in May 1921 <p>Disarmament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banned conscription; army restricted to 100,000 men • Not allowed tanks or heavy artillery • Air force scrapped completely • Navy restricted to 15,000 sailors and 36 ships; ban on submarines • Allied military occupation of the Rhineland for 15 years • Disarmament to be monitored by an Allied commission until 1927 <p>Territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost Alsace-Lorraine to France (contained 75% of Germany's iron resources) • Saarland came under the League of Nations; plebiscite held after 15 years • Creation of independent Poland • Danzig port administered by the League • Poland received the Polish Corridor to gain access to sea; cut East Prussia from Germany • Lost Eupen-Malmedy (Belgium), Upper Silesia (Poland), Memel (Lithuania), South Tyrol (Italy), North Schleswig (Denmark, after plebiscite) • Lost all overseas colonies in Africa and the Pacific • Creation of new independent states eg. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia <p>Creation of the League of Nations (see below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany to be excluded from the League until it was considered ready to be admitted 	<p>War guilt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided legal and moral justification for all economic, territorial and military concessions, limitations and restrictions the defeated powers were forced to make • Deeply damaged German pride; was a source of humiliation • Did not feel it should accept the entire blame for the outbreak of war eg. believed it fought a defensive war due to encirclement by other powers • Saw the Treaty of Versailles as a <i>diktat</i> – was not given any opportunity to negotiate the terms • Became a source of resentment against the West <p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immense amount embittered Germany • Reparations were heavy on the German economy • German unwillingness and inability (debatable) to pay • Resulted in a prolonged struggle to force Germany to pay from 1921-23; culminated in the Ruhr Crisis in January 1923 (see below) <p>Disarmament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stung German pride due to its long military history • Render outbreak of war by Germany impossible; it could already barely even defend itself • Germany protested that 100,000 troops was insufficient to maintain law and order; left it vulnerable to attack and invasion • Failure to promote equal international disarmament (see below); Germany to declare it unfair • Germany was determined to exploit every loophole in the Treaty; terms were never fully enforced • Disappointed France, which wanted to annex Rhineland; would later lead to the 1923 Ruhr Crisis due to lack of enforcement of Treaty terms <p>Territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost a large part of its empire

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost 13% of land and 12% of population • Lost 16% of coalfields, 50% of iron and steel industry • Damaging effect on Germany's economy due to the loss of vital raw materials and labour • Splitting up of German lands and colonies among WWI victors was a blow to national pride • Desire for reunification of Germany would later be exploited by Hitler for territorial conquests (eg. Anschluss, Sudeten crisis) • Territorial secessions led to 6 million ethnic Germans living under foreign rule – Germany felt this went against the principle of self-determination • Germany was not allowed the right to self-determination; plebiscites not granted to Germans such as those in the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia <p>Creation of the League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robbed Germany of its great power status • Saw the League as a “victors’ club” (see below)
St Germain, 1919 (Austria)	<p>War guilt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria was regarded as a successor to Austria-Hungary, which had dragged the rest of the countries into WWI • Forced to accept war guilt • Accepted the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian empire <p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forced to pay reparations <p>Disarmament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited army to 30,000 men <p>Territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost territory to Italy, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Poland • Anschluss (union) with Germany forbidden 	<p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was not able to pay reparations; Bank of Vienna collapsed in 1922 <p>Territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost 75% of pre-WWI territory and 80% of its population • Creation of new independent Czechoslovakia, which had 3 million Germans in the Sudetenland • South Tyrol given to Italy had 230,000 ethnic Germans • Creation of a series of self-determined ‘successor’ states in eastern and south-eastern Europe • However, Austria itself was not granted self-determination • Contained over 12 nationalities that were scattered • 40% of Austrians were subjected to foreign domination • Stirred deep resentment against the Allies
Trianon, 1920 (Hungary)	<p>War guilt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hungary was regarded as a successor to Austria-Hungary, which had dragged the rest of the countries into WWI • Forced to accept war guilt • Accepted the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian empire <p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forced to pay reparations <p>Disarmament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited army to 35,000 men <p>Territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost territory to Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Romania 	<p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was not able to pay reparations; economy collapsed in 1922 • Reparation payments, loss of mines, industries and vast farmlands, loss of port city Fiume meant that Hungary would no longer have access to sea and limited its ability to trade <p>Territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost 75% of pre-WWI territory and 66% of its population • 3.3 million Hungarians were subjected to foreign domination; ignored self-determination principle • Created deep resentment; later sided with Nazi Germany to regain lost territory

Neuilly, 1919 (Bulgaria)	War guilt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had sided with the Central Powers in WWI • Forced to accept war guilt Reparations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forced to pay reparations of £100 million Disarmament <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited army to 20,000 men Territorial losses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost territory to Yugoslavia, Romania and Greece • Granted part of western Turkey 	Territorial losses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 million Bulgarians were subjected to foreign domination • Later sided with Nazi Germany to regain lost territory
Sevres, 1920 (Turkey)	War guilt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had sided with the Central Powers in WWI • Forced to accept war guilt Reparations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forced to pay reparations • Allies given right to control Turkish finances Disarmament <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited army to 50,000 men Territorial losses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ended Turkish control over the Middle East and North Africa • Palestine, Iraq and Transjordan given to Britain as mandates • Lebanon and Syria given to France as mandates • Ceded Smyrna and Eastern Thrace to Greece • Straits of Constantinople open to all nations • Allowed to station foreign troops in Turkey 	Territorial losses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treaty terms sparked a nationalist uprising • Was annulled due to the Turkish war of independence • Led by General Mustafa Kemal who overthrew the Turkish sultan in 1922 • Defeated Greece • New treaty was negotiated
Lausanne, 1923 (Turkey)	Reparations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All reparation payments and checks on Turkish finances were ended Disarmament <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits to military were abolished Territorial losses/gains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regained Smyrna and Eastern Thrace from Greece • Recognised Turkish control over Constantinople and the Straits • Gave up all claims in Syria, Cyprus, Iraq, Egypt and Sudan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turkey's successful challenge to the Treaty of Sevres showed the weakness of the Allies in enforcing their terms

Assessment of the Treaty of Versailles: Was the Treaty of Versailles harsh on Germany?		
Thesis (Traditionalist view; John Maynard Keynes)		Anti-Thesis (Revisionist view; Alan Sharp & Ruth Henig et al.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Treaty of Versailles was harsh and made the outbreak of WWII inevitable A “Carthaginian peace” according to Keynes – the extremely harsh treatment of a defeated power designed to permanently eliminate it as a future threat Based on a spirit of revenge and ignored the economic consequences for Germany and Europe Europe would be poorer and more prone to another war as a result of the economic and territorial burdens placed on Germany Reparation amount of 132 billion gold marks was a sum that could not be raised; Germany defaulted in 1922 on just the second instalment 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Treaty of Versailles was not too harsh on Germany; in fact it could possibly have been even more severe Considering the strong desire for revenge among victorious nations Moreover Germany was spared the creation of a Rhineland republic and had lower reparations due to British intervention <i>etc</i> <p>Germany’s position in Europe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Treaty left Germany in a relatively strong position in Europe; Germany was still the strongest power in Europe economically Arguably Germany emerged stronger after the war In Eastern Europe, Russia remained weak and isolated The divided Austria and Hungary were politically and economically weak Represented a power vacuum that would favour German expansion in the future In Western Europe, France and Belgium were ravaged by occupying troops during WWI In contrast, German territory was virtually untouched Eg. by 1921 Germany was producing 3 times as much steel as France Economic historians have argued that Germany could have met the reparation demands fixed in 1921 if it had reformed its financial system or raised taxes Hyperinflation in the 1920s was due to the issuing of banknotes rather than overwhelming reparation payments Dawes Plan drawn up in 1925 ensured German economic stability
Effect on international relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Treaty of Versailles may not have crippled Germany completely, yet it was significant enough to create tension, stir resentment, and prevent reconciliation It thus served as a catalyst for revenge as soon as Germany recovered 	

Assessment of the Treaty of Versailles: To what extent was the Treaty of Versailles a failure?	
Criteria	Argument
Failure to satisfy the demands of all the victors in WWI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for compromise among the Allies meant that the Treaty of Versailles satisfied none of them Conflict arose due to the differing interests of the Allies, as well as the nature and extent of punishment Germany should face The Treaty would thus be subjected to numerous revisions during the 1920s as the Allies were dissatisfied with the outcome
Failure in keeping to Wilson's Fourteen Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilson's Fourteen Points provided the framework for negotiations on the peace settlements at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 Germany was optimistic that the treaty would incorporate the spirit of the Fourteen Points and would not be excessively punished However, the Fourteen Points were never upheld in the final treaty Secret treaties between nations remained eg. Treaty of Rapallo, 1922 Freedom of the seas was not secured Free trade was never established in Europe; conversely tariffs were raised even higher Failure of disarmament conferences Germans were denied self-determination Colonies were distributed among victors as spoils under the guise of the mandate system Russia was rejected from the League of Nations and the USA never joined
Failure in making Germany weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany emerged in a strong position in Europe (see above)
Failure in making Germany accept the treaty terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Treaty of Versailles was incongruous with German expectations Expected lenient peace; believed the Treaty would be based on Wilson's Fourteen Points, which made no mention of punishment Did not surrender and was not invaded in WWI; did not expect to be treated as a defeated nation when it felt it was not To Germany, the Treaty of Versailles was a massive humiliation; saw it as a <i>diktat</i>
Failure in preventing another war and maintaining international peace and stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Treaty saw major changes to the European balance of power The failure to satisfy the demands of all the victors in WWI and the expectations of Germany, Japan and Italy created tension and stirred resentment The Treaty compromised peace between Germany and the Allies, and raised tension between the Allies themselves Britain, France and the USA emerged as divided powers in the aftermath of the peace settlement However, the Treaty did not directly lead to WWII The Allies failed to enforce the terms of the Treaty consistently and collectively Britain and France were forced into progressive revisions of the Treaty while Germany evaded the execution of reparations and disarmament Could be argued that other circumstances were responsible in damaging international relations eg. the Great Depression

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• International relations were improving during the late 1920s eg. Locarno and the 'Locarno Spring' |
|--|---|

The geopolitical and economic impact of the treaties on Europe

Geopolitical impact	Economic impact
<p>Creation of new states in Central and Eastern Europe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant changes to the geopolitical situation in Central and Eastern Europe • The collapse of the German, Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires led to the creation of no fewer than 10 new states • Lacked political or economic stability; were small, weak and unstable • Poor economic and diplomatic cooperation made them prone to hostilities • Difficulty in balancing self-determination with economic stability in drawing frontiers • Nationalities did not live in well-defined geographical areas; often scattered • At the same time there was a need for new states to have access to resources in order to survive • Eg. Polish Corridor gave Poland access to the sea for its economic survival even though it contained 2 million ethnic Germans <p>Political instability in the 'successor states'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were hoped to act as a buffer to check the spread of communism and provide protection against a resurgent Germany • No tradition of democracy in many new states • In the new democracies, there was a lack of experience in mass politics • A multiplicity of weak political parties emerged • Increased demand for authoritarian rule, which was seen as active and decisive • Rise in extremism due to overall resentment and vindictiveness arising from the peace settlements • Racial tensions caused widespread political dissent • 'Successor states' often contained a wide range of ethnic and cultural groups <p>The Little Entente (1921)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formed between the new states of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania • Realised their vulnerability; wanted protection from the irredentist claims of Hungary, which was angered over territorial losses from the Treaty of Trianon • France supported the alliance as a counterweight to the possibility of German resurgence • Also negotiated an alliance with Poland in 1921 • Promised assistance to these nations in upholding the 1919 settlements and boundaries 	<p>Economic recovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWI and the Treaty of Versailles exacerbated the economic distress in Europe • Failed to address the economic question except that of reparations • Reparations hindered economic recovery in the defeated nations • Failed to address the issue of war debts • The USA refused to cancel the debts of its Allies • France and Britain had to keep demanding reparations from Germany to pay off their debts • Caused economic instability and tension • Debt crisis led to the Ruhr Crisis in 1923 • Dawes Plan eventually solved the conflict <p>Revising the Treaty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Maynard Keynes strongly condemned the Treaty; felt that a weak Germany would hurt the European economy • The USA and Britain started to see the need to revise the Treaty • Created tension between Britain and France • France did not want the German economy to strengthen again; demanded the high reparations that had been imposed <p>International trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to promote international trade among the newly created European states • New states were small and economically fragile, thus erected trade barriers to protect their economies • Failure to develop strong trading links would exacerbate the impact of the Great Depression 1929 <p>Impact of territorial losses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of new independent states and the loss of territory in defeated nations created a variety of economic difficulties • Germany lost colonial and other overseas trading markets due to the Treaty of Versailles • Territory and colonies had provided raw materials and markets for German goods • The newly-created European states were economically weak • Industry and agriculture were underdeveloped

<p>Impact on Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of humiliation, resentment and vindictiveness in all parts of German society • Fuelled German hatred to the new states • Germans were a minority in many of these countries • Treaties may have strengthened Germany due to lack of challenge from a strong Russian or Austro-Hungarian empire • States on Germany's eastern borders were politically and economically weak; represented a power vacuum for Germany to fill once it had recovered economically • The Great Powers that might have restrained Germany were now gone, replaced by an array of weak, vulnerable states <p>Treaty of Rapallo (1922)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed between Germany and Russia after the failed Genoa Conference • Both countries agreed to write off any financial claims on each other • Agreed to cooperate economically and promote trade • Allowed Germany to develop military equipment in Russia and avoid the disarmament clause of the Treaty of Versailles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poland was divided economically; western part gained from Germany was much more economically advanced than eastern part gained from Russia • Treaty of St Germain had taken away nearly all of Austria's industrial resources and left it reliant on agriculture • 'Successor states' experienced rapid inflation from 1921-23
<p>Bottom line</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Allies had hoped that the new Central and Eastern Europe countries would become democratic and serve as a barrier against communist Russia and a resurgent Germany • However, the new states were politically divided, had poor economic conditions, weak industry and currencies, high debts and low investment • Free trade was also destroyed due to the creation of new borders and political tensions • Parliamentary democracy failed to take root in these new states, except Czechoslovakia • Experienced political tension internally and externally

The establishment and impact of the Mandate System	
Establishment	Assessment
<p>Rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was believed that imperialism and colonial disputes had been a major cause of WWI The Mandate System was created to administer the colonies instead of distributing them as spoils of war Supervised by the League of Nations Mandates were distributed to the countries that had conquered them from the Germans and Ottomans in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League Purpose of the system was the well-being and development of people in the mandates A vehicle to educate and improve colonial populations, with the intention of the mandates eventually becoming independent democratic states <p>Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divided into 3 classes depending of the degree of development and readiness for independent status <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A mandates were countries ready for independence soon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former Ottoman states in the Middle East eg. Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq B mandates were less advanced and had no immediate prospects for independence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> German colonies in Africa Were divided between France, Britain and Belgium C mandates were thinly populated and economically underdeveloped <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given directly to the nations that had conquered them German possessions in the Pacific were distributed between Japan, Australia and New Zealand 	<p>Controversy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was seen as imperialism in disguise Was merely a cover for the division of spoils agreed during WWI eg. Sykes-Picot agreement had divided Ottoman possessions between Britain and France; seen as dividing up the Middle East The Arabs had hoped for land and independence after fighting for the British during WWI; was denied and led to uprisings The system was created and decided by the Council of Four with no reference to the League of Nations Benefitted Britain and France; majority of mandates went to them <p>Impact on Italy and Japan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> British and French gains from the Mandate System alienated Italy and Germany, which resented the lack of an empire; saw it necessary for economic survival Italian embitterment led to increased support for nationalistic movements by Mussolini; was determined to acquire territory for Italy, one of the causes of the Abyssinian Crisis in 1935-36 Japan annexed and fortified its mandates in the Pacific Lack of an empire was one of the reasons for the invasion of Manchuria in 1931

Enforcement of the provisions of the treaties: US Isolationism – the retreat from the Anglo-American guarantee	
Rationale	Reasons for failure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France needed a guarantee of security against a future German attack • Still felt threatened by Germany • Was unconvinced of the power of the League to prevent a future conflict from occurring • Originally wanted to detach the Rhineland from Germany and create an independent Rhineland republic that would be neutral and/or under French influence • Serve as a buffer against German resurgence • USA and Britain objected, however they knew that France would remain resolute unless a firm measure of military support was issued • In return for demilitarising the Rhineland, Lloyd George proposed the guarantee to allay French concerns • Promised British and American military support in the event of a German attack 	<p>US isolationism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Senate refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles • Convinced that it had been tricked into entering WWI and had paid an unfair price; did not want to be committed to defending Europe or be involved in future European affairs • Rejected Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations; would have compelled the US to take part in matter in which it had no interest • Rejected the Anglo-American Guarantee, which was supposed to commit the USA and Britain to France's defence <p>British isolationism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanted to preserve its freedom of action in Europe • Historically, British policy was to intervene against any nation threatening the European balance of power • Refused to commit itself to any one country • Lacked the will to enforce the Treaty of Versailles; felt it was too harsh on Germany and favoured the reduction in reparations • British security and economic concerns were not as great as France's • Britain feared that France might try to achieve dominance in Europe through the Treaty gains • France's actions raised the possibility of conflict with Germany, eg. its alliance with Poland and the Little Entente in 1921 • Rejected the Anglo-American Guarantee as it feared being embroiled in a war with Germany • Lack of American support reduced British enthusiasm

The Anglo-American Guarantee: Impact on international relations

France	Britain	Germany
<p>France had to depend on itself for defence, which shaped its foreign policy until 1925</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> French foreign policy was to enforce the punitive clauses of Treaty of Versailles to keep Germany weak economically and militarily Culminated in the Ruhr Crisis in 1923 Germany defaulted on reparation payments; France invaded the Ruhr to forcefully obtain resources Alienated Britain due to its unilateral action Would later withdraw from the Ruhr in 1925 Would be France's last effort to enforce the Treaty of Versailles due to lack of support and cooperation from the USA and Britain; Briand's policy of reconciliation Formed a network of alliances such as the Little Entente in 1921, but were only weak substitutes for the Anglo-American Guarantee <p>French foreign policy undermined the League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the continued threat posed by Germany to France, without a guarantee of security by the USA and Britain, France would not agree to disarmament Believed that the Covenant of the League of Nations was too weak to defend it against German aggression Undermined the League's mandate to carry out international disarmament The League was unable to punish France for the Ruhr occupation Withdrew on its own due to Germany's economic collapse, high military spending and strained relations with Britain The ineffectiveness of the League to deal with France would embolden Germany to undermine the Treaty of Versailles 	<p>Strained relations between Britain and France</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Britain withdrew into isolationism Emergued out of the Paris Peace Conference as a satisfied power Was unsupportive of French insistence on containing Germany by enforcing the punitive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles Ruhr Crisis destroyed Britain's trust in France Saw France as an aggressive power trying to undermine the European balance of power The lack of unity between France and Britain, the only two powers in the League that had the ability to uphold collective security, would undermine the effectiveness of the League 	<p>Germany became emboldened to undermine the Treaty of Versailles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany faced no opposition from the USA and Britain, which had retreated into isolationism France could not oppose Germany without their firm support Would continue to undermine French security Defaulted on reparation payments; second default led to the Ruhr Crisis Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 undermined the disarmament clause of the Treaty of Versailles

Enforcement of the provisions of the treaties: French insecurity and Germany's efforts to undermine the Treaty of Versailles	
French insecurity	Germany's efforts to undermine the Treaty of Versailles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> France had been invaded 5 times by Germany since 1814 Was deeply concerned about the danger posed by Germany The Treaty of Versailles had failed to address French insecurity; felt it did not do enough to cripple Germany Failed to consistently commit to a fixed foreign policy Tried different methods of dealing with Germany <p>Enforcement of the punitive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between 1919-24, France focused on enforcing the punitive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles through the use of force, particularly on reparation payments Both to keep Germany economically weak and repay its debts to the USA and Britain Culminated in the occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 (see below) Would destroy trust with Britain <p>Forming a network of alliances and working for a strong the League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the same time, France tried to contain Germany through defensive alliances with Eastern European countries as a measure of security after the collapse of the Anglo-American Guarantee Eg. Alliance with Poland and the Little Entente in 1921 However, did not manage to assuage French concerns as the states involved were comparatively weak France also worked for a strong League of Nations and enforce collective security <p>Compromise and reconciliation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the Briand era (1925-32), France approached the German problem through a policy of reconciliation In the aftermath of the Ruhr Crisis, France turned towards a compromise solution to the reparations problem Wanted to improve relations with Germany German chancellor Stresemann also supported cooperation Resulted in the Locarno Treaties, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Young Plan and the cancellation of majority of the remaining reparation payments 	<p>War guilt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A common theme that united all Germans was the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles Caused maximum offence to Germany but had inflicted only minimal long term damage to it The Germans expected Wilson's Fourteen Points to serve as the basis for negotiations Did not expect to be excluded from negotiations The Germans had believed that their army was on the verge of victory Its territory had not been invaded in 1918 and the armistice signed was only meant to be a ceasefire and not an unconditional surrender Hence they had clearly failed to recognise that it had been defeated and was unprepared for the punitive Treaty of Versailles The democratic Weimar Republic formed after WWI bore the burden of the blame; politicians were labelled 'November criminals' and Germany had been 'stabbed in the back' Resulted in humiliation and deep resentment from Germany These losses and a gnawing sense of injustice felt by many Germans meant that they were determined to undermine the Treaty of Versailles <p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany was unable to pay the reparation amount of 132 billion gold marks In December 1921 Germany declared that it needed a temporary moratorium By 1922 Germany had defaulted on just the second instalment Used every opportunity to avoid reparation payments Economic historians have argued that Germany could have met the reparation demands fixed in 1921 if it had reformed its financial system or raised taxes Had its industrial base intact after WWI <p>Disarmament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 to avoid the disarmament clause of the Treaty of Versailles

Disarmament Conferences			
Reasons for disarmament <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The arms race was believed to be one of the major causes of WWI • Outlined in Wilson's Fourteen Points; reduce the threat of war • High cost of arms race; countries wanted to focus on economic recovery • Need to diffuse increasing tensions between the USA and Japan in Asia 			
Conference	Summary	Reasons for success/failure	Impact
Washington Naval Conference (1921-22)	Four Power Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed with USA, Britain, Japan and France • Guaranteed territorial rights and possessions in the Pacific • Agreed to defend one another in the event of an attack • Replaced the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 • Anglo-Japanese Alliance: would have bound Britain in an alliance with Japan in an event of a naval war with the USA Five Power Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed with USA, Britain, Japan, France and Italy • Agreed to maintain a ratio of naval armament of 5:5:3:1:1 • Limit the size of their navies • No new battleships to be built for 10 years • The USA and Britain were forbidden from building new naval bases in the Pacific Nine Power Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed with USA, Britain, Japan, France, Italy, China, Belgium, Portugal, the Netherlands • Confirmed the 'Open Door' policy in China • Guaranteed China's territorial integrity • Japan returned Shandong to China 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most successful of the disarmament conferences • Only a small number of nations were involved; easier to reach an agreement • Most nations were not in a position to embark on a costly naval rearmament programme after WWI • Great public support for disarmament immediately following WWI • However, the agreements depended entirely on the cooperation of the parties involved • Lacked any enforcement provisions • Conference failed to include Germany and Russia; would later challenge disarmament • Japan and Italy would leave the League in the 1930s 	Four Power Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced tensions in the Far East; limited the possibility of conflict between the 4 powers • Dissolved the Anglo-Japanese Alliance; removed a source of friction between the USA and Britain Five Power Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the USA and Britain were able to reduce armament spending; avoided an expensive naval race • Japan resented having a smaller fleet than the USA or Britain; felt its great power status was not recognised • However, Japan was left supreme in the Far East; actually benefitted most from the conference • Gained security; no new American or British bases could be built in the Pacific to oppose its dominance • Gave Japan complete control over China and the Pacific in the event of future disputes • USA and Britain would be reluctant to challenge Japan's position during the Manchurian Crisis in 1931
London Naval Conference (1930)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was held to revise and extend the Washington Naval Agreement in 1922 • Revised the ratio of naval armament for the USA, Britain and Japan to 10:10:7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall success • Small number of participants • Great Depression in 1929 meant that governments were keen to reduce expenditure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Japan's ratio • French and Italian unhappiness • Treaty was to be revised in 1936

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> France and Italy refused to participate in the new agreement; however agreed to continue ban on building new battleships for 5 years Established rules regarding submarine warfare; set a maximum tonnage for cruisers 	on armaments; little enthusiasm for military spending in a time of domestic economic hardship	
World Disarmament Conference (1932-33)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempted to scale down all forms of armaments globally 31 member nations attended including the USA and the USSR Conference addressed arms reduction as a whole Britain's proposal to limit offensive weapons was rejected France's proposal for a League army was rejected Germany's proposal of equality of armaments was rejected by France unless its security was assured Germany walked out of the conference Hitler rejoined the conference in 1933, but the powers remained adamant in denying Germany equal treatment Walked out of the conference and from the League of Nations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure <p>Great Depression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Great Depression of 1929 had hurt the atmosphere of optimism and international cooperation Nations became fearful for their own security <p>Ambitious</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conference was too ambitious in its aims of addressing land, air and naval warfare Previous conferences only considered naval disarmament Large participation by nations reduced ability to make a unanimous decision <p>Disagreement on terms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problem of distinguishing between offensive and defensive weapons Difficulty in deciding the level of armaments that was 'consistent with national safety' <p>Lack of enforcement mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conference had no enforcement mechanism and no organisation to oversee compliance Eg. As early as 1922, Germany was evading disarmament through the Treaty of Rapallo Nations were unwilling to apply sanctions to enforce disarmament <p>Disarmament could not proceed unless all nations felt secure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> France was unwilling to reduce military spending without a firm guarantee of support and protection from other major powers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany could continue its rearmament programme unrestrained after its withdrawal from the conference and the League Europe began to enter a period of increased tension Beginning of increased arms spending to defend oneself eg. Maginot Line in France

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rejected Germany's demand for equality of arms • Britain wanted more armaments to protect its empire <p>Disarmament could not work unless fundamental sources of conflicts were resolved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany, Russia and Italy were determined to revise the Paris peace settlements and were strengthening themselves • Hitler was determined to overcome the military and territorial clauses of the Treaty of Versailles 	
Second London Naval Conference (1936)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was held to revise the London Naval Agreement in 1930 • Collapsed after Japan and Italy walked out • Japan did not wish to submit to limits on its naval construction • Demanded equal tonnage with the USA and Britain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure • The international situation had changed dramatically • Japan and Germany were rapidly rearming • Increasing number of crises and conflicts in the world destroyed hopes for disarmament 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USA, Britain and France signed an agreement to limit cruiser tonnage • Collapsed after 1936

The League of Nations: Effects of the absence of major powers

Reasons

- The USA did not join the League due to its policy of non-interventionism
- Congress saw Article 10 of the Covenant as potentially undermining American sovereignty; refused to commit to the defence of nations outside of its interests
- Unwilling to honour League rulings on economic sanctions for aggressor states, which would damage the US economy
- Germany was not allowed to join the League temporarily as punishment for WWI
- Joined in 1926 but left in 1933
- The USSR was not allowed to join the League due to the Allied fear of communism
- Joined in 1934 but was expelled in 1939

Diminished the League's legitimacy

Absence of USA

- US rejection of the League and its principle of collective security diminished the credibility of the organization and the principles it was founded on
- Especially since it was Wilson who had argued for its establishment in the first place
- Provided support for countries that were unwilling to fulfil their pledges under the Covenant eg. Russia, Germany, Italy and Japan

Absence of Germany and the USSR

- Made the League appear to be a 'victors' club' to Germany, a 'capitalist club' to the USSR and a 'European club' to the rest of the world
- Made the League appear to encompass certain exclusive countries with the deliberate exclusion of others
- Germany would thus have neither the desire to support the peace treaties nor the League and its principles

Undermined collective security

Absence of USA

- Was the only country that had emerged stronger after WWI; wealthiest nation in the world
- Britain and France were in the process of economic recovery and had limited ability to enforce collective security
- US presences have given the League's economic sanctions real weight
- The League did not have the resources or moral authority to challenge countries that opposed the League
- The USA had the greatest potential to intervene in the interest of maintaining peace
- Absence deprived the League of a powerful member of very great moral and material influence
- The principle of collective security depended on collective action; absence of great powers would limit the League's reactions in a crisis

Absence of Germany and the USSR

- Had no option to engage in diplomacy
- Removed the chance for negotiated settlements of their grievances; would take matters into their own hands
- Had no stake in League actions or decisions
- Resorted to secret diplomacy, which undermined the League eg. 1922 Treaty of Rapallo
- The ability of the League to use economic sanctions to

Shaped French and British foreign policy

Britain

- The immediate effect of US withdrawal from the League was British retreat from the Anglo-American Guarantee
- Britain would revert to its traditional policy of isolationism to preserve its freedom of action
- Britain would not commit to intervention in Europe without American support; was suspicious of French ambitions
- Limited enthusiasm to enforce the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the principle of collective security

France (see above; Anglo-American Guarantee)

- French anxieties and insecurity were not addressed
- Would enforce the punitive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles by force
- Would attempt to form a network of alliances to guarantee its security eg. alliance with Poland and the Little Entente in 1921
- Attempt to work towards a stronger League to enforce collective security

	discourage aggression would prove hollow if these countries did not abide by League policies	
--	--	--

The League of Nations: The principle of collective security

Features

- The cornerstone of the League of Nations
- Centred around Article 10 – agreeing to protect member states against aggression that threatened their security
- Assumed that all nations would be prepared to act together to prevent foreign aggression unilaterally by a single power

Problems with the concept of collective security

- Overly altruistic; assumed that nations would be equally prepared to act in unity against aggression regardless of whether or not the incident was vital to their interests
- Valuable resources had to be sacrificed for the defence of a principle rather than for vital interests
- Collective security demanded nations to surrender their freedom of action and sovereignty to enforce policies with which they might disagree to or intervene against countries with whom they might be allies or had a profitable relationship
- Countries were often accountable to their own electorates for their own actions and had to act in the best interests of their own country
- Assumed all nations saw every crisis in the same way and were willing to make the same amount of sacrifices
- Few nations were willing to commit to military action; collapse of 1923 Draft Treaty of Mutual Assurance and 1924 Geneva Protocol
- Collective security was only effective if it was in line with the interests of all nations involved

Problems with the tools to enforce collective security

- Problems with the dispute settlement process undermined collective security
- Naively assumed that moral suasion would keep countries from going to war
- Eg. 1931-33 Manchurian Crisis: Japan could not be deterred by moral condemnation when its survival was at stake
- Nations were reluctant to impose economic sanctions if aggressor nation was a valuable trading partner; would threaten their own economies
- Would not be effective if some members continued economic relations with aggressor nation for their own national interests
- Eg. 1935-36 Abyssinian Crisis: economic sanctions were imposed on Italy but were ineffective as Germany and the USA were not bound by them
- Lack of a military force; nations were unwilling to commit themselves by providing military support in order to crush aggression

Absence of major powers

Absence of USA

- Was the only country that had emerged stronger after WWI; wealthiest nation in the world
- Britain and France were in the process of economic recovery and had limited ability to enforce collective security
- US presences have given the League's economic sanctions real weight
- The League did not have the resources or moral authority to challenge countries that opposed the League
- The USA had the greatest potential to intervene in the interest of maintaining peace
- Absence deprived the League of a powerful member of very great moral and material influence
- The principle of collective security depended on collective action; absence of great powers would limit the League's reactions in a crisis

Absence of Germany and the USSR

- Had no option to engage in diplomacy
- Removed an chance for negotiated settlements of their grievances; would take matters into their own hands
- Had no stake in League actions or decisions
- Resorted to secret diplomacy, which undermined the League eg. 1922 Treaty of Rapallo
- The ability of the League to use economic sanctions to discourage aggression would prove hollow if these countries did not abide by League policies

The League of Nations: Early attempts at peacekeeping

Event	Summary	Assessment
Successes		
Aaland Islands Dispute (1920)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disputed islands between Sweden and Finland; both countries laid claim to it Both countries threatened military action Legally belonged to Finland but had a Swedish majority League awarded the islands to Finland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Success as it prevented further escalation of the conflict However, did not uphold the policy of self-determination as 90% of the population were Swedish
Upper Silesia incident (1921)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A rich industrial area on the border between Germany and Poland Area was important for its coal and iron deposits Contained both Poles and Germans The Treaty of Versailles had a clause for a plebiscite administered by the League A plebiscite was introduced that led to a close result in favour of Germany; fighting broke out The British wanted it handed over to Germany while France wanted it to go to Poland A League commission decided that the area was to be split between Germany and Poland Despite the results of the plebiscite, Poland received a larger proportion and the main industrial area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Success as peace was restored; both Germany and Poland reached an agreement However, France had successfully achieved its demands against the rights of a defeated power
Greco-Bulgarian War (1925)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Border skirmish between Greece and Bulgaria Greek soldiers were skilled; Greece invaded Bulgaria Bulgaria appealed to the League The League ordered an immediate ceasefire Ordered Greece to pay compensation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Success as the League managed to stop the violence from escalating into a large-scale war
Failures		
Vilna incident (1920)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict between Lithuania and Poland Lithuania was originally under Russia until WWI; declared independence in 1918 Made the city of Vilna its new capital More than 30% of its population were Polish Invaded by Polish forces in 1920; refused to withdraw France opposed military action on Poland; Britain refused to act alone The League awarded Vilna to Poland after pressure from France 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure as the League acquiesced to the demands of a major power
Ruhr Crisis (1923)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict between France and Germany France and Belgium wanted reparations from Germany, which was unwilling to pay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure as the League could not prevent the military invasion by a major power USA had to step in with the Dawes Plan before France withdrew its forces

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unilaterally invaded the Ruhr to control its industries • Germany encouraged resistance by the industries; caused hyperinflation and economic collapse • The League was unable to resolve the situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • after being guaranteed payment • Failed to uphold collective security
Corfu Crisis (1923)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict between Greece and Italy • 4 Italians in a boundary commission were assassinated in 1923 in Greek territory near the Albanian frontier • Italy demanded and apology and compensation • Whence Greece refused, Italy invaded Corfu • Greece appealed to the League but Mussolini refused to cooperate; threatened to withdraw from the League • Managed to receive compensations; left Corfu claiming victory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure as the League could not prevent the military invasion by a major power • Issue was not resolved by the League • Italy only withdrew voluntarily when its demands were fully complied with
Mosul Conflict (1924)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict between Britain and Turkey • Sykes-Picot agreement designated the oil-rich region of Mosul a British territory • Became a point of contention with Turkey • Britain wanted Mosul to become a part of Iraq (a British mandate) but Turkey wanted it • Turkey appealed to the League, which sent a commission • Recommended that Mosul become a mandate of Iraq; accepted by both sides • However, as Iraq was already a British mandate, in practice it meant that Mosul came under British control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure as the League conformed to the demands of a major power
Memel Conflict (1924)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lithuania seized Memel, a German port under League control in 1923 • The League was distracted by the Ruhr Crisis • France refused to be involved in the conflict • The League gave Memel to Lithuania 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure as the League could not prevent the use of force to seize territory and resolve a conflict

The Ruhr Crisis (1923): Impact on international relations

Reasons for the Ruhr Crisis

- France's security lay in upholding the terms of the Treaty of Versailles
- Was increasingly concerned about security since the collapse of the Anglo-American Guarantee; would have given France support in the event of a German attack
- Was anxious to enforce the reparation settlements in full
- Needed reparation payments to pay off debts to the USA
- Wanted to continue to weaken Germany by preventing its economic recovery
- Saw the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 as a way for Germany to evade paying reparations
- When Germany failed to meet its payment schedule in December 1922, French and Belgian troops invaded the Ruhr in January 1923
- Intended to collect reparations through seizing the output of Ruhr mines and factories
- Saw the use of force as an easy solution to its own economic problems

Short-term

Escalated tensions between Britain and France

- Britain was more concerned about German economic recovery rather than the payment of reparations
- France's unilateral action soured Anglo-French relations; seen as a threat to European stability
- Germany won sympathy from Britain among other nations
- France realised that aggression would not solve the question of security and began a more lenient policy towards Germany

German instability

- Passive resistance to the Ruhr invasion: resulted in German strikes and rioting in protest, factories stopped producing goods to prevent them from falling into French hands
- Resulted in massive hyperinflation; the government had to print more money to support the workers on strike
- The German economy collapsed
- Political instability; rise in extremism
- Was only restored with the Dawes Plan in 1924 and the Locarno Treaty in 1925

Long-term

Increased American involvement in European affairs

- Key player in the resolution to the Ruhr Crisis and the reparations issue
- The vitality of the USA's European trade and investments depended on European economic recovery; was undermined by German economic collapse
- Proposed the Dawes Plan in 1924
- French troops were withdrawn from the Ruhr by August 1925
- Allowed Germany to reschedule its reparation payments; total amount reduced and deadlines were extended
- Received extensive foreign loans from the USA
- Much private American capital flowed into German businesses and government bonds
- However, the German economy became heavily reliant on American loans
- Young Plan in 1930 reduced the total amount of reparations to be paid from 132 billion gold marks to 40 billion
- Showed that the USA could not remain completely isolated, as it needed strong trade links with Europe to prosper
- After the Ruhr Crisis, the USA remained the guarantor of the European economic order; France took a backseat role
- Gained increased influence in European affairs

Improvement in international relations between France and Germany

- German chancellor Stresemann called off the passive resistance in the Ruhr
- Announced that Germany would comply with its obligations under the Treaty of Versailles
- Locarno Treaty signed in October 1925
- Germany accepted its western frontiers as agreed in the Treaty of Versailles

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upheld the demilitarisation of the Rhineland; Allied troops withdrew from the Rhineland by June 1930 • By 1930 Germany became a fully independent state • Britain, France and Germany not to attack one another unless in self-defence • Britain and Italy were to intervene under the Treaty of Mutual Guarantee if either side broke the agreement • Allowed Germany to enter the League of Nations in October 1926 • Germany promised to comply with reparation payments under Stresemann's Policy of Fulfilment • Seemed to be a genuine breakthrough in Franco-German relations • Finally offered France the security it had wanted for so long • Allowed Germany to be rehabilitated without posing a threat to western Europe <p>The 'Locarno Spring'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General sense of optimism in international diplomacy: Germany had accepted its borders and renounced violence, democracy was flourishing • A sense of progress towards peace and a new relationship between the Allies and Germany was evident • Signing of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in August 1928 renounced war as an instrument of national policy; however there were no enforcement procedures and was not binding • Seemed to be proof that WWI and its tensions had finally been resolved; the European economy was recovering, peace with Germany was established and communism was contained
--	---

Locarno and the “Locarno Spring”: Impact on international relations

Improvement in Franco-German relations	The ‘Locarno Spring’	Limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> German chancellor Stresemann called off the passive resistance in the Ruhr Announced that Germany would comply with its obligations under the Treaty of Versailles Locarno Treaty signed in October 1925 Germany accepted its western frontiers as agreed in the Treaty of Versailles Upheld the demilitarisation of the Rhineland; Allied troops withdrew from the Rhineland by June 1930 By 1930 Germany became a fully independent state Britain, France and Germany not to attack one another unless in self-defence Britain and Italy were to intervene under the Treaty of Mutual Guarantee if either side broke the agreement Allowed Germany to enter the League of Nations in October 1926 Germany promised to comply with reparation payments under Stresemann’s Policy of Fulfilment Seemed to be a genuine breakthrough in Franco-German relations Finally offered France the security it had wanted for so long Allowed Germany to be rehabilitated without posing a threat to western Europe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General sense of optimism in international diplomacy: Germany had accepted its borders and renounced violence, democracy was flourishing A sense of progress towards peace and a new relationship between the Allies and Germany was evident Signing of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in August 1928 renounced war as an instrument of national policy; however there were no enforcement procedures and was not binding Seemed to be proof that WWI and its tensions had finally been resolved; the European economy was recovering, peace with Germany was established and communism was contained 	<p>Germany’s eastern border</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Locarno Pact did not guarantee Germany’s eastern border; significant as this was where its worst grievances against the territorial settlements of the Treaty of Versailles were found Germany’s continued cooperation with the USSR through the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 meant that it was continuing to evade disarmament Sources of tension thus still existed <p>Undermining the League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Locarno Treaty was negotiated outside the League The League was not strengthened and the principle of collective security remained uncertain <p>Dependent on economic outlook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Locarno spirit was closely tied to the economic health of Europe that prevailed in the 1920s Allowed reparations to be paid and political extremism to disappear – the ‘Golden Age of Weimar’ For this optimism to continue, European economic health had to be maintained, especially with the support of the USA The Great Depression in 1929 would thus threaten the Locarno Spirit and undermine international peace and cooperation

Impact of the Great Depression		
Economic devastation	Rise of political extremism	Downfall of the 'Locarno Spirit'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collapse of the American economy • American national income dropped by 50% from 1929-32 • Had a ripple effect on the rest of the world, especially Europe • The USA refused to scale down British and French war debts; made it difficult for them to recover • Britain and France demanded reparations from Germany to honour their own debts to the USA • Germany declared it was financially weak and opposition from right-wing groups was too great to continue reparation payments • Lausanne Conference in 1931 to settle reparations collapsed; the Nazis never paid any further reparations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rising unemployment and economic decline caused people to turn towards extremist parties and their lucrative promises of economic recovery • Governments were blamed for the crisis and this contributed to the rise of aggressive states; saw war and conquest as a solution to economic problems <p>Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany's economy was over-dependent on US loans through the Dawes Plan, which ceased when the Depression began • Heavily reliant on the flow of short-term, volatile foreign capital • Economy collapse and unemployment soared; 6 million unemployed by 1932 • German people gradually lost faith in liberal democracy represented by the Weimar Republic • The Nazis offered attractive solutions to the crisis and achieved widespread support; culminated in Hitler's rise to power in 1933 • Hitler's solution to Germany's economic weakness was to advocate territorial expansion through his policy of Lebensraum to seize vital resources • Was determined to overturn the Treaty of Versailles by any means necessary <p>Japan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Japan, the government believed a policy of autarky would solve the nation's economic problems • Manchuria was rich in raw materials, had fertile land, and provided a market for exports; culminated in the invasion of Manchuria in 1931 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depended entirely on economic prosperity • The Great Depression destroyed the positive, optimistic spirit of Locarno • Robbed nations of the physical ability and motivation to preserve peace and cooperate • International agreements were no longer the focus of nations, which were only concerned about their economies • Old hostilities and suspicions surfaced again, while authoritarian regimes came to power, which were prepared to risk aggression • The nations that had previously supported collective security could no longer afford to do so and lost interest in the idea • Ushered in a return to a world dominated by national self-interest and the dominance of military forces

Manchurian Crisis (1931-33)		
Reasons for Japanese invasion	Reasons for the failure of collective security	Impact on international relations
<p>Failure to recognise Japan as a great power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypocrisy of the Mandate System Was merely a cover for the division of spoils after WWI between victors; seen as imperialism in disguise System was created and decided by the Council of Four with no reference to the League – benefitted Britain and France Japan was only allowed to retain the German islands in the Pacific north of the Equator Got Shandong, but only as a mandate British and French gains alienated Japan, which resented the lack of an empire Colonies were seen not only as a symbol of prestige but also important for economic survival The world was divided between the powerful imperialist nations and the 'have-nots' Japan thus sought to become a great power through the use of force; considered the Pacific as its sphere of influence Also refused racial equality in the Covenant of the League; felt discriminated against and needed to prove its great power status <p>Impact of the Great Depression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Japan had undergone an industrial revolution from the late 19th century; had become the largest industrial power in Asia Had few natural resources, exploding population, short of fertile land Economic growth was based on the success of its trade with the rest of the world Depended on the export of manufactured goods primarily to the USA Collapse of US markets and higher US tariffs created enormous economic hardship within Japan Massive unemployment and starvation in rural areas 	<p>Political</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult for western governments to justify to their electorates why they were intervening in events so far away Democracies could not make decisions that were not supported by the public None considered the Manchurian Crisis to be a threat to European collective security Distance from Europe meant that the invasion was not as damaging for the League's authority as a European conflict would have been The British had some sympathy for the Japanese; saw Japan as a barrier against Soviet communism France was distracted by the growing German threat Both Britain and France could not cooperate on a policy with respect to Manchuria; neither wanted to be responsible for taking the lead <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The USA, Britain and France were reluctant to use force; Britain and France were the only 2 members of the League with the ability to take on Japan The Great Depression had caused major economic difficulties for all countries The USA, Britain and France was severely affected by the Depression; population was focused on the internal crisis and was reluctant to intervene in international affairs The USA and Britain had extensive property trading networks and investments in China and the Far East; feared military intervention might lead to war Reluctant to impose economic sanctions as they did not want to antagonise Japan <p>Military</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of Western armed forces or bases in the Far East 	<p>Japan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Felt discriminated against Left the League of Nations Military became more powerful, acted on its own; dictated Japanese foreign policy as the civilian government could not control it Improved Japan's economic and strategic position; gained access to vast coal and iron resources, and space for land and agriculture Japan was in a favourable position to widen its conquests in mainland China and Southeast Asia Emboldened to launch a full-scale invasion of China in 1937; led to the 2nd Sino-Japanese War <p>China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of territorial sovereignty Failure of the League to protect one of its members; Collective security in the Far East was dead Would lead to a full-scale war with Japan during the 2nd Sino-Japanese War from 1937-1945 <p>The League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure of collective security due to clashing interests and the Great Depression No control over Japan, which had left the League The USA and Britain entered into a policy of appeasement The League's failure over Manchuria may have encouraged other nations to solve their economic problems through aggression May have provided Mussolini with the courage to invade Abyssinia in 1935

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 1931, 50% of factories closed down, silk prices fell 2/3 • Led to the decline in prestige of the liberal democratic government, demands for action by radical nationalist groups • Strong belief that Japan needed a self-sufficient empire <p>Resources in Manchuria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was rich in coal and iron resources; supplied 50% of the world's soya beans • Would provide a market for Japanese exports • Japan had already made significant economic investments in the region since the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 • Took control of the South Manchurian Railway • China was growing stronger under the rule of Chiang Kai-shek; Japan felt it might lose its rights in Manchuria <p>Buffer against communist Russia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japan feared Soviet communist expansion • Manchuria lay between the USSR and Japan's colony Korea; hence would serve as a buffer <p>Japanese dominance in the Pacific</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the Washington Naval Agreement of 1922, Japan had military supremacy in the Far East • None of the Great Powers had the forces or bases in the region to oppose Japanese military aggression • The Great Depression meant that the USA, Britain and France were in no position to intervene • Attack on Manchuria posed few risks 	<p>necessary to support a military expedition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not want to risk war due to Japanese naval superiority • The League had no armed forces of its own; could only resort to moral condemnation • Failure as Japan's economic survival was at stake 	
---	---	--

Abyssinian Crisis (1935-36)		
Reasons for Italian invasion	Reasons for the failure of collective security	Impact on international relations
<p>A 2nd Roman Empire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mussolini wanted to build a new Roman empire and be the new 'Julius Caesar' Expand Italy's colonial holding in Africa; existing colonies not very rewarding Already controlled Libya, Eritrea and Somaliland Abyssinia was adjacent to the existing Italian colonies; was the only African territory available An annexation would allow Italy to united these states into an East African Empire Could rival the Mediterranean influence of Britain and France <p>Italian Fascism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mussolini had always wanted Italy to play a bigger role in international affairs Part of the national strength and pride of the Fascist ideology Mussolini's popularity was sagging Wanted to avenge Italy's ignominious defeat in 1886; tried to capture Ethiopia but was defeated <p>The Great Depression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Italy was hit hard by the Great Depression Wanted to use the invasion as a tactic to deflect attention away from domestic economic hardship Believed there were oil deposits in the region; outlet for a growing population and open new markets for Italian goods <p>Rise of Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany under Hitler was returning to the international scene and was seen as a threat to world peace Feared a strong Germany on its borders; might have felt the need to act before Hitler became too powerful Hitler's failed annexation of Austria in 1934 worried 	<p>Political</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Britain and France did not want to antagonise Italy; needed it as an ally against Hitler to prevent him from gaining power Afraid that Mussolini would draw closer to Hitler Hoare and Laval developed a plan to give Italy 2/3 of Abyssinia in exchange for ending the invasion Details were leaked and caused massive public outcry; both ministers were sacked and the plan collapsed French domestic political situation was very unstable; no mood for foreign intervention British public opinion was strongly opposed to the invasion, but would not support action independent of the League Emperor of Abyssinia was a dictator who governed a corruptly-run and poor country; did not command much international respect and support <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The League imposed economic sanctions on Italy Failed as they did not include oil, steel and coal; would have seriously hampered the Italian invasion Britain did not close the Suez Canal to Italian shipping; embargo on oil would have halted the entire operation Germany, Japan and the USA were not bound by the sanctions; continued trade with Italy Many non-members continued trade 	<p>Britain and France</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were seen as attempting to placate Mussolini rather than use collective security Significantly undermined their rhetoric; were seen as hypocrites Exposed as military weak and more concerned with protecting their own interests than upholding the League's Covenant Lost an ally against Germany <p>The League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The League and the principle of collective security was discredited; could no longer exert any authority A permanent member of the League had again successfully ignored the League and had been victorious through violence and war Powerful states realised that the League could be ignored Small states lost faith in the League The leading powers in the League were unwilling and unable to apply collective security Collective security had failed entirely; after the Abyssinian Crisis, all European crises would henceforth be handled outside the League <p>Italy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear that Britain and France were unwilling to support his territorial ambitions; only option was to associate himself with the more powerful Germany Drew closer to Germany as Hitler did not criticise his actions; gave rise to the Rome-Berlin Axis in October 1936 Left the League in December 1937 <p>Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emboldened Germany into aggression

<p>Mussolini</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have felt the need to resolve the Abyssinia question before Hitler tried to take Austria again <p>Italian confidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western powers had not reacted to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria; believed that they would not act differently • Friendly relations with Britain and France • Formed the Stresa Front agreement in April 1935 to maintain the Locarno Treaty and support Austria's independence • An attempt to reach an agreement to counter-balance Germany; pledged to resist any German attempt to modify the Treaty of Versailles by force • Britain and France needed Italy as an ally against Germany; failed to intervene • Had already tacitly conceded that Abyssinia lay within the Italian sphere of interest • Mussolini believed that Britain and France would turn a blind eye to an Italian invasion of Abyssinia • Assumed that their friendship would allow him to pursue his colonial ambitions in return for his allegiance as part of the anti-Hitler coalition 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abyssinian Crisis provided a distraction for Hitler's reoccupation of the Rhineland in March 1936 • Hitler realised that Britain and France were not willing to use force even when their opponent was as weak as Italy • Clear that there was no effective opposition to his expansionist plans • Strengthened his determination to press forward with Germany's territorial demands and revision of the Treaty of Versailles
--	--	---