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1.0 Objective

This Unit discusses the key features of the important events taking place with the beginning of the World War I and the subsequent peace and security attempts made at the international level to stop such war in future. After going through this lesson you will be able to learn:

- the causes, course, nature and consequences of the First World war;
- the details of the Paris Peace Conference convened soon after the war;
- about the formation, functions, achievements and failure of a World Organisation (League of Nations); and
- about the security attempts made to make the world safe and protected for peaceful co-existence.

1.1 Introduction

The First World War was one of the greatest catastrophes that befell upon the human civilization. It was the ultimate result of the various factors. The war which lasted for four years and three months was different from the wars fought in earlier period of human history, in so far as it was fought on world-wide scale and had repercussions on practically all the countries of the world. This War was a "war to end all wars in future" and it was fought with the popular catchword of making world safe for democracy. It is regarded as the real world war taking into account the unscrupulous use of mechanical arms and ammunitions and large scale loss of life and property. With Germany's unconditional surrender the statesmen of the world chose Paris which had been the nerve centre for the allies cause as the site for the conclusion of peace and made necessary preparations. The peace-makers got assembled at Paris in an atmosphere of idealism tinctured with national aggrandizement but subsequently conceded to one of the fourteen points of Woodrow Wilson envisaging the formation of the league of nations which would settle the disputes by amicable means and safeguard the world peace. With the signing of the peace treaty of Versailles the league came into existence and became the cynosure of world hopes. Soon after the war the world showed anxiety to preserve the hard earned peace. The Paris Peace Conference established an international machinery in the league for the prevention of war, for pacific settlement of international disputes and for collective security aggression. The
efforts for security were made both through the league system as well as outside it.

1.2 First World War

The 20th century witnessed two epoch making events, two world wars, one in 1914 and the second one in 1939. The First World War was one of the greatest catastrophes that befell upon the human civilization. It was the ultimate result of the various factors. The war which lasted for four years and three months was different from the wars fought in earlier period of human history, in so far as it was fought on world-wide scale and had repercussions on practically all the countries of the world. The birth of the World War I can be traced by a close observation of the international politics in between 1871 to 1914. In its scope, dimension and magnitude it surpassed all wars fought up to 1914. During this war the various nations involved in the war made use of modern technology and tried to find new methods of destruction and defence. This was also different from earlier wars in so far it was not fought by the armies, navies and air force alone but by the people as a whole.

1.3 Causes of the War (Origin)

The chief causes responsible for the outbreak of the war were as follows:

1.3.1 System of Secret Alliances

The system of secret alliances which developed after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 was the greatest cause of the First World War. On the eve of the war Europe was divided into the armed camps- Triple Alliance and Triple Entente. The former consisted of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Turkey and Italy and the latter of England, France, Russia and Japan. The division of Europe into two rival camps created a climate of cold war most conducive to an actual war. After the fall of Bismarck there existed a Franco-Prussian Alliance in 1894 which was aimed against Germany. In 1904 Russia joined France and England against Germany.

These secret alliances naturally gave rise to suspicion, anger and conflict. According to Prof. Fay, “the system of secret alliances made it inevitable that if war did come it would involve all the Great Powers of Europe. The members of each group felt bound to support each other in order to strengthen the solidarity of the group.
1.3.2 Race for Armaments

Another cause of the war was the mad race for armaments between the powers. This race for armaments started soon after the Franco-Prussian war. As a result the armaments of all the great powers began to grow year after year. The armaments were meant for defence and preservation of peace but they created fear, suspicion and hatred among the various nations. This race for armaments was bound to end only in a war. Another impact of this race was that the military staff in almost all the countries came to yield more powers, which was not conducive to peace.

1.3.3 Narrow Nationalism

Narrow nationalism or competitive patriotism was another cause of the war. It was this intense and narrow nationalism in Siberia which led to the murder of Archduke Francis Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary. The relation between Russia on one hand and Germany and Austro-Hungary on the other became extremely strained in 1908, when Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. The incident gave setback to the Serbs for a greater Serbia. Russia as an ally of Serbia violently got excited over this incident because it weakened Russia’s own position in the Balkans. The peace treaty of Berlin was flouted in spite of opposition from Britain, France and Russia. The bitterness between Austria and Serbia over the issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina ultimately led to the First World War.

Moreover, Palmerstone in England, Napoleon I and Napoleon III in France, Bismarck in Germany and Mazzini and Cavour in Italy had infused the freshet of nationalism into the anaemic minds of people to such an extent that the nationalism that the subsequent people tasted, never collapsed despite the cross currents of history and rather supplied fuel to the wild pyre of the world war.

1.3.4 Aggressive Imperialism

One of the potent factors which added tension and led to the World War I was aggressive imperialism. Due to rapid industrialisation in most of the western European countries, there was an unhealthy competition which began amongst the European powers to find colonies for their products. By the end of 19th century England, France and Russia each had built up huge colonial empire and Germany was left with the smallest share of extra European possessions. Germany believed herself to be the greatest nation in the world and was not willing to accept the subordinate place which fortune had assigned to her in the imperial sphere. She was keen to acquire a world empire worthy of her position. Consequently,
when Germany tried to capture the markets which were already in the hands of Britain, it led to bitterness between the two. Great Britain was not prepared to give up her colonies, protectorates, spheres of influence and markets, and Germany was bent upon getting them at any cost. Under such circumstances the war became inevitable.

1.3.5 Franco- German Rivalry

The French desired to get back Alsace and Lorraine which had been snatched away from them by the Germans by the Treaty of Frankfurst of 1871. The French nationals considered the loss of these two territories as a great insult to them and a great setback to their economic and industrial progress. So both the spirit of revenge and economic motive prompted the French people for a war against Germany. The war was not possible as long as the shrewd and diplomat Bismarck was the Imperial Chancellor of Germany. But after the withdrawal of Bismarck from the German politics in 1890, his successors unnecessarily interfered in the North- African territories, which were under the French influence and thus aggravated the old hostility between the two countries which became a cause for the outbreak of the First World War.

1.3.6 The Balkan Crisis

The contest for the control of Balkan Peninsula between Austria-Hungary and Russia also contributed to the World War I. After the fall of the Turkish Empire a number of small countries emerged in the Balkan Peninsula. Three of the countries- Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia began to clash with each other for the control of fertile Macedonia. Russia was keenly interested in the Balkan politics and backed Serbia in her demand for ‘Bigger Serbia’ because she saw in it an opportunity of getting control over Constantinople and Mediterranean Sea, the attainment of which had always been the objective of Russian foreign policy.

During the Bosnian crisis of 1908 Russia adopted sympathetic attitude towards Serbia and threatened to take steps against the Austrian aggression. But Germany’s support to Austria forced Russia to retreat which increased bitterness between Austria, Serbia and Russia. In 1912-13 another crisis occurred in the Balkan and Austria did her best to thwart the ambitions of Serbia. Austria forced Serbia to evacuate various Adriatic towns which the Serbs had conquered. Austrian attitude was greatly resented by both England and Russia. This Austro-Serbian conflict greatly intensified the tension and ultimately precipitated the war.
1.3.7 Italy’s Desire for Irredentism

Another cause of the war was the desire of the people of Italy to recover Trentino and the areas around the part of Trieste which were inhabited by the Italians but were still under the control of the Austria-Hungary.

As these areas once formed part of the Roman Empire the Italian leaders raised the slogans of “Italia Irredenta” or “Unredeemed Italy”. Further, the economic bankruptcy and rapidly growing population of Italy also compelled her to look around for more land and economic resources. This brought Italy closer to Germany (another dissatisfied power) which was equally keen to challenge the status quo and establish empire abroad.

1.3.8 Lack of Machinery to Regulate International Relations

The lack of machinery to regulate the affairs of the states also contributed to the war. The states were following strict secrecy in their diplomacy and certain states were not made known even to the members of the ministry. As a result the issues were clouded with mystery. Again, though by the end of the 19th century certain principles of international law and morality had been evolved through the Hague conferences, the states paid scant regard to them in the absence of power to enforce these rules. Further, the states considered themselves as sovereign and did not consider these rules of international morality binding on them. The absence of an enforcing power created anarchy in the international relations. In this atmosphere of anarchy every nation could do: “What is pleased or what is dared, because there was no international government to make laws for the nations and compel all nations to respect such laws”.

1.3.9 The Immediate Cause

The immediate cause for the outbreak of World War I was the murder of Archduke Ferdinand, the heir to the Austrian throne by a Serbian. The Archduke went to Sarajevo, a city of Bosnia on 28th June 1914. After completing the formalities at the Town Hall, the Archduke was proceeding to the city museum when he was killed along with his wife. The Austrians were full of indignation and held Serbia responsible for the crime and wanted to crush Serbia. Even Germany promised to support Austria-Hungary. Consequently, Austria served Serbia with an ultimatum which she refused to comply with because of Russian backing. An effort at mediation was made by the powers but without fail. On 28th July 1914 Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. Serbia welcomed this war.
In the war that followed, Serbia was supported by Russia, France, England and Japan. Although Italy was not a member of the Triple Alliance she remained neutral till 1915, when she also declared war against Austria-Hungary and Germany. Turkey however, fought on the side of the Central Powers (Austria-Hungary and Germany). Thus, the World War I began with full swing till October 1918 between the Allied Powers comprising England, France, Russia, Japan, Serbia and U.S.A. and the Central Powers comprising Austria, Germany, Hungary, Turkey and other allies.

1.4 Course of World War I (1914-18)

Nineteenth century war jingoism led to a phase of international anarchy in which ends justified means and in which the doctrine that necessity knows no law, became popular. Internationalism proved to be a frail barrier to tide over the crisis. The murder on June 28, 1914 of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir apparent of the Hapsburg throne and his wife in the streets of Bosnian capital Sarajevo by a twenty-year old Serbian youth named Gavrilo Princip was the fatal spark which caused the explosion. The news of the assassination shocked the whole continent. Austria decided to settle her account on the question of Serbia and Germany desired to offer her the full support. On July 28, 1914 Austria declared war on Serbia and the next day Germany gave orders of mobilisation. Russia did the same. On August 1, 1914 Germany declared war. On August 4, she invaded Belgium and the same His Majesty's Government declared war on Germany. On August 3, Germany had declared war on France and on August 1, Russia had got involved too.

1.4.1 War on Two Fronts

The war began in 1914 on land and sea. On the Western front, it was fought between Germany, Austria on one side (Italy deserted to the Allies) and England, France and Belgium on the other. On the eastern front, Germany, Austria, Bulgaria and Rumania fought against Serbia and Russia. Subsequently, Turkey joined the Central Powers which brought the war to Asia.

On the Western front, Germany made a thrust in Belgium. All efforts of England to protect Belgium ended in a failure. Germany conquered Belgium. From Belgium and from the Rhineland German army started pouring in France in large number. They arrived within fifteen miles of Paris. The French made a counter thrust at Marne under General Joseph Joffre. The battle of Marne (September 1914) compelled Germans to retreat inch by inch. Meanwhile, the British troops began to reinforce the French. The Germans could also be routed by the Anglo-French army
in the battle of Verdun (August 1916). On sea the Germans carried a merciless submarine warfare drowning everything they came upon. They did not even spare the neutral ships and neutral goods particularly those of America. These goods were sent to reinforce England.

On the Eastern front, Russia made a thrust in Germany and Austrian Galicia. It looked as if Russia would capture Berlin very soon. But the German General Hindenburg assisted by his young colleague Ludendorff expelled the Russians from Germany by inflicting heavy losses on the Russians in the battle of Tannenberg (August 1914). The Austrians entered Serbia and captured Belgrade. But they were pushed back by the Serbians. By the spring of 1915 the Germans under Hindenburg made a great attempt on the eastern front and captured Galicia, Ukraine and Crimea from Russia. In 1917 the Czarist Government fell from power after the Bolshevik Revolution. Russia concluded the Treaty of Brest Litovsk (now in Belarus) with Germany in March 1918 and withdrew from the war.

On the Western front, in 1916 the Germans engaged the Allies in the battle of Somme and suffered heavy losses in the hands of the Allies. To divert western pressure on the Germans, Austria attacked Italy. As war with the eastern front stopped with the Treaty of Brest Litovsk, Germany brought her army from the eastern front to the west. Under General Hindenburg and Ludendorff the Germans carried everything before them and captured Antwerp in Belgium.

1.4.2 U.S.A. Joining the War

In 1915, Germany captured Warsaw and Vilna. By 1916, Russia ceased to be a serious menace to the central powers. While Turkey and Bulgaria had joined the Central Powers, Italy joined the Allies early in 1915. The war at sea went in favour of the Allies. Germany resorted to unrestricted submarine warfare in order to defeat the British blockade and to prevent supply of war materials to England by U.S.A. But in doing so, Germany deliberately violated the neutral right of U.S.A. to trade with England. As early as February, 1915, Germany warned that British waters were a prohibited zone where neutral ships were liable to sinking by her submarines. In 1917 Germany began to sink American merchant ships in the Atlantic by her submarines. Germany disregarded American protest against the violation of the law of “freedom of the high seas”. But Germany paid scant attention to these protests. The American steamer, the Gulfight was torpedoed and the famous luxury ship, the Lusitania was sunk on May 7, 1915 off Iceland leading to a loss of twelve hundred lives. President Wilson of America in a note to Germany declared it as a crime against humanity. The answer to this note by Germany appeared to be
unsatisfactory. This Lusitania incident hardened the U.S. stand against Germany.

Meanwhile, another event embittered the U.S. relations with Germany. England intercepted a telegram sent by the German Foreign Secretary Zimmerman to the German envoy in Mexico. The British government sent the telegram to the U.S. government. In this telegram Germany advised her envoy that if America joined the war on behalf of England then Mexico should declare war on U.S.A. Germany promised help to Mexico to recover her “lost territories” (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona) from U.S.A. The revelation on this telegram caused considerable excitement in U.S.A. The subversive activities of the Austrian ambassador and the German military attaché in U.S.A. added fuel to the fire.

The American President Wilson had finally come to the conviction that war with Germany was inevitable. He tried to avoid the war by inviting the belligerents in a peace congress. But the terms offered by Germany were unacceptable to the allies. Meanwhile Germany carried her submarine warfare in an unrestricted way. On February 3, 1917 U.S.A. cut off her diplomatic relations with Germany as a protest against German attack on U.S. vessels. Meanwhile the Czarist Government fell from power in Russia and the Kerensky Government took over after the March Revolution. The U.S.A. felt that the Kerensky Government was ideologically more acceptable to her than the Czarist Government. The U.S. apathy of joining the Allies in which Czarist Russia was a partner was now removed. The U.S.A. now was in a position to give an ideological motivation to her war aims as the “protection of democracy”.

On April 4, 1917 the U.S.A. declared war on Germany and joined the Allies. Germany was exhausted by this time. With U.S. entry the initiative passed to the hands of the Allies. A revolution in Germany led to the fall of Kaiser’s Government and she surrendered to the Allies during November 1918. Turkey fought against the Allies and won some success in Mesopotamian and Gallipoli. But ultimately England defeated Turkey and forced the Turks out of Asia Minor by December 1917. Japan declared war on Germany and captured the German colonies of Shantung and Kiaochow in China. China also declared war on Germany. By September 1918 the Central Powers had been completely exhausted and the German military leaders recognized that they were reaching the limits of their endurance and asked the emperor to sue for peace.

1.4.3 Italy and the Allies

Italy refused to support Germany and Austria on the ground that Austria was the aggressor. Her real purpose in staying out was to bargain
for territory. Because her irredentist claims were directed against Austria, only one outcome was possible. In April 26, 1915, Italy concluded the Secret Treaty of London with the Entente powers by which England, France and Russia promised her the Trentino, Southern Tyrol, Trieste including Fiume, Northern Dalmatia, Dalmatian Islands, Valona, Rhodes Islands with Greek population, concessions in the event of partition of Turkey, equitable compensations if France and Britain extended their colonial possessions at the expense of Germany. Italy was to gain nearly all the Austrian and Turkish territories that she wanted. Hence, Italy entered the war against her former allies.

1.4.4 Victory of the Allies

Later, after the entry of the United States into the war in 1917, the tide began to turn against the Central Powers. The Allies finally defeated the Central Powers in November 1918. The chief reasons for the defeat of the Central Powers were as follows: (1) 27 Allied states fought against 4 Central Powers, so the Allied states had more manpower and more resources. (2) The Allied states had almost complete control of the seas, so they could successfully blockade the German coastline and starve the Central Powers of food and raw materials. (3) The Allied states had moral support due to their claim to fight for democracy. (4) The Germans committed two important strategic errors. The first was the invasion of Belgium which offended the moral conscience of the world and brought Britain into the war. The second was the unrestricted submarine campaign which strengthened universal hatred of German militarism and brought about the entry of the United States into war on the Allies' side.

The First World War lasted for four years and three months. It began on August 4, 1914 and ended on November 11, 1918. It involved sixty sovereign states, overthrew four Empires (the German Empire, Hapsburg Empire, Turkish Empire and the Russian Empire), gave birth to seven new nations, took ten million combatant lives (another 30 million were wounded), and cost about £35,000 million.

1.5 Nature of World War I

Known as the Great War at the time, World War I was, indeed, the most disastrous war ever fought in history. Words are totally inadequate to describe the slaughter, and statistics too cold to convey the human cost. Around 13 million are estimated to have died on the battlefronts of Europe, about 1-1/2 million on the western front alone in the year 1916. The Russians lost 2-1/2 million killed, wounded, or taken prisoner in the year 1915. In one battle, Verdun fought between February and July 1916, one of the most devastating engagements in which the French repulsed a
major German offensive, around 700,000 lost their lives. That is 100,000 more than the total losses in the entire four years of the U.S. Civil War.

This was the war that began with patriotic fervour on the part of both the soldiers marching off, and their loved-ones cheering them on. Some believed that the economic inter-dependency of European nations would compel governments to call off the war if it threatened to last more than six months. That was an assumption based on the belief that human beings were rational. Instead, as the costs of the war mounted, governments increased their demands upon the enemy with the thought that they had to compensate for the losses.

The German Emperor promised his soldiers that they would be home "before the leaves fell."

The Schlieffen Plan called for the defeat of France in 4 weeks, but, instead, German armies were stopped just short of Paris at the Battle of the Marne River (September 6-12, 1914). Alfred, Graf von Schlieffen, who served as chief of the German general staff from 1891 to 1905, took a contrary view, and it was the plan he developed that was to guide Germany's initial wartime strategy. Schlieffen realized that on the outbreak of war Russia would need six full weeks to mobilize and assemble its vast armies, given the immense Russian countryside and population, the sparsity of the rail network, and the inefficiency of the government bureaucracy. Taking advantage of this fact, Schlieffen planned to initially adopt a purely defensive posture on the Eastern Front with a minimal number of troops facing Russia's slowly gathering armies. Germany would instead concentrate almost all of its troops in the west against France and would seek to bypass France's frontier fortifications by an offensive through neutral Belgium to the north. This offensive would sweep westward and then southward through the heart of northern France, capturing the capital and knocking that country out of the war within a few weeks. Having gained security in the west, Germany would then shift its troops to the east and destroy the Russian menace with a similar concentration of forces.

Meanwhile, the Germans defeated and threw back the Russian offensive in the east at the Battle of Tannenberg (August 1914) without the help of army units transferred from the west.

On the Western front, both sides dug in, building lines of trenches that extended from the Channel coast to the Swiss border. Unlike any other war, there would be no possibility of outflanking the enemy. Artillery and machine guns gave the advantage to the defense. Offense was suicidal because it exposed flesh and blood to the deadly weapons.
On the Eastern front, although the Russians had huge reserves of manpower and generally overwhelmed Austro-Hungarian armies, the Germans invariably defeated the Russians. The Russians lacked the industrial base to be able to provide their armies with the huge quantities of weapons needed in modern warfare. The Turkish military government, which had received military aid from the Germans prior to the war, joined the Central Powers in November, 1914. Italy, though a part of the Triple Alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary, did not enter the war on the side of the Central Powers. England and France promised the Italians territorial acquisitions after the war and persuaded them to join on their side in June, 1915.

The United States remained out of the war until April, 1917. President Woodrow Wilson had popular support in the determination to remain neutral.

The British put a naval blockade into place as soon as the war began. The Germans retaliated with the use of a new weapon, the submarine. The British blockade interfered with neutral shipping, and the United States was the largest neutral. The U.S. protested confiscations of U.S. cargoes, but the British were careful to compensate for loss of property, and there was no loss of life. The German submarine, however, could only stop a merchant vessel by sinking it. Loss of lives and property was unavoidable. The U.S. protested and the Germans put restraints on their U-Boat commanders.

Repeated sinking of vessels carrying U.S. cargoes occurred, and loss of American lives was involved. But even the sinking of the passenger liner, the Lusitania, in May, 1915, in spite of all the outrage it created at the time, did not change the U.S. policy. President Wilson was re-elected in November, 1916 after pledging to keep the U.S. out of the war. Wilson sought to act as an intermediary between the two belligerents, hoping to bring an end to the war. But as the war continued, and war aims were increased, Wilson realized that peace was not possible so long as each side expected victory. He said as much in a speech he gave in December, 1916; a speech known as the "peace without victory" speech.

Even as he said this, the German military command was deciding upon a military solution to the war. They decided to launch an unrestricted submarine warfare which no longer exercised restraint to spare neutral shipping. They were willing to take the risk that the U.S. might intervene against them based on the calculation that the English and French could be subdued before U.S. power could make any appreciable difference. It was unrestricted submarine warfare, and the
heavy loss of American lives and property that, more than anything else, changed American public opinion and persuaded Wilson to declare war.

Wilson thought in ideological terms, and already strongly favoured the two democratic nations, England and France. When the Russian Revolution broke out in March, 1917, and it appeared that Russia was establishing a liberal government, he could think of the war as a struggle between the democracies and the autocratic governments of the Central Powers. Furthermore, Wilson had been giving thought to a new approach to preserving peace in the future. He saw the balance of power method as having failed to keep the peace and he looked to a principle of collective security as a means to do so in the future. That is, democratic nations would form an international organization to concert collective action against any aggressor. This vision led Woodrow Wilson to coin the phrases that this was a "war to save the world for democracy" and this was a "war to end all wars."

The U.S. intervention could not affect the land war for almost a year because of the time required to train large numbers of American soldiers and send them across the ocean. But it did immediately affect the war at sea as the U.S. Navy joined with the British Navy to combat the submarine. Introduction of the convoy system in the summer of 1917 slowed the heavy loss of shipping, while increased shipbuilding provided replacements.

Following the revolution in Russia, the Russian war effort collapsed, making it possible for the Germans to transfer troops from the Russian to the western front.

The Germans realized that time was against them, and that they had to break through in the west before large numbers of U.S. troops could reinforce the French and the English. They, therefore, carried out a great offensive beginning in February, 1918. The offensive gained more ground than the Germans had done since the first month of the war. But in the end it bogged down, and the Germans were thrown on the defensive, facing a renewed and reinforced enemy whose forces grew with every passing day. In September, 1918, the German army command recognized that they were reaching the limits of their endurance and asked the emperor to sue for peace.

In January, 1918, President Wilson had laid out a 14-point basis for peace which called for recognizing the self-determination of peoples, among other principles. To the Germans, this appeared to be a much more reasonable basis for peace than any terms they were likely to receive from the French and the English. Therefore, the Germans made their
peace overtures to the United States government. President Wilson, however, was not willing to negotiate with the existing German government which he considered to be autocratic and not representative of the German people. This delayed negotiations even while the German war effort, particularly on the home front, was collapsing.

As workers in the Ruhr rebelled and sailors in the navy mutinied, and street protests erupted in Berlin and other German cities, the leading German general (General Ludendorff) fled, and finally, at the end of October, 1918, the emperor abdicated and fled into exile in Holland. In the midst of street demonstrations in Berlin, leaders of the German Social Democratic Party, Ebert in particular, were persuaded by their followers to assume power. It was this government that signed the Armistice Agreement that ended the war.

This had been a war unlike any other in history. Whole nations had mobilized. The workers in the factory on the home front were as important as the soldiers at the front in manufacturing the weapons, equipment and supplies that were so rapidly consumed by the war. Governments took control of national economies to an unprecedented degree in order to plan and allocate resources for the war effort.

Every able-bodied person was involved, unemployment was wiped out, class distinctions became less important, and workers’ incomes increased. Women were employed in large numbers in the factories. Loss of life and destruction of property were so immense that no side could declare victory. All lost.

1.6 Results of the War

The World War I left manifold impact which can be conveniently studied under the following heads:

1.6.1 Economic Results

- The war caused terrible loss of life and property. Out of 65 million people who took part in the war, about 9 million were killed; and 29 million were wounded or reported missing. In terms of money also the war is estimated to have cost about 400 billion dollars.

- Because of the war the prices of commodities showed a steep rise which caused much hardship and suffering to the people. This obliged the various governments to take measures to regulate prices and control distribution. Thus, it gave an impetus to the rise of state socialism.
• The enormous expenses involved in the war compelled the governments to impose heavy taxes on the people which caused much hardship to the people. Further, the government resorted to printing of currency notes without taking into account the reserve bullion stocks. Thus the introduction of paper currency was largely the outcome of the World War I.

• The war provided an impetus to the trade unionism. During the war demand for labour increased tremendously. The industrialists provided all sorts of facilities to the workers to keep their factories running to full capacity. The workers exploited this favourable atmosphere to promote their interests and succeeded in extracting concessions from the factory owners. They also set up trade unions to take care of their interests. Hence, it can be said that the war tremendously increased the importance of the workers.

• The war led to devaluation and economic depression. During the war various governments raised loans from all possible quarters for the maintenance of their armies and ships which were beyond their repaying capacity. As a result, in the wake of the war most of the countries were obliged to devalue their currency and were faced with serious problems of economic reconstruction. This in turn paved the way for the economic depression which caused much hardship to the people all over the world in the thirties.

1.6.2 Social Results

In the social sphere also the war had far-reaching repercussions. They are as follows:

• The enormous loss of life during the war caused untold sufferings to innumerable families which compelled the leaders to think of avoiding re-occurrence of war in future. This led to the establishment of the League of Nations to resolve international disputes amicably on the basis of reason and justice.

• The war contributed to the progress of women folk. As many able-bodied persons lost their lives in the war, there was shortage of labour. Factory owners were therefore, obliged to engage women workers. The women workers gave a good account of themselves and soon came to be recognised as regular labour force. They also took active part in various political movements. All this greatly contributed to the elevation of the status of women.

• It gave a serious blow to racialism and promoted feeling of fraternity among the people of the world. Before the war, the Europeans
regarded themselves as superior and refused to mix up with the black Africans and Asians. During the war the Europeans were forced to shun this feeling of racial superiority and the European soldiers fought shoulder to shoulder with the Asian and African soldiers. The feeling of racialism hence got slowly subsided and was replaced by the feeling of fraternity of man all over the world.

- It gave a serious setback to education. During the war many educational institutions were closed down and students were encouraged to undergo military training to provide necessary fighting force to keep the war going. In most of the countries, military training was made compulsory for the students. All this largely hampered the progress of education.

- The war resulted in the development of international culture. It brought people professing different cultures close to each other and they learnt from each other novel features of their respective cultures ushering in them benevolence and mutual coherence to accept each other’s culture with dignity. As a result a new culture of the international nature evolved which combined the good points of various cultures.

- The war too gave a great boost to the scientific progress. The war-hit countries tried to improve their techniques to manufacture ships, submarines, aeroplanes etc. and invented various lethal gases to gain advantage over their opponents. These modern techniques of war cut short the duration of the war. Further, scientific inventions also contributed to the greater industrial and agricultural progress.

### 1.6.3 Political Results

In the political sphere also the war produced no less significant results. They are as follows:

- The war proved to be a shattering blow to the autocratic monarchical system and paved the way for the development of democracy in Europe. Three autocratic dynasties- the Romanov in Russia, Hohenzollern in Germany and Hapsburg in Austria-Hungary were destroyed and republican system of government was established there. In a number of other countries also monarchy was replaced by republic. The emergence of democratic system led to recognition of people’s political rights.

- It provided a fillip to the principles of nationalism and self-determination. After the war empires having people with different cultures were dissolved and independent states with distinct
cultures made their appearance. Some of the states which thus engaged were Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia. Alsace-Lorraine was restored to France and Schleswig-Holstein was restored to Denmark. Countries like China, Turkey, Egypt and Ireland too felt the impact of nationalism.

- The weakened position of the European powers provided an impetus to the freedom movements in Asia and Africa. The colonial countries began to feel that in view of the weakened position of the colonial powers they could hope to gain freedom. Therefore, they accelerated their struggle for freedom.

- The war led to a change in the policy of colonial powers towards colonial people. The concept of treating the colonial people of the colonial possessions as stooges began to change. In the post World War I era, the colonies were granted certain rights and certain restrictions were imposed on them under the mandate system. In short, we can say that greater importance began to be attached to the interests of the colonial people after the war.

- It too prompted the spirit of internationalism. During the war various nations came in close contact with each other through various pact and agreements. These close relations persisted even after the war and greatly contributed to the development of international spirit.

- Probably, the most significant political result of the war was the creation of the League of Nations. The horrors of war convinced the world leaders of the need to evolve some machinery to prevent war and promote international cooperation. This culminated in the establishment of the League of Nations dedicated to the cause of world peace and order.

Thus, the First World War was an outcome of the aggressive nationalism expressing itself in the cult of militarism, alliances, counter-alliances, economic imperialism and a chain of crises. By 1907, Europe had come to be divided into two antagonistic camps - the Triple Alliance, consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy and the Triple Entente consisting of England, France and Prussia. Although Italy was a lukewarm partner, the alliance of the Central Powers was a strong one. In the Balkans the deteriorating situation contained many irreconcilable elements- Germany’s friendship with Turkey, Austria’s rivalry with Russia and the conflicting aspirations of the small Balkan nations. The Anglo-German maritime and colonial rivalry was a crucial factor. The murder of Archduke Ferdinand, the Hapsburg crown prince at Sarajevo by Slav terrorists precipitated the outbreak of the First World War.
1.7 Paris Peace Conference

The World War-I was a "War to end all Wars" and it was fought with the popular catchword of making world safe for democracy. In its scope extent and magnitude of massacre, destruction and annihilation, it had surpassed all wars, say the Napoleonic wars, the Crimean war, the Danish War, the Austro-Prussian war or the Franco-Prussian war. It is regarded as the real world war taking into account the unscrupulous use of mechanical arms and ammunitions and loss of life and property. The loss of life in the war had been twice the total number of deaths involved in the previous wars between 1790 to 1913. It mobilised 65 million men of whom 13 million died and 7 million were crippled and disabled. The destructions on both sides were so extensive that the distinction between the combatants and the noncombatants completely vanished. About two-thirds of the world population were affected by this war. The death rate of the civilian was much greater than that of the military personnel and that was due to famine, epidemics, raids and indiscriminate attacks of both the belligerents.

1.8 The Armistice

After the fall of Austria and Bulgaria, on 30th September 1918 the German General Ludendorff advised the Kaiser to conclude peace with the Allies. Woodrow Wilson, the American President as terms of the armistice demanded that 1) Germany should withdraw her troops from the soil of the Allied Powers and 2) Germany should announce a democratic government in pace of the despotic one. The German Government agreed to these demands on 20th October and on 11th November, the armistice was signed between Marshall Foch, the General of the Allied Powers and the German representatives. Hence Germany 1) Withdrew her army from the territories of the Allies 2) Declared the Rhineland as demilitarised zone, 3) Surrendered her war-materials, submarines, battleships in large numbers to the Allies, 4) Repudiated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk previously concluded with Russia in March 1918.

With Germany's unconditional surrender the statesmen of the world chose Paris which had been the nerve-centre for the allies cause as the site for the conclusion of peace and made necessary preparations. The peace-makers assembled at Paris in January 18, 1919 in an atmosphere of idealism tinctured with national aggrandizement, amidst the glittering scenes reminiscent of the
Congress of Vienna. However, this conference was more a widely representative body than that of the Congress of Vienna. Crowned heads now became conspicuous by their absence.

**1.9 Composition of the Conference**

To the conference came representatives not only from the "Allies" but also from the "Associated Powers". During the final stages of the war, many countries had become belligerents largely in order to gain a voice in the final settlement. So the group of Allied and Associated Powers was a large one. Several south and central American states like Cuba, Brazil, Panama, Liberia, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Uruguay, the newly emerged states recognised by the Allies like Czechoslovakia and Poland etc. represented the conference. A host of other small nationalities and pressure groups like Americans and Zionists, Lebanese and Egyptians, Kurds and Koreans sent unofficial and unrecognized representatives to lobby the powers for consideration. Of course, it excluded some powers—Russia, Germany, Austria, Turkey, Hungary, Bulgaria and above all, the Neutral Powers. Though, the exclusion of these powers proved to be undoing for the Paris Peace conference, yet it was a gigantic one represented by 32 countries absorbing 1037 members including 70 plenipotentiaries.

Among the diplomats assembled at the conference, most prominent were President Woodrow Wilson of America, the British Prime Minister Lloyd George, the French Foreign Minister George Clemenceau and the Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando, popularly known as the 'Big Four'. Besides them, there were other diplomatic representatives who played no significant part in this conference. The French President Poincare and the French Commander Marshall Foch exerted their enormous influence upon it although they were not representatives to it. Their only objective was to keep Germany weak and crippled in every possible way. Greece was represented by Venizelos, Poland by Roman Dmawski. The Japanese representatives Kimmochi Saionji and Nobuyaki Makino got their opinions and aims in regard to the Far East very clear and fixed.

To make the business possible, more than 58 Commissions of various sorts were established and coordination among them was established by the Council of Ten or the Supreme Council represented by two members each from America, Britain, France, Italy and Japan. As the Far Eastern questions were put in the hands of the Japanese representatives, they remained almost
unconcerned about European questions. As Italy withdrew from the conference for sometime after opposing the discussions over the Adriatic problems, the decisions on important issues practically passed into the hands of the 'Big Three' - Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Wilson.

In the conference, Wilson assumed the role similar to that played by Czar Alexander-I in the Congress of Vienna. An ex-Professor of Political Philosophy at Princeton, a brilliant orator, an idealist and a man of rigid conviction, Wilson was accepted by Europe as a prophet. "Not since the days of ancient empire" writes Langsam "had Rome witnessed such a triumphant procession as that accorded the President of the United States". The Germans looked upon Wilson as their 'Protector'. But the glamour was deceptive. His paradoxical position was that he, the great democrat preaching and bestowing democracy in Europe, had no majority at home. In the Congressional Elections of November 1918, the Republicans had gained majority. In Paris the vicious loompening of the French Press had undermined his position. He could not be understood by all. He had no knowledge of the existing European problems. In the words of Langsam, "In diplomacy, Wilson was no match for his foreign colleagues at Paris."

Great Britain was represented by her Prime Minister, Lloyd George, a well-informed, realistic, alert and clever diplomat who had full support of the British people. His immense personality, characteristics virtues, political foresight and clear understanding of the European problems made him the key figure in the conference.

George Clemenceau, popularly known as 'Tiger' represented France. He was an experienced diplomat, cynical and had strong determinations. During the American civil war he was engaged as a news-reporter in America. He had practical experience in the arts of war and politics. His chief aim in the conference was to extend the glory of France, to ensure its national security and to keep Germany paralysed for all time to come.

Vittorio Orlando, a learned, eloquent and artful diplomat represented Italy. Though an ex-professor of law, a scholar, a fine orator, he was not well conversant with English because of which he failed to create any impression in the conference.
1.10 Initial Problems of the Conference

There were too many knotty problems that handicapped the work of the Paris peace makers.

1.10.1 Difficulties of Taking Decisions

The conference was a larger one. In addition to 70 plenipotentiaries and 1037 delegates, the number of news reporters of different countries representing the conference was not negligible. Fifty-six commissions on special subjects had been appointed. The opinions and counter-opinions of the experts were too numerous and too wide for assimilation. Hence the difficulties in the way of taking decisions were numerous.

1.10.2 Lack of Well-defined Principles

In spite of a great debate on the post war reconstruction of the world the leaders could not find out any formula or a definite plan to make a peaceful coordination of the varied conflicting interests. At one time or another each of the plenipotentiaries was on the verge of withdrawing in sheer exasperation. Hence solutions of the post-war problems almost became impossible.

1.10.3 Ideological Difference among the Leaders

The 'Big Four'- Wilson, Lloyd, Clemenceau and Orlando on whom the responsibility of taking decisions was entrusted lacked ideological unity among themselves. Wilson, an idol of peace, favoured a durable peace based on justice and neutrality instead of taking revenge. In regard to the reconstruction and redistribution of the European states, he was in favour of attaching importance to the opinion of the people concerned. But on the issue of international peace settlement, sitting at a place far away from America he could not gauge the feeling of the Americans and of the U.S. Senate. Lloyd was eager to establish international peace on the basis of truth and justice only if the British interests were protected. Though a social reformer, he could not surpass his aggressive mentality in the conference. Clemenceau wanted such a treaty as to guarantee the security of France even at the cost of Germany's national and economic solidarity. And Orlando was more eager to protect the territorial interests of Italy than to ensure world peace. An abiding harmony could not be brought among their ideologies which ultimately pushed the conference into difficulty.
1.10.4 Conflicting Interests of Different States

The peace makers in Vienna had believed in the doctrine of compensation but the Paris Peace Conference had to answer the expectations they had themselves used. Wilson had promised that peoples and provinces would not be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were chattels or pawns in the game of balance of power. Opposed to this propagandist verbiage there were the naked national interests of the powers concerned which were difficult to be reconciled with the slogan that the war was being fought to make the "world safe for democracy".

1.10.5 Selection of Paris ill-timed

The choice of Paris as the site for the conference was rather unfortunate, for Paris was in a tumult of passion and its atmosphere was full of cynicism, spite and vengeance. In Paris, German guilt had been assumed for a fact. The bellicose temper, the vindictive tone of the Paris Press, the slogan of "no mercy to the beaten foes" had rendered the city almost a nightmare. Thus a neutral city, such as Geneva or Lausanne would have been much better. It was due to the pressure of France that Paris was selected instead.

1.10.6 Secret Treaties Signed

Wilson sponsored a long list of "Fourteen Points" as the basis of international peace and Germany accepted it partly. On the other hand, many secret treaties were concluded among the European states during the war. But these as opposed to the Fourteen Points in many respects, created difficulties in the conference. Wilson was not in favour of secret diplomacy of any nature. In contrast, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan were eager to observe the terms of the secret treaties.

These were the initial handicaps with which the Paris Peace Conference embarked on its task. In short Paris Conference had to face a legion of problem: the harmonizing in the peace terms of a large number of different national objectives, the drawing up of a treaty acceptable to dozens of states, the ending of several local civil wars in Central Europe, the calming of war strung national hysterias, meeting the threats of famine, disease and Bolshevism, the reconciling of Wilsonianism with other and older principles.
However, despite these problems, Wilson’s Fourteen Points were the watchwords of the peace makers.

### 1.11 Wilson’s Fourteen Points (8 January 1918)

- No secret treaty of any nature should be concluded after the terms of world peace openly accepted and “diplomacy shall proceed always frankly”.
- Excepting the territorial waters, the high seas should remain open to ships of all nations in times of war and peace.
- The removal of economic barriers (tariffs) and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions.
- "Adequate guarantees" should be there to reduce the national armaments to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.
- The colonial rights of country should be reconsidered openly and disinterestedly. At the time of any such reconsideration, the interests of the people concerned should be taken into account.
- The restoration of all Russian lost territories.
- The evaluation and restoration of the Belgium territories.
- The evacuation and restoration of France and the return of Alsace and Lorraine to France.
- The territorial frontiers of Italy should be determined on the basis of nationalism.
- The people of Austria-Hungary should be given opportunity of autonomous development.
- Foreign troops should be withdrawn from Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro. A policy should be adopted for the establishment of relation among the Balkan states and their political and economic independence should be guaranteed.
- Autonomos development for the non-Turkish possessions of the Turkish Sultan and internationalisation of the Straits of Dardanelles.
- An independent polish state with the Polish speaking people should be reorganised and her economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by an international covenant.
- An international organization shall be established affording mutual guarantees of political sovereignty and territorial integrity of all powers strong or weak.

Subsequently, Wilson’s further four principles enunciated on 11th February 1918 were to become the guidelines for the peace makers. They were:-
• Every issue must be settled by the essential principle of justice.
• Peoples and provinces were not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty.
• Territorial claims of the different contending states would be resolved with an eye to the interests of its people.
• For the preservation of the peace of Europe, all efforts should be made to satisfy the national aspirations of all nations.

Among all these issues and circumstances, the first plenary session of the peace conference was held on January 18, 1919. The 'Big Four' held 145 sessions and when Italy left the 'Big Three' dominated. The routine work was finished in 16 meetings held by 58 commissions and committees. The commissions on the League of Nations, on preparation of damages and on territorial problems were among the more important of these bodies.

Finally, the Paris conference drafted various peace treaties. The first among them was the Peace Treaty of Versailles signed between the Allied Powers and the vanquished Germany. Its territorial, economic, military and political provisions all aimed at crippling Germany to nadir. So this peace treaty could not make world safe for democracy, rather contained the ominous provisions of another world war.

It also drafted some other treaties like the Treaty of St. Germain signed between Austria and the Allied Powers on September 10, 1919, the treaty of Neuilly signed between Bulgaria and the Allied Powers on November 27, 1919, the treaty of Trianon signed between Hungary and the Allied Powers on June 4, 1920, the treaty of Sevres signed between Turkey and the Allied Powers on August 10, 1920 and the treaty of Lausanne between the same Allied Powers and Turkey on July 24, 1923.

In the new state structure brought about by the Peace settlement, the problem of minorities became one of the most important because the new map could not fulfill the aspirations of all nationalities. In most of the states, therefore, important minorities were left whose rights had to be safeguarded. The Japanese proposal of equality of all nationalities had been rejected. Nevertheless, something had to be done for the minorities. The Paris conference appointed a "New State Committee" to consider the security problems of the minorities. This committee was not in
favour of awarding autonomous rights to the minorities. However, special arrangements were made with Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey in this respect. Moreover, the Allied Powers concluded separate minority treaties with Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Greece and Armenia. In most of the cases, the states concluded bilateral minority treaties among themselves. In all these treaties, political, economic, cultural and humanitarian rights of the minority communities were recognised. The supervision over the minority guarantees was left to the league of nations and it was only by the consent of a majority of the league council that these guarantees could be modified.

1.12 Criticism

No doubt the peace makers assembled at Paris could not produce a substantial solution and strove only for a futile patch work. Yet, it deserves credit as the first world peace conference.

Of course, there was too much delay. But considering the size of the conference and complexity of issues conforming it, there was the justification of delay.

The peace conference was only a ‘rough and tumbled affair’. It couldn’t differentiate between essential and nonessential matters. The issues such as the military, political and reparation questions should have been agreed upon by the victorious allies. The other issues like disarmament, economic reconstruction and league of nations should have been worked in an impassioned manner. This was another mistake.

Besides, the shibboleth of Wilsonian idealism met its complete black out at the fierce opportunism of Clemenceau and the narrow nationalism filled with hatred for Germany. So, Wilson became a disillusioned prophet. Throughout the conference there was a conflict between idealism and realism. The confusion that haunted the conference, haunted also the minds of men in 1919- a tension between hopes and ideals of a more orderly world. Lipson writes, "it was an atmosphere poisoned by memories of carnage in the battle fields, of the devastated areas, and of the crushing burdens laid upon posterity, that the statesmen of peace conference came back together in the French capital in 1919 and set their hands to the task of rebuilding the new Europe".

Hence, the Paris Peace Conference was a failed extravaganza. In a short time, the world got prepared for war and the world was
eventually reduced to crying. Hence we can conclude the achievements of the Paris Peace Conference that "to the extent that it was the outcome, the Paris Conference must stand in history as a conspicuous failure, but it was an overall failure of human intelligence and wisdom and in part, the failure of organisation and method. This was not due to either an excess of realism or lack of idealism, but rather to a misapplication of both."

1.13 League of Nations

The League of Nations that emerged with the cataclysm of the World War I was expected to become the champion of peace. The huge loss sustained during the war, pillage, genocide, the rattling of guns shattered the finer sensibilities of the humanity. The world desperately wanted peace and hence the World War I was fought, in Wilsonian estimate, "as a great war to end all wars and make the democracy safe for the world." Wilson knew very well that they are fought in the minds of men and let the minds be prepared for peace." And that is why, one of the fourteen points of Wilson envisaged the formation of the league of nations which would settle the disputes by amicable means and safeguard the world peace. With the signing of the peace treaty of Versailles the League came into existence and became the cynosure of world hopes.

1.14 Origin

Although the league of nations was directly an outcome of the First World War, yet a considerable amount of influence was exercised by the pre-war movements like the concert of Europe, the Hague conferences and the public international unions, in the modeling of the different organs of the league of nations. However, it cannot be denied that the league provided for the first time a comprehensive system with the union in one institution of a number of separate elements which had previously existed in a piece real fashion.

The idea of having a league of states was being canvassed even before the outbreak of the war. In 1903, Sir Henry Campbell proposed the creation of a 'League of Peace'. In 1911, Sir Edward Grey emphasized the need of establishing some sort of a Comity or Concern of Nations. After the outbreak of the war, frantic efforts were made to find out the basis of a lasting world peace. Prof. Rappard of Switzerland took a lead in this regard followed by a group of Englishmen under the leadership of Lord Bryce. In U.S.A. also, an organisation known as 'The League to Enforce Peace' was
formed under the leadership of ex-President Traft in 1915. Proposals for organising an international body which could effectively disperse with war and establish peace were also submitted by Sweden, Denmark, Norway, England, France etc. The establishment of league of nations received special impetus when President Woodrow Wilson announced his famous fourteen-point programme in January 1918, the fourteenth point itself stressing upon the formation of the same. It said "a general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of providing mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike."

1.15 The League Covenant

The covenant of the league was drafted by a very small and compact group consisting of ten members- two from each of the five great powers, Great Britain, U.S.A., France, Italy and Japan. Since protests were lodged from the minor states, nine additional members were added from the minor states. President Wilson of U.S.A. served as the Chairman of the Commission. Subsequently the covenant was incorporated in Treaty of Versailles as Part-I and was signed on June 28, 1919. The covenant actually came into force on January 10, 1920 after obtaining the ratification of the requisite number of states.

1.16 Aims and Objectives of the League

The chief aim of the league was "to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war." The contemporary world also had hoped that the league would not only solve the international disputes but would also avert the possibility of war as well by reducing armaments of all states.

The signatory states to the league covenant pledged to maintain world peace and security through international cooperation instead of resorting to war, to regulate relations between nations honourably and to respect all treaty obligations. In Article X of the covenant it was stipulated that in case of any conflict between two or more nations they would accept league's mediation and would not report to arms during the period of mediation. Article XVI of it spoke of imposition of economic blockade and enforcing military measures by the member-states if necessary against any state violating the league covenant.
1.17 Membership

There were two types of members of the league- the original and non-original. Article 1 provided that "The original members of the league shall be those of the signatories which are named in the Annex to this covenant and also such of those other states named in the Annex as shall accede without reservation to this covenant." As regards the non-original members, the covenant provided in Article 1(2) that "any fully self governing state, dominion or colony not named in the Annex may become a member of the league if it's admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly.

There were 3 methods for the cessation of membership. Firstly, Article 1(3) provided that any member can cease membership after 2 years notice if at the time of its withdrawal the state concerned had fulfilled all its international obligations. Secondly, Article 2b stated that if any member signified it's dissent from an amendment of the covenant "in that case it shall cease to be a member of the league". Thirdly, Article 16 provided for expulsion of any member by unanimous vote (excepting the state concerned) of the council. During the life-time of the league 16 states withdrew from its membership. USSR was the only country to be expelled from the membership of the league for violating Article 16 of the covenant when she committed aggression on Finland in December, 1939. Though 62 states were members of the league, their total strength at any one time never excluded 58.

1.18 Organisation of the League

The league of nations had three main organs - the Assembly, the Council and the Secretariat and two other subsidiary organisations, viz. the Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

1.18.1 The Assembly

The Assembly consisted of representatives of the members of the league. Each member had right to send three representatives but could cast only one vote. The Assembly thus closely resembled a diplomatic conference, it certainly was not an international legislative body. All important decisions could be taken by the Assembly by the unanimous agreement of the members present at the meeting. The Assembly was expected to meet at least once a year. However, special sessions of the Assembly could be convened
as and when necessary. The Assembly elected its own President at every new session by a majority of votes.

The functions of the Assembly were of three kinds—Elective, Constituent and Deliberative Powers. Its Elective Powers related to elections. It could admit new members by a 2/3rd majority of its members. It elected annually three of the nine permanent members of the council. While the council nominates the Secretary-General, Assembly approves it. For 9 years it elected 15 judges to Permanent Court of International Justice in conjunction with the Council. The cooperation between the Assembly and the Council was essential for the additional members of the council or increasing the strength of the council. So far its constituent powers were concerned, it could adopt amendments to the covenants of the league by a majority of its members. These amendments were to be ratified by the council. The important powers of the league were its deliberative ones. It had to make deliberations on international political and economic matters likely to endanger world peace and on advising reconsideration of the treaties which had become inapplicable. It has the power to supervise the working of the council and technical commissions and revise the budget of the league prepared by the Secretariat. From these functions it appeared, the Assembly was a dominant organ of the league.

1.18.2 The Council

The Council was designed to be a small body to serve as the executive organ of the league. It consisted of five permanent members (USA, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan) and four non-permanent members mostly small powers. Since the USA did not join the league, the membership of the council stayed at eight until two non-permanent seats were added in 1922. According to the Article 4(2) of the covenant the council could increase the member of permanent and non-permanent members with the approval of the majority of the Assembly. It was due to this power that Germany was given a permanent seat in 1926 and USSR was made a member in 1934. The number of non-permanent members was also eventually increased to eleven.

The council was expected to meet at least once a year. It met either at the seat of the league or at such other place as was decided upon. Emergency meetings of the council could be summoned during the emergency out of war or threat of a war.
It was assigned as extensive functions as those of the Assembly. It could deal with all the matters within the sphere of the league or affecting the peace of the world. In addition, the council was specifically entitled with the following functions: a) nomination of additional permanent members of the council; b) formulating plans for the reduction of armaments, taking into account the geographical situation and circumstances of each state; c) to advise how the evil effects of manufacture of munitions and implements of war by private enterprise can be prevented. However, due regard had to be given to the necessities of those members of the league which were not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety; d) advise upon the means which the members of the league were to preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of their fellow members; e) to define the scope of authority or control to be exercised by the Mandatory Powers under the Mandate System; f) to direct the work of the Secretariat and receive reports from the subsidiary organs of the league; g) to recommend to the several governments effective military sanctions and expulsion of any member who had violated any of the covenants of the league. The council also prepared plans for disarmament and nominated the Secretary-General subject to the approval of the Assembly.

### 1.18.3 The Secretariat

The league covenant provided for a permanent Secretariat at Geneva headed by a Secretary General, appointed by the council with the approval of the league-Assembly. The members of the Secretariat enjoyed diplomatic privileges and immunities, but they retired their own nationality despite the members of the International Council Service. All appointments of the Secretariat were made by the Secretary-General with the approval of the council. The Secretary-General with two other Under Secretaries General and two Deputy Secretaries-General was charged with the duty of compilation and publication of all international problems coming for consideration before the league. It divided it's works into eleven sections dealing with the matters of law, economics, politics, transit, administrative commissions, minority questions, mandates, disarmament, health, social problems and international associations.

The chief functions of the Secretariat included: i) Coordinating the widespread activities of the league carried on by its various organs; ii) Providing a source of continuity and follow up for league work; iii) Keeping the records of the league agencies;
iv) Furnishing information and analysis to organs and delegates; v) Registration of treaties and international engagements entered into by the members of the league; vi) Arrangements of meetings and conferences.

1.18.4 The Permanent Court of International Justice

Article 14 of the covenant directed the council to prepare the necessary plans for the establishment of a permanent court of International Justice and to submit them to the members for their approval. Thus the council appointed a committee of Jurists in February, 1920. The committee prepared a statute of the court which was submitted for the approval of the Council, Assembly and the members of the league. After due ratification of the plan, the Court was set up at the Hague in February 15, 1922. By 1939, 51 states had become the members of the Court.

Initially this Court consisted of 11 judges and 4 deputy-judges. The strength of the judges was increased to 15 through an amendment in 1930. In 1936 the offices of the deputy judges were abolished. All these judges were elected for a term of 9 years by the Council and the Assembly. On the basis of absolute majority the Court elected a President and a Vice-President from amongst its members for a period of 3 years. All judges were given diplomatic privileges and immunities. They were eligible for re-election. At Hague, it met every year from June 15 onwards, though its special session could be convened by the President at any time. It worked with 3 special chambers—Summary Procedure, Labour and Transit and Communications.

The Court enjoyed two types of jurisdictions—Voluntary and Compulsory. The voluntary jurisdiction implied that two or more states involved in a dispute could refer the dispute to the Court for settlement, while the compulsory jurisdiction implied that certain other states specifically signed an understanding and accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes involving the interpretation of a treaty, breach of an international obligation, or the question of international law etc. By 1939, 39 states accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The Court followed the same procedure which a regular tribunal observed, viz. briefs were filed, arguments heard, evidence examined and the decisions were made by majority vote after much deliberations. It also rendered advisory opinions to the council and the Assembly on legal points. Although these opinions were not binding for the Assembly as well as for the Council, still they followed the same.
During its life span the court tried 65 cases, handed down 32 judgments, 27 advisory opinions and several hundred orders. The statute of the Court was signed by 52 states or all members of the league including two ex-members, Brazil and Costa Rica, except by Argentina, Honduras, Nicaragua and Peru. Moreover of all the states signing the statute it was not ratified by Bolivia, Columbia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Liberia, Panama, Paraguay, El Salvador, Luxemburg and Persia (Iran).

1.18.5 The International Labour Organisation (ILO)

All members of the League automatically were treated as members of the International Labour Organisation. But Germany was a member of ILO without being the member of the League. The organisation of ILO was almost similar to the organisation of the League. It had three organs - i) The General Conference similar to that of the Assembly; ii) The Governing Body similar to that of the Council; iii) The International Labour Office similar to that the Secretariat.

To the General Conference each member state sent 4 delegates- one selected by the labour, one by the employers and two nominated by the government. Though the General Conference did not possess any legislative powers it could focus world attention on the evils and suggest measures for the improvement of the condition of labourers. Though it’s venue was at Geneva, the meeting could be held at some other place if it was recommended by 2/3rd majority in the previous meeting. It designated the members of the Governing Body, adopted the annual budget and examined the application of conventions. In toto, it was the principal policy making body of the ILO.

The Governing Body consisted of 32 delegates 16 representing governments 8 representing employers and 8 workers. Its term was fixed at three years. It met at least once every three months. Its functions were i) To determine policy and work programmes; ii) Making of agenda for the conference; iii) To prepare the annual budget of the ILO; iv) to supervise the work of the International Labour office and its various committees and Commissions.

The International Labour Office with its seat at Geneva was under the charge of a Director appointed by the Governing Body. It collected information on all phases of industrial life and labour and prepared the agenda for the annual General Conference meetings. It
also published an official Bulletin, an International Labour Review and numerous other documents and reports.

The ILO performed significant services during the inter war period. By 1939, it’s labour conference adopted 73 recommendations and 67 conventions to be submitted for consideration and implementation to the member states. Though the league had its demise in 1940, the ILO survived and became an important allied organ of the UNO in 1945.

1.19 Achievements of the League

The League of Nations existed for 20 years. Its achievements may be studied under the following heads:

1.19.1 Political Achievements

About 40 political issues of both major and minor character were handled by the league during its existence. The league successfully settled the disputes relating to smaller states. But it failed where dispute between bigger states were involved.

1.19.1.1 Dispute over Aaland Islands

When in 1920 a dispute dropped up between Sweden and Finland over the issue of the Aaland Island, both appended to the league council for its settlement under the mediation of England. Sweden and Finland were not members of the league. According to the League Covenant the League had no right to intervene in the mutual disputes of states excepting it’s member states. However, in 1921 the council resolved the dispute by which Aaland Island was given to Finland but it took the responsibility of protecting the private properties of the Swedish nationals living there Apart from this the Island was neutralised and demilitarised.

1.19.1.2 Dispute over Eupen and Malmedy, 1920-21

In 1920-21 Germany protested to the council against the attribution of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium. In September 1920, the council decided to recognise as final the transfer of the districts of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium. On February 22, 1922 Germany was informed by the Secretary General that the decision was final.
1.19.1.3 Dispute over Upper Silesia, 1921

This was a border dispute between Germany and Poland in which France favoured Poland and Britain sympathised with Germany and which the conference of Ambassadors, a body consisting of 4 ambassadors to France - British, American, Italian and Japanese- and a representative of the French Government and a body which among other things was to draw out the boundaries left unsettled by the peace treating working as the successor to the Allied supreme council had failed to solve. The league council successfully recommended a boundary which was accepted to Germany and Poland.

1.19.1.4 Dispute over Vilna, 1920

Vilna had been the capital of Lithuania since 1323. Russia occupied it in 1795. After the First World War it was restored to Lithuania, but Poland occupied it in 1920. The League Council failed settling the dispute allowing Vilna to be annexed to Poland after a plebiscite of doubtful character in 1922. The council clearly demarcated the border between Poland and Lithuania and succeeded in maintaining peace between the two for a long time by recognising the union of Vilna with Poland.

1.19.1.5 Dispute over Corfu, 1923

In August 1923, certain Italian military officers were murdered in Greece. The Italian Government demanded apologies and full reparations for the crime from the Greek Government. As the latter failed to comply with the demands of Italy, she occupied the Island of Corfu. In September, 1923 the Greek Government referred the matter to the league council. Later the league council notified that the communication had been received from the conference of Ambassadors informing that the settlement of the dispute as a result of diplomatic negotiations.

1.19.1.6 Greco-Bulgarian Dispute, 1925

The border dispute between Greece and Bulgaria cropped up in 1925, Greece attacked Bulgaria when Greek general and a Greek soldier were shot dead by the Bulgarian troops. As a result of the league’s intervention Greece was compelled to pay a huge indemnity for violating the border of Bulgaria. In this case the league could not give evidence of its integrity and impartiality.
1.19.1.7  The Chaco War, 1928

In 1928 trouble started in Gran Chaco, situated between Bolivia and Paraguay. Soon the matter surfaced and reached the council and the latter sent a telegram to both the parties, urging both the parties to reach an amicable settlement. Instantaneously, an immediate quarrel was reverted. However, in 1932, fresh quarrels started which could not be checked by the efforts of the neighbouring states. The league sent a commission of inquiry in January 1933. On June 12, 1936, the Inter American mediation led to a cessation of hostilities but it was not until 1938 that the matter was decided by arbitration.

1.19.1.8  Manchurian Dispute, 1931

Under the Russo Japanese Treaty of 1905, Japan was entitled to station 15,000 troops in Manchuria for the protection of the South Manchurian Railway with headquarters at Mukden. On 18th September, 1931, on the plea that the Chinese attempted to blow up the railway line sized the railway and captured all Chinese towns north of Mukden. By mid-November, Northern Manchuria was occupied and on January 4, 1932, the Japanese reached Shanghai. China appealed to the League Council which called upon the disputants to withdraw their troops. But as the Japanese did not comply, the council appointed a five-men commission headed by Lord Lytton of England and other members from U.S.A., France, Germany and Italy.

In the meanwhile, Japan attacked Shanghai and China. Once again appealed to the Assembly which adopted a resolution on March 4, 1932 asking Japan to evacuate Shanghai. And under an Armistice of May 5, 1932 Japan quitted Shanghai but continued to hold on to Manchuria. The league could not do anything except that some of the powers of the league refused to recognise Manchukuo. Japan criticized it and subsequently left the league.

1.19.1.9  Italian Attack on Ethiopia, 1934-36

The dispute between Italy and Ethiopia cropped up with Italy’s attack on a Ethiopian village of Walwal in 1934. In 1936 Italy attacked Ethiopia and the latter appealed to the league. The league council separately accused Italy of violating the terms of the league covenant. The council admitted this accusation. The council sanctioned only economic blockade against Italy but did not agree to risk any kind of military measure against her. Taking advantage of the
League’s extreme impotency, Italy occupied Ethiopia. In fact, from that moment world’s confidence upon the league of nations was greatly under mined.

1.19.1.10 German Aggression and the League, 1935-39

A serious challenge was posed to the league by Germany. On October 14, 1933 Germany withdrew from the league and on March 16, 1935 she ordered conscription in violation of the Treaty of Versailles. On March 7, 1936 the Rhineland was remilitarized in violation of the Locarno Treaties in March 1938 Austria was occupied and in March 1939 Czechoslovakia was invaded and seized. The league took no effective action against Germany for all these violations except adopting resolutions and giving warnings. In September 1939 Germany invaded Poland and the World War-II started. By this time the league had almost become defunct.

In addition to the above cases the league also handled a lot of other cases. Besides maintaining international security the other political activities of the league were also important. The Mandates Commission, a body composed of eleven experts in colonial government, received annual reports from the Mandatory Powers. On the territories administered by them the Commission submitted these reports to the council with its comments and recommendations and the latter recommended these to the Mandatory Powers.

The league also looked after the problem of the minorities and appointed a committee of three members of the council for this purpose. The Committee was to receive complaints from the minorities and discuss the matter with the government of the concerned state, and generally succeeded in obtaining an understanding from the government to remedy the grievance complained of. However, if the committee failed to obtain satisfaction it could refer the petition to the council. In short the league worked through the method of persuasion and consent.

The league also successfully administered the Saar territory through a Governing Commission from 1920-1935, till a plebiscite was conducted there in January 1935. It also guaranteed the constitution of the free city of Danzig and appointed a High Commissioner to arbitrate on disputes between the Free City and Poland. Moreover, both the parties were given the right to appeal to the council against the decision of the High Commissioner.
1.19.2 Social Achievements

The social and humanitarian work of the league was in part a co-ordination of sporadic international activities which had begun before the war. In Article 23 of the league covenant it was provided that the league members would always endeavour to take steps collectively for the improvement of the public health all over the world. With a view to preventing and controlling disease everywhere in the world through international cooperation, the league Assembly had proposed to establish a permanent, Health organisation in 1923. It helped much in preventing the spread of Cholera and Plague in the East. In 1923 a Malaria Commission was appointed. Similar efforts were made to combat other diseases.

The Article 23 also laid down that "the members of the league will entrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to traffic in women and children and traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs." The campaign against slavery was another important activity of the league. A slavery convention was concluded at Geneva in 1925 and in 1932 the league decided to set up a permanent Slavery Commission. It tried to improve the lot of the working people through the ILO, though the various conventions concluded by the ILO were generally not ratified by the member states. An advisory commission for the welfare of the children was also set up by the league.

The league also successfully solved the problem of the care and resettlement of millions of war prisoners and refugees. The chief contribution of the league in this regard was mainly that of coordination with the help of funds provided by the states and private charitable institutions. To assist the intellectuals in the war devastated areas the league appointed an International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in 1922. In 1926, the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was set up at Paris to coordinate "international collaboration with a view to promoting the progress of general civilisation and human knowledge and notably the development and diffusion of science, letters and arts." This was achieved through conferences, lecturers, published materials to urge collective security, support of the league, elimination of inflammatory material from text books and also radio broadcasts etc.

Impressed by the humanitarian work of the league, Cordell Hull, the Secretary of state remarked in 1939. "The league of
nations has been responsible for more humanitarian and scientific endeavour than any other organisation in history."

1.19.3 Economic Achievements

In the economic sphere the league provided for a new and elaborate machinery for international cooperation. It set up financial and economic committee comprising experts from various countries. These committees met annually at Geneva and directed the work of the financial and economic sections of the league. The Financial Committee of the league helped in tackling the problem of counterfeiting, falsification of commercial documents, double taxation and fluctuating value of gold. For international economic development, the league convened an international financial conference in Brussels in 1920 with a purpose to check inflation to control gold standard, to remove all impediments to international trade and commerce and to improve the international transport system. The Finance Conference made certain important recommendations to augment the mobility of labour, capital and commodities in all countries, to help industrial establishment of all states in a spirit of cooperation, to stabilise custom duties of all countries, and to keep an eye upon the agricultural improvement simultaneously with industrial development.

The Economic Committee of the league also did the preliminary work on a number of major international conferences viz. the World Economic Conference of 1927 and the Monetary and Economic Conference of 1933. To secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league, the league created an Autonomous Communication and Transit Organisation which was concerned with the freedom of international transit, the collection of transit statistics, press facilities and accuracy of reporting the simplification of passport and other travel documents, the uniformity of high way traffic regulation, coordination of the national public works programmes etc.

"If measured by what other international organisations had accomplished in the past" holds Potter "the league's performance even in the security field rates very high, indeed very high than that of any other international institution with the exception of a very few highly special and limited agencies." Probably, the greatest contribution of the league was the influence it exercised in spreading the idea of international cooperation. Though politically a failure, the league had much to its credit in the social, economic
and educational fields. Even in the political sphere it was able to reduce tension on many occasions and resolve disputes.

1.20 Failure of the League of Nations

Shortly after the formation of the league, the world was betrayed and belied and it's hopes were found on rocks. It failed utterly to up keep the banner of peace and it's failure was a foregone conclusion. Right from its inception, it was jeered as a "band of robber nations", "a disreputed daughter of a dishonoured mother", "a Trojan horse of allied diplomatic strategy" and "a dreamy discovery" as Hitler cynically would point out. The solemn words of the preamble that it should try to "achieve international peace and security by acceptance of obligations not to resort to war and by a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of the organised people with one another," never crystallized into reality. The crisis after crisis created tensions in the European landscape, but the league exhibited a shilly-shally attitude and lackadaisical apathy. It became a silent spectator when the Japanese attack on Manchuria, Italy's rape on Ethiopia, Germany's aggression on Austria, the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, the turbulence of the Spanish civil war and the invasion of Poland ate away the peace of Europe. That is why, an analysis of the causes that spelt the death knell of the league of nations is needed.

The very idea of the league was novel and experimental and no nation had a clear-cut vision about the working of it. The political arena preceding it was amply characterised by "Power-Politics" and "International Anarchy". The league members showed no interest to harmonise and hence its failure was inevitable.

The clash between nationalism and internationalism entailed the door of the league. Every nation was obsessed with her national self interest and when her national interest clashed with the international interest, the latter was sacrificed for the former. Thus the deeper influence of the national sovereignty prevented the development of unflinching allegiance to the international organisation, the league. Hence, it was founded on rocks and it's failure became inescapable one.

The covenant of the league was an anathema for the league of nations. The treaty of Versailles with which the covenant was appended was an ill-fated document, combining with it, contempt, vengeance, idealism of Lloyd George and materialism of Clemenceau.
It was criticised as a dictated peace "and since the league of nations sprang out of the provisions of the peace treaty of Versailles, it was cynically seen as a "disreputed daughter of a dishonoured mother" to many it was an instrument of victorious allies to maintain the status quo like that of the concert of Europe, which was supposed to maintain the settlement arrived in 1815. Thus the league became the hope of a vanished world.

The champions of the league of nations submit an excuse that the league of nations was virtually a world organisation, but paradoxically enough, the major powers like USA, USSR, Germany, Turkey, Austria etc. did not represent here. So the league was not the gathering of free nations, but a congress of the victorious states. Even though Wilson was the architect of the league, his country, the USA withdrew from the league. It was almost unrealistic to hope that the league would become the hope of the world. Had the USA and USSR been the members, they might have sent soldiers to fight against the invaders and defended the citadel of the league. But it was a vain hope. Even, England evinced the lukewarm apathy towards the league and the league only became an important debating society, a bar of international diplomacy.

The league was also inherent with some loopholes which much handicapped the progress of the league. According to Prof. Morgenthau a grave constitutional weakness of the league was that it permitted the states to resort to war under certain conditions. The covenant made a distinction between the offensive and defensive war and permitted the latter by which it was assumed that war was the normal solution of international disputes. Moreover, the provision of taking decisions by a unanimous vote of the members of the council, except the parties to the dispute, proved unworkable. The league also lacked teeth, because no international force was provided to enforce its decisions. It could merely request the member states to act in a particular manner in a given situation, but its request was not binding on them. This sort of weakness of the league was exploited by the aggressive nations.

According to Anthony Eden, the equal status granted to all the members of the league, irrespective of their size and status was not a proper basis representation in an international forum. The idea of "one nation one vote" led to Liberia being treated as important as Soviet Union and Costa Rica as important as United Kingdom.
The failure of disarmament conferences also accelerated the tempo of the decline of the league. Of course the conclusion of the Locarno Pacts, the Geneva protocol of 1934 etc. were the distinct landmarks in the history of the disarmament conferences. But the disarmament conferences could not disarm the major militarist powers. While Italy, Germany and Japan went on increasing their strength and military manoeuvres the powers like Britain and the USA gave them the indirect support. Even if the economic sanctions were at the disposal of the league, they were hardly applied in case of any country except Italy where it was applied in a half-hazard manner. When the national interests were handicapped, the countries were reluctant to apply the same, taking it a liability. Thus, the policy of collective security which shirked military action never gave solid bedrock of security against man like Hitler or Mussolini. Hence the league met its own failure.

The league was a world organisation, contrived to replace the old system of "Power Politics" and 'international anarchy' by a new international cooperation. But to a surprise the league succumbed to the pressure of the old system of 'Power Politics'. Every nation tried to materialise its own interests using the league as a veritable instrument. If France wanted to seek the security through the league by crushing Germany to nadir, England viewed league as the preserver of balance of power and empire of disputes. The USA and USSR could not support the league, Germany and Italy left the league in lurch by abandoning it for world hegemony. As a matter of fact, what was everybody's business became nobody's interest and thus the league was lost in the process.

Above all, the militarism, ultra-nationalism and chauvinism of the powers like fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and militarist Japan became menace for the peace of the world. Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy and Tojo in Japan emerged like messiahs with their watchwords of anti-Bolshevism, anti-Semitism, anti-capitalism and anti-communism. They came to wreck the league and their ultra-nationalism only hastened the process of its wreckage. They were bitterly dissatisfied with status quo and were swept away by a fever of romantic swashbuckling nationalism in attempts to change it by force which at first were successful.

However, while the militarists of Germany, Japan and Italy spearheaded the era of aggression, the danger might have been averted had the western powers become farsighted. But they were busy retaliating the inflow of Bolshevism. They wanted to see the collapse of Bolshevism at the hands of the dictators of Rome,
Berlin and Tokyo and that is why, they pursued the policy of appeasement towards these dictators. Moreover, the tear of communism compelled them to adopt such appeasement policy.

Finally, in many cases like the crisis of Manchuria, Italy's rape of Ethiopia, Germany's attack on Austria, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia and Spanish Civil War, the League of Nations proved to be utterly ineffective organisation. All these crises entailed the doom of the League of Nations.

1.21 Search for Security

Soon after the World War-I the world showed anxiety to preserve the hard earned peace. The Paris Peace Conference established an international machinery in the league for the prevention of war, for pacific settlement of international disputes and for collective security aggression. The efforts for security were made both through the league system as well as outside it.

1.22 French Quest for Security

The French search for security was the most important single factor that determined the European politics during the inter-war period. No sooner did France emerge from the first world war as a victories power and attend the Paris Peace Conference, she started the mission of the endless search for her security. France looked exhausted and internally disrupted. She knew very well that if she would not guard her very well and ensure her security, the German invaders would leave no stone unturned to attack her. Hence, the French quest for security became the watch word of the French foreign policy right from the Paris Peace Conference till the mid-thirties with its leader Raymond Poincare.

Clemenceau, the country's idol in 1918 was also an old fashioned realist whom nothing mattered much excepting the security of France and the destruction of the German empire. At the Paris Peace Conference he put forth various proposals and made bargains which included - (1) extension of the French boundary up to Rhine as the measure of French security; (2) Permanent de-militarization of Rhine land; (3) Fixation of the western frontier of Germany at the river Rhine with all its bridges under the control of the French administrations and (4) The creation of a new state under the French dominance covering 10,000 sq. miles of territory between the Rhine in the east and the Netherlands, Belgium and France on the west. The French
memorandum presented in 1919 said "the danger comes from the possession by Germany of the left bank and Rhine bridges. The safety of the western and overseas democracies makes it imperative, in present circumstances for them, to guard the bridges of Rhine."

However the fulfillment of the French demand involved the separation of more than five million German people from their mainland. So far as the Rhine land was concerned the treaty of Versailles provided for the permanent demilitarization and it’s placement under the charge of a commission for 15 years. Thus, from the Paris Peace Conference France emerged dissatisfied. But to her satisfaction, in June 1919, she signed two treaties with Britain and USA respectively which promised France the Anglo-American help in the event of any unprovoked attack from Germany. But when Woodrow Wilson did not sign the peace treaty of Versailles, the peace treaty of USA with France became void and England was reluctant to give France all sort of security provisions that France aspired to get. For the next four years, France searched her security through a system of treaty guarantees and system of alliances.

At this moment, French quest for security coincided with the universal quest for peace through the league of nations. The provisions of the collective security enshrined in the league provided sanctions or penalties against any state that resorted to war, gave solace to the French minds. France also proposed to create an international army for the effective working of the provisions of the league, USA and Britain negated. In 1921 the general session of the league passed the resolution that the steps to be taken against an aggressive power were to be decided by individual governments, which naturally made the concept of collective security a mere mockery. Hence, in her desperate search for security, France took resource to military alliances.

In September 1920, she signed a military convention with Belgium where each one promised to come to each other’s rescue, in case one is attacked by the German imperialists. France also agreed the inclusion of Luxemburg in a custom union with Belgium although it had earlier voted for the economic affiliation with France. In 1921, she signed a treaty with Poland agreeing to help the polish against the Bolsheviks. Both promised for mutual consult and mutual protection in the event of an unprovoked war.

France also approached U.K. But U.K. agreed to come the rescue of France only at the event of any unprovoked war and this
frustrated the aim of France and her search for security. The Washington Conference of 1921 which limited her naval armaments and the question of separation created misunderstanding between France and Britain. In 1924, she made a military alliance with Czechoslovakia in 1926 a peace treaty with Rumania and in 1927 with Yugoslavia. All these treaties aimed at cordonning off Germany. France also wanted to beat Germany with the stick of separation demanding heavy indemnity. When Germany was unable to pay the second installment, France occupied the Ruhr despite the admonition of other powers. Now Poincare was replaced by Herriot who once again sought the French security through the collective security of the league of nations.

In 1924 France joined the Geneva Protocol which regarded war as an international crime and warned the members not to take recourse to mutual attack and submit all disputes to the International Court of Justice. But due to the opposition of Britain and her dominions, the Geneva protocol fell through. She also signed the Locarno Pact and the Kellogg-Briand Pact which rendered her some respite for her security. The last attempt of security against France was the demand for superiority in arms in the Disarmament Conference. But Germany’s insistence on parity ultimately led to the failure of the conference and the German race for armament began. The world soon was heading towards another global war.

1.23 The System of Guarantees and Alliances

Upon the failure of the league of nations to provide for effective collective security, such attempts were made afresh outside the league framework in the form of concluding regional pacts and alliances. The league covenant was no bar to the accomplishment of regional security through bilateral and multilateral pacts and alliances. The Treaty of Mutual Assistance concluded in 1923 was the first attempt in this direction on regional basis. After the first world war, France made futile demands upon Britain and the USA for collective security under the league against the future aggression of Germany. The league of nations, because of its several problems, failed to provide much hope of security which led to the frustration of the peace-loving people and hence a sense of panic and anxiety reigned supreme everywhere in the world. At this juncture, people everywhere looked for security outside the league framework and this led to the formation of regional pacts and alliances.
1.23.1 French Alliances

The country which felt much frustrated at the failure of the league to establish a system of collective security inside the league framework was France. Hence France gave Europe a lead in the quest for security on regional basis. The details of the French alliances with European nations have been discussed earlier.

1.23.2 The Little Entente

Since 1919 Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania not only had formed alliances with France, but also they had entered into treaty relations with each other which collectively was known as 'Little Entente'. The main purpose of these bilateral treaties was to preserve the European peace settlement as effected by the Versailles and other peace treaties and to resist any attempt by the former enemy countries to alter the existing frontiers or to restore the Habsburg dynasty. In 1921 the Czechoslovak-Rumanian and the Yugoslav-Rumanian Treaty and in 1922 the Czech-Yugoslav Treaty were signed. In between 1922 and 1933 these developed a close collaborations between these countries of the Little Entente. During this period France was able to establish her influence upon the Little Entente in many ways. France gave her assistance to Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania in various ways to resist the attempt of an 'Anschluss' between Germany and Austria and the Hungarian demand for the revision of the peace treaties. But in fact, the Little Entente could never acquire strength enough to resist the aggression of Germany in later years.

1.23.3 The Italian Alliances

Like France, Italy also developed a system of alliances with the revisionist group comprising Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria. After Mussolini came to power the chief aims of Italy's foreign policy were (1) to establish her hegemony on the Adriatic cost and (2) To accomplish political re-organisation of central Europe under Italy's leadership. In 1920 according to a treaty, Italy acquired Fiume from Yugoslavia. In 1926 Italy established her authority over Albania.

Italy demanded territorial redistribution in favour of Hungary after concluding a treaty with her in 1927. Italy opposed the 'Anschluss' between Germany and Austria. In 1934 Mussolini achieved another diplomatic success. A treaty between Italy, Austria and Hungary was concluded which was to maintain peace in Europe
reserving the independence of each state and to speed up their economic revival.

According to the Treaty of Paris of 1928 some parts of Hungary and Bulgaria were ceded to Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. So, Bulgaria and Hungary had been demanding revision of the Treaty of Paris. The conclusion of any sort of defensive treaty between the countries like Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Yugoslavia was not at all desired either by Bulgaria or by Hungary. So when the Little Entente was formed and when France stepped into it, Hungary, Greece, Bulgaria and Turkey established friendship with Italy for the purpose of forming a parallel system of alliances. Meanwhile, France and Italy entered into sharp rivalry for supremacy in the Balkan region. Hitler’s rise to power caused anxieties for Rumania and Yugoslavia. So, in 1934 Turkey, Greece, Rumania and Yugoslavia signed the Balkan Pact.

But the efforts for regional security in the Balkan region could not achieve much success in the face of increasing fascist pressure. On the other hand, the Rome Protocol concluded between Italy, Austria and Hungary did not succeed much in achieving any measure of security. Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia in 1985 the formation of Rome-Berlin-Axis in 1936, Germany’s occupation of Austria in 1938 the destruction of Czechoslovakia in 1939, all these completely paralysed the above mentioned regional alliances.

1.23.4 The Middle East and the Saadabad Pact

As Turkey played a dominant role in the creation of the Balkan Entente, she also took the lead in the bringing some of the middle Eastern states closer together. In July 1937, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq and Turkey signed the Pact of Saadabad which provided for inviolability of frontiers, reciprocal non-aggression, consultations on all questions of common interest, and non intervention in one another’s internal affairs. Like many others this attempt, too, collapsed in the face of forces of anarchy.

1.23.5 The Scandinavian Block

The Scandinavian states like Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland and Finland had remained neutral in the first world war. After the war they established cultural and economic cooperation among themselves in and outside the league of nations. But when the security of the small states became endangered and all attempts at collective security failed, the foreign ministers of
Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden concluded a defensive treaty among themselves on May 27, 1938 declaring their neutrality in a European war. But all attempts of the Scandinavian states for ensuring regional security were frustrated when Russia finally attacked Finland in 1939-40 and Germany occupied Norway and Denmark.

1.23.6 The Baltic Pact

The rise of Hitler to power in Germany threatened the security of the Baltic states. To resist against the Nazi Germany's aggression, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia concluded the Baltic Pact in 1934 by which the signatories agreed to establish economic and cultural cooperation among themselves and to direct their foreign policy after mutual consultations. Apart from this, they agreed to assure neutrality in a European war. But their security measures broke down when in 1940 Russia finally occupied the Baltic states.

1.23.7 Briand’s Project of European Union

The French statesman Briand proposed to form a European union as a better means for European security. The purpose of this union was to establish close cooperation among the states in the spheres of public health, foreign-trade, culture and industry. In 1929 Briand sent his proposal to 26 states to form a European Congress, a permanent committee and an executive body taking one representative from each country. The aim of the European Union was to solve social and economic problems of Europe and to organise a common wealth in Germany, the retirement of Austin Chamberlain as the British Foreign Secretary (1929) the death of Briand (1932) and the deterioration in the economic and political situation in Europe.

1.23.8 The Pact of Rome

Because of the Economic Depression and the rise of Hitler in Germany, the mutual relations among the European states began to deteriorate. To remove the possibility of war in Europe, Mussolini proposed to preserve peace for a definite period of time. At last due to his efforts England, Italy, France and Germany signed a treaty in Rome in March 1933, known as the Pact of Rome by which the signatories agreed to discuss mutually all important political and economic issues and to do the needful for the success of the Disarmament problem.
1.23.9 London Agreements

The Pact of Rome led to the deepening of the Soviet suspicions against the western powers. So without wasting time she proposed a general non-aggression treaty to her neighbours and in July 1933, the delegates of Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Persia, Poland, Rumania the Soviet Union, Turkey and Yugoslavia signed three London Agreements by which the signatories pledged to maintain their mutual security to give military help to each other in case of foreign attack and to keep the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) unaltered. They like many other pacts and protocols, also remained like dead letters.

1.23.10 The Geneva Protocol, 1924

By 1924 the purpose of the occupation of the Ruhr by France and Belgium proved to be a total failure and the separation problem was partially settled by the Dawes Plan. Thus the climate was quite favourable for fresh efforts at ensuring security. Such efforts were made in 1924 by the Geneva Protocol drafted by the Greek and Czech representatives. The Protocol proposed:

- Compulsory arbitration as the only legal means of settling international disputes and declared any aggressive war as an international crime;
- Signatories were required to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in all legal disputes;
- The political disputes were to be referred to the league council. However, if the league council failed to reach a unanimous decision the council was to entrust the responsibility of taking decisions to a committee of arbitrators. The states were obliged to accept the decisions of the arbitrator;
- The members agreed to maintain peace and not to mobilise forces while the arbitration was going on;
- The Protocol defined the 'aggressor' as a state which refused to accept arbitration;
- The council was entitled to sanction economic boycott or use of force against the aggressor as a disciplinary measures;
- In the event of a war separation was to be imposed on the aggressor for the offence of starting war. Of course, the amount of separation was to be determined keeping in view the financial and economic capacity of the aggressor;
• On the recommendations of Japan even domestic affairs were placed under the jurisdiction of the league council;
• The Protocol laid more stress on world security instead of regional security;
• The question of security was linked up with the question of reduction of armaments. The protocol fixed a date of disarmament conference on June 15, 1925. The conference was to be held only if sufficient number of states had ratified the protocol by that time.

While the small powers supported the Geneva protocols the big powers opposed it, hence letting it to be abandoned. Though it was rejected it was a grand plan designed for the international security. It not only established an indisputable test of identifying the aggressor but also made arbitration compulsory in all cases of dispute. In short, the Protocol banned all wars except these fought in defence of the territorial integrity of a state or in pursuance of the sanction enforced by the league or to enforce the decision of the world court. The Protocol also made an effort to remove some of the defects of the league covenant which had certain provisions regarding the settlement of internal disputes, but it was not clear regarding the measures to be applied for the settlement of international disputes in case of difference of opinion in the Council. The protocol provided for the system of arbitration under such situation. Again, the league council under the covenant had no right to interfere in the domestic disputes. The Protocol prescribed arbitration through the league council in such cases also. It also marked an improvement on the covenant of the league in a sense that whereas earlier, the council could not take proper and timely proposed for armistice.

In toto, the Geneva Protocol tried to remove some of the legal defects of the covenant and was the first genuine attempt to strengthen the league council. E. H. Carr observes, "The Geneva Protocol did nothing to strengthen the powers of the Council under Article 16 of the covenant or to make military sanctions obligatory," and it therefore went less far to satisfy the French demand than the Draft Treaty of mutual assistance. The Protocol, however, satisfied one vital interest of France and her allies the preservation of the Peace settlement of 1919. Doubtless, the protocol accentuated "what was afterwards attacked as one of the weaknesses of the covenant; it’s tendency to identify security with the maintenance of the 1919 settlement and its failure to provide adequate machinery for the revision of that settlement." For the second time again the
efforts of the French Government to strengthen peace in her own ways proved abortive, mainly one account of the uncompromising nature of Great Britain.

**Merits**

Although the Geneva Protocol was rejected, some of its merits cannot be over looked.

Firstly, the signatory states were forbidden to enter into any kind of hostility excepting under "certain special conditions" as stated in the protocol.

Secondly, acceptance of arbitration was made compulsory on the part of the belligerent states for the settlement of all political and legal disputes.

Thirdly, it was the first occasion when war was declared illegal by the signatories to the protocol.

Fourthly, some defects of the league covenant were attempted to be removed in Geneva Protocol. For the settlement of national disputes, there were some provisions in the league covenant no doubt. But there was no clear indication in the covenant as regards measures to be applied for the settlement of international problems in case of difference of opinion in the council. The protocol prescribed the system of arbitration under such situation.

Fifthly, the league council had no authority to interfere with or to resist disputes born of domestic crisis. The Geneva Protocol prescribed arbitration through the league council under such condition and indicated that any of the disputants refusing to accept the decision of the arbitrators would be branded as an aggressor.

Sixthly, it was not always possible for the league council to take proper and timely measures against any state involved in aggressive activities. In that case the protocol proposed for armistice.

Seventhly, for the preservation of international peace and security through disarmament, the Geneva Protocol arranged to convene the disarmament conference which was not provided in the league covenant.
"Taken all in all, however the protocol" observes Alfred Zimmern, "was a brave and consistent attempt to bring down to earth the ideal of peace through law."

1.24 Washington Conference, 1921-22

The USA had been pursuing the policy of splendid isolation as advocated by the President George Washington prior to the outbreak of first world war. After the Paris Peace Conference and the treaty of Versailles, the attitude of USA began to confuse between the two poles of extreme idealism and extreme caution. Despite the fact that the USA chalked out its isolationist policy, the real story behind it was that she was looking out for her economic interests. And this analogy comes to be more apparent while we discern the attitudes and approaches of USA towards the Far East which constitute the backdrop of Washington Conference of 1921-22.

After the first world war the Far East emerged to the flash light of the world diplomacy. The centre of gravity shifted from the European regions to the Pacific regions. But in the Far-East, because of the liquidation of the czarist Russia and weakness of the Chinese republic, Japan became an unabated power throwing challenges to USA's 'open door policy'. In the Treaty of Versailles Japan had also gained the upper-hand. On the other hand, USA was determined to have conspicuous role in the region of the Far-East and that is why to settle the far-eastern questions, USA invited other powers except Russia to Washington in November 1921. Though the Washington Conference was not a spectacular success as it could neither bring a viable solution in the Far-East nor it could thwart and subside the Japanese militarism yet it constituted a landmark in the history of Far East and USA's foreign policy.

In the Paris Peace Conference, America was hailed as the Chief Engineer. But it's ultimate withdrawal from the membership of the league of nations had far-reaching consequences. But it had no immediate effect on the European settlements. In the Far East says E. H. Carr "the United States could not afford to preserve the same attitude of serene detachment". In the Far East, Japan was coming into prominence because during the first world war, Japan had maintained her good relations with Great Britain and all the same she was able to secure recognition from USA, France, Russia and Great Britain and her special position in the Far East. After the
termination of the first world war, Japan became a power to be reckoned within the pacific region.

The main objective of Japan in the Paris Peace Conference was to establish her rights on a firm basis as well as to secure international recognition to her occupation of the German colonies. But USA because of China's request was not favourable to 'Japanese aspirations'. However, in the treaty of Versailles, Japan could secure some diplomatic gains acquiring from Germany the leased territory of Kiaochow in the Shantung province of China a decision which caused China to refuse her signature to the treaty. In addition to this, Japan also got mandate over Germany's former Island possessions in the pacific like Guan and Yap.

Leaving aside Russia, Japan had become the only great power on the borders of China and by the simultaneous destruction of Russian and German navies, she had been left not only the greatest naval power in the Far-East, but the third naval power in the world. Thus, Japan's threat to China and her bid for naval supremacy were highly disquieting to the American interests. On the other hand, America could discern the virtual dangers of Japanese expansion that threatened the unity and integrity of India. The Secretary of States, Flughes opposed Japanese expansion at the expense of Russia and China. He warned that USA would not recognise any claim or title arising out of Japanese occupation now acquiesce in any action of Japan that might impair existing treaty rights. Moreover, despite the promises of the Lanshing-Ishii Agreement, which had vowed to respect the independence and territorial integrity of China and preservation there of the "open door" for trade, commerce and industry, the menace of Japanese domination still hung over China as a whole. The Japanese promise to observe the "open door principle" was not wholly dependable. Thus in the prevailing circumstances, USA could not just maintain the 'wait-and-see' attitude.

Moreover, the United States was aware that in 1921 there would come up the issue of the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance that had been extended in 1911 for a decade. That is why, USA evinced an interest in convening a conference that might forestall any united Anglo-Japanese action and injuries to the interests of the United States and her principles of "open door".

Under these conditions, the Congress adopted a resolution of Senator Boran calling upon the President to invite Great Britain and Japan to sort out difference on this subject. In accordance
with this, President Hardinge announced that some powers like Britain, France, Italy, Japan, China, Portugal, Belgium and Netherlands etc. were to be invited to a conference on the Far-East and too announced the naval arrangements to meet in Washington on November 11, 1921. The conference continued unto February 1922 and concluded seven treaties, two of which dealt with naval disarmament and the other five with Pacific and Far-Eastern questions. However, the main three treaties which deserve special mention are the 1) Four Power Treaty 2) Five Power Treaty and 3) Nine-Power Treaty.

The Four Power Treaty was signed by Britain, France, America and Japan on December 13, 1921 by which the powers pledged to preserve the mutual rights and interests in the Pacific region and to settle all the disputes by peaceful means. This treaty buried the Anglo-Japanese alliance. The importance of this simple document was two-fold. It drew the United States for the first time into a limited system of consultation with other great powers, on matters of common concern and it provided a descent pretext for bringing to an end the Anglo-Japanese alliance which had become highly unpopular in USA.

The Five Power Treaty was signed between USA, Britain, Japan, France and Italy on February 16, 1922 which provided for an extensive measure of naval disarmament it's essential features being the establishment of naval parity between the British empire and the United States and fixing up the strength of Japan in capital ships at 60% of the British and American figures. The French and Italian quotas were 35%. The ratios for the naval strength for USA, Britain, Japan, France and Italy were fixed to be 5:5:3:1.75:1.75 respectively. No limitation was fixed on the light cruisers, destroyers, submarines and other auxiliary craft. The signatories further agreed to maintain the status quo, in respect of fortifications and naval bases in a specified area of the Pacific.

The third treaty was the Nine Power Treaty signed between Britain, USA, France, China, Belgium, Japan, Italy, Holland and Portugal in February 1922 which stipulated the provisions that all the signatories should respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of China. They should also refrain them from taking advantage of conditions in China, to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of citizens of friendly states. The signatories also reaffirmed the principle of Open Door and agreed not to support any agreement designed to create spheres of influence or to provide for the enjoyment of mutually
exclusive opportunities in China. On the whole the treaty disappointed both China and Japan-China, because she had expected extensive concession, from the powers and her expectations were doomed, and Japan because her interests and rights in China were not recognised and the Lanshing-Ishii Agreement was practically abrogated. This treaty was a source of satisfaction to the Americans for it gave a fresh lease of life to the American Policy to the Open Door in China.

At the Washington Conference, China had demanded the restoration of the province of Shantung to itself. At last a treaty was signed between China and Japan on February 4, 1922 at the instance of Britain and America. This agreement provided for the release of Shantung and all former German property rights there in to China in return for a monetary compensation.

Another treaty was signed between Japan and USA concerning Yap which guaranteed the free access of USA to Yap, a mandate under Japan.

A careful review of the works of the Washington Conference proves that in a sense, it completed the works of the Paris Peace Conference. Intimidated by a firm Anglo-American front and by the moral pressure of world opinion, Japan had accepted it. She had been persuaded to abandon her sole war gain on the mainland of China, she had not ventured to claim naval parity with the British empire and United States and thus, the Japanese menace to the integrity of China and to Anglo-American naval supremacy in Pacific had been vanished. Says Langsam "the naval agreement concluded at the conference temporarily ceased the tension among the United States, Great Britain and Japan." For the Americans it was also a syndrome of their diplomatic victory over the Far-East and this became a passport to the increased importance of USA in the Far-East region.

It is true that from a practical point of view the Washington Conference failed to achieve any concrete results. The militarists in Japan viewed it as a state in their back and as an ungratified American diplomatic success. The peaceable elements in Japan were thoroughly discredited and the militarists were roused to a violent and aggressive course of action. The truth is that failed to remove the basic sources of conflict between the USA and Japan. The naval competition, with a short interruption continued unabated; the economic conflict in China became more and more acute; and the bitterness and resentment caused by issues of racial discrimination
went on mounting. Thus seen the achievements of the Washington Conference were rather small. At least it only provided a breathing interval during which the Japanese war lords prepared themselves for further aggression.

1.25 Locarno Pact, 1925

The story of Locarno Pact can be traced back to the years following the World War I. Though Germany was defeated in the war and very severe terms were imposed on her, France saw Germany a potential future danger. Therefore, during the peace settlement of 1919 France insisted on having a physical guarantee through possession of Rhine. This demand of France was however turned down by the Allies on the ground that it involved the separation of more than five million Germans from their motherland. As France was keen to gain ‘productive guarantee’ by striking at the root of German industrialism she occupied Ruhr under the pretext of German failure to make separation payments in full. France embarked upon the policy of alliances with less important powers to strengthen her security. She concluded alliances with Belgium (1920), Poland (1921), Czechoslovakia (1924) etc. to perpetuate her ascendancy and keep Germany in subjection.

Germany on her part was equally bitter. The terms offered by the Allies were very harsh and on the top of it Germany was held guilty for the war. She was also required to pay huge separations. When she failed to make separations as per schedule France and Belgium captured the Ruhr Valley, which was the very heart of German industry. France even made an attempt to set up a separatist state in the Rhine land. Thus both Germany and France suspected each other. While France was haunted by the spectre of German recovery and revenge, Germany was afraid of French designs on the Rhineland and her economic strength. Hence no permanent peace could be possible unless the countries were able to arrive at some sort of understanding.

In 1922, Germany asked France to enter into a mutual agreement not to resort to war for a generation and Germany did this only to lessen French fears roused by Germany’s treaty with Soviet Union. But at that time France was in no mood to accept the German offer. In the same year in 1922, the Treaty of Rapallo was signed between Germany and Russia which rendered great anxiety to the Western Powers, who were more concerned with the Bolshevik menace rather than a possible revival of German militarism. In order to detach Germany from the influence of Soviet
Russia, it was felt essential to strike a balance between Germany and France. By that time the circumstances were quite favourable. France realised that they had gained nothing substantial by the occupation of the Ruhr valley and she had been completely isolated. Germany stood completely exhausted. The labour Government in England was also inclined towards a settlement between France and Germany. Thus for the first time since 1919 all the three nations, Britain, German and France were in mood of compromise. The coming into power of Briand in France as foreign minister and Stresemann in Germany further facilitated the task.

On January 10, 1925 Stresemann made a proposal for 'Rhine Land Pact', where by France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy were to jointly guarantee the Franco-German border. The French realised that the Germans had not accepted the treaty of Versailles as final and would renounce it at the first opportunity. However, France insisted that her allies Poland, Belgium and Czechoslovakia should also be invited to participate in the talks. In October 1925, delegates from seven states - Belgium, Czechoslovakia, England, France, Germany, Italy and Poland met at Locarno in Switzerland and concluded a number of treaties which are collectively termed as Locarno Pact. These treaties were formally signed by the powers in London on December 1, 1925. Among the treaties the following were especially important:

### 1.25.1 Franco-German and German-Belgium Treaty of Arbitration

According to this treaty (1) the Franco-German and Belgium-German frontier was guaranteed and permanent demilitarization of the Rhineland was reaffirmed, (2) Belgium, Germany and France pledged to each other not to resort to war except in the event of the breach of the provisions relating to the Rhineland and the infringement of mutual frontiers; (3) in case of infringement of Germany's western frontier, the signatories were to take care to resist that collectively; (4) where the violation was doubtful, the league council was to decide it.

### 1.25.2 Arbitration Treaties between Germany and Poland and Germany and Czechoslovakia

It was mainly concluded relating to the eastern frontier of Germany. Upon England's refusal to guarantee the eastern frontier of Germany, the latter was compelled to conclude two separate treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia. According to them,
1.25.3 Arbitration Conventions between Germany and Belgium and Germany and France

According to these treaties it was decided that the signatories would settle their mutual differences by peaceful means.

1.25.4 Treaties of Guarantee between France and Poland, and France and Czechoslovakia

According to these treaties it was decided that the signatories would render help to each other if any country endangered the interests of any one of them by flouting the Locarno treaties. When the Locarno Pact was formally concluded the signatories promised to put into practice the principle of disarmament through the league of nations. Germany entered the league of nations as a permanent member in 1926 and a preparatory commission was formed to make necessary arrangements for the proposed world disarmament conference.

1.26 Criticism

Locarno treaties were not free from defects.

Firstly, in spite of the abandonment of the German and French demands over Alsace Lorraine and the Rhineland respectively, the problem of Germany's eastern frontier was not satisfactorily solved and there was hardly any certainly of its peaceful settlement.

Secondly, England's refusal to defend the eastern frontier of Germany definitely implied that she was unwilling to accept the responsibility of collective security on an international basis. As an effect the ideal of collective security as adopted in the league covenant proved to be a failure.

Thirdly, although the Locarno Agreements were unanimously accepted, the old and new international disputes continued to exist below the surface. Although Germany was under obligation to wake peaceful settlement of all disputes with Poland and Czechoslovakia she did not regard their frontiers inviolable. So, France was not relieved of her anxieties about security that was provided by the
Geneva Protocol. Whereas this had been the goal of the French policy.

Fourthly, the possibility of Franco-German alliance and cooperation weakened the basis of France-Polish alliance.

Fifthly, Russia considered the Locarno treaties as a conspiracy of the western powers against itself.

Sixthly, the Locarno Pact hobbled a terrible blow at the Treaty of Versailles and the league covenant. In spite of the league covenant’s provision for collective measures against the aggressor, similar provision of mutual assistance was adopted in the Locarno Pact. So, the Locarno Pact had created the impression that in spite of the covenant’s provision no country was bound to render military help against the aggressor until the conclusion of mutual assistance treaties among the states. Even if, a similar kind of provision had been included in the Treaty of Versailles, the Locarno Treaty paved the way that unless confirmed by other engagements of voluntary character the Versailles Treaty would not be a binding force upon them.

In short, the Locarno Pact proved beneficial only to Germany. It not only weakened the French alliance system but also hastened the evacuation of the Rhine land. It led to readmission of Germany in the family of European nations and provided her with an opportunity to rearm herself. It did practically nothing in respect of disarmament strengthening of security or improvement in the league system. The spirit of friendliness and goodwill which is generally described as the spirit of Locarno was only short lived. The rise of Hitler completely finished this spirit in Germany and she denounced the Locarno Treaties as unscrupulously as any other treaty.

1.27 Kellogg-Briand Pact, 1928

Next to the Locarno Pact another important international treaty was the Kellogg-Briand Pact or the 'Pact of Paris' signed on August 27, 1928 which tried to outlaw war and carried the principle of 'pacification' a step further. The chief architects of this pact were Briand, the Foreign Minister of France and Kellogg, the U.S. Foreign Secretary. However, the initiative for the negotiation of this treaty was taken by the French Minister Briand, who proposed in April 1927 to the U.S. Government that the two countries should renounce war as an instrument of national policy and they
should agree to settle all disputes arising between them by pacific means.

France had on the other hand, the difficulties in accepting the proposal of Kellogg. Because as a member of the league of nations and according to the league covenant she was under obligation to go to war or to support a war under certain conditions. In March 1928 Briand at last proposed that the proposed pact should be concluded by the big powers and the signatories should have the right to enter into war only in self-defence. In April 1928 Kellogg sent the draft of the proposed pact to England, Germany, Italy and Japan. After securing approval of these states, Kellogg circulated the final draft of the proposed pact to fourteen states (England, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, India, Free Irish state, Italy, Japan, Poland, New Zealand and South Africa). After the consent of all the states was secured the representatives of fifteen states including Russia met at Paris and signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact on August 29, 1928. Through the good offices of France, Russia also accorded her consent to this pact. By 1930 sixty-two states had signed the pact.

The pact was one of the shortest treaties on record and included the following terms:

1) The signatory states agree not to have recourse to war for the settlement of international controversies. They renounced war as an instrument of national policy in their relations with each other;
2) The members agreed to settle all their disputes or conflicts by peaceful means;
3) The members who sought to promote their national interest by resort to war were to be denied the benefits of the treaty.

1.28 Shortcomings of the Pact

The Pact was subjected to so many exceptions and limitations that its scope was greatly limited.

Firstly, the Pact did not provide any machinery either for its enforcement or for its interpretation. It failed to provide any machinery of sanction. It failed to institute any authority to determine the measures to be taken against the aggressor. Neither the Pact set up any machinery for mutual consultations on matters of common concern including causes of war or threats of war.
Secondly, the pact failed to outline the specific measures to be taken against the aggressor. Nor did it specify the means of pacific settlement of disputes which the signatories would be obliged to employ on the outbreak of an aggression or conflict.

Thirdly, the Pact did not clearly define the term ‘aggression’. Aggression might take the form of a declared war or an undeclared war. The signatories to the Pact, without flouting violently the terms of the Pact, might take recourse to undeclared wars. In fact, within a few years of the signing of the pact, Italy and Japan, though signatories to it, launched undeclared wars on weaker powers without any opposition from other signatories to the Pact.

Fourthly, the Pact no doubt condemned and renounced war. But the principle of war was not declared illegal. Further, it failed to indicate the conditions under which the signatories to the Pact would resort to war on ground of self-defence.

Fifthly, it cannot be said that the Kellogg-Briand Pact fully accepted the principle of renunciation of war. Because it allowed wars of several types, for instance, it permitted war in self-defence, military operations against the aggressor or breaker of peace under the terms of the league covenant. Thus the possibility of war was not fully removed by this pact.

Sixthly this pact considerably undermined the importance of the league of nations. It only condemned wars but it had no appropriate provisions for punishing the aggressor. The pact did not provide sanctions expressed or implied whereas the league covenant provided the means for resisting all kinds of war and aggression. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, America held Japan guilty of the violation of the pact of Paris, but she refrained from taking any measure against Japan. Britain also remained silent. Thus the Pact was not only inefficacious, but also a serious challenge to the league covenant. It was in fact “a high sounding nothing”. Doubtless, it has been called an instrument of international confusion. It was only an inspiration rather than an achievement.

1.29 Importance of the Pact

Despite these limitations the importance of the pact of Paris cannot be wholly ruled out. Though handicapped in many ways, the pact was a great landmark in the sphere of international relations.
Firstly, as Hardy has pointed out, "As an historical event this almost universal repudiation of war as an instrument of policy seems to have a unique importance. As a gesture indicative of a new ethical attitude to war, it is undeniably impressive.

Secondly, the pact gave rise to a series of treaties and understandings like arbitration treaties, conciliation treaties, non-aggression and mutual assistance treaties. These treaties and understandings, doubtless, constituted a major effort to achieve collective security outside the league of nations.

Thirdly, the pact broke America's isolation from world politics and signed her desire to build up a world system under American leadership as distinct from the league of nations which had fallen under Franco-British leadership.

Fourthly, the Pact made Soviet-U.S. collaboration with the members of the league of nations possible to work for collective security and world peace. The pact brought these two powers into the vortex of world politics. It was particularly important maintains Gathrone Hardy in that it created a basis upon which the great nations outside the league the United States and Russia could take a direct interest in the collective organisation of peace.

1.30 Let Us Sum Up

The First World War was an outcome of the aggressive nationalism expressing itself in the cult of militarism, alliances, counter-alliances, economic imperialism and a chain of crises. The war proved to be a shattering blow to the autocratic monarchical system and paved the way for the development of democracy in Europe. It gave a serious blow to racialism and promoted feeling of fraternity among the people of the world. It provided a fillip to the principles of nationalism and self-determination and prompted the spirit of internationalism.

The Paris Peace Conference was only a ‘rough and tumbled affair’. It couldn’t differentiate between essential and nonessential matters. The issues such as the military, political and reparation questions should have been agreed upon by the victorious allies. Throughout the conference there was a conflict between idealism and realism. The confusion that haunted the conference, haunted also the minds of men in 1919- a tension between hopes and ideals of a more orderly world. Hence, the Paris Peace Conference was a failed extravaganza. In a short time, the world got prepared for war and the world was eventually reduced to crying.
The league was a world organisation, contrived to replace the old system of "Power Politics" and 'international anarchy' by a new international cooperation. But to a surprise the league succumbed to the pressure of the old system of 'Power Politics'. Every nation tried to materialise its own interests using the league as a veritable instrument. If France wanted to seek the security through the league by crushing Germany to nadir, England viewed league as the preserver of balance of power and empire of disputes. The USA and USSR could not support the league, Germany and Italy left the league in lurch by abandoning it for world hegemony. As a matter of fact, what was everybody's business became nobody's interest and thus the league was lost in the process.

The League of Nations, because of its several problems, failed to provide much hope of security which led to the frustration of the peace-loving people and hence a sense of panic and anxiety reigned supreme everywhere in the world. At this juncture, people everywhere looked for security outside the league framework and this led to the formation of regional pacts and alliances. But the efforts for regional security in the Balkan region could not achieve much success due to increasing fascist pressure. The Washington Conference completed the works of the Paris Peace Conference. Intimidated by a firm Anglo-American front and by the moral pressure of world opinion, Japan had accepted it. The Locarno Pact proved beneficial only to Germany. It not only weakened the French alliance system but also hastened the evacuation of the Rhine land. It led to readmission of Germany in the family of European nations and provided her with an opportunity to rearm herself. Though handicapped in many ways, the pact was a great landmark in the sphere of international relations. The Kellogg-Briand Pact gave rise to a series of treaties and understandings like arbitration treaties, conciliation treaties, non-aggression and mutual assistance treaties. These treaties and understandings, doubtless, constituted a major effort to achieve collective security outside the League of Nations. The Pact made Soviet-U.S. collaboration with the members of the league possible to work for collective security and world peace. The pact brought these two powers into the vortex of world politics.
1.31 Key Words

Anschluss: Political Union of Austria with Germany.

Anti-Semitism: Anti-Jewish racism.

Appeasement: Appeasement was a moral and realistic expression of all that was liberal and Christian in British culture.

Armistice: A peace agreement.

Belligerents: Belonging to or recognized as a state at war and protected by and subject to the laws of war.

Chauvinism: Undue partiality or attachment to a group or place to which one belongs or has belonged.

Combatant: One that is engaged in or ready to engage in fight

Covenant: A written agreement.

Indignation: Anger aroused by something unjust, unworthy, or mean anger.

Irredenta: A territory historically or ethnically related to one political unit but under the political control of another.

Jingoism: Extreme chauvinism or nationalism marked esp. by a belligerent foreign policy.

Mandate System: An authorization granted by the League of Nations to a member nation to govern a former German or Turkish colony.

Aggrandizement: To enhance the power, wealth, position, or reputation.

Plenipotentiaries: Persons and especially diplomatic agents invested with full power to transact business.

Shilly-shally: To show hesitation or lack of decisiveness or resolution.

Trojan Horse: Someone or something intended to defeat or subvert from within usually by deceptive means.

Unionism: Principle or policy of forming or adhering to a union.
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*****
2.0 **Objective**

This Unit deals with a set of developments taking place during the interwar period from the crisis in capitalism to rise of totalitarianism. After going through this lesson you will be able to know:

- how capitalism in the western world faced a serious crisis leading to the onset of Economic Depression;
- how the American President developed an effective strategy, the New Deal to restore American economy following the Depression;
- how a socialist state came into existence in Russia after the Bolshevik revolution with its will to lead Russia on socio-economic and political aspects;
- how the post World War I era led to the rise of totalitarianism (aggressive nationalism) in Italy and Germany; and
- how Turkey could be put into the path of modernisation under Mustafa Kemal Pasha with his domestic and foreign policies.

2.1 **Introduction**

The inter-war period largely affected the growth of capitalism in the western world. Debts provided by the USA to the European powers during the course of the First World War could not be repaid back due to severe economic debacle. These inter-allied war debts were interrelated with the Treaty of Reparation that the Allied Powers signed with Germany after the war. For a decade after 1929 a terrible economic crisis, otherwise known as the Great Depression engulfed the whole world with its impact on both economic and political fields. The ‘New Deal’ Policy of Franklin Roosevelt, the American President despite being launched to restore the US economy hardly served the purpose. Given such kind of situations, Italy and Germany too got victimized and hence could not stop seeing rise of totalitarianism (Fascism and Nazism respectively) into their mainstream politics. This period too witnessed the emergence of a socialist state in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 with its emphasis on socio-economic and political reforms under Lenin and Stalin; and a modern Turkey under Mustafa Kemal Pasha to ensure her a strategic position in the international politics.

2.2 **Crisis in Capitalism**

During the course of the First World War huge debts were provided by the USA to the European powers. The approximate position of the
inter-allied debts at the end of the war was that the USA had lent a sum of £ 2,325,000,000 to her European partners; Britain had lent £ 2,183,000,000; which France had advanced about £ 100,000,000. These inter-allied war debts were interrelated with the Treaty of Reparation that the Allied Powers signed with Germany after the end of the war.

The European powers favoured an all-round cancellation of the war debts once the war was over with a plea that the USA had contributed in terms of money to a war to which they had contributed in terms of men and money both. The French wanted a cancellation of these debts provided reparation were left untouched. As long as the French hoped that reparation would be paid, they dissociated the problem of reparations from that of the inter allied debts. But when by 1923 they started doubting the receipt of reparations from Germany, they started linking the two. Thus, before 1923 they took the view that reparations must be paid but that the inter-allied debts should be cancelled. After 1923 their attitude was that inter-allied debts could be paid only if Germany paid the reparation, thus making Britain and USA directly interested in the business of realising reparations from Germany.

The economic realism of the British led them to maintain that these debts as well as reparations were non-commercial debts and was therefore the deadweight on the economic recovery of the world. Their policy was impressed in the famous Balfour Note of August 1, 1922 in which it was said that sum Britain would require from her debtors would depend solely upon the amount that she would have to pay to the USA and that she would be ready to abandon her claims to all reparations from Germany and repayment of debts from the Allies of such renunciation formed part of a general plan by which this great problem could be dealt with as a whole and find a satisfactory solution. In this, the British government implied that the problems of separations and war debts were inter linked and that both should be boldly solved.

The official American attitude was rigid. From the very beginning they had taken care to exclude the question of inter-allied debts from the discussion of reparations at the Paris Conference. If the European powers could squeeze Germany, why should they expect a different standard from the USA? The European debtors, what the US leaders argued, spent huge amounts on costly armaments which should have been paid to the US, if they had the moral obligations. Therefore, the US Congress set up the World War Foreign Debt Commission to collect the debts by 1947 with at least 4½ % interest. Agreement was reached between the USA and Britain
that from 1923 to 1932, Britain would pay to the USA a sum of £33,000,000 a year and from 1933 to 1984 a sum of £38,000,000 a year. On April 29, 1926 a funding agreement between France and the USA was made by which France was to pay her debts for 62 years. Similarly, Britain concluded agreements with the European Allies in 1926 and 1927. However, by 1932 both the reparation and the necessary arrangements towards the payment of inter-allied war debts had been buried.

Both the Dawes and the Young Plans proposed and worked by U.S.A. did not work up to the levels desired. By 1930 the world was engulfed with a terrible economic depression, which not only stood in the way of Germany securing further foreign loans but also stood in her way balancing her budgets. The foreign investors began to withdraw their capital and deposits from Germany. As a result the economic structure of Germany practically collapsed and it was not possible for her to pay reparations. The problem of unemployment further made situation explosive. Under such circumstances, President Hindenburg of Germany appealed to President Hoover of USA for moratorium. Hoover asked all states to suspend their mutual payments of reparation for one year from July 1931. Germany was however, asked not to utilise the money released from reparation payment for military purposes. The un-postponable settlement which was to buy German railway bonds and to have the railway turn money over to the German Government so that the latter may use the money for economic purpose.

In spite of one year's moratorium (Hoover's Moratorium) Germany’s economic condition did not improve up to expectation. In January 1932 the Bank of International Settlement declared that it would be impossible for Germany to pay her reparation. In June 1932, the representatives of Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Japan and Germany met at the Lausanne Conference to discuss the economic debacle of Germany as well as the world wide economic crisis, the war-time debts and reparation. According to the Lausanne convention (1) the Young Plan was annulled and (2) Germany was given the privileges to make a total payment of £150,000,000 as reparation in one installment. There was hardly any doubt about the practicability of these terms.

It may be noted that it was not a gesture of philanthropy towards Germany on the part of these powers. It was a desperate attempt on the part of these countries to save their own countries from economic ruin. As USA refused to cancel the war debts, the decisions of Lausanne Conference were automatically nullified. As
Germany was neither in a position nor willing to pay anything, the reparation payments automatically came to an end. The debtors of America on similar grounds also refused to make full payments to U.S.A. However, all of them, with exception of Finland which kept on paying her installment in full, agreed to make token payments. Subsequently, all such token payments were also stopped.

The chapter of reparation was finally closed with the rise of Hitler in Germany in 1933. He officially repudiated to reparation pledges. In the words of E. H. Carr, "The year 1932 saw the last act in that confused drama of reparation and inter-allied debts which had tormented the world for more than ten years. The Lausanne Conference buried them both in the same unhonoured grave." The world was heading towards economic crisis.

2.3 Great Depression

For a decade after 1929 a terrible economic crisis, otherwise known as the Great Depression engulfed the whole world. Its impact was not restricted in the economic field alone, but was felt in the political field. Great Britain abandoned her gold currency and the principle of free trade and the rest of the world followed her steps. Even the USA introduced state control in her economy and trade and commerce. As a result the Allies abandoned their demands of reparation from Germany. In the hope of revitalising her economic life, the Germans proceeded to establish dictatorship by abandoning the Weimar Constitution. To bring an end to the economic depression, everywhere in the world movements for economic self-sufficiency began.

2.4 Causes of the Depression

The following causes are considered responsible for this depression.

2.4.1 Dislocation of International Trade

From the economic stand point of view when the people have less purchasing power but the supply of goods is more there comes a depression. During the intense time of the World-War-I there came the dislocation of International Trade and national economics. The European states in order to set their economics in order tried to produce maximum and there started a rush of raw materials. Heavy industries like, coal mining, engineering, ship building geared up to produce more. As a result they started producing more goods than could be profitably consumed.
In the meantime rationalisation and mechanisation of industries started. The scientific technique earlier used in destruction during the World War I was now applied in constructive purposes, to industries to increase their efficiency. This resulted in wiping out of the jobs of the millions. By March 1933 the number of people out of work in USA was 14 million or 25% of the total labour class, in Britain was 3 million or 25% of the total labour class and in Germany was more than 2/5th. So unemployment grew up which led to the loss of purchasing power by the workers. Industrially underdeveloped countries in order to protect their indigenous industries raised high tariffs which further contributed to the piling up of industrial products in the developed countries and aggravated the situation.

2.4.2 Mechanisation of Agriculture

The policy of mechanisation of agriculture was adopted by most of the European countries which led to unprecedented agricultural production. As a result the prices of wheat considerably fell to the lowest ebb even not seen before in about 500 years. Even the countries like Australia, New Zealand and Argentina produced more wheat than they could consume. Though the agricultural countries needed agricultural commodities, they could not import the same on account of their exceedingly low purchasing powers. Hence, the agricultural countries had to undergo the worst suffering.

2.4.3 Unequal Distribution of Gold

During the first World War the European countries borrowed a lot of money from USA which they had to pay back in gold. After the war the debtor countries started paying their debts in gold which led to the shortage of gold in most of the European countries. As a result most of the European countries gave up gold currency. Things worsened more when America refused to accept payments of debts in goods and other commodities except that of gold. Hence there followed the further flow of gold into America. Taking into consideration their shortage of gold, the European countries imposed restrictions on gold export which adversely affected their trade and pushed them into depression. On the other hand, the presence of gold in abundance in USA resulted in the withdrawal of American capital from abroad since the scope of investment and profit was greater in USA market than in other countries which held the gold reserve of swelled. Estimation goes, by 1931 USA and France between them shared 60% of world gold resume. The
American gold hoard rose between 1913 and 1924 from 1.924 billion to $4.499 billion or half of the world’s total gold supply.

And serious international economic imbalance came up when the USA became a creditor nation on a large scale following the World War I. Britain had been a creditor nation before the war, but it had used the profits from its overseas investments and loans to pay for its chronic excess of imports over exports. USA by contrast normally had a favourable trade balance accentuated by tariffs that were kept at high levels for reasons of domestic politics. In addition money poured into the country in the 1920s in payment of war debts.

This imbalance was neutralised for several years by large scale American loans and investment abroad- between 1925 and 1928, the average annual American foreign investment was $1.1 billion. The debtor countries were forced to curtail imports from the US and certain branches of the American economy, especially agriculture, were hurt. Moreover, some countries found it necessary to default on their debts, which shattered certain financial firms in the US.

The American economy was as serious as the imbalance of the International economy, the reason being that wages lagged behind the rising productivity. Between 1920 and 1929 hourly industrial wages rose only 2% while the productivity of workers in factories jumped 55%. At the same time, the real income of the farmers was shrinking because agricultural prices were falling while taxes and living costs were rising. Such poverty in the countryside was a serious matter, because the rural population at that time was one fifth of the total population.

2.4.4 Crisis of the Wall Street

The immediate cause of the economic crisis was the fall of the Wall Street. In October 1929 all of a sudden the prices of shares in the Wall Street fell substantially. With the intervention of the US Government and the big capitalists the situation was brought under control for some time. However, in November 1929 there was again a fall in the price of the shares which proved disastrous for the American capitalists. Therefore, the American capitalists decided not to invest any money in any foreign country and the American Government refused to advance any loans to other countries. This further complicated the things for the European countries and rendered the situation still worse.
The stock market crash began in September 1929 in US. Within one month, stock values dropped by 40% and the decline continued for three years. During that period, US steel stock fell from 262 to 22, General Motors from 73 to 8, and 5000 banks closed their doors. General Motors had produced 5.5 million automobiles in 1929, but in 1931, they produced only 2.5 million. The steel industry in July 1932 was operating at 12% of capacity. By 1933, both general industrial production and national income had slumped by nearly one-half, wholesale prices by almost one-third and merchandise trade by more than two-thirds. The weakness of American banking system was a factor contributing to the crash of 1929. A great number of independent banking firms were operating and some of these lacked sufficient resources to withstand financial storms. When one closed its doors, panic spread and depositors rushed to withdraw their savings from other banks, thus setting in motion a chain reaction that undermined the entire banking structure.

2.4.5 Rise of Communism and Cancellation of Debts

The Russian Revolution (Bolshevik Revolution) started in 1917. The net result of the revolution was the overthrow of Czarist Government, the manifested government of corruption, exploitation and suppression and outcome of a popular government (Communist) under Lenin. The Czarist Government had taken much debt from the European countries. Now the Communist Government started cancelling payment of debts which resulted in enormous economic loss of various European states and contributed to economic depression.

2.5 Impact
2.5.1 Impact on Germany

Germany felt the worst impact of economic depression because she was greatly dependent on US for payment of reparations and long-term loans provided by the American investors. The US investment in Germany which stood at $1000 million in 1928 was reduced to $550 million in 1929. Germany was not in a position to pay her debts to USA and her budgetary deficit rose to £ 60,000,000. Although an one year moratorium on reparation payments initiated by the American President Hoover was granted to Germany, it did not end the problem. The rationalization of industry in the country led to increase in unemployment and contraction of home market. So standard of living decreased. In July 1931, the German Danat Bank was declared insolvent. The Berlin Stock Exchange, the Börse, closed for two months.
Germany sought to retrieve her difficult position by effecting customers union with Austria which was prohibited by the Treaty of Versailles, but it was opposed by France. Even the league did not approve of this customers union. Thus the things further deteriorated. The situation was exploited by the Nazis under Hitler who stormed his way to power through the fissure created by the depression. Germany was virtually on the verge of economic collapse. With the end of moratorium the situation again deteriorated and it became evident that Germany was not able to pay reparations. The Lausanne conference ultimately cancelled all German reparations in exchange for a token payment of £150,000,000. Further restrictions were imposed on import of foreign goods and export of funds, which left an adverse effect on the standard of living of Germans.

2.5.2 Impact on England

The depression left a deep impact on the British economy. The Hoover’s Moratorium on Germany adversely affected Britain. She was deprived of £11 millions in reparation payments from Germany. Further, Britain had advanced long term loans to Germany and other countries of world by herself borrowing money on short term basis. With the onset of depression she was not able to call back the money lent abroad. The May Committee on National Expenditure was appointed to revive the economy which recommended wage reduction and cut in unemployment insurance given to the unemployed people. Subsequently, England suspended export of gold and went off the gold standard. Though the abandonment of gold standard provided some relief to the debtor countries it could not offset the depression. Soon after Britain imposed restrictions on free trade and adopted high tariffs.

2.5.3 Impact on the USA

Over the million people were rendered jobless with the onset of the depression. Living standards were drastically lowered down. Now the USA remained no more a wealthy nation. It suffered from wholesale misery and privation. No more it remained a political stable country. During these years, she witnessed a strong process of ideas and agitations. Various proposals were made for income redistribution. The Townshend Plan came for reduction of the old age pensions. Extremist movements started. Political turbulence reigned supreme. In the meantime, the USA went for general election and Franklin D. Roosevelt won by sweeping majority in 1932. Soon after he evolved a new economic
policy, New Deal which served as an escape value for the political discontent and effectively neutralized the extremist movements.

The poverty of America during this depression has been attested by Oscar Ameringer of Oklahoma City in his book "Unemployment in the United States", published in 1932. The writer in his own eyes has seen and experienced certain scenes and facts. He visited some 20 states of USA. He writes -

- In Washington the forest fires used to rage the forest every summer. But in the summer of 1931 the unemployed timber workers and bankrupt farmers fought with the raging fire to save the timber so that they could earn some honest dollar by setting the timbers.
- In Seattle city numbers of women in the night were searching for scraps of food in the refuse piles of the principal market of settle.
- In Montana thousands of bushels (1 bushel = 8 gallons) of wheat left in the fields uncut since the harvesting charge was much more than the real price of wheat.
- In Oregon, thousands of bushels of apples rotted in the Orchards. Only perfectly good apples were sold at 40 to 50 cent per box containing 200 apples. And millions of children that winter did not eat a single apple on account of the poverty of their parents.
- In Oregon too, thousands of ewes (female sheep) were killed by the sheep-raisers because they did not bring enough in the market to pay the freight on them, means carrying charge was more than their actual value.
- One sheep-raiser in Canada said, he had killed 3,000 sheep and thrown them down the Canyon (deep Gorge) because it cost $ 1.10 to ship a sheep and he would get less than a dollar for it. He said he could not afford to feed the sheep and he would not let them starve, so just cut their throats and thread them.

2.5.4 Impact on India

The economic depression worsened the conditions of the peasants and workers in India. The prices of agriculture products dropped by over 50% by the end of 1932. The employers tried to reduce wages. The peasants all over the country began to demand land reforms abolition of Zamindari, reduction of land revenue and rent and relief from indebtedness. Workers in the factories and plantations
increasingly demanded better conditions of work and recognition of their trade union movements in the cities and the Kisan Sabhas (Peasants Union) in many areas particularly in U.P., Bihar, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Punjab. The first All India Peasant organisation, the All India Kisan Sabha was formed in 1936 with Swami Sahajanand, the militant founder of the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha (1929) as President elected, and N.G. Ranga, the pioneer of the Kisan movement in Andhra as the General Secretary. The Kisan Sabha launched many agrarian programmes like - 50% reduction in land revenue and rent, a moratorium on debts, the abolition of feudal levies, security of tenants, a living wage for agricultural labourers and the recognition of peasant unions. The peasants also began to take a more active part in the national movement.

The Civil Disobedience movement was launched in this atmosphere and in many parts of the country it soon took the form of a no-tax and no-rent campaign. Peasants had got succeeded in their demands in Bardoli Satyagraha in 1928 under Sardar Patel in Gujarat. Now peasants encouraged by Bardoli Satyagraha joined the protest in large number. In Andhra Pradesh peasants threatened for an increase in the land revenue. In UP a no-rent movement continued. Peasants in Gujarat, especially in Surat and Kheda refused to pay their taxes. In Bihar and Bengal movements started against the Chowkidar tax (a tax paid by the villagers for the upkeep of their own oppressors). In Punjab a no-revenue campaign started which got support from the Kisan Sabhas. Anti Zamindari struggles emerged in Andhra and the first target was the Venkatagiri Zamindari in Nellore district.

Left ideology crept up propagated by J. L. Nehru, Subhas Bose, the Communists and other Marxists and left individuals. In 1934, finally the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) was formed which consolidated the left forces. The Communists found shelter in it and created grounds for the Kisan movement. The culmination was the establishment of the All India Kisan Congress in Lucknow in April 1936 which later changed to All India Kisan Sabha.

2.6 General Impact
2.6.1 Led to Abandonment of Gold Standard

Because of the misdistribution of gold in the world, England stopped the export of gold and abandoned the gold standard. She
was soon followed by about 40 states. Thus, the depression left a deep impact on the currency system of the world.

2.6.2 Led to Abandonment of Policy of Free Trade

Most of the countries imposed restrictions on imports and restored to high tariffs. Thus it led to abandonment of policy of free trade and adoption of high tariffs all round. England proceeded to enact the Industrial Protection Act to protect her own industries against other countries which had artificially increased the volume of their export by devaluing their currency. Like England other nations also took steps to keep their economics in stable condition. All this gave rise to aggressive economic nationalism and resulted in keen competition between different countries. Hence there grew a feeling of international competition and the international atmosphere was surcharged with suspicion.

2.6.3 Led to Rise of Military Nationalism

In the Far East the economic crisis reduced the Japanese foreign trade by almost half and contributed to unrest in the domestic politics. Compelled by the need for economic expansion Japan decided to embark upon a policy of conquests. Japan’s attack on Manchuria in 1931 was dictated by the economic consideration and created a breach in the system of collective security.

2.6.4 Rise of Fascism in Italy

In Italy the Great Depression created many domestic problems which could not be successfully tackled. This gave rise to the fascist movement under Mussolini. The frustrated unemployed youth found respite in Mussolini’s fascist movement.

2.6.5 Rise of Nazism in Germany

The Great Depression caused social unrest in Germany and paved the way for the emergence of Nazi Party under Hitler. The Nazi Party which bitterly criticized the Peace settlement opposed payment of reparations imposed on Germany. The Nazi Party became popular and came to power.
2.6.6 Political Instability in France

In France the economic crisis led to instability of government and produced ministerial crisis. The value of French currency fell so much that in state of all the assistance rendered by the British and U.S., she could not recover.

2.6.7 Promoted Socialistic Ideas

Depression gave a rude shock to the belief of capitalism and in its place socialistic ideas gained currency. That is why sometimes the years between 1930 and 1939 are described as the "Pink Decade". In contrast to the depression in the capitalist countries the Soviet Union continued to progress in the economic field. Between 1929 and 1936 she successfully completed the first two five year plans which pushed the production by more than four times. This prompted the people of the capitalist countries also to appeal to their governments to tide the depression and stimulate recovery. The New Deal of Roosevelt in America and the economic nationalism of Great Britain introduced state control even in the greatest capitalistic democracies in the world.

2.6.8 Policy of Appeasement

The policy of appeasement adopted by England, France and the US towards the fascist powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) during the years 1933 to 1939 was also largely the outcome of the economic crisis. During this period these powers so such pre-occupied with their economic problems that they could not think of involving themselves in the international sphere. This encouraged the fascist powers to embark on policy of aggrandizement and pushed the world into another world war.

2.6.9 Paralysed the League of Nations

The depression indirectly paralysed the league of nations by creating problems which could not be solved by it and ultimately sounded its death knell. The far eastern crisis of 1931 the Italian aggression of Ethiopia the brutal murder of the Spanish Republic by Germany and Italy. Germany's attack on Czechoslovakia and Japanese aggression on Manchuria were some of the problems which the league failed to solve which greatly undermined its prestige and contributed to its decline.
2.6.10 Gave Serious Setback to Democracy

The Great Depression gave a serious setback to democracy. As in a number of countries the democratically elected governments could not effectively deal with the problems of growing unemployment and provide security to the people, people lost faith in these governments as well as the principles of democracy. In their place preference was shown for the fascist and communist regimes because they promised the people relief.

Thus, the year 1933 ultimately witnessed the end of this crisis though not the restoration of economic stability. Its long term effects were discernible in the World War-II. It had already put the cart before the horse of the normal life of the European economy and left statesmen in lurch, leaving them no alternative to choose.

2.7 New Deal

The Economic Depression (1929-33) had great adverse effects on the economic sphere of USA. The devaluation of dollars reached such an extent that the multi-millionaires of the Wall Street of USA lost their magic wand to control the US market. The depression on the other hand, came like the bolt from the sea for the European nations who were then not in a position to repay the loans to the US. But the year 1932 ushered a unique importance by projecting Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the leader of the Democratic Party to the Presidential post of America. President Roosevelt evolved within 1933 to 1941 an economic measure, the 'New Deal', his domestic policy, to help restore the depressed American economy.

2.7.1 Background

In 1932 by far for the first time the phrase 'New Deal' was used by the President Roosevelt at the Philadelphia Convention of the Democratic Party Primaries. Arthur Schlesinger (Jr), a renowned American historian comments, "New Deal is but the evolution of the Square Deal via New Freedom." The phrase "Square Deal" was given to the domestic policy of Theodore Roosevelt, the American President from 1901 to 1908. Similarly, the domestic policy of Woodrow Wilson, the USA President (1912-17) went by the name "New Freedom". Therefore, New Deal was not a New Deal or a domestic innovation rather was a byproduct of both Theodore Roosevelt’s and Wilson’s domestic policies.
Theodore Roosevelt, a socialist was more popular to the Democratic Party than his own party, Republic. He could visualise the three-dimensional happiness of the rich as well as irreparable condition of the poor. For the first time, he dreamt of the gap between the poor and the rich to be narrowed down and the rich not to be allowed to become extremely rich and the poor to become extremely bankrupt. His domestic policy of "Square Deal" was like a square having four equal in the eyes of law and were deserved to materialise all powers, rights and duties equally which is otherwise known as the egalitarian concept of society. The runner and the forerunner of this society was the egalitarian President Theodore Roosevelt himself. From 1908 to 1912 this Square Deal was still in operation.

In 1912 when President Woodrow Wilson came to power he added some new economic points into the parameter of Square Deal like the rationalisation of banking, equal status to women compared to men, equal payment for both men and women workers and called of the "New Freedom". Also some social reform measures were brought about. However New Freedom was obliterated by the beginning of the World War I from 1920 to 1932 the Republican leaders of the White House could neither adopt any new economic measure nor could continue the "Square Deal" or "New Freedom" to stabilise the already depreciated economic status of USA. The ill-fated Economic Depression and its adverse effects on USA could be well assessed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, the new American President voted to power in 1932 and asked him to earmark a new economic policy, the "New Deal". Thus New Deal was not a new concept but the "old wine in the new bottle".

2.7.2 Principles of New Deal

The New Deal emphasized the government to spend its revenue for the development of the people to follow the principle of Deficit Financing which meant to spend more than the earning. His idea behind this was that if the government could be able to spend more, more and more people would be employed which would arrest the problem of unemployment. The New Deal focused on the principles of 4 R's - Relief, Recovery, Reform and Roosevelt. His New Deal was three dimensional in nature catering to the economic principles of relief, recovery and reform. His government brought a measure to control over the national economy through the federacy. While 95% of the economy of the state was brought under the public sector, only 5% came under the purview of the private sector. Therefore, Roosevelt was condemned by the European nations as
the "Commy", a "True Communist" a "Spy of the Soviet Union" or "an agent of the Communist Russia".

### 2.7.3 Implementation of the Principles

On March 5, 1939 Roosevelt declared a nationwide bank holiday and on March 9 the Congress passed an act giving the President power to regulate currency and credit transactions, penalise the hoarding of gold, appoint conservators to assist national banks whose assets were endangered and issue Federal Reserve notes against government obligations. National economy might have been imbalanced had there not been the control over the issue of currency and notes. The Congress passed Economic Bill and a bill establishing a civilian conservation corps to provide employment for several hundred thousand growth on public works especially in forests and national parks. All agricultural credit matters were placed in the hands of a Farm Credit Administration and most of the banks were reopened.

Another important step launched under New Deal was started when government loans to the farmers were facilitated. The government of Roosevelt adjusting "Deficit Financing" started sanctioning loans to the rural as well as urban needies. The production of additional crops placed under official control. Interim relief or time extensions were granted to bankrupt farmers and agriculturists during which it was expect they might retain possession of their land. State Banks and Trust Companies were given borrowing privileges similar to those of the member banks. Loans were granted to the poor for their house building and for starting business and protection was offered to building and to loan associations. It had been seen that during 1921 to 1932 agricultural products were devalued because productions were at the stagnating point because there was no export or import of goods. But with the outcome of New Deal business flourished amazingly and export and import touched heights.

The Wagner Act, named after a Senator's name Wagner was passed in the Congress in 1935. Which prohibited the persecution of workers for setting up trade unions and going on strike. The law obliged the capitalists to recognize the trade union organizations and conclude collective agreements with them. The entrepreneurs were forbidden to create “Company” Unions. The Wagner Law was a substantial attachment in the part of the workers the outcome of their dogged class struggle. In August 1935 the congress passed a law on social security according to which pensions were stipulated
for workers who had reached the age of 65, unemployment benefits were introduced and allowances for invalids, orphans and widows were earmarked. Though the law did not embrace all categories of the American proletariat, it had still some achievements.

The US leaders, praising the Wagner Act, called it "as the great charter of labour". Under Roosevelt the trade union officials increasingly preached class cooperation, trying to eliminate the strike movement completely. The right socialists in their very appeal to the Americans convinced that "Roosevelt's policy was a step towards socialism". The General Secretary of the Communist Party of USA, Earl Browder who subsequently became a renegade, either over estimated the significance of Roosevelt’s New Deal or put it on the same shelf as fascism. The Communist Party was correct in defining the bourgeois essence of the New Deal and support Roosevelt’s progressive measures. Prof. J. K. Galbraith, a renowned economist of the modern times as well as American Ambassador to India holds "The New Deal is unique by balancing the power of the industrialists with that of the workers."

To bring about a 'recovery' in industry, agriculture, commerce and the credit and monetary system and moreover a balance in the twin areas of credit expansion and deficit financing, a National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) was created in America. Industries were divided into 17 groups, monopoly prices were established, the firms of commercial credits were stipulated and the volume of output and markets were allotted. The NIRA earmarked some "codes of the fair dealing" the main purpose of which was to prohibit setting of goods for less than the set price. This helped to keep the monopoly prices high and considerably, boosted the profits made by the monopolists. The law guaranteed a minimum age, the maximum length of the working day, the conclusion of collective agreements, the right to set up trade unions and the rendering of assistance to the multi-million strong army of the unemployed. Roosevelt set up Public Works Administration (PWA) which found jobs for the unemployed. Camps were also taken up for unemployed young people who were engaged in public work for a pittance. From 1933 to 1937 $12 billion dollars were allotted for public works.

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) or Muscle Shoals Act was passed with a view to giving the government authority to develop power and natural resources. This was further advocated by Roosevelt to stimulate industry, relieve unemployment and check the waste of
resources resulting from lack of planning. The securities law gave the government regulatory powers over the sale of stocks and securities.

For the first time in the USA, President Roosevelt brought about a dynamic organisation of "National Youth Administration" (NYA) for the young people of the USA, the representatives to which were represented equally from the Democratic Party and Republic Party. No inequality prevailed in the youth administration. Everybody got the equal opportunity for the development of his own career. Coordination of National Youth was brought about in the NYA.

In the meantime a Civil Works Administration (CWA) had been organised with an appropriation of $ 400 million from the PWA to finance public works projects and thus remove names from the relief rolls. In some cases, surplus food, clothing and fuel were directly allotted to distressed families. Another PWA allotment went to an Emergency Housing Corporation organised to purchase slum sections in the larger cities and erect on the sites low-cost apartment buildings.

In 1935 a new work relief bill was passed by the Congress and the President Roosevelt by which he dispensed the money to existing organs of administration and to newly created instruments, such as the Works Progress Administration (WPA). The most far-reaching new projects were concerned with the elimination of grade crossings, the electrification of rural areas and rural rehabilitation or the transfer of farming families from unprofitable marginal lands to more fertile regions the task of which was entrusted to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Rexford G. Tugwell. By the end of 1935 almost 530 codes covering 95% of the nation’s industry had been within 1923 to 1925. About 4 million persons were given employment. The banking system was improved and unfair practices in business were curtailed. In the case of labour, a conflict with the employers over the closed shop and collective bargaining surfaced. The dispute was marked by strikes, lockouts, picketing, court injunctions and violence.

2.7.4 Results

The results of the debit side were in commensurable as about 10 millions had remained unemployed the imbalance between agricultural and industrial prices had not been adjusted, the cost of living had gone up without a commensurate rise in wages and above all the net income of the chief railways for October 1934 was less than half of that for October 1933 and less than one-third of that for October 1932 and the
government found itself in possession of increasingly large blocks of railroad securities. The national debt had risen from $19,500 millions in June 1932 to $29,800 millions in March 1935.

Roosevelt’s New Deal as noted by the Communist Party of USA was aimed at consolidating the foundations of capitalism and undermining the class struggle of the workers. It could not play a determinant role in pulling the USA out of the crisis. Roosevelt began his activity at the same time as the world economic crisis came to an end. After the crisis had reached its peak and economic revival had begun the biggest monopolists of the USA started to oppose Roosevelt’s “anti-crisis” legislation, i.e., New Deal. A beautiful and rhythmic song was sung all over the country on New Deal which went-

"The ‘Red New Deal’ with a Soviet seal
Endorsed by a Moscow hand
The strange result of an alien cult
In a liberty loving land,"

The summary of the song was that the New Deal, Communistic in its philosophy, backed by the foreign ideology and the soviet hand of Roosevelt offered disastrous results to the liberty loving land of USA.

The Supreme Court of America shocked the government and delighted the opposition by declaring the whole Acts passed by the Congress under Roosevelt unconstitutional. The president became irritated and declared that the decisions took the country back to the "horse-and-buggy days of 1789", but opponents of the New Deal held that the constitution and the country, after narrow escapes, had at last been saved. Roosevelt with his farsightedness conceived of an interesting policy by which he could be able to increase the strength of the Supreme Court from 8 judges to 17. Now any law he wanted to pass he got the support of the maximum judges (9 judges) in the court to his own side. He became now the master over judiciary for which he was criticised severely.

2.7.5 Criticism

The question spontaneously cropped up whether New Deal was a capitalistic measure or socialistic or communistic. The business under the principle of New Deal was to run within the precinct of Law, to have government control over private business, to obstruct the laissez-
faire trade and to starve the free-trade business. This is how it opposed the socialistic and capitalistic principles. Therefore, the American businessmen looked down upon Roosevelt calling him as a barrier to capitalism. But on the other hand, Roosevelt convinced the public that New Deal was cemented not to weaken capitalism but to strengthen it. American capitalism was there just like a child without parental care and he tried so far to develop a superstructure on it.

Others condemned New Deal as revolutionary and not innovative which brought about an acceleration of the declining of laissez-faire. Previously there was no control over the business but when government control was perpetuated on the free trade business people designated New Deal to be communistic. But Roosevelt repeatedly said it was more capitalistic rather than communistic as because it was not innovated rather was evolved out of the surface of Square Deal through New Freedom which were almost capitalistic in nature. Therefore, Roosevelt appealed, the measure which happened to be the remodelling of the previous measures of capitalistic nature could be none other than capitalistic.

Then the question crops up- was New Deal successful? It succeeded substantially but not wholly or totally. The problem of unemployment was controlled somehow but not gone out of land. The strength of the unemployed was 8 million in 1932, increased to 10 million in 1936 and to 12 million in 1939-40. So, this problem remained consistent with the rising population of the USA. Similarly capital investment did fall alarmingly. During the period 1921-28, 9.5 billion dollars were invested in American business, but during the period 1932-39 especially in 1938 total investment was fluctuating in between 1 to 2.5 billion dollars. So there was the drastic reduction of 66% of dollars up to the period of 1939.

Regarding the achievements and failures of New Deal various critics give various opinions. William Faulkner, a renowned American historian quotes, "The New Deal might have brought about prosperity to American land in 1950 after seventeen years of its operation, if there had not been the advent of the World War II." Thomas Bailey observes, “American capitalism was mad and Franklin Roosevelt with the magnetic charisma of New Deal made it same." Prof. Elson, an economist held, “New Deal reiterated the American phase in the diplomatic capabilities of American democracy and capitalism.” However, the measure of New Deal equipped with the down facing economic phenomena of America was a stepping stone to bring about an economic balance for which the American
President, Franklin Roosevelt had to be praised rather than to be looked down upon.

2.8 The Making of the Russian Revolution

The Russian Czars were despotic and their government lacked strong administration. The nobles and the church gave support to the Czarist autocracy to desire benefits for themselves. Russian witnessed a good number of Famines during the 18th and the early 19th century which caused great suffering to the poor peasants. Excepting Alexander I and Alexander II the rest of them were known for their cruelty and oppression, all rights were denied to the Russians. Therefore, the people had no alternative but to show their anger through revolts. Revolts continued but were suppressed with great vigor. However, the people never trailed behind and continued to resist the Czarist regime by founding revolutionary organization, like the Nihilists and Anarchists carrying on underground activities.

The educated liberals of the Zemstvos and students formed revolutionary organizations and demanded early and better reforms, but to of no effect. In 1898 the liberals founded the Russian Social Democratic Party; composed of members profoundly influenced by the writings of Karl Marx and others. In 1903 a session of this party was held in which it witnessed a split on the issue of admission of the common men into its fold. One group in majority called Bolsheviks led by Lenin was aggressive and the members advocated the admission only the most devoted workers whereas the other group called Mensheviks inserted the admission of those who wished to join the party. Both of them got formally separated in 1911.

In the meantime, Russia entered into the first World War, supported Great Britain and France and opposed the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria and Italy). The Russian entry into the war was a blunder on the part of Czar Nicholas II since the country was hardly prepared to launch such a big war and therefore, led to disastrous consequences. Prince Rasputin, the evil adviser was killed. A coalition was formed in the Duma which forced the Russian emperor to abdicate absent the throne. So on March 15, 1917, Czar Nicholas II was persuaded to abdicate. He left the country with his family. A provisional government was formed in Petrograd. The Mensheviks led by Kerensky came to power. But Kerensky’s government was falling short of expectations entertained by the common people and workers.
It was under these circumstances, that the Bolsheviks planned to bring about the downfall of the provisional government. Lenin, the leader of the Bolsheviks prepared the workers for bringing about a revolution, known as the Bolshevik Revolution or the Russian Revolution. Lenin had organized secretly the establishment of Soviet Councils in towns and cities. He arrived in Russia from Germany in a sealed trough. He struck a deadly blow to the government of Kerensky and the latter fled the country. The government was taken over by Lenin himself on November, 1917 and subsequently many towns and cities of Russia came under his control. The important members of the Bolshevik government were Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin.

The Bolshevik Revolution was an event of international significance like the French Revolution of 1789. It struck terror in the minds of the ruling class of other capitalist states. It aroused hopes of liberation from imperialist rule in the minds of millions of colonial peoples. The emergence of the Soviet Union gave a fillip to the national liberation movements in the colonial countries especially in Asia and Africa.

The Revolution was essentially proletarian in nature. It virtually liquidated the powers of the nobles, the clergy and the bourgeoisie. On the ruins of the old order, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established and this fact had its effect on the domestic as well as foreign policies of Soviet Union after 1917.

The western powers were not sympathetic towards Bolsheviks since their government made peace with Germany by signing the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1917 and surrendered large tracts of territories. This treaty weakened the western alliance as Russian was not to fight against Germany. Thus the whole burden of carrying on the war with Germany fell on Britain. Had not the USA joined the war on the side of Britain, Germany would have been victorious.

2.9 Establishment of Socialist State in Russia

There was a civil war in Russia between 1918 and 1921. There were many diverse groups fighting against the Bolsheviks. The mass of the socialist revolutionaries fought against them. There were the Czech legionaries. In May 1918 the Czech legion under a French commander rebelled against a communist attempt to disarm them. White Russians under able commanders like Anton Denikin, Alexander Kolchak, Nikolayevich Wrangel and Nikolay Yudenich assailed the Soviet Republic from all sides. They received advisers, tanks, aeroplanes, and munitions
from Britain, France and their Allies. The Allies cut off war and civilian supplies to Russia. The nobles also escaped from Russia and appealed to the Allies for help against the brutal Bolshevik Government. Bolshevik propaganda was fraught with dangerous potentialities.

In January 1918, the Ukraine broke away from Russia. The Bolshevik government did not approve of it and hence invaded Ukraine but was defeated by the confined armies of Germany and Ukraine. By 1920 the whole of Ukraine was cleared of the foreigners and Ukraine became a part of Russia.

The enemies of the Bolsheviks revolted in White Russia under General Nikolay Yudenich and advanced upon Petrograd. However, Yudenich was decisively beaten in 1919 and all opposition was gradually crushed. In order to pacify non-Russian nationalities in the Baltic region, the Soviet government recognized the independence of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Finland in 1920, while White Russia continued to be a part of the Soviet Union.

Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan declared independence in 1918. The Bolsheviks invaded them to conquer them but Generals Denikin and Wrangel defeated them. Finally in 1920 the Bolsheviks overpowered all opposition. Denikin escaped the civil war in the Caucasus ended.

Admiral Alexander Kolchak established a conservative Government in Siberia in December 1918 and marched into eastern Russia. The Bolsheviks countered them. Kolchak was defeated in December 1919, captured and later on executed in 1920.

Vladivostok had been occupied by Japan in December 1917. It was vacated in 1922 and made a part of Soviet Russia.

The end of the Civil war in Russia did not bring peace to that country. As the Bolsheviks were in a minority, they were compelled to resort to force in order to retain their power and establish their social system. Their enemies were the classes which had been the upholders of the old order with the nobility and bourgeoisie at the top. After the success of the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin had declared, “We will destroy everything and on the ruin we will build our temple. It will be a temple for the happiness of all. But we will destroy the bourgeoisie, grind it to powder.”
The suppression of the nobility and this bourgeoisie was carried out with thoroughness and much cruelty. All those who were actively or passively opposed to the Bolshevik plans were rushed as counter-revolutionaries and enemies of the people. All political parties were gradually broken up so that no organized opposition could develop. A decree also suppressed all opposition newspapers. The Bolsheviks controlled the press and published only that news which was authorized by the censor.

The All Russian Commission for combating counter-Revolution speculation and sabotage known as the Cheka was organized on December 1917 to eradicate all opposition to the rule of the Bolsheviks. A large number of persons suspected of opposition was arrested, some were short dead. Even women were not spared. On 18 July, 1918, the entire family of Czar Nicholas II, his wife and their children together with a number of attendants were shot dead.

The orthodox church of Russia was a special target of Lenin as it preached obedience to the rule of the Czar and was a rallying centre of the counter revolutionary forces. Lenin announced that not only the church but also the workshop of God must be extirpated. A decree of 5 February 1918 separated the church from the state. Slogans like Religion is a weapon of reaction” and “religion is a deception” were circulated. Churches were turned into anti-religions museums.

Lenin made efforts to build the communist party, established several cadres, and controlled the political and economic institutions of the country. To a great extent the success of Lenin’s early economic reforms depended upon the policies of terrorization.

Rebellious elements were uprooted and the party officials compelled the people to accept the new policies of the government. Criticism was disallowed and democratic rights were sized.

Hence Lenin’s early radical reforms could not be successful partly due to mismanagement and partly due to the non-cooperation of millions of peasants. It was expected that the country’s economy would be managed well after the redistribution of lands, nationalization of industries and resources, and efficient distribution of manufactured goods. None of these took place. During and after the revolution, imports of all materials coming from the west had stopped. Factories crippled and frequent strikes led to serious shortages of consumer goods. When consumer goods stopped flowing to villages, the villagers stopped
supplying their surplus food grains. They resorted to hoarding and invited the wrath of the party officials.

Agricultural production declined in 1920-21 due to non-import of fertilizers. The country experienced one of the worst famines in its history. Compared to 1913 figures, the agricultural and industrial production showed a steep decline, almost by two-thirds in 1920-21. Russia was on the brink of disaster and the people were on the verge of a revolt. The food policy of the government provided for the requisitioning of food. The government took no food stuffs from poor peasants. The middle class peasants were required to give a moderate part of their surpluses and that of rich peasants of surrender the greater part. Market activities were curtailed workers were paid in kind. The government introduced universal labour consumption. He who did not work was not to eat. A system of better of goods like grain, flour, salt, sugar cloth etc. was introduced. Banks and credit institutions were temporarily closed. The state acquired full control of foreign trade, heavy industries, banking corporations, railways, forests and rivers.

Lenin realized the magnitude of his blunder. The Supreme Economic Council did not deliver the goods and made it necessary for Lenin to evolve a new strategy for overcoming of mounting economic problems overwhelming his government.

2.10 Its Economic and Political Aspects

The economic and political aspects of the socialist state in Russia prove beyond doubt its establishment. Given the centuries old socio-economic and political structures that Russia had been under and given the amount of pressure from all quarters against the czarist regime, the Bolsheviks under Lenin had no other option but to think of Russia moving on the path of socialism. Let us discuss some of the key issues of the economic and political aspects of such establishment of the socialist state.

2.10.1 Economic Aspects

During the Civil War (1917–1921), the Bolsheviks adopted War Communism, which entailed the breakup of the landed estates and the forcible seizure of agricultural surpluses. The Kronshtadt Rebellion signaled the growing unpopularity of War Communism in the countryside in March 1921. At the end of the civil war, disillusioned sailors, primarily peasants who initially had been stalwart supporters of the Bolsheviks under the provisional government, revolted against the new regime.
Although the Red Army, commanded by Trotsky, crossed the ice over the frozen Baltic Sea to quickly crush the rebellion, this sign of growing discontent forced the party to foster a broad alliance of the working class and peasantry (80% of the population), despite left factions of the party which favoured a regime solely representative of the interests of the revolutionary proletariat. At the Tenth Party Congress it was decided to end War Communism and institute the New Economic Policy (NEP), in which the state allowed a limited market to exist. Small private businesses were allowed and restrictions on political activity were somewhat eased.

However, the key shift involved the status of agricultural surpluses. Rather than simply requisitioning agricultural surpluses in order to feed the urban population (the hallmark of War Communism), the NEP allowed peasants to sell their surplus yields on the open market. Meanwhile, the state still maintained state ownership of what Lenin deemed the "commanding heights" of the economy: heavy industry such as the coal, iron, and metallurgical sectors along with the banking and financial components of the economy. The "commanding heights" employed the majority of the workers in the urban areas. Under the NEP, such state industries would be largely free to make their own economic decisions.

During the NEP period, agricultural yields not only recovered to the levels attained before the Bolshevik Revolution, but greatly improved. The break-up of the quasi-feudal landed estates of the Tsarist-era countryside gave peasants their greatest incentives ever to maximize production. Now able to sell their surpluses on the open market, peasant spending gave a boost to the manufacturing sectors in the urban areas. As a result of the NEP, and the break-up of the landed estates while the Communist Party was strengthening power between 1917 and 1921, the Soviet Union became the world's greatest producer of grain.

Agriculture, however, would recover from civil war more rapidly than heavy industry. Factories, badly damaged by civil war and capital depreciation, were far less productive. In addition, the organization of enterprises into trusts or syndicates representing one particular sector of the economy would contribute to imbalances between supply and demand associated with monopolies. Due to the lack of incentives brought by market competition, and with little or no state controls on their internal policies, trusts were likely to sell their products at higher prices.

The slower recovery of industry would pose some problems for the peasantry, who accounted for 80% of the population. Since agriculture was relatively more productive, relative price indexes for industrial goods
were higher than those of agricultural products. The outcome of this was what Trotsky deemed the "scissors crisis" because of the scissors-like shape of the graph representing shifts in relative price indexes. Simply put, peasants would have to produce more grain to purchase consumer goods from the urban areas. As a result, some peasants withheld agricultural surpluses in anticipation of higher prices, thus contributing to mild shortages in the cities. This, of course, is speculative market behavior, which was frowned upon by many Communist Party cadres, who considered it to be exploitative of urban consumers.

In the meantime, the party took constructive steps to offset the crisis, attempting to bring down prices for manufactured goods and stabilize inflation, by imposing price controls on essential industrial goods and breaking-up the trusts in order to increase economic efficiency.

Both the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and later, the Soviet Union, were countries in the process of industrialization. For both, this development occurred slowly and from a low initial starting point. Because of World War I, the Russian Revolution and the ensuing Russian Civil War industrial production had only managed to barely recover its 1913 level by 1926. By this time about 18% of the population lived in non-rural areas, although only about 7.5% were employed in the non-agricultural sector. The remainder was stuck in the low productivity agriculture.

According to David A. Dyker, the Soviet Union of the 1930s can be regarded as a typical developing country, characterized by low capital investment and most of its population resident in the countryside. Part of the reason for low investment rates lay in the inability to acquire capital from abroad. This in turn, was the result of the repudiation of the debts of the Russian Empire by the Bolsheviks, as well as the worldwide financial troubles. Consequently, any kind of economic growth had to be financed by domestic savings.

The economic problems in agriculture were further acerbated by natural conditions, such as long cold winters across the country, droughts in the south and acidic soils in the north. However, according to Dyker, the Soviet economy did have "extremely good" potential in the area of raw materials and mineral extraction, for example in the oil fields in Transcaucasia, and this, along with a small but growing manufacturing base, helped the USSR avoid any kind of balance of payments problems.
2.10.2 Political Aspects

In the 19th century, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, called for the international political unification of the European working classes in order to achieve a Communist revolution; and proposed that, because the socio-economic organization of communism was of a higher form than that of capitalism, a workers’ revolution would first occur in the economically advanced, industrialized countries. Yet, in the early 20th century, the socio-economic backwardness of Imperial Russia (uneven and combined economic development) facilitated rapid and intensive industrialization, which produced a united, working-class proletariat in a predominantly rural, agrarian peasant society.

Moreover, because the industrialization was financed mostly with foreign capital, Imperial Russia (1721–1917) did not possess a revolutionary bourgeoisie with political and economic influence upon the workers and the peasants (as occurred in the French Revolution, 1789). So, although Russia’s political economy principally was agrarian and semi-feudal, the task of democratic revolution therefore fell to the urban, industrial working class, as the only social class capable of effecting land reform and democratization, in view that the Russian propertied classes would attempt to suppress any revolution, in town and country. In April 1917, Lenin published the *April Theses*, the strategy of the October Revolution, which proposed that the Russian revolution was not an isolated national event, but a fundamentally international event — the first world socialist revolution. Thus, Lenin’s practical application of Marxism and working-class urban revolution to the social, political, and economic conditions of the agrarian peasant society that was Tsarist Russia sparked the “revolutionary nationalism of the poor” to depose the absolute monarchy of the three-hundred-year Romanov dynasty (1613–1917).

2.10.2.1 Imperialism

In the course of developing the Russian application of Marxism, the pamphlet *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916) presented Lenin’s analysis of an economic development predicted by Karl Marx that capitalism would become a global financial system, wherein advanced industrial countries export financial capital to their colonial countries, to finance the exploitation of their natural resources and the labour of the native populations. Such super-exploitation of the poor (undeveloped) countries allows the wealthy (developed) countries to maintain some
homeland workers politically content with a slightly higher standard of living, and so ensure peaceful labour–capital relations in the capitalist homeland. Hence, a proletarian revolution of workers and peasants could not occur in the developed capitalist countries, while the imperialist global-finance system remained intact; thus an underdeveloped country would feature the first proletarian revolution; and, in the early 20th century, Imperial Russia was the politically weakest country in the capitalist global-finance system.

2.10.2.2 Leninist theory-The Vanguard Party

The Communists, therefore, are, on the one hand, practically the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the lines of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement. The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: Formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

Hence, the purpose of the Leninist vanguard party is to establish a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat; supported by the working class, the vanguard party would lead the revolution to depose the incumbent Tsarist government, and then transfer power of government to the working class, which change of ruling class — from bourgeoisie to proletariat — makes possible the full development of socialism. In the pamphlet What is to be Done? (1902), Lenin proposed that a revolutionary vanguard party, mostly recruited from the working class, should lead the political campaign, because it was the only way that the proletariat could successfully achieve a revolution; unlike the economist campaign of trade-union-struggle advocated by other socialist political parties; and later by the anarcho-syndicalists. Like Karl Marx, Lenin distinguished between the aspects of a revolution, the "economic campaign" (labour strikes for increased wages and work concessions), which featured diffused plural leadership; and the "political campaign" (socialist changes to society), which required the decisive revolutionary leadership of the Bolshevik vanguard party.

2.10.2.3 Democratic Centralism

Lenin organised the Bolsheviks as a democratically centralised vanguard party, wherein free political-speech was recognised legitimate
until policy consensus; afterwards, every member of the Party would be expected to uphold the official policy established in consensus. Full, inner-party democratic debate was Bolshevik Party practice under Lenin, even after the banning of party factions in 1921. Although a guiding influence in policy, Lenin did not exercise absolute power, and continually debated and discussed to have his point of view accepted. Under Stalin, the inner-party practice of democratic free debate did not continue after the death of Lenin in 1924.

2.10.2.4 Revolution

Before the Revolution, despite supporting political reform (including Bolsheviks elected to the Duma, when opportune), Lenin proposed that capitalism could ultimately only be overthrown with revolution, not with gradual reforms— from within (Fabianism) and from without (social democracy)— which would fail, because the ruling capitalist social class, who hold economic power (the means of production), determine the nature of political power in a bourgeois society. For a Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry, a revolution in underdeveloped Tsarist Russia required an allied proletariat of town and country (urban workers and peasants), because the urban workers would be too few to successfully assume power in the cities on their own. Moreover, owing to the middle-class aspirations of much of the peasantry, Leon Trotsky proposed that the proletariat should lead the revolution, as the only way for it to be truly socialist and democratic; although Lenin initially disagreed with Trotsky’s formulation, he adopted it before the Russian Revolution in October 1917.

2.10.2.5 Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In the Russian socialist society, government by direct democracy was effected by elected soviets (workers’ councils), which "soviet government" form Lenin described as the manifestation of the Marxist ‘democratic dictatorship of the proletariat’. As political organisations, the soviets would comprise representatives of factory workers’ and trade union committees, but would exclude capitalists, as a social class, in order to ensure the establishment of a proletarian government, by and for the working class and the peasants. About the political disenfranchisement of the Russian capitalist social classes, Lenin said that ‘depriving the exploiters of the franchise is a purely Russian question and not a question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in general.... In which countries... democracy for the exploiters will be, in one or another
form, restricted... is a question of the specific national features of this or that capitalism’.

Soviet constitutionalism was the collective government form of the Russian dictatorship of the proletariat, the opposite of the government form of the dictatorship of capital (privately owned means of production) practised in bourgeois democracies. In the soviet political system, the (Leninist) vanguard party would be one of many political parties competing for elected power. Nevertheless, the circumstances of the Red vs. White Russian Civil War, and terrorism by the opposing political parties, and in aid of the White Armies' counter-revolution, led to the Bolshevik government banning other parties; thus, the vanguard party became the sole, legal political party in Russia. Lenin did not regard such political suppression as philosophically inherent to the dictatorship of the proletariat; yet the Stalinists retrospectively claimed that such factional suppression was original to Leninism.

2.10.2.6 National Self-determination

Lenin recognized and accepted the existence of nationalism among oppressed peoples, advocated their national rights to self-determination, and opposed the ethnic chauvinism of “Greater Russia” because such ethnocentrism was a cultural obstacle to establishing the proletarian dictatorship in the territories of the deposed Tsarist Russian Empire (1721–1917). The internationalist philosophies of Bolshevism and of Marxism are based upon class struggle transcending nationalism, ethnocentrism, and religion, which are intellectual obstacles to class consciousness, because the bourgeois ruling classes manipulated said cultural status quo to politically divide the proletarian working classes. To overcome the political barrier of nationalism, Lenin said it was necessary to acknowledge the existence of nationalism among oppressed peoples, and to guarantee their national independence, as the right of secession; and that, based upon national self-determination, it was natural for socialist states to transcend nationalism and form a federation.

In post–Revolutionary Russia, Stalinism (Socialism in one country) and Trotskyism (Permanent world revolution) were the principal philosophies of Communism that claimed legitimate ideological descent from Leninism. Thus, within the Communist Party, each ideological faction denied the political legitimacy of the opposing faction.
2.10.2.7 Lenin vs. Stalin

Until shortly before his death, Lenin worked to counter the disproportionate political influence of Joseph Stalin in the Communist Party and in the bureaucracy of the soviet government, partly because of abuses he had committed against the populace of Georgia, and partly because the autocratic Stalin had accumulated administrative power disproportionate to his office of General Secretary of the Communist Party. The counter-action against Stalin aligned with Lenin’s advocacy of the right of self-determination for the national and ethnic groups of the former Tsarist Empire, which was a key theoretic concept of Leninism. Lenin warned that Stalin has “unlimited authority concentrated in his hands, and I am not sure whether he will always be capable of using that authority with sufficient caution”, and formed a factional bloc with Leon Trotsky to remove Stalin as the General Secretary of the Communist Party. To that end followed proposals reducing the administrative powers of Party posts, in order to reduce bureaucratic influence upon the policies of the Communist Party. Lenin advised Trotsky to emphasize Stalin’s recent bureaucratic alignment in such matters (e.g. undermining the anti-bureaucratic Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspection), and argued to depose Stalin as General Secretary. Despite advice to refuse “any rotten compromise”, Trotsky did not heed Lenin’s advice, and General Secretary Stalin retained power over the Communist Party and the bureaucracy of the soviet government.

2.10.2.8 Trotskyism vs. Stalinism

After Lenin’s death (21 January 1924), Trotsky ideologically battled the influence of Stalin, who formed ruling blocs within the Russian Communist Party (with Grigory Zinoviev and Lev Kamenev, then with Nikolai Bukharin, and then by himself) and so determined soviet government policy from 1924 onwards. The ruling blocs continually denied Stalin’s opponents the right to organise as an opposition faction within the Party — thus, the re-instatement of democratic centralism and free speech within the Communist Party were key arguments of Trotsky’s Left Opposition, and the later Joint Opposition.

In the course of instituting government policy, Stalin promoted the doctrine of Socialism in One Country (adopted 1925), wherein the USSR would establish socialism upon Russia’s economic foundations (and support socialist revolutions elsewhere). Conversely, Trotsky held that socialism in one country would economically constrain the industrial development of the USSR, and thus required assistance from the new
socialist countries that had arisen in the developed world, which was essential for maintaining Soviet democracy, in 1924 much undermined by civil war and counter-revolution. Furthermore, Trotsky’s theory of Permanent Revolution proposed that socialist revolutions in underdeveloped countries would go further towards dismantling feudal régimes, and establish socialist democracies that would not pass through a capitalist stage of development and government. Hence, revolutionary workers should politically ally with peasant political organisations, but not with capitalist political parties. In contrast, Stalin and allies proposed that alliances with capitalist political parties were essential to realising a revolution where Communists were too few; said Stalinist practice failed, especially in the Northern Expedition portion of the Chinese Revolution (1925–1927), wherein it resulted in the right-wing Kuomintang’s massacre of the Chinese Communist Party; nonetheless, despite the failure, Stalin’s policy of mixed-ideology political alliances, became Comintern policy.

2.10.2.9 The Oppositionists

Until exiled from Russia in 1929, Leon Trotsky helped develop and led the Left Opposition (and the later Joint Opposition) with members of the Workers’ Opposition, the Decembrists, and (later) the Zinovievists. Trotskyism ideologically predominated the political platform of the Left Opposition, which demanded the restoration of soviet democracy, the expansion of democratic centralism in the Communist Party, national industrialisation, international permanent revolution, and socialist internationalism. The Trotskyists’ demands countered Stalin’s political dominance of the Russian Communist Party, which was officially characterised by the ‘cult of Lenin’, the rejection of permanent revolution, and the doctrine of Socialism in One Country. The Stalinist economic policy vacillated between appeasing capitalist kulak interests in the countryside, and destroying them. Initially, the Stalinists also rejected the national industrialisation of Russia, but then pursued it in full, sometimes brutally. In both cases, the Left Opposition denounced the regressive nature of the policy towards the kulak social class of wealthy peasants, and the brutality of forced industrialisation. Trotsky described the vacillating Stalinist policy as a symptom of the undemocratic nature of a ruling bureaucracy.

During the 1920s and the 1930s, Stalin fought and defeated the political influence of Leon Trotsky and of the Trotskyists in Russia, by means of slander, anti-Semitism, programmed censorship, expulsions, exile (internal and external), and imprisonment. The anti-Trotsky campaign culminated in the executions (official and unofficial) of the
Moscow Trials (1936–38), which were part of the Great Purge of Old Bolsheviks (who had led the Revolution). Once established as ruler of the USSR, General Secretary Stalin re-titled the official *Socialism in One Country* doctrine as “Marxism-Leninism”, to establish ideological continuity with Leninism, whilst opponents continued calling it “Stalinism”.

### 2.11 New Economic Policy (NEP) (1921-29)

The two major economic policy makers of the USSR, Lenin created the NEP while Stalin created the planned economy. By early 1921 it became apparent to the Bolsheviks that forced requisitioning of grain had resulted in low agricultural production and widespread opposition. As a result, the decision was made by Lenin and the Politburo to try an alternative approach. The so-called New Economic Policy (NEP) was approved at the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

Everything except "the commanding heights", as Lenin put it, of the economy would be privatized. "The commanding heights" included foreign trade, heavy industry, communication and transport among others. In practice this limited the private sector to artisan and agricultural production/trade. The NEP encountered strong resistance within the Bolshevik party. Lenin had to persuade communist skeptics that "state capitalism" was a necessary step in achieving communism, while he himself harboured suspicions that the policy could be abused by private businessmen.

Lenin was a realist. In 1921 he started a new economic policy in order to bring about economic and political stability to the country and build a socialist economy. The farmers were given the freedom to use their economic resources. The government gave up its monopoly in grain and introduced free trade in all agricultural products. Private capital was allowed to operate in the spruce of trade under certain restrictions. Efforts were made to revive and improve the system of money circulation. It however, private capital was not allowed to enter large-scale industries, transport, foreign trade and learning. Even foreign capital was welcomed to increase production.

The State General Planning Commission was set up in 1921 and the work of planning, control and management was given to it. Attempts were made to supply agriculture with farm machines and supplements. Through the Central Agricultural Banks, credit was even to peasants.
Both agricultural production and productivity of labour in agriculture increased.

The government greatly emphasized the development of industries. Key industries and big enterprises were rehabilitated. All and medium sized enterprises were either temporally closed or even on lease. Loans and concessions given to foreign capital led the way for the state capitalism. There was an unprecedented growth of production. There was rise in production and wages. In 1925-26 wages were 34% above those in 1913. Workers gained no count of the expenditure by the government on social and agricultural requirements, medical services and annual paid holidays. Strikes in the factories were banned and street discipline was imposed. A new currency was introduced on the basis of gold standard.

As a result of the new economic policy, food production went to and food rationing was ended in November 1921. The trouble was evaluated and stabilized. The budget stood balanced. It was a mixed economy, partly controlled and partly free.

As novelist Andrei Platonov, among others, noted, the improvements were immediate. Rationing cards and queues, which had become hallmarks of war communism, had disappeared. However, due to prolonged war, low harvests, and several natural disasters the Soviet economy was still in trouble, particularly its agricultural sector. In 1921 widespread famine broke out in the Volga-Ural region. The Soviet government changed its previous course and allowed international relief to come in from abroad, and established a special committee chaired by prominent communists and non-communists alike. Despite this, an estimated five million people died in the famine.

2.12 The death of Lenin and the fate of the NEP

Following Lenin’s third stroke a troika made up of Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev emerged to take day to day leadership of the party and the country and try to block Trotsky from taking power. Lenin, however, had become increasingly anxious about Stalin and, following his December 1922 stroke dictated a letter to the party criticising him and urging his removal as general secretary, a position which was starting to arise as the most powerful in the party. Stalin was aware of Lenin's Testament and acted to keep Lenin in isolation for health reasons and increase his control over the party apparatus.
Zinoviev and Bukharin became concerned about Stalin's increasing power and proposed that the Orgburo which Stalin headed be abolished and that Zinoviev and Trotsky be added to the party secretariat thus diminishing Stalin's role as general secretary. Stalin reacted furiously and the Orgburo was retained but Bukharin, Trotsky and Zinoviev were added to the body.

Due to growing political differences with Trotsky and his Left Opposition in the fall of 1923, the troika of Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev got reunited. At the Twelfth Party Congress in 1923, Trotsky failed to use Lenin's Testament as a tool against Stalin for fear of endangering the stability of the party.

Lenin died in January 1924 and in May his Testament was read aloud at the Central Committee but Zinoviev and Kamenev argued that Lenin's objections had proven groundless and that Stalin should remain General Secretary. The Central Committee decided not to publish the testament.

Meanwhile the campaign against Trotsky intensified and he was removed from the position of People's Commissar of War before the end of the year. In 1925, Trotsky was denounced for his essay Lessons of October which criticised Zinoviev and Kamenev for initially opposing Lenin's plans for an insurrection in 1917. Trotsky was also denounced for his theory of permanent revolution which contradicted Stalin's position that socialism could be built in one country, Russia, without a worldwide revolution. As the prospects for a revolution in Europe, particularly Germany, became increasingly dim through the 1920s, Trotsky's theoretical position began to look increasingly pessimistic as far as the success of Russian socialism was concerned.

With the resignation of Trotsky as War Commissar the unity of the troika began to unravel. Zinoviev and Kamenev again began to fear Stalin's power and felt that their positions were threatened. Stalin moved to form an alliance with Bukharin and his allies on the right of the party who supported the New Economic Policy and encouraged a slowdown in industrialisation efforts and a move towards encouraging the peasants to increase production via market incentives. Zinoviev and Kamenev criticized this policy as a return to capitalism. The conflict erupted at the Fourteenth Party Congress held in December 1925 with Zinoviev and Kamenev now protesting against the dictatorial policies of Stalin and trying to revive the issue of Lenin's Testament which they had previously buried. Stalin now used Trotsky's previous criticisms of Zinoviev and
Kamenev to defeat and demote them and bring in allies like Vyacheslav Molotov, Kliment Voroshilov and Mikhail Kalinin. Trotsky was dropped from the politburo entirely in 1926. The Fourteenth Congress also saw the first developments of the Stalin personality cult with Stalin being referred to as "leader" for the first time and becoming the subject of effusive praise from delegates.

Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev formed a United Opposition against the policies of Stalin and Bukharin but they had lost influence as a result of the inner party disputes and in October 1927 Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev were expelled from the Central Committee. In November, prior to the Fifteenth Party Congress Trotsky and Zinoviev were expelled from the Communist Party itself as Stalin sought to deny the Opposition any opportunity to make their struggle public. By the time the Congress finally convened in December 1927 Zinoviev had capitulated to Stalin and denounced his previous adherence to the opposition as "anti-Leninist" and the few remaining members still loyal to the opposition were subjected to insults and humiliations. By early 1928 Trotsky and other leading members of the Left Opposition had been sentenced to internal exile.

Stalin now moved against Bukharin by appropriating Trotsky's criticisms of his right wing policies and he promoted a new general line favouring collectivization of the peasantry and rapid industrialization of industry forcing Bukharin and his supporters into a Right Opposition.

At the Central Committee meeting held in July 1928, Bukharin and his supporters argued that Stalin's new policies would cause a breach with the peasantry. Bukharin also alluded to Lenin's Testament. While Bukharin had support from the party organization in Moscow and the leadership of several commissariats Stalin's control of the secretariat was decisive in that it allowed Stalin to manipulate elections to party posts throughout the country giving him control over a large section of the Central Committee. The Right Opposition was defeated and Bukharin attempted to form an alliance with Kamenev and Zinoviev but it was too late.

Starting in 1928, the five-year plans began building a heavy industrial base at once in an underdeveloped economy without waiting years for capital to accumulate through the expansion of light industry, and without reliance on external financing. The country now became industrialized at a hitherto unprecedented pace, surpassing Germany's pace of industrialization in the 19th century and Japan's earlier in the 20th century.
As weighed growth rates, economic planning performed very well during the early and mid-1930s, World War II-era mobilization, and for the first two decades of the postwar era. The Soviet Union became the world’s leading producer of oil, coal, iron ore, and cement; manganese, gold, natural gas and other minerals were also of major importance. However, information about the Soviet famine of 1932–1933 was suppressed by the Soviet authorities until perestroika. In 1933 workers' real earnings sank to about one-tenth of the 1926 level. Common and political prisoners in labour camps were forced to do unpaid labour, and communists and Komsomol members were frequently "mobilized" for various construction projects.

The German invasion of World War II inflicted punishing blows to the economy of the USSR, with Soviet GDP falling 34% between 1940 and 1942. Industrial output did not recover to its 1940 level for almost a decade.

After the reconstruction of the economy (in the wake of the destruction caused by the Russian Civil War) was completed, and after the initial plans of further industrialisation were fulfilled, the explosive growth slowed down, but still generally surpassed most of the other countries in terms of total material production.

2.13 Response and Reaction in the West of the Russian Revolution

After the revolution the relations of Soviet Union with the western powers got strained because of several reasons. Firstly, the Bolshevik Revolution produced for the west an embittered ideology of world socialist revolution to which they could not at all acclimatize themselves.

Russia’s withdrawal from the war and the conclusion of a separate peace with the central powers at Brest-Litovsk on March 3, 1918 were bitterly resented in the Allied countries. Under this treaty Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Courland, Livonia, Estonia were ceded to Germany. The independence of Finland, Ukraine and Georgia was recognized by Russia. This treaty not only enabled Germany to impose the Treaty of Buftea (March 5) and the Treaty of Bucharest on Rumania (May 7) but it also rekindled the war enthusiasm of the Germans who now got the fertile lands of Ukraine, access to the oil wells of Azerbaijan and Rumania and the way open for the intensification of anti-British activities in Persia Afghanistan and India. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk led the western powers to build up the fiction that the Soviet Government deliberately concluded
peace with the Germans to enable them to concentrate all their forces against the Allies in the West.

Moreover, the Russian repudiation of the Czarist debts and the Russian decrees nationalizing the foreign industrial enterprises created a perpetual source of friction. The hostile attitude of foreign powers, quite clear within a month of the revolution, led to the cancellation of foreign debts, on December 24, 1917, to the suspension of payment of interest on State Bonds and of dividends on shares, the cancellation of state loans, the annulling of bank shares, and nationalization of all joint stock companies. All these steps were bound to aggravate the Soviet relations with the West.

The Civil war in Russia and subsequent western support to the white anti-Bolshevik forces with munitions and technical aid brought tension between Russia and the west. By November 16, 1917 France, Britain and the USA had demonstrated their hostility to the Bolshevik regime and stopped all supplies, by April 5, 1918 the united forces of Britain, France and Japan landed at Vladivostok and by May 1918 open hostilities and began. The civil war and the intervention came to a victorious end only towards the end of 1920. The civil war, intervention and blockade resulted in unprecedented sufferings and privations to the Russians. The counter-revolutionary intervention made the social revolution more savage and suspicious than it would have been otherwise. If from the Russian point of view the years 1917-21 were years of intervention and terror, from the western point of view these were the years of all-out revolutionary offensive by Russia against the “bourgeois world”.

The years following the Bolshevik Revolution witnessed the building up of the Soviet economy under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin both of whom were in favour of peaceful co-existence from the very beginning. For reasons of security Soviet Union always stood for total and universal disarmament, save unqualified support to the Pact of Paris of 1928, sponsored the Litvinov Protocol in 1929 and concluded hundreds of bilateral and multilateral international agreements based on neutrality and non-aggression. She also repeatedly expressed her desire to be a member of the League of Nations provided it would not antagonize the international peace and security. Though Russia cherished to live in peace and avoid all sorts of international threat or war, the western powers were hell-bent on restoration of capitalism in Russia. At the Geneva Conference of 1922 they were given a rebuff and at Locarno in 1925 a bold bid was
made by the west to bring Germany back into its orbit in an anti-Soviet crusade in order to provide a reply to the Rapallo Treaty of 1922.

2.14 Totalitarianism in the Inter–War Period

Totalitarianism is a form of government that theoretically permits to individual freedom and that seeks to subordinate all aspects of the individual’s life to the authority of the government. Italian dictator Benito Mussolini coined the term ‘totalitario’ in the yearly 1920s to describe the new Fascist state of Italy which he further described as: “All within the state, none outside the state, and none against the state.” By the beginning of World War II, totalitarianism had become synonymous with absolute and oppressive single-party government.

In the broadest sense, totalitarianism is characterized by strong central rule that attempts to control and direct all aspects of individual life through coercion and repression. The totalitarian states of Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler (1933-45) and the Soviet Union under Joseph Stalin (1924-53) were the first examples of decentralized or popular totalitarianism in which the state achieved overwhelming popular support for its leadership.

Large-scale, organized violence becomes permissible and sometimes necessary under totalitarian rule, justified by the overriding commitment to the state ideology and pursuit of the Stalin’s Soviet Union, whole classes of people, such as the Jews and the Kulaks (wealthy peasant farmers) respectively, were singled out for persecution and extinction.

Police operations within a totalitarian state often appear similar to that within a police state, but one important difference distinguishes them. In a police state the police operate according to known consistent procedures. In a totalitarian state the police operate without the constraints of laws and regulations. Their actions are unpredictable and directed by the whim of their rulers. Under Hitler and Stalin uncertainty was interwoven into the affairs of the state. The German Constitution of the Weimer Republic was never abrogated under Hitler, but an enabling act passed by the Reichstag (Germany’s Parliament) in 1933 permitted him to amend the constitution at will thereby nullifying it. Similarly, Stalin provided a constitution for the Soviet Union in 1936 but never permitted it to become the framework of Soviet law. Instead he was the final arbiter in the interpretation of Marxism- Leninism Stalinism and changed his interpretations at will. Neither Hitler nor Stalin permitted
change to become predictable, thus increasing the sense of terror among
the people and repressing any dissent.

2.15 Fascism in Italy (Rise of Benito Mussolini)

Italy after a period of neutrality in 1919-15, entered the War on May
23, 1915. The Italians found the war more exacting than they had
anticipated. The net direct cost of the war to Italy was more than &
12,000,000,000, while property damage amounted to an additional &
3,000,000,000. Hence, Victor Emmanuel’s (King of Italy) subjects were
disappointed with the disastrous effects of the war.

Economically, the currency, Lira had fallen by 70% in face value,
the cost of living was getting tough, and the budget deficit was running in
astronomical figures. The banks restricted credit and did not accept
industrial securities for granting loans. Peasant tenants refused to pay
rent. Working class instead of the employers took over the charges of the
factories, when wages was lowered. The national debt had increased six
fold. The labour had become lawless, resorting to the violence, bloodshed
and arson. During 1919 and 1920 a total of 35,000,000 workdays was
lost, and there had come into existence a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Besides it, Italy was passing through a period of political topsy-
turvy. With the intrigues and trickery resulting from a multi party system,
the art of government in Italy degenerated into the manipulation of short
lived coalition blocs. From June 23, 1919 to October 31, 1922, six
ministries came to the Chamber of Deputies (Italian Parliament) headed
by Nitti (twice), Giolitti, Bonomi and Facta (twice). The parliament had no
definite principles and was turned into a breeding ground of corruption.

The condition of Italy was further precipitated when at the Paris
Peace Conference the Allies treated her as “the jackal at the feast”. The
Italian demand of getting Fiume and Dalmatia was utterly disapproved by
the Allies. By the summer of 1920, Giolitti because of the domestic
problems withdrew the Italian troops from Albania out of which he gained
nothing. In the Near East, both Greece and Turkey coined prominence to
the dissatisfaction of Italy. In Africa where Great Britain, France and
Belgium acquired the former German colonies, Italy got only small
extensions to Libya and Somaliland. Italy was denied mandates even
though her colonizing capacity was better than that of many. Thus, the
Paris Peace Conference instead of instigating Italy to march towards peace
caus ed her immense frenzy of frustration. The Italian fiery young patriots
and nationalists condemned Woodrow Wilson, the American President and shouted “Death to Wilson”.

Such conditions invited a resurgence of Marxian socialism. Lenin’s Marxian thought inspired deep the Italian socialists. They got 156 seats out of 574 in the General election of November 1919 to the Chamber of Deputies. They demonstrated against the existing government, conducted strikes and committed sabotages. Internal troubles reached in Zenith in 1920-21 by the Socialist extremists during the period of Giovanni Giolitti. They condemned capitalists, set up “revolutionary tribunals” and armed themselves as “red guards” and above all, made the metal industries, the railways and agriculture paralyzed. The government almost remained irresolute and supine.

In April 1921 Giolitti dissolved the parliament in the election. The socialist representation in the Chamber was cut from 156 to 122; and the Communist party had 16 representatives. The Populist’s member increased to 107, but a nationalist group, the Fascist, obtained 35 seats. Getting no majority Giolitti in June 1921 resigned but the premiers who succeeded him were mediocre and apparently important to stop the growing violence of the Communists and Fascists. The Fascists at that time produced able and charismatic personalities. On the other hand the communists had no leaders of outstanding manoeuvre.

On August, 1 1922, a general strike was declared and then proved to be a godsend to the Fascists. By taking over the essential services themselves, the Fascists brought the strike to a close within twenty four hours, thereby earning the gratitude and confidence of large numbers of people.

On October 28 1922, after the government of the day had further discredited it, Mussolini and his follower marched on Rome and occupied the public offices, railways, post and telegraph offices, etc. This was on the whole a peaceful event. The government could do nothing but resign. A day later the king sent for Mussolini to form the Ministry and this he did readily on October 30, 1922. Since that day he was the undisputed ruler of Italy till his fall on July 24, 1943. Mussolini became the head of the state, head of the government, head of the army, seat of executive authority and fountain of justice. As if he was determined to convert Italy into a living prototype of Hegel’s ideal state and if Italy had lost her paradise at the Paris Peace Conference, he promised her to restore it back.
2.16 Main concepts of Fascism

The word Fascism is derived from an Italian word ‘fascio’ or ‘fasce’ literally meaning a ‘well-tied bundle of rods’. The word ‘fascism’ appears to have been invented by Mussolini; it became the home of his movement after March, 1919 and of his government after October, 1922. The Fascist leaders prescribed a particular uniform as ‘black-shirts’ of the followers of Mussolini in Italy.

The main principles of Fascism may be enumerated as under:

- Fascism was based on narrow and extreme nationalism. It glorified the nation and regarded total commitment to the state on the part of the individual as constituting supreme duty. In other words, Fascism emphasized total loyalty on the part of the individual to the state. It was therefore, natural that it considered it necessary to control the mind of the individual in the interest of the state.

- The Fascists were opposed to democracy, liberalism and all forms of socialism. Democracy was described as stupid, corrupt, low moving and the worst form of government “a decaying corpse” the institution of parliament was rendered as a useless talking hop. The Fascists condemned the democratic principles of majority rule, individual freedom and quality.

- The Fascists were opposed to all socialist ideals. Evolution of revolutions, the socialists’ emphasis on class conflict, the material interpretation of history and the idea that everything in life was determined by economic factors were rejected by them. According to Mussolini, “economic wellbeing would reduce than to the level of animals”. The fascists thus rejected the idea of class war and stood for cooperation between all sectors of society in the glory of the State.

- Fascism was opposed to international peace and harmony and advocated war as notional policy as it was believed by its advocates that war alone could provide the people of a nation the opportunity to show their strength. Emphasizing the importance of war in the life of a nation, Mussolini had said, “war is to man that maternity is to woman”. He was determined to expand the boundaries of the state through conquests.

- Fascism believed in myths. Instead of scientific education, emphasis was put on propaganda. Lies were spoken again and again. It was assumed that if a life was spoken hundred times it became a truth. In Italy the myth of “fatherland” was used.
• The Fascists believed in an authoritarian, totalitarian and omnipotent state. They put emphasis on the duties of the citizens and not on their rights. They were always prepared to sacrifice the individual at the altar of the state.

• The Fascists did not believe in the laissez faire principles of individualism. They did not accept the ideas of public ownership as advocated by state socialists. They believed in the institution of private property which was to be worked in the interest of the nation. There were to be no strikes or lock-outs. Complete harmony was to be secured in industry in order to achieve the goal of highest production.

• Fascism opposed internationalism. It proclaimed, “International peace is a coward’s dream”. In the words of Mussolini, “Imperialism is the eternal and immutable law of life”. Abyssinia was annexed in 1936 after a most brutal warfare. He said, “Italian expansion is a matter of life and death. Italy must expand or perish.”

• The Fascists believed in a corporate state. They rejected the territorial representation and substituted in its place the principle of functional representation. There was a network of corporations covering agriculture, commerce, industry, credit, insurance and fine arts. There were also corporations of state employees, disabled soldiers and of universities and primary schools. The relations between the various corporations were regulated by the state. All laws were initiated by the Fascist party. The Chamber of Deputies could only discuss them but could not reject them.

• Fascism gave utmost regard to leaders who were worshipped as heroes or supermen. Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy were virtually worshipped and wide publicity was given to their photographs and greatness. It was maintained that Hitler was Germany and Germany was Hitter. Fascism was anti-revolutionary and anti-democratic. It resisted all changes and crushed all movements which stood for a change.

2.17 Domestic Policy

Mussolini, on assuming office demanded dictatorial powers for about a year to end disorder and violence in the country. He began to appoint his loyal supporters to key posts in the administration with a view to establishing virtual control over the administrative machinery. He then concentrated on establishing his supreme control over the legislature. He accomplished this task by getting the Acerbo election law passed by
parliament which provided that whichever party secured the largest
number of votes in the national election was to fill two-thirds of seats in
the Chamber of Deputies.

In the election of 1924 the Fascists gained a majority of votes mostly
by adopting terror tactics and thereby occupied two-thirds of seats in the
Chamber of Deputies. The opposition parties were cowed down and some
of its leaders were either kidnapped or murdered. The parliament became
a defunct body and the Fascists dominated the national scene. Again in
the 1929 elections the Fascist practically dominated the parliament.

As a next step towards establishing his control, the municipalities
in towns and cities were deprived of their local autonomy and podesters
were appointed to look after them. The press was censored and the
papers belonging to the opposition parties were totally suppressed:
Mussolini was held responsible to the king only. He administered the
country with assistance of a Grand Council consisting of the Fascists.
They occupied ministerial posts, drafted legislation, and discussed
national and international issues. All educational institutions were
brought under the state control. The text books prescribed, contained the
glorification of the state. Death penalty which had been earlier abolished
was reviewed to deal with the traitors. A secret police force came into
being under the direct control of the Fascist dictator. Thus in all respects
Italy became a totalitarian state.

The fascist rule in Italy brought about total transformation in
political, economic and social life of the country. Strict law and order was
maintained. Large-scale violence and strikes which bedeviled the country
were stopped. Fascism advocated six doctrines namely totalitarianism,
nationalism, idealism, authoritarianism, romanticism and militarism,
which were to regulate the life of the people.

An outstanding achievement of Mussolini’s domestic policy was the
concordat, which solved “the Roman question” the conflict between the
Catholic Church and the state, which Mussolini described as a “thorn in
the flesh”, began with the annexation of Rome by the ruling dynasty in
1870. All efforts to pacify the Pope for acquiring this city held by him did
not succeed. The relations between the two continued to deteriorate and
the Catholics loyal to the policy were naturally found lacking in their
loyalty to the state. Mussolini decided to end this conflict by offering
adequate compensation. Similarly, the Pope Pius XI was eager to end the
quarrel. Both of them signed a treaty-the Lateran Treaty in 1929 and
hence the problem seized.
The Lateran Treaty had three documents: a political treaty, a concordat, and a financial settlement. By the first, the Pope recognized the House of Savoy as the legitimate dynasty ruling over Italy and in return King Victor Emmanuel III recognized the Pope as a leader of the Vatican City and supreme pontiff of the Catholic Church. The second, the concordat defined the future relation between the kingdom of Italy and the papacy. Roman Catholic faith as recognized as the sole religion of the state. In consolidation faith the government the pope could appoint all his officials and church institutions were recognised.

The last agreement was mainly financial in character. A sum of 89,375,000 was paid in cash and another sum of $ 250,000 carrying 5 percent interests in the form of bonds was given to the pope to compensate him for the loss of Rome. After the Lateran Treaty, Mussolini declared, “the citizen is Catholic and the Catholic is a citizen”, to which Pope remarked “God has been restored to Italy and Italy has been restored to God”. Thus “the prisoner of the Vatican” was liberated. The Lateran accord removed a threat to the well-being of a Fascist state.

2.18 Mussolini’s Economic Policy

Mussolini was determined to eradicate the economic handicaps of the country. The essence of his economic policy was to bring about self-sufficiency of the state in all aspects. He launched the “Battle of the wheat” to bring along self-sufficiency in food production. He financed hydroelectric projects and encouraged merchant-marine. He introduced high tariffs to discourage imports and at the same time gave incentives to exports. Hundred of officials who were found redundant were retrenched. Higher dose of taxes was imposed on the rich. Strikes and lockouts were banned. These steps brought about sound economy and balanced budgets.

A variety of public works including repairing of ancient and historic monuments were undertaken, Marshy lands in the south were reclaimed and steps to prevent malaria were undertaken. Transport and communications in the country were improved.

The government also imposed control over business and labour. He established a ‘Corporate state’. All trade unions and employers were made a part of it. A law in 1926 recognised thirteen confederated syndicates (six of employees, six of employers and one of intellectuals). In 1930 Mussolini established a National Council of Corporation whose aim was to promote production, job facilities and settlement of disputes. Later, this council
was divided into seven sections each looked after one particular field of production, such as building construction, mining, textiles and so on. In course of time each section was transformed into a small corporation. Mussolini became the president of all corporations. He implemented a “Charter of Labour’, which guaranteed the workers’ job, granted them some benefits such as extra-payments of wages, discharge compensation and social insurance.

The domestic policy of Mussolini impressed many. Trains ran in time. There were no strikes and violence. Begging was stopped. Tourist industry flourished. Education was made compulsory for children. The Italian currency became stable and banking industry developed. Airplanes were manufactured indigenously. New cables were laid. However, the Great Economic Depression of 1929 seriously hampered the sound economy so carefully built by Mussolini and left millions of Italians unemployed. His government was unable to cope with the economic problems. It was in these circumstances that he tried to divert the attention of the people from the pressing problems at home to his adventures in foreign affairs.

2.19 Nazism in Germany (Rise of Hitler)

The circumstances under which Nazism arose in Germany were in many respects similar to those under which fascism had its origin in Italy although there were some striking differences.

Germany, situated in the heartland of Europe, had been a veritable centre of European trade and commerce. Vast natural resources, industrialization, prosperous agriculture and an industrious people contributed to the rise of Germany in Europe. Naturally in world politics Germany played a prominent role after its unification in 1871. The World War I ended disastrously for Germany. She was defeated which resulted in the loss of her overseas colonies and certain parts of Germany itself.

After the war, Kaiser William –II the German Emperor flew to Poland and a provisional government was established under the socialist leaders Friedrich Ebert & Philipp Scheidemann to manage the affairs of the state. The provisional government drafted a new constitution on February 6, 1919 known as the Weimar Constitution and Germany thereby became a Republic. But this seemed to be an imposed republic. From the very beginning it was unpopular with the people. It was a professor’s constitution, altogether academic and failing to take into account peculiar
German traditions and temperament. Hence it made the room for the totalitarian rise of Nazi Hitler.

Some critics of European politics view that the rise of Nazism and totalitarian Hitler was inherent in the cryptic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which was a dictated peace for Germany. Many of the terms were harsh and were calculated to reduce Germany to a second or third rate power in the international world. A heavy disarmament programme was laid down. The strength of the army was reduced to 1,00,000 volunteers with 4,000 officers and the normal strength was reduced to 15,000 men with 1500 officers. For years, her air force was forbidden.

Huge reparations were demanded from Germany which she would not pay. It is true that they were scaled down later, especially by the Dawes Plan and young Plan, and were finally repudiated altogether. But as long as the demand lasted it infuriated the people and made the young feel that for many years to come they were destined to be wage slaves of the Allies. The left bank of the river Rhine was demilitarized and severe restrictions was imposed on the possibility of Germany deserting herself in the military field. When Germany failed to make payments, France and Belgium invaded the Ruhr, the centre of German’s economic resources in 1923 and occupied it for some years.

To the misfortune of Germany she was deprived of her colonies and they were parcelled out among the allies in the form of mandated territories. A mandatory system was brought into existence according to which the victorious allies were called the mandatory powers and the defeated ones called the mandates. The former was to train the latter towards the path of self-government. But practically the victors proceeded to treat the Mandates as their colonial possessions.

The most important cause for the rise of Hitler was the economic collapse which let loose the force of anarchy and violence. The mark was depreciating fast and inflation came about. This meant the virtual wiping out of the professional classes. Middle classes were reduced to poverty. Unemployment was mounting up high with the number in 1932 reaching the peak figure of 6 millions. German heavy industries were dismembered by the new frontiers which completely altered the map of Central Europe, depriving Germany of part of her territory and distributing some of her nationals over foreign lands. Disillusioned and rebellious youth ran either to Communism or to Nazism seeking refuse either in a totalitarian state of Germany's inspiration or in that which the Russia revolution had conjured up.
When Germany was under this precarious condition, communism was making rapid headway and it looked as if Germany might fall a prey to the rapidly spreading communistic ideologies and methods. The Germans became very much apprehensive of communism and desired for a hero to save them from the clutches of communism. The Nazi party under Hitler promised them to solace since the Nazi movement was based on anti-Semitism and anti-communism. Hence the Nazi party got prominence and made its headway in German politics.

Moreover, various weak governments made the people frustrated and hence encouraged them to be a part of the field of Nazism. Between 1919 and 1933 there were 21 cabinet headed by Chancellors. There were innumerable parties working at cross purposes with each other, 38 having participated on the 1932 elections to the Reichstag. The Social Democrats who had a large following could have been the saviors of the country if they had been true to their professions and adopted a far reaching and constructive programme for the economic rehabilitation of the country. But in their fear of communism, they were afraid to take bold steps, and instead, compromised with the industrialists and the loaded aristocracy. According to John Strachey, it was the weakened and compromising policy of the Social Democrats which directly led to the rise of the Nazis to political power.

However, Hitler was the product as well as the Protagonists of circumstances. If situations were proportions for his emergence, he also timed the situations with unique acumen and steadfast statesmanship. An adept psychologist, a clever demagogue, a tireless worker and an able organizer, Hitler could sway the German nation by his fiery oratory and energy. Born on April 20, 1889 in Upper Austria, he was brought up the trends of Military training and during World War I he served merely as a soldier. Up to May 1919 he lived in Munich and in 1920. He resigned from the army and joined the German workers party which was subsequently known as the Nationalist Socialist Party.

In 1923 Hitler made a futile attempt to capture power by dint of force and he was arrested on the charge of treason. While he was in the Jail, he wrote the ‘Mein Kampf” or “My struggle” on which he outlined and distinct aims and objectives of Nazi Party. During the period, 1924 to 1929, the economic conditions were somehow good and trend in prince was checked. But towards 1930-31, the Great Economic Depression set in. Because of the radical programmes of the party it became popular. In the election of 1930 the Nazi party won 107 seats in the Reichstag and in the election of 1932, the Nazis won 232 seats out of 680 seats. Since no
party gained majority, President Hindenburg appointed Hitler as the Chancellor in 1933 and under his leadership a Coalition party was formed between the Nationalist Party and Socialist Party. Hitler was waiting for an opportunity to assume dictatorial power and he got it when some persons, suspected to be communists, set fire to the Reichstag. Finally the Reichstag delegated all powers to Hitler as the Chancellor and suspended individual liberty and freedom of press.

In the March election of 1933 the Nazi party won and the communists were arrested and killed. When Hindenburg died in 1934 Hitler took over the charge of the Presidency also with the self–styled title, Fuhrer. Even before the death of Hindenburg, Hitler had assumed dictatorial powers through Enabling Acts. With Hitler becoming Fuhrer in 1934 the Weimar Republic died a natural death and Nazism reigned supreme and became an undisputed political ideology in Germany for many years till 1945 when Hitler died.

2.20 Nazism as a concept

Nazism was not a well worked to theory of the state or government. It kept on changing or adjusting itself according to the exigencies of the situation. In many ways, it can be compared with Fascism. Not only did the personality of Hitler contribute a great deal towards its development, but also the writings of persons like Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Rosenberg and H.S. Chamberlain. The concept of Nazism may be enumerated as under:

- Nazism gave too much importance to the State. This was in keeping with the Hegelian tradition which had deified the state. According to the Nazis the state was a super human entity. The ‘Volk” or the community was the raw-material out of which the state was built.
- The Nazi party was the connecting link between the ‘Volk” and the State. It was with the help of that party that the Germans were united under a common leadership. The state gave its weighs of authority to the programme and activities of the Nazi party. It is no exaggeration to say that the State was the Nazi party, and the Nazi party was the state. No other party was tolerated within the country.
- Nazism did not believe in the democratic leadership. It believed in the leadership of one man. According to the Nazis, some were born to lead and the others were born to obey and follow. They believed Hitler as the head of the state, the government and the army. His word was law. He was a God. “He does not talk he orates; he does not discuss—he pronounces judgement; he does not walk—he strides.”
• The Nazis were the masters in the art of propaganda. The Nazi machine was able to control the Germans in every walk of life. Children, young men and women, industrialists and labourers were pressed into service to do the Nazi propaganda. The stage, cinema, the radio, the press, art, science, literature and schools were used to carry out Nazi propaganda. Nazi propaganda was introduced into every subject at school. Arithmetic was made a matter of estimating the size and destructive force of bombs, and religion became the worship of the Fuhrer.

• The Nazis condemned both the Protestant and the Catholic Church on account of their slave mentality and internationalism. According to Professor Bergmann, “The high priest of the new German paganism is Hitler himself. He is real Holy Ghost. Hitler is lonely, so is God. Hitler is like God. Hitler is new, greater, and a more powerful Jesus Christ.” The Churches in Germany were kept under the control of the state and any eroticism resulted in putting the critics in the concentration camp.

• The Nazis believed in the well-known saying Might is Right. They also preached and practiced the philosophy of the sword. They followed a policy of expansion and conquest. In spite of his professions of peace, Hitler embarked upon a career of conquest. The result was that the whole of Europe was brought under the hegemony of Germany.

• The Nazis believed in the purity of the Aryan blood. They considered the Aryans to be the master-builders of civilization and the other stocks to be inferior quality. Hence Nazism followed on anti-Jews policy. The Jews were held responsible for the miseries of the German nation. So great was the hatred against the Jews that thousands of them were put into concentration camps. Millions of them ran away from the country.

• According to the Nazis, the only function for women was to breed more pure Nordic Children (Nordic race responsible for great cultures of Greece and Rome in ancient times) and preserve the Nordic race. Mothers were to exhaust themselves in order to give life to children and fathers to fight on the battle–field in order to secure the future of their sons. There was no higher or finer privilege for a women that that of sending her children to war. Hitler wanted that in the education of women, emphasis must be paid primarily on physical development, then on spiritual values and early on mental development.

• The Nazis were put into confusion whether they would buy butter or guns with their money. They could not have both. The Germans
decided to have guns because the latter could give them better also. Outlining the Nazi policy in 1935 Goering said: “We had to make up our minds whether we would use our foreign exchange for metals or for other things. We could either buy butter or surrender our freedom or we could seek to win our freedom and give up our butter. We have decided in favour of force. The German people have decided that it is ready to make great sacrifices for a great purpose.”

- The Nazis were patriots out and out. They loved their country and hated all others. They were the enemies of internationalism. They opined that international ties were bound to lessen the intense patriotism and zeal of the Germans. Hence Hitler did not want to see Germany as a member of the League of Nations.
- The Nazist economic theory gave same emphasis on national unity and solidarity. General welfare was placed above private interests and a policy of autarcy aiming at the economic self-sufficiency of Germany was followed.

The state was to control both imports and exports. No money could be taken out of the Reich. Even fresh capital could not be secured without the permission of the government. Strikes and lockouts were forbidden. They labour courts were set up. The state took into its hands the duty of fixing the prices of the goods and the wages of the labourers. The whole economic system was controlled by the State.

### 2.21 Application of Nazism

The National Socialist German Workers Party, popularly known as the Nazi party began its political activities in 1919. When Hitler joined the party, it was a small group and within a short period it became a mass movement throughout Germany. In 1933 Hitler asked the Reichstag (Parliament) for dictatorial powers and got them and he was busy setting up of a totalitarian regime in Germany. The application of the Nazi rule was direct and severe or the people of Germany indirect yet paralyzing on Europe and the rest of the World.

The guiding principle of Hitler’s foreign policy was ‘divide and Conquer’. Strategy informed him to win confidence of any country first and destroy her afterwards. He saw no reason to honour international treaties and agreements and repudiated them all. To the Nazis, the League of Nations, disarmament, security and the policy of appeasement came in the way of progress of a Nation. In short, the German foreign policy was based on two objectives. 1) Acquisition of territories, 2) violation of
treaties, as the Treaty of Versailles proved to be blunder for Hitler for his territorial expansion.

Germany had begun war preparations since 1934, but its membership of the League of Nations (She joined the League in 1926) was an obstacle. Likewise it had no interest in disarmament, and quit the Disarmament Conference in 1933 and also withdrew from the League of Nations. All these aggressive designs of Hitler warned Europe of a great menace. But Germany did not wish to alarm its enemies. It therefore, adopted a policy of caution to give confidence to the European nations and prove to them its bonafide as a nation that believed in peace.

Nazism was greatly influenced by the teachings of Nietzsche, Hegel and Rosenberg. While Hegel gave the ideas of extreme militarism and narrow nationalism, Nietzsche’s nihilism rejected the western ideas of morality and dignity of men. This nihilism came out clearly in the terror and the murder of the innocents, the concentration camps and the gas chambers. Nationalism was the essence of Nazi process which manifested itself through the organized killings of millions of people.

The Nazi rule had a tremendous impact on the political, socio-economic and cultural life of the German people. Soon the Nazis came to power they acted quickly to bring about uniformity and confrontation to their rule political oppression was unleashed, denying the people of all civil and political liberties and freedoms. All political parties were banned, newspapers were either censored, Nazified or abolished. The press was largely controlled. Even the cinema and theatre were forced to toe the party line. All the labour unions were banned and in their place were set up the government sponsored labour fronts. The Nazis completely rejected Christianity and the Church since they were regarded as a deliberate Jewish plot to weaken the Vigor of the German race.

The Naziist influence in the sphere of education was no less a significant aspect. The Nazis wanted education to produce and shape the young minds into good Nazis. Schools were transformed into propaganda machines and school curriculum was rearranged to include subjects like race studies and genetics. Books either not liked or read by good Nazis were burnt publicly. Thus a total control was established over thinking, reading and writing of the people.

The economic life of the Germans had been greatly worsened due to reparations and economic depression. There was untold misery and unemployment. By 1931 around six million Germans roamed
unemployed. When Hitler came to power there was improvement in the economic situation. To establish control over the economy a series of four year plans were formulated and the industry was centralized in the hands of corporations such as Krupps, who were under the control of the Nazis. After 1935 Germany launched massive rearmament plan and was geared to war. Hence there started booming of heavy industries which provided ample employment opportunities to the Germans.

Since the Nazi party provided full employment facility, people wished to become the member of the Front organization of the Nazi party in exchange for full employment and social security. Similarly the salaried employees, the socially and economically important upper class of industrialist such as Krupp, the big land owners, all supported Nazism. The industrialists and big landowners rendered support to the Nazis because the latter promised the former the abolition of free labour unions which were the constant source of threat to the industrialists. Moreover, the industrialists had realized that remilitarization of Germany meant expansion of industry and expansion of industry meant the growth of more business and more profits.

However, the worst victims of the Nazi rule were the Jews who were alleged to have stabbed the nation in the back in 1918 and caused untold misery to the Germans. The Jews were the leaders in business and politics during the period of the Weimar Republic. Hitler substituted ‘Aryan’ for the ‘Nordic’ race. According to him the Aryans were the culture creators’ and the Jews ‘culture destroyers’. Hence he regarded the Jews as the enemies of Aryan supremacy and considered the Germans, the Dutch and the British as the Aryans.

A policy of systematic persecution of the Jews was followed. Professors of Jewish origin were dismissed form universities and books written by the non-Aryans were removed from the libraries. A Jew or a person married to a Jew was not permitted to hold government office and by the Nuremberg Laws the Jews were denied the German citizenship. The worst manifestation of Hitler’s anti-Semitism was the concentration camps and the gas chambers to which millions of innocent Jews-children, men and women were sent. At Auschwitz in Poland millions of Jen’s were sent to the gas chambers to be stifled to death. Hitler had thus decided to exterminate the Jews from the face of the earth.

During 1940-44 the entire European continent was under the control of Hitler and the people of Eastern Europe provided the slave
labour to the Germans. Hitler’s hatred for the Polish people was so much that he had said that they deserved only one master, the Germans.

The application of Nazism was not limited to Germany only. The expansionist, militarist policy of Hitler had led to military conscription in 1935, militarization of Rhineland in 1936, annexation of Austria in 1938, of Czechoslovakia in 1939, and the beginning of the Second World War with the invasion of Poland in September, 1939. France was vanquished in 1940. The Nazis while in possession of large parts of Europe attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941 and declared war on the United States in December, 1941.

The Second World War ended cynically for Germany with the defeat and suicide of Hitler in 1945. Though Hitler died his sinister ideas advocated by him reappeared in parts of the world. The apartheid in South Africa and racial discrimination against the American Negroes were all manifestations of the Nazi concept of racial superiority.

2.22 Modernization of Turkey

Of all the vanquished powers in the World War I, Turkey was described as the much thoroughly conquered. The reason was that not only her provinces but also her capital were under the occupation of the Allied Powers and moreover, most of her provinces had already been distributed among the Allies by means of secret covenants. In the pre-First World War era, Turkey, otherwise known as the ‘Sickman of Europe’ had been a cynosure of the European powers. Turkey had joined the war to safeguard herself from the clap-trap of the imperialists. But to her disillusionment, she was defeated in the war and signed the treaty of Sevres on august 10, 1920, which was harsher than that of Versailles. This treaty aimed at paralyzing turkey in all aspects to the satisfaction of the allies. But it was Mustafa Kemal Pasha who played a dynamic role of a few philosopher and guide for Turkey, saved its prestige and placed it before the world states as a respected country.

2.23 Domestic Policy of Mustafa Kemal Pasha

Turkey had been greatly influenced by the Arab-Asiatic impact and this had turned her society into a stagnant and prejudiced one. Kemal Pasha, then the leader of the ‘Young Turk Movement’ wanted to bring about sea-changes to the socio-economic and political framework on the pattern of western civilization and modernisation because he had a great admiration and obsession for the western civilization and culture. Thus he
could be able to bring Turkey from the blind alleys of medievalism to a ‘Nationalist Revolution’ of modernity.

The Young Turk Movement started during 1910 and 1911 aimed at the modernization of Turkey. But this movement was constantly threatened by the European powers and therefore, could not snowball into a real movement. The Balkan wars, the First World War and the Italian war, all handicapped the Young Turk Movement. Moreover, the Treaty of Sevres relegated Turkey to the status of a corpse. Kemal Pasha was deaf against this Pact.

In the mean time, the Treaty of Lausanne was signed between Turkey and other allied powers on July 24, 1923 after which a coup was staged in Turkey. This coup overthrew the Sultan of Turkey and Abdul Majid, the cousin of the ex-Sultan became the new Sultan whom the Assembly declared to be the Caliph.

In October 1923, the Assembly voted for the dissolution of the Cabinet and declared Turkey as a Republic. Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected as the new President and a new constitution was drafted in 1924 along the background of the British constitution. The term of Grand National Assembly (Turkey’s Parliament) was fixed for four years. The members of the parliament were elected by universal suffrage. Kemal Pasha selected a Prime Minister who appointed his Cabinet. Then he introduced a number of reforms which transformed Turkey from the medieval orthodoxy to the trends of modernism. This was known as the ‘Nationalist Movement’.

Article 1 of the Constitution declared Turkey a Republic and abolished the title of Sultan and the institution of the Caliph. Thus the Sultanate was abolished on November 1, 1922 and that of the Caliphate in March 1924. The second watchword of Kemal was secularism. As a product of modern teachings, he knew very well that since the time Machiavelli wrote “The Prince” and separated religion from politics, the world came at the threshold of modern age. Kemal was determined to separate religion from politics and introduce secularism. His main targets of attack and criticism were the old institutions and in this direction the first step he undertook was the abolition of the caliphate in 1924 which paved the way for a radical secularism. Langsam says, “The abolition of the caliphate had a wide significance because by depriving themselves of Caliph, the Turks at the same time deprived most Mohammedans of a spiritual leader”.
The Constitution of 1924 still recognized Mohammedanism as the state religion. But a change came in 1928 when the constitution was amended. With this amendment the Grand National Assembly unanimously deleted from the constitution the article which declared Islam to be the state religion. Henceforth, Islam was tolerated like other religions. The officials no longer swore by the name of the Allah, but by the name of the republic. Minor religious changes were also introduced. It was no longer necessary to remove one’s shoes prior to entering a mosque. Many of the mosques received pews and music was permitted at services.

Another important landmark in the domestic policy of Kemal Pasha was the changing status of women class. In 1925 laws were passed which abolished the legal polygamy, required the registration of marriages and gave the President the power to grant divorces. Formerly, a Turk could divorce his wife by repeating three times the words “I divorce you”, but now the women were given marriage rights similar to that of women in western countries. Thus women were no more treated as commercial merchandise or a marketable commodity, but they got a place of equality in the society. This testified the setting up of an egalitarian society.

In 1926 civil marriages were made obligatory, the wearing of veil was made optional and western clothing was introduced. The doors of education and various professions were also opened up for women. Various women’s clubs and societies sprang up and even the appointments of women to the rank of judges were allowed. Municipal offices were also extended for women to contest. In 1934 the constitution was amended to allow women to vote in national elections and became parliamentary delegates. The first ever Turkish lady to receive the university degree was Halide Edib, a distinguished writer and a novelist too.

Besides, the Turkish Judicial System was not left unturned. The old Law Code or the Shariat was abandoned. The parliament adopted new social, penal and commercial codes based on the western models and thus, equality in law (populism) prevailed. The new penal code, borrowing a lot from Switzerland, Germany and Italy was adopted. Article 69 of the constitution abandoned privileges and made all classes, ranks and groups equal in the eyes of law. This equality became the bedrock of Turkish Republican Democracy.

Another important area of Mustafa’s reform was the free and universal system of education. Compulsory universal education was provided to the children from the age seven to sixteen. By 1932 the
percentage of illiteracy decreased from 85 to 42. The Gregorian calendar and the twenty-four clock were adopted. In 1923 law was passed providing for the introduction of the Latin Alphabets over a period of fifteen years. Newspapers were ordered to abandon the old Arabic typing and publication of books printed of Arabic characters was forbidden. An official dictionary was published in 1929 containing only words Turkish in origin. The Metric system was made compulsory to follow.

The government also published new “ABC” books. All the government officials, heads of banking institutions and business houses were ordered to attend special schools for several hours a day. Students were asked to study new “ABC” books. Each school was required to have primary standard. Secondary schools were established in towns, and two universities, one at Istanbul and other at Ankara were established. Technical and industrial schools were set up. Severe restrictions were placed in the teachings of schools and as a symbol of intellectual liberation, the wearing of cap or turban was prohibited. The government and the radio stations were used to encourage all these teachings. Mustafa Kemal accepted the title suggested to him by the Assembly, namely ‘Ataturk’ or the ‘Father of the Turks’.

Kemal desired to develop economic resources and inaugurated an era of industrialization without too much foreign influence. During the days of the Sultan, relatively few Turks concerned themselves with trade, commerce and industry. The masses when not in military services, generally labored in the fields. Now the government successfully balanced the budget and carried the era of reforms without the aid of the foreign influence. The state established monopolies on industries of tobacco, salt, liquor, matches, playing cards, arms and ammunitions.

The capital of Turkey was transferred from Constantinople to Ankara. A Central Labour Office was set up at Ankara with its branches in provincial towns which administered the labour laws. Public help and social security measures were introduced. State departments were erected to study agriculture, commerce, shipping and industry. The government subsidized agriculture by the free grant of cattle, ploughs and houses to deserving families.

In 1929 the National Assembly voted a public work programme to extend over twelve years and to include works on railways, ports and irrigation. Engineers were appointed to complete the works. Kemal Pasha introduced the protective tariff system which stimulated the indigenous industries for better production. In 1934 the government adopted several
plans- a four-year plan for agriculture, a five-year plan for industry, a three-year plan for mining and a ten-year plan for roads. He also took the initiative to connect his capital city with sea by mail, tried to annihilate the mosquitoes in surrounding swamps, instituted reforms in sanitation, roads and police protection. The city was beautified; the movie houses and the recreational centres were kept disciplined.

Another milestone of Kemal’s domestic policy was the programme of nationalism which raised the slogan of “Turkey for Turks” and “Turks for Turkey” which cemented the Turkish sense of nationalism. All the Turks were infused a sense of patriotism the introduction of Latin Alphabets and the glorification of their race enhanced the spirit of nationalism. All the great men were claimed to be Turks during the period. Since the Turkish word “Adam” stood for man and since “Adam” was the traditional first man, it was popularly said that “Adam” was Turkish and so all mankind was Turkish. This generated more dynamic national feelings.

To conclude, the main target of Kemal’s domestic policy was to bring about regeneration in the Turkish society and to modernize it on the pattern of western civilization. Without his sincere efforts and endeavours the modern Turkey might have become an insignificant desert in the Middle East. In this context, he can be compared with Czar Alexander II of Russia who had uplifted Russia from the sheer medievalism to the threshold of western influence. The critics of Kemal Pasha condemned him as a dictator or a tyrant. None the less, his strong sense of nationalistic upsurge and his remarkable reforms on the domestic front set new chapters in the history of Turkey.

2.24 Foreign Policy of Kemal Pasha

After the World War I, the Treaty of Sevres was signed between Turkey and the Allies. The state of Hedjaz was made free and kept under the suzerainty of Great Britain. Mesopotamia, Palestine and Iraq were to be given to Great Britain under the mandate system. Syria, Lebanon and Galicia were put under the French protection. Italy got Southern Anatolia. Adrianople, Gallipoli, the islands of Ambrose and Tenedos, Smyrna and the Dodecanese islands were given to Greece. Besides, Turkey also agreed to pay huge war indemnity.

The Treaty of Sevres was taken to be a humiliating treaty by the people of Turkey and hence they revolted under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. War broke out between Greece and Turkey. Ultimately, peace was restored by the Treaty of Lausanne signed on 24 July 1923. It
extended the border of the Turkey to the Eastern Thrace upto Maritsa River including Adrianople. The islands of Ambrose, Tenedos and the Rabbit were given back to Turkey. Smyrna was restored to Turkey. The boundary with Iraq was left to be settled in future. Mosul was to remain with Great Britain. The Dardanelles and the Bosporus were internationalized. The straits zone was opened to all nations in times of peace. By a separate convention, Greece and Turkey accepted the compulsory exchange of population.

The aim of the foreign policy of Turkey was to solve the problems left unsolved by the Treaty of Lausanne. Turkey found in the Soviet Union a warm friend. The latter supported turkey at the Lausanne Conference. A treaty of friendship and neutrality was signed between Russia and Turkey in 1925 by which both promised to help each other at the time aggression by a third party. Towards 1934-35 the relations of Turkey with Russia gradually cooled down since Kemal Pasha did not like the Russian communistic propaganda and on the other hand Russia also did not like Turkey to undergo westernization. Turkey was much perturbed when Russia signed the non-aggression pact with Germany in 1939. In order to maintain the balance of power in the Balkan Peninsula, Turkey proposed a treaty with Russia which the latter turned down. When the World War II broke out and Hitler attacked Russia, Turkey maintained neutrality.

The relations of Turkey with the western powers also underwent certain change. In the First World War Turkey was in the opposite camp of the Allies and after the war, the Allies wanted to ruin the fortune of Turkey. The Treaty of Sevres bears ample testimony to it. However, Turkey’s relations with Great Britain began to change. On June 5, 1926 a treaty was signed between Turkey and Britain which settled the Mosul question. Turkey agreed to relinquish her claims to Mosul in return for promise that ten percentage of Mosul’s oil production could be available for her use. This treaty resulted in the improvement of the Anglo-Turkish relations. In 1929 a part of British Mediterranean fleet paid a courtesy visit to Istanbul by which the former hostility ended and a good future of friendship and cooperation started growing.

In 1930, the Greek-Turkish Treaty was concluded at Ankara which settled the property claims, exchanged population and many other controversial questions. The two countries accepted the principles of naval equality in the eastern Mediterranean. Turkey entered into the League of Nations on July 18, 1932 which conformed to her peaceful institutions and objectives.
Despite these arrangements the problem lingered. In July 1938, France and Turkey reached an agreement whereby it was decided that the future status of Alexandretta could be determined by a general election. The election gave the Turks a majority of 32 out of 46 in the Assembly of Alexandretta and proclaimed the autonomy under the name of the republic “Hatex”. Then the republic hoisted the Turkish flag and sent a delegation to Ankara asking for the union with the mother country. Finally, Alexandretta was united with Turkey in 1938. France gave her consent to this union in a non-aggression pact signed between herself and Turkey in June 1939. By this act the last remaining act of revenge of Turkey against the west was eliminated and the road was made through for closer cooperation.

Turkey too played a significant role in the Middle East and the Balkan regions. In the meantime, the principle of Pan-Islamism was abandoned in these regions which made Turkey easier to lead the nationalist movement in the Middle East. In 1922, Turkey and Afghanistan entered into a treaty of friendship in Moscow and agreed to help each other against the attack of imperial powers. By this treaty Turkey got recognition as the natural leader of the nationalist movements for independence in Western Asia. In the same year, a Triple Alliance was concluded among Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan. In 1926, the treaty of friendship and security was signed between Turkey and Prussia.

The chief aim of Turkey’s foreign policy after 1933 was to ensure the regional security of the Middle East. For that purpose Turkey concluded the Sadaabad Pact with Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan in 1937. The last Balkan Conference was convened at Ankara in 1929 and taking this opportunity Turkey improved her relations with Rumania and Yugoslavia. In 1934, the Balkan Pact was concluded by Turkey’s efforts and with it, the collective security system of the Balkan region came into being. The treaty with Greece marked the beginning of an active Turkish policy in the Balkans. Turkey started opposing the ambition of Mussolini in the east, and in 1934 she became a party to the Balkan Entente Pact which united Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania and herself with a mutual guarantee of peace, independence and territorial integrity.

Turkey had a fear of Fascist regime. Italy’s imperialistic ambitions and the invasion of Abyssinia under Mussolini coupled with Hitler’s rearment of Germany and the remilitarization of Rhineland kept the European powers at stake. So, Turkey focused her attention towards the amity of France and Britain which the latter responded with perfect reciprocity since they also needed Turkey’s cooperation to counter both
Mussolini and Hitler. Being aware of this fact, Turkey was in a position to bargain with Great Britain and France to settle the unsolved problems, the problem of the straits and Alexandretta.

The straits question was solved to Turkey’s satisfaction by the Montreux Convention signed in 1936 by which Turkey was given the right to fortify the straits. Turkey regained military control of this strategic waterway and strengthened her position in the Mediterranean and Black Sea region.

The problem of Alexandretta was a dispute between France and Turkey. But this problem proved to be more complicated with the involvement of Syria as a third party. In 1936 a treaty was concluded between France and Prussia which promised Syria of her independence including Alexandretta. This made the question more acute and puzzling. Turkey referred the question to the League Council. The Council in May, 1937 brought about a special statute calling for de-militarization, autonomy and special guarantees for the Turkish population settled in Alexandretta.

The Ethiopian adventure of Italy and conclusion of Russo-German non-aggression pact brought Turkey closer to Britain and France. Throughout the initial years of the war, Turkey followed the policy of neutrality but ultimately they supported the Allied powers and declared war on the Axis powers on February 23, 1946, i.e. only a few days before the surrender of the Germans.

2.25 Let Us Sum Up

From the above discussion we came to know that by 1932 both the reparation and the payment arrangement of the inter-allied war debts had been buried. Both the Dawes and the Young Plans proposed and worked by U.S.A. did not work up to the levels desired. By 1930 the world was engulfed with a terrible economic depression and Germany got severely victimized by it. It stood on the path of collapse. Rise of Nazism to power in Germany under Hitler brought about a scrapping of the reparation plan which ultimately imbalanced many of the European states’ economy. Italy under Mussolini too stood beside Germany to see her challenging the western powers with Japan and Spain as their allies.

The New Deal developed by the American president Roosevelt focused on the principles of 4 R’s - Relief, Recovery, Reform and Roosevelt. This was three dimensional in nature catering to the economic principles
of relief, recovery and reform. His government brought about measures to control over the national economy through the federacy. It aimed at consolidating the foundations of capitalism and undermining the class struggle of the workers. It could not play a determinant role in pulling the USA out of the crisis. Roosevelt began his activity at the same time as the world economic crisis came to an end. It succeeded substantially but not wholly or totally.

Russia moved on the path of progress under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin after socialism was restored. Lenin made efforts to build the communist party, established several cadres, and controlled the political and economic institutions of the country. To a great extent the success of Lenin’s early economic reforms depended upon the policies of terrorization. His early radical reforms could not be successful partly due to mismanagement and partly due to the non-cooperation of millions of peasants. It was expected that the country’s economy would be managed well after the redistribution of lands, nationalization of industries and resources, and efficient distribution of manufactured goods. None of these took place. As a result of the NEP, and the break-up of the landed estates while the Communist Party was strengthening power between 1917 and 1921, the Soviet Union became the world’s greatest producer of grain.

Turkey too witnessed unprecedented progress in her socio-religious, economic and political milieu once its ‘Ataturk’ (father of modern Turkey) came to power. The Young Turk Movement started during 1910 and 1911 aimed at the modernization of Turkey. The main target of Kemal’s domestic policy was to bring about regeneration in the Turkish society and to modernize it on the pattern of western civilization. He could be able to bring Turkey from the blind alleys of medievalism to a ‘Nationalist Revolution’ of modernity. His strong sense of nationalistic upsurge and his remarkable reforms on the domestic front and his farsightedness in carving out an effective foreign policy set new chapters in the history of Turkey.
2.26 Key Words

Acerbo Law: The Acerbo Law was an Italian electoral law proposed by Baron Giacomo Acerbo and passed by the Italian Parliament in November 1923.

Bolshevik: A majority wing of the Russian Social Democratic Workers’ Party led by Vladimir Lenin.

Borse: The Stock Exchange of Berlin.

Bourgeoisie: Members of the middle class.

Cheka: Soviet Secret Police Agency which enjoyed unlimited authority to arrest and shoot at its discretion suspected counterrevolutionaries during the Bolshevik Revolution.

Deficit Financing: Practice in which a government spends more money than it receives as revenue, the difference being made up by borrowing or minting new funds.

Duma: The Russian Parliament.

Fabianism: A milder and markedly centralist version of socialism which emerged in Britain.

Komsomol: Soviet Youth Organisation.

Kronshtadt Rebellion: Kronshtadt is a naval port in the Leningrad region of northwestern Russia. In March 1921, in the so-called Kronshtadt Rebellion, Kronshtadt sailors revolted against the Soviet government from this naval base.

Meshevik: A minority non-Leninist wing of the Russian Social Democratic Workers’ Party led by L. Martov.

Moratorium: A legally authorized period of delay in the performance of a legal obligation or the payment of a debt.

Orgburo: The Organisational Bureau of the Bolshevik Party.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittance:</td>
<td>A small portion, amount, or allowance; also a meagre wage or remuneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proletariat:</td>
<td>The labouring classes particularly the industrial workers who lack their own means of production and hence sell their labour as a means to live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalisation:</td>
<td>To bring into accord with reason or cause something to seem reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Deal:</td>
<td>Principle of the U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt (1901–09) of his personal approach to then prevalent social problems and the individual. It embraced Roosevelt's idealistic view of labour, citizenship, parenthood, and Christian ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariffs:</td>
<td>A schedule of duties imposed by a government on imported or in some countries exported goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalitarianism:</td>
<td>The political concept that the citizen should be totally subject to an absolute state authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street:</td>
<td>The Stock Exchange of USA situated in New York City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Communism:</td>
<td>Economic policy applied by the Bolsheviks during the period of the Russian Civil War (1918–20). More exactly, the policy of War Communism lasted from June 1918 to March 1921.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemstvos:</td>
<td>Organ of rural self-government in the Russian Empire established in 1864 and dominated by the nobility. Got abolished after Bolshevik Party coming to power in 1917.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.0 Objectives

This Unit covers a wide discussion from the issues of rise of nationalism in some of the nations to foreign policies of some of the bigger nations of the world that rose to prominence and subsequently played a major role in determining the international politics during the interwar period. After going through this Unit you will be able to learn:

- how there was the rise of nationalism in Indo-China and Indonesia against the French and Dutch hegemony respectively and how all these countries got themselves free from the yoke of foreign rule after setting a consistent freedom struggle;
- about the problem of Palestine and its struggle against Israel for an independent status of its own;
- how the freedom struggle in Egypt gained currency against the colonial administration of England and how it could see its independence under the leadership of Nahas Pasha of the Wafd Party; and
- about the foreign policies of the USA, USSR, UK, France and Germany developed during the interwar period.

3.1 Introduction

The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China was almost entirely confined to the Vietnamese. They had a tradition of nationalism dating from their long struggle for independence against China. Their civilization remained predominantly Chinese in character after independence. The writings of Montesquieu and Rousseau bred in them feelings of nationalism and had long run impact on them germinating within them a sense of protest as well as oneness.

Indonesian nationalism in the 20th century was almost different from earlier movements of protest; the Padri War, the Java war, and the many smaller examples of sporadic agrarian unrests. By contrast, the nationalism of the 20th century was the product of the new imperialism and was part of the wider currents of unrest affecting many parts of Asia and Africa. In Indonesia nationalism was concerned not merely with resistance to Dutch rule but with new perceptions of nationhood, embracing the ethnic diversity of the archipelago and looking to the restructuring of traditional patterns of authority under Indonesia as a modern state.
The problem of Palestine was centre to the Arab-Israel conflict which disturbed the peace in the Middle East for a long time. It still holds one of the greater issues before the world settle the cause of the Palestinians against the Jews of Israel. It has been a battle between the Zionists and the Palestinians for the possession of the same territory. To the Zionists, it is the question of Israel while to the Arabs, it is the question of Palestine. Some scholars have tried to project this clash as a clash between theocratic politics and indigenous nations; between the Jews representing the racial unity and the Arabs representing the secular and nationalistic ideal.

Egypt with the Suez Canal running through it constitutes the nerve-centre of the British politics. The principle of self-determination proclaimed by President Wilson exercised profound influence on the young Egyptians. They therefore started an agitation for independence under the leadership of Saad Pasha Zaghlul. At the close of the war Egypt was full of discontent due to the bad treatment of the British Army officers and civil officials who regarded Egypt as a British colony. Origin of the Wafd Party and its subsequent struggle against the British hegemony became instrumental in giving the Egyptian Freedom Struggle a definite colour and shape. Hence, Egypt moved on the path of independence.

The foreign policy of USA during the interwar period had a new orientation which included some new principles like pacifism, anti-imperialism, and isolationism from European affairs, disarmament and opposition to mandate system of the League of Nations. Her foreign policy differed from region to region. While she was isolationistic towards European countries, was cooperative towards the Far East and Asia and dominating towards Latin American and Caribbean countries which openly declared a three-dimensional foreign policy based on adaptability and variability.

The foreign policy of Soviet Russia, like that of any other country, has been aiming at the enhancement of the security and welfare of the state. It has to a great extent been determined by the country’s location, climate, historic traditions, ideology as well as the relative strength of the other centres of powers.

The foreign policy of Great Britain in the inter war period was largely influenced by the principles of the protection of commercial communities and colonial empire, maintenance of European peace and order, maintenance of naval supremacy, avoidance of war and above all,
belief in the democracy and in the internationalism of the League of Nations.

One of the important and persistent single factor which determined the foreign policy of France in the inter war period was ‘search for security’. Despite being a victorious power in the First World War, she had a constant fear of aggression from her border state, Germany on which she pegged huge reparation for the war-led losses done to her.

The German diplomacy during this period after getting economically ruined had been her desire to step into the family of nations. This goal was urgent as a protective measure for the weakened state and necessary for the revival of trade. While some German statesmen preferring to look eastward advocated alliance with the Bolsheviks and defiance of the treaty restrictions, some other preferring westward proposed the fulfillment of treaty obligations and reconciliation with the former enemies. In foreign policy Hitler pursued the same technique which had given him so large a success in internal affairs. ‘Reliance on force and the rejection of compromise’ became the keystone of his attitude towards the world.

3.2 Rise of Nationalism in Indo–China

The Indo-china region comprises three countries Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos. The geography of this region bears closely to its past and present. It is a region where China touches the ‘Indies’. Reaching Vietnam from the West makes one feel that one has arrived already in the Chinese world. And arrival from the East makes one feel as of having already left China. There are areas with low-lying water-lands and rich soil. Some of the region is mountainous and infested with wooded plateau areas. There is a vast terrain favourable to guerilla war.

The climate of the region depends on the monsoons which emanate from the pressure changes over the Asian land mass between summer and winter. North-eastern winds blow from November to March bringing relatively cooler air. During May to September there is a moist climate. So under the nature of conflict, its origin and consequences developed and gained momentum.

3.3 Historical Background

Let us discuss the historical background of this region country wise.
3.3.1 Vietnam

Vietnam extends roughly 1,000 miles along the eastern side of an Indo-China peninsula between the deltas of Red River and Mekong. In the east is the Gulf of Tonkin and the South China Sea; in the west the mountains of Annahute Chain separate it from Kampuchea and Laos. It has also a long border with the People’s Republic of China. The population of Vietnam comprises mixed ethnic groups of highland tribes, Chinese, Kampuchean and other non-Vietnamese communities. Majority of the people are Buddhists and Taoists. 54

The three historic regions of Vietnam – Tonkin, Annam and Cochin–China came under the French control between 1862 and 1884 and were lately annexed to Kampuchea and Laos to form the French ruled Indo-Chinese Union, more frequently called French Indo-China. During the Second World War when Japanese occupied the Indo-China, Vietnam was established on September 2, 1945 under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. The state came to be known as the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

3.3.2 Kampuchea

Kampuchea, formerly known as Cambodia, is the smallest state in Indo-China peninsula. It shares border with Thailand on the west and northwest, Laos on the north and Vietnam on the east and southeast. Eighty-five percent of its population constitutes Khmers (Cambodians). Various ethnic minorities of Kampuchea include Chinese, Cheem-Malays, Khmer Lachs (the locals) and the Vietnamese etc.

The State of Kampuchea was established as a French protectorate in 1863 at the request of King Ang Duong. In early 1940s, Japanese were in control of it. Following the Japanese surrender after World War II, Cambodia was recognized as an autonomous kingdom within the French Union. Norodom Sihanouk emerged as the king of the state. Sihanouk had been negotiating with the French to get independence for Cambodia, which was formally announced on November 9, 1953. The Geneva Agreement of 1954 reinforced it and called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cambodia.

3.3.3 Laos

Laos is a landlocked country between Vietnam and Thailand sharing its borders with Burma, Kampuchea and China. It is largely a mountainous country scattered with dense forest. The demographic
composition of Laos comprises four major groups – Lao-Lun, Lao-Theung, Lao-Tai and Lao-Soung.

In 1893, Laos became a French protectorate. On June 19, 1949 it was accorded the status of a limited self government in the form of an associated state within the French Union. On October 23, 1953, the French recognized the full sovereignty of Laos. With the signing of Geneva Accords in 1954 the French completely withdrew from the scene by December, 1954.

3.4 Factors Contributing to the Rise of Nationalism

Several factors worked together for the rise of nationalism in Indo-China. Nationalism got a wider shape and dimension in Vietnam in comparison to Laos and Cambodia. And the Nationalist movement in Indo-China was almost entirely confined to the Vietnamese. They were the most numerous of all the peoples of the area, and by 1945 constituted about 75 percent of a population roughly estimated at 25 millions. Factors contributing to the rise of nationalism in Indo-China are discussed below.

3.4.1 System of French Administration

Indo-China had the neat hierarchy of French colonial administration modeled on the Napoleonic pattern which was largely the work of Paul Doumer who held the office of the Governor General from 1897 to 1902. He unified the corps of civilian services, reconstituted the administration of Tonkin, and organized the government of the newly acquired Laos territories in 1893. In Tonkin he wiped out last vestiges of autonomy by abolishing the offices of viceroy, and transforming what was theoretically a protectorate into what became for all practical purposes a directly administered colony. The Laos territories became an autonomous protectorate under a ‘Resident Superior’ responsible to the Governor General.

Two of Doumer’s pre-war successors strove to liberalize the administration by native collaboration. Paul Beau (1902-7) re-established the offices of viceroy, abolished by Doumer in Tonkin and set up on an indigenous consultative chamber there. He also created provincial councils and schools for the training of native officials. Albert Sarraut (1911-14) went further in the same direction by introducing the method of association, whereby more natives were recruited into the subordinate services and public instruction was reorganized so as to increase the supply of native candidates for government service and improve its
quality. He also established further Consultative Chambers of Natives in the protectorates similar to the Tonkin one. But the rigid structure built by Doumer survived all attempts to check excessive centralization. In any case colonial self-government was never the aim of French policy; assimilation rather than association was its keynote.

Theoretically, the Governor-General had quasi-absolute powers; but he was under the close supervision of the Directorate of Control in the ministry of colonies, which periodically sent out Inspectors of colonies to investigate his administration. And as he was not a professional colonial administrator but usually a politician unacquainted with the internal problems of the territories he was called upon to govern, his function was to pass on the dictates of his superiors to the experienced permanent officials who served under him.

The Governor-General was assisted by a Grand Council of Economic and Financial interests. This was composed of high-ranking French and Indo-Chinese officials together with representatives of the colonial council of Cochin, China and of the Chambers of Commerce and Agriculture. It was a purely advisory body and could only deal with matters brought before it by the Governor-General; but the general budget of the colony and those of its various divisions had to be submitted to it. The bulk of the legislation for Indo-China was enacted by the French parliament or took the form of decrees issued by the ministry of colonies.

Technically Cochin-China was the only one of the five divisions to rank as a colony and to be under direct control. Annam, Cambodia, Laos and Tonkin were all protectorates. Cochin-China's government was in the hands of a Governor, assisted by a Privy Council and a Colonial Council; the former took after an Executive Council and the latter to a Legislative Council in a British colony. The colony of Cochin-China was divided into major districts named provinces with a French administrative officer at the head of each. Notwithstanding the policy of association enunciated by Albert Sarraut, the percentage of native subordinate officials in the French service was much lower than in the case of the Dutch and British regimes in South-East Asia. In Burma, for instance while in 1900 Europeans occupied nearly all the posts in the 'covenanted' civil service, the vast majority of the administrative posts were outside this in the provincial services, and with a very few exceptions were filled by Burmese or Indians. After the introduction of diarchy in 1923, Burmese and Indians were recruited in increasing numbers into the highest grade of the administrative and police services.
In Annam, Cambodia and Laos the kings and their courts, together with their hierarchy of mandarins, continued to exist alongside the French administration. The real control, however, in each protectorate was in the hands of a 'Resident Superior', assisted by a Privy Council and a Protectorate Council with composition and powers similar to those of their counterparts in Cochin-China. Each protectorate was divided into provinces under residents, who were Frenchmen. In a protectorate however, the exercise of power was less direct than in Cochin-China. The actual administration was carried out by the native officials under the guidance of their French opposite numbers, who never intervened directly unless it became absolutely necessary. The mandarins therefore were in no sense figureheads, but French control was absolute. The system was not unlike the Dutch method of indirect rule in Indonesia. But in both cases the distinction between direct and indirect rule in Indonesia was a legal rather than a practical one.

The facade of native administration was imposing; it was also useful in making foreign rule somewhat less unpalatable. The Consultative Native Assembly, which assisted the Resident Superior, is an excellent example of the system of camouflage used by the French. Most of its members were elected but by a narrow group of officials and others of trusted loyalty. Even then it could not debate political subjects, while on other matters it could express its views only if the Resident Superior agreed to a debate. So far the budget estimates of the protectorate were concerned, they were laid before the Consultative Native Assembly, but merely as a matter of form.

So, the system of administration introduced by the French in Indo-China, somewhere centralized, somewhere liberal and somewhere imposing, dissatisfied the Indo-Chinese and they had been urging a cessation of the existing administrative order. This kind of dissatisfaction finally snowballed into a protest against the ruling government and ultimately found its culmination in the form of nationalism.

### 3.4.2 French Educational Policy

In Cochin-China the chief aim of French educational policy was at first simply to train interpreters. Franco-vernacular schools were accordingly opened in the larger centres. When it was found that they were channels to promotion, the sons of notables flocked to them. A scheme drawn up in 1879 to promote the official policy of assimilation provided for secular elementary schools to be established in every village and canton; but it made little progress, while left to them the village
schools of the traditional type were gradually disappearing and leaving an unfilled gap. In the protectorates the native systems continued to function and western education made very slow progress. A few Franco-vernacular schools were established at provincial capitals for training native subordinates; their standards were very low. As in the case of the other colonial territories in South-East Asia, Vietnamese nationalism seems to have been the special product of the Franco-Vernacular schools. In 1990 it was complained that in Cochin-China the curves of crime and of European education rose concurrently.

Paul Beau founded the modern educational system by creating in 1906 a council to reorganize public instruction. It was to be based on the village elementary school reaching literacy by the use of either Chinese Characters or the system of Romanization invented by Catholic missionaries in the 17th century. The best pupils were to go to Franco-vernacular primary and secondary schools; the rest might proceed to a primary vernacular school at the headquarters of the canton, where French was optional, or in a few cases to a secondary vernacular school. This system was introduced first into Annam and Tonkin, and later, in 1909-10, into Cochin-China. But by 1913 there were only 12,103 pupils in the government primary schools; in Annam and Tonkin private education was preferred. In Cambodia and Laos the monastic schools remained the sole purveyors of elementary education.

All these schools proved to be cynosure for spreading nationalism in Vietnam.

3.4.3 Cultural Assimilation

Cultural assimilation became another potent factor for the rise of nationalism in Indo-China. It became still more the aim of French policy during the First World War. In 1915 the traditional competitive examinations for the Mandarinate in Tonkin were abolished. Sarraut, during his second term of office (1917-19), followed this up by introducing a scheme under which the state was to take all primary instruction and make the study of French universal. This project, however, proved too expensive and had to be abandoned. Hence the division into vernacular and Franco-vernacular schools was restored in 1924; but so slow was the actual progress in providing state schools in the village that in 1926 where there was no state school a village was allowed to provide its own.

Generally speaking, the French were not interested in vernacular education; rather they aimed at injecting an even larger dose of French
culture. There was a curious inconsistency about their policy in this matter, for a comparatively small coterie of French scholars carried out remarkable researches into the languages and litterateurs, the history and archaeology of the East and established at Hanoi in 1899 the finest centre of oriental studies in the world. No praise can be too high for the work it has done in discovering, caring for and restoring Indo-Chinese historical movements, and in particular revealing to the world the glories of Khmer and Cham art and architecture.

The policy of assimilation had strangely different results from those it was intended to produce. It has been said that the bitterest opponents of the French were those who knew the language best. When Paul Beau, as a concession to nationalism, founded the University of Hanoi in 1907, there was such an outburst of nationalistic assertiveness among the students that the following year it was closed and not reopened until Sarraut's second term as Governor-General was over.

3.4.4 Impact of Western Thought

As discussed earlier the nationalist movement in Indo-China was almost entirely confined to the Vietnamese. They had a tradition of nationalism dating from their long struggle for independence against China. Though their civilization remained predominantly Chinese in character after independence was achieved, it was on their own, and in their expansion southwards into the territories previously held by the Chams and the Khaers i.e. Central and southern Annam and Cochin China- they substituted it for the Indonized culture they found in those areas. They held themselves to be superior to the other peoples of Indo-China and their culture to be at least as good as that of the west, except on the technical plane. Their elites were influenced by the writings of the contemporary Chinese reformers, notably Kang Yu Wei, who had submitted a plan of radical reform to the Chinese emperor in 1898, advocating the study of western culture. They turned to the study of the French philosophical writers and flocked to the University of Hanoi when it first opened in 1907. But their introduction to the writings of Montesquieu and Rousseau bred in them feelings of frustration, that the rights of liberty and equality should be taught and denied at the same time. These kinds of feelings had long run impact on them germinating within them a sense of protest as well as oneness.
3.4.5 Impact of Foreign Wars and Revolution

Japan’s victory over Russia in 1905 led to the development of a revolutionary movement of Vietnamese with headquarters at Tokyo. Its leader, Phan Boi Chau, was joined there by prince Coung De of the Royal House of Hue. But in 1910 they were expelled, because Japan wanted French loans and to obtain them they had to agree to respect the French position in Asia. Chau then transferred to canton and under the influence of the Chinese revolution founded in 1912 a political group called ‘the Association for the Restoration of Vietnam’. It was responsible for a number of outrages in Tonkin, but was suppressed by the French. Phau Chau Trinh, an associate of Phan Boi Chau in Tokyo believed strongly in the contribution of modern science towards the freedom of Vietnam. Coming to Vietnam he went on promoting the ideas of the formation of study groups. These study groups under the clock of modernization disseminated the revolutionary ideas and principles. Due to their revolutionary activities both of them were arrested and ended their days under police supervision. The French measures of repression, including the rounding-up of suspects and their imprisonment, and the closing of the university of Hanoi, brought what may considered the first phase of the 20th century national movement to an end.

3.4.6 Impact of World War I

Sarraut’s liberal policy during his first tenure of office (1911-14) helped to keep Indo-China relatively quiet during the First World War. But France had made generous promises which she was not prepared to redeem after the War. She also injured Vietnamese susceptibilities by forcibly recruiting nearly 1,000,000 of them for war service in Europe. They brought back subversive ideas when they returned home. Because of the reduction in the French armed forces, there was an attempted rebellion in 1916 with leaders drawn from the official class. The French learnt of the plan and disarmed the Vietnamese troops at Hue. The young emperor Duy Tau, a party to the conspiracy, made a dramatic effort to retrieve the situation, for which he and his father were exiled to the island of Reunion in the Indian Ocean.

The Post-War period saw the rise of political parties taking their inspiration from developments in the outside world. The educated were stirred by the doctrine of self-determination proclaimed by president Wilson of America within his ‘Fourteen points’ for the settlement of Europe. Some wished to imitate Gandhi’s Swaraj movement in India, while others imbibed the teachings of the Cantonese communists. The
constitutionalists were headed by the emperor Khai Dinh, who in 1922 went to Paris to try to persuade France to abandon coercion and seek Vietnamese co-operation in the administration of Annam and Tonkin. He failed but on returning home left his nine-year old son, Vinh Thuy (later the emperor Bao Dai), to be educated in France. The Progressive Party, led by the journalist Pham Quynh, campaigned for such constitutional reforms as the establishment of an elected consultative Assembly and the appointment of ministers responsible to the emperor. The French did indeed establish Consultative Assemblies in Annam and Tonkin, but they were given no political power. Moreover, they frustrated an attempt to form a Vietnamese people’s progressive party to advocate Pham Quynh’s proposals.

In the French colony of Cochin-China Bui Quang Chien, after founding a Constitutional party went in 1923 to France to present proposals for reform, but ultimately had to return empty-handed. The French Community in Cochin-China was utterly opposed to any forward policy, and was supported by powerful financial groups in France.

3.5 Struggle for National Independence

The uncompromising rebuff of the moderates naturally opened the way for the rise of revolutionary groups who now stole the limelight from the constitutionalists. In 1925 the Revolutionary party of young Annam was founded. But the mutual jealousies of its leaders paralysed it, and when its communist members seceded in 1929 it soon came to grief; for the secessionists informed the police against their former comrades and the party was suppressed. A Tonkinese Party, the Vietnam Quoc Dan Dang (Vietnam National Party) was formed clandestinely in 1927 through Kuomintang contacts. It consisted largely of journalists and teachers, who began by preparing booklets on current affairs for publication, but went on to advocate strong-arm methods. It had a very limited following, but hoped for foreign aid. It sought also to win over the Vietnamese battalions in the army. In January 1929 it made an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Governor-General Pierre Pasquier, and in the following month killed Herve Bazin, the head of the Labour Bureau. Its terrorist activities brought the police so not on its trail that it was forced to launch a rebellion with inadequate precautions. This began with the abortive Yen Bay Mutiny of February 1930, and there were outbreaks of violence in many places. The French reacted with tremendous severity. Every kind of manifestation, even unarmed demonstrations, was broken up by force, and so many of its leaders were arrested that the party dissolved. The surviving leaders fled to Yunnan.
The struggle had become one for national independence, and the communists now took the lead. In 1925 emigres in Canton had founded the Association of Revolutionary Vietnamese Youth. Five years later, this became the communist party of Indo-China. The leader of the movement called himself Nguyen Ai Quoc (Nguyen the patriot). He was later to be known as Ho Chi Minh. Born in 1890, the son of a minor local official in northern Annam, he had gone to Europe in 1911 as a galley boy on a French Merchant vessel and for the next few years had traveled widely. At the end of the First World War he was in Paris sharing lodging with Phan Chu Trinh, the ex-agitator, and helping him with his work as a photographer’s assistant. There he formed an association of Vietnamese peoples, and on its behalf presented a memorandum to the Versailles Peace Conference. He edited Le Paria for the French Communist Party, and in 1923 was sent as a representative of the party to the Congress of the International Peasant Council of Moscow.

In Russia he studied revolutionary technique. In 1925 he was in Canton as an interpreter on the staff of the Borodin Mission, then associated with Dr. Sun Yat-sen. The Vietnamese Revolutionary Youth Association formed by him was composed largely of young men at the Whampoa Military Academy, when Kuomintang officer cadets were trained under Russian supervision. When in 1927 the Borodin mission was expelled from China Ho Chi Minh was left with it.

In the following year the headquarters of the Association was transferred to Hong Kong; but with the removal of Ho’s control all discipline in the movement vanished. An appeal to him for help brought him to Gong Kong in January 1930. He restored the authority of the central committee, changed the Association’s name to the Vietnam Communist Party and transferred its headquarters to Haiphong. Nevertheless, at this time his chief aim was that of winning Vietnamese National Independence, and he was willing to co-operate with anti-French nationalists of all types. According to him, national independence was to be accomplished through a democratic bourgeois regime. Communism was to be introduced only at a larger stage. His programme envisaged winning the support of both intellectuals and peasants. It included the reduction of fiscal burdens; the redistribution of land among the peasantry; and the abolition of the conscription of labourers and soldiers for service abroad.

At the time of the move to Haiphong in 1930 Tonkin and north Annam were in turmoil. The Nationalist Party’s premature attempt at revolution had been a complete failure, but there was grave peasant
unrest occasioned by the great slump and the failure of two successive rice harvests. The communists sought to exploit the situation by organizing mass demonstrations, strikes and other disturbances. The French reacted with the same vigour as before; thousands were arrested and the communist organization was completely disrupted. In June 1931, Ho Chi Minh himself was arrested in Hong Kong and sentenced to deportation on a French ship. But the British Privy Council granted his appeal and he was released. He then made himself underground.

With the suppression of the northern risings, Cochin-China became the next centre of unrest. In 1932 two communist leaders, who had been studying abroad, returned home, Tran van Giau from Moscow and To Thu Thau from France. They proceeded to found a French–language Journal La Lutte, which gained considerable influence. The communist party functioned under the guise of rural friendly societies, but was watched closely by the French Security service, which, as soon as war broke out in Europe in 1939, carried out mass arrests of suspects. An underground Stalinist section organized a peasants’ revolt late in 1940, but was quickly suppressed.

In 1925, Prince Nguyen Vinh Thuy was chosen by the French to succeed to the throne at Hue and took the regnal title of Bao Dai (Keeper of Greatness). He was the first of his line to have a European upbringing and education, and much was hoped of him when in 1932 he returned from France. He had studied the writings of the constitutionalists Pham Quinh and was anxious to play his part in the conduct of affairs. In May 1933, accordingly, he appointed a new group of younger men as ministers. Among them, incidentally, was Ngo Dinh Diem, who as Minister of the Interior occupied a key position for carrying out a programme of reform. But Bao Dai found the opposition not only of the French, but also of the Vietnamese conservatives, too much for him; he lacked the force of character to put up a real fight.

Thus, with the failure of other parties and leaders, the National movement came under communist control, Ho Chi Minh’s self-effacing, firm and intelligent leadership was ultimately to prevail. His movement, though driven underground, defied all attempts to extirpate it. In May 1941, Ho emerged from obscurity in Kwangsi province in China and together with a number of other political exiles founded, with the Chungking (China) government’s blessing, the ‘Viet Nam Doc Lap Dong Minh Hoi’ (League for the Independence of Vietnam), better known as the Viet Minh, which was to become the spearhead of the nationalist movement, in the first place against the Japanese occupying forces in
northern Vietnam. Thus while in the pre-war period the Vietnamese national movement was ineffective and weakened by personal rivalries and local jealousies, it was to find new life under the direction of a leader of inflexible will and tireless energy. The pity was that French intransigence was chiefly responsible for this state of affairs. The Vietnamese, with their deep attachment to property and the patriarchal family system were not natural recruits to communism.

3.6 Rise of Nationalism in Indonesia

The Republic of Indonesia, an archipelago in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, lies across the equator for one-eighth of the Earth's circumference off the coast of the South East Asian mainland. Its islands can be grouped into the Greater Sunda Islands of Sumatra, Java, the southern extent of Borneo and Celebes; the Lesser Sunda Islands of Bali and a chain of islands that runs eastward through Timor; the Moluccas between Celebes and the island of New Guinea; and the western extent of New Guinea Known as Irian Jaya. The country is the largest in the Southeast Asia about 1,948,700 square kilometers in area, with a maximum dimension from east to west of about 5,100 kilometres and a dimension from north to south of about 1,800 kilometres. It is composed of some 13,670 islands of which more than 7,000 are uninhabitable. In the early 21st century Indonesia was the most populous country in Southeast Asia and the fourth most populous in the world.

Indonesia was formerly known as the Dutch, or Netherlands, East Indies; the Islands were first named Indonesian in modern times by a German geographer in 1884 although this name is thought to derive from ‘Indos Nesos’, “Indian Islands” in the ancient trading language of the region. The capital, Jakarta Batavia is located near the north western coast of Java. After a period of occupation by the Japanese (1942-45) during World War II, Indonesia declared its independence from the Netherlands in 1949; and it was not until the official recognition by the United Nations of Irian Barat as a part of Indonesia in 1969 and the incorporation of the former Portuguese territory of East Timor in 1975-76 that the nation took on its present form.

Indonesian nationalism in the 20th century must be distinguished from earlier movements of protest; the Padri War, the Java war, and the many smaller examples of sporadic agrarian unrest had been “Pre-nationalistic” movements, the product of local grievances. By contrast, the nationalism of the 20th century was the product of the new imperialism and was part of the wider currents of unrest affecting many parts of Asia.
and Africa. In Indonesia nationalism was concerned not merely with resistance to Dutch rule but with new perceptions of nationhood, embracing the ethnic diversity of the archipelago and looking to the restructuring of traditional patterns of authority under Indonesia as a modern state. It derived in part from specific discontent, the economic discriminations of colonial rule, the psychological hurt arising from the slights of social discrimination, and a new awareness of the all-pervading nature of Dutch authority. Important, too was the emergence of the new life, educated but lacking adequate employment opportunities to match that education, westernized but retaining still its ties with traditional society.

Why not we discuss here the factors responsible for the growth of nationalism in Indonesia?

**3.6.1 The Ethical Policy**

Liberals confidently assumed that, just as freedom of enterprise would maximize welfare at home, so the application of European capital to the task of developing colonial resources would gradually improve the lot of colonial peoples. By the end of the 19th century, growing criticism of the Dutch record in the Indies was given to particularly influential expression by C.T. van Deventer, Liberal Democratic Member of the States General, who argued that the Netherlands had been draining wealth from the Indies and had incurred thereby “A Debt of Honour” that should be repaid. He suggested that the Netherlands should turn from its strictly laissez-faire policy in the Indies and pursue instead a positive welfare programme supported by funds from the metropolitan treasury. In 1901 a change of government in the Netherlands provided the opportunity for a new departure in policy along the lines suggested by van Deventer. According to the Ethical Policy, as it was called, financial assistance from the Netherlands was to be devoted to the extension of health and education services and to the provision of agricultural extension services designed to stimulate the growth of the village economy.

The Ethical Policy was seen by its most-fervent supports as a noble experiment designed to transform Indonesian society, to enable a new elite to share in the riches of western civilization, and to bring the colony into modern world. Its ultimate goals were, of course, not clearly defined. Van Deventer looked to the emergence of a westernized elite who would be “indebted to the Netherlands for its prosperity and higher culture” and who would gratefully recognize the fact. Others hoped for the growth, by “cultural synthesis”, of a new East Indian society based on blending of
elements of Indonesian and western cultures and able to enjoy a large measure of autonomy within the framework of the Dutch empire.

Despite these rather grandiose visions, the achievements of the Ethical Policy were such more modest. It neither checked declining living standards not promoted an agrarian revolution. It did, however, provide agricultural assistance and advice, but this was directed to the improvement of techniques of irrigation and cultivation within the existing wet-rice technology of Java. Its effect, therefore, was to confirm the gulf between the European economy of the estates, mines, oil wells, and large scale commerce and the traditional, largely subsistence Indonesian economy of wet-rice or shifting cultivation. In education, a little was done to provide a greater degree of opportunity at primary, secondary and even tertiary levels, but at the end of the 1930s only a handful of high school graduates were produced locally, and the literacy rate was calculated at just over 6%.

The goals of the Ethical Policy were set too high, and the devices adopted to implement them were too modest. Given the backwardness of the traditional societies it was not to be expected that a new order would be created as easily as the proponents of the policy had hoped. Nevertheless, during the years of its operation the Indies did see the release of tremendous forces of social change. These resulted, however, not from the conscious plans of the Ethical policy, but from the undirected force of western economic development. Java’s population, which had risen from about 6 million to almost 30 million over the course of the 19th century, increased to more than 40 million by 1920. The increase of population, together with urbanization, the penetration of a money economy to the village level, and the labour demands of western enterprise combined to disrupt traditional patterns. Where the Ethical Policy was most effective, despite the limitations of its educational achievement, was in producing a small educated elite who could give expression to the frustration of the masses in a society turning loose from its traditional moorings. Western currents of thought had their impact also within Islamic circles, where modernist ideas sought to reconcile the demands of Islam and the needs of the 20th century. It is against this background that a self-conscious nationalist movement began to develop.

3.6.2 Impact of Dutch Imperialism

Rapid economic development was accompanied by territorial expansion. Though the Dutch had established their control effectively over Java by the mid-18th century and though they had gradually expanded
their original holdings in Sumatra over the course of the 19th century, their control over the rest of the archipelago was patchy and incomplete. It was exercised in the main, through agreements with local rulers rather than through direct control over territory. In the closing years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th rapid moves were made to round out the Dutch empire and extend it effectively over the whole of the Indies. In northern Sumatra, warfare with the people lasted with varying degrees of intensity from 1873 to 1908 and brought the northern tip of Sumatra under Dutch control.

In Celebes and Moluccas, where the Dutch had for long exercised a general authority, a new instrument—the Short Declaration (in contrast to the earlier Long contract) bound local rulers to accept the control of Batavia, Dutch authority was extended in this way over Bone and Luwu in the Celebes, over central Borneo, over Bali and the lesser Sunda Islands, and over Ternate, Ceram, and Buru in the Moluccas. Footholds were established also over parts of west New Guinea. Communications were developed—roads and railways in Java and Sumatra and expanded shipping services to link Java to the outer islands to serve the needs of the new plantation economy. Between 1870 and 1910 the Dutch had thus effectively completed the process of converting the Indies into a unified colonial dependency and, indeed, of laying the foundations of the future Indonesian republic.

The “new imperialism” of the late 19th century may be seen as part of a worldwide movement whereby the industrial countries of Western Europe partitioned among themselves the hitherto underdeveloped areas of the globe. In Africa and in the South Pacific, in Burma (Myanmar), Indochina, the Malaya, as well as in Indonesia, a new “forward movement” was taking place that stood in dramatic contrast to the earlier patterns of commercial empire. If the European presence created a watershed in Indonesian history, it is to be discerned about 1870 rather than in 1600.

The social impact of these developments upon Indonesian society was tremendous. The economic and political expansion brought a new Dutch population to the Indies: civil servants to staff the growing services of government, managers to run the new estates, and clerks to staff the import-export houses and other businesses. These came to form a European enclave within the major cities and accentuated the line of social division in what was increasingly a caste society divided along racial lines. The Dutch, however, were never a purely expatriate community whose members were anxious to retire as soon as possible to the Netherlands. Many of them regarded the Indies as their home. Their sense
of belonging was very different, for example, from that of the British in India, and it was to give an added bitterness to the later struggle to retain the colony after World War II.

The growing cities, from the Indonesian point of view became the home of a new urban way of life and stimulated social change. A new elite emerged under the influence of the expanding western impact. So did a new class of unskilled and semiskilled workers who found employment as domestic servants or as labourers in the light industries that began to develop. Rural society, though more sheltered, was also altered by the currents of change. Although the agrarian law and the labour legislation had provisions to protect the existing customary rights over land and to guarantee fairness of contracts for labourers, the mere fact of contract employment on the estate affected the village society from which workers were drawn and played its part in hastening the growth of a rootless and disoriented population, emerging increasingly from the shelter of traditional village society but not absorbing into the new urban culture. The kind of difference that the imperialism created between the urban and rural societies proved to be a precursor for the emergence of nationalism.

### 3.6.3 Principle of Decentralisation

After a tremendous outpouring of noble sentiment, a programme of decentralisation and native welfare was set in motion, with the same almost incredible hesitation that had marked the abandonment of the culture system. Decentralisation was the new gospel. It envisaged the delegation of powers from the Hague to Batavia (later Jakarta), from the Governor-General to departments and local officers, and from European to Indonesian officers. It also meant the establishment of autonomous organs managing their own affairs in cooperation with the government. In practice, however, the Decentralisation Law of 1903 and the decrees of 1904-05 creating local councils composed of Indonesians, Europeans and Chinese went nothing like as far as the decentralisation scheme which the Governor-General had submitted to the home government as far back as 1867. And up to the outbreak of the First World War which cut off Batavia’s communications with the Hague, the Governor-General remained completely under the control of the home government.

In 1905 the Deputy Director of the Civil Service, de Graaff, raised the question of the substitution of Indonesians for Europeans and the unification of the two services, in connection with his proposal for a reform of Java’s territorial organization which would give local officers greater power. But for the time being it was sidetracked. In 1914, he
submitted a wider scheme embracing the reorganization of the whole of the Indies into twelve governments, each with a degree of financial autonomy. This was also shelved but his plan to give Indonesian officers greater powers the word actually used was ‘emancipation’ - was generally approved. Nothing, however, was done until 1921, when it was laid down that certain concessions might be made to Regents in recognition of special merit. But the first Regent to be emancipated declared that it made no difference whatever to his position, and for another ten years, in the words of Raden Djajadiningrat, ‘the European administration remained just as before’. For the wake sake the Dutch introduced the system of decentralisation and so far its operational practicality was concerned the administration stuck to a centralized scheme jeopardizing the plan of granting autonomy to the local Indonesian officers. Hence, anomaly was widely exhibited and the Indonesians claimed the seizure of this anomaly which ultimately merged with the mainstream of Indonesian nationalism.

3.6.4 Lack of Village Autonomy

Meanwhile the promoters of the ‘Ethical policy’ had turned to the village as the lever for the improvement of native welfare. Beginning with de Graaff’s Village Regulation of 1906, which provided for a village Government, comprising the headman and village officers, and a village gathering competent to regulate village institutions and provide for its requirements measures were taken to improve agricultural production and veterinary care, to establish village schools, provide sound credit and promote public health. The most elaborate village administration was built up. But it was an instrument for such excessive interference from above that there was hardly any village autonomy left, and the general effect was to turn villages against the Dutch rule. The Dutch method has been described by J. S. Furnivall as, ‘let me help you, let me show you how to do it, let me do it for you’ which meant the Dutch offered autonomy on one hand but took away on the other.

3.6.5 Impact of Foreign Wars and Revolts

The first signs of an awakening national self-consciousness began to show themselves in Java early in the 20th century. Such external influences as the Boxer Rising in China, the Filipino revolt against Spain, and the rise of Japan undoubtedly played their part, for they had a marked effect on the minds of little groups of educated people in the various countries of South-East Asia, who were worried by the inferior status accorded to them under western domination. It was significant that
in 1899 Japan claimed, and received equal rights with Europeans in the Netherlands Indies. But in each country the nationalist movement took on a special character of its own.

In Indonesia the predominance of Java, with two thirds of the total population crowded into one-fifteenth of the total area, was a marked feature of its early stages. Cultural factors here were active, an increased awareness of the value of Javanese culture with its roots deeply in the far-distant past, and a demand for the spread of education, regarding which the Dutch had shown themselves woefully negligent before the 20th century. A new chapter in the native movement opened with the emergence in 1900 of the gifted Raden Adjeng Kartini, daughter of the Regent of Japara, as a Champion of education for women. Her letters published in 1911 stimulated the release of a native spiritual energy which led to the foundation of Kartini schools for girls. Both she and Dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo, a retired medical officer who began a campaign for the advancement of Java in 1906, looked to the spread of western education as the means of salvation.

3.6.6 Slow Progress of Education

Like the French in Indo-China, the Dutch were not enthusiasts for native education beyond the elementary stage. Fear of stimulating popular discontent made them slow in providing secondary and higher education. The pressure exerted by Sarekat Islam practically forced them to improve the Dutch-vernacular schools and thereby create a demand for more advanced education. In response to this More Extended Lower Instruction (MULO) schools were founded, and in 1919 General Middle Schools, which provided courses in Western languages, mathematics, science and oriental literature leading up to University entrance. But the rate of progress in the provision of schools of this type was too slow for the nationalists, who tried to fill in the gaps by establishing ‘wild’ schools literally by the thousand. The inefficiency of most of these, coupled with the fact that many of them were used for the purpose of spreading political discontent compelled the government to take them more and more under its control. Hence when provincial councils were created, education was not one of the subjects transferred to them.

From 1907 onwards immense efforts were put into the foundation of village schools. The practice was for the village, or group of villages, to build the school, often with materials provided free of cost by the government, and to contribute ninety guilders annually towards its upkeep. The government provided the teachers and text exempted, since
pressure had to be brought on many of them to send their children. By 1930 there were several million in these schools. But they were so closely controlled that they were organs of the central government rather than of the village communities. Perhaps the most paternal feature of the whole system was its extremely efficient provision of reading water not only for the children but for popular consumption as a whole.

The extremely tardy development of higher education must be understood in the light of the few opportunities that existed outside government service for Indonesians with specialist qualifications. In their years few Indonesians qualified Entrance for entry to the Bandung Technical College opened in 1919, the Law College in 1924, the Medical College in 1926 and the government institutions teaching agriculture and forestry. In 1941 when the University of Batavia (now the University of Indonesia) was formed, its enrolment of Indonesian students was small. There were no hostels for students coming from a long distance, and no community life such as similar British institutions fostered.

Notwithstanding the great strides taken by the Dutch to extend education in Indonesia under the ‘New course’, the annual budget allotment, compared with the Philippines, was very small. Moreover, the provision of education failed to keep pace with the rise of population, and the member of illiterates was actually greater in 1940 than it had been at the beginning of the century. Hence the slow progress of education for the Indonesians rights from the elementary stage to the university degree coupled with the Dutch government’s haphazard interest to arrest such progress generated a sense of protest among the Indonesians. Their general educational interests when not fulfilled led them to a sensible path of resistance further accelerated into a common protest again boiling down to a point of self-consciousness shaping the form of nationalism later.

3.6.7 Influence of the Nationalist Movement

The formation of Budi Utomo (‘High Endeavour’), the first nationalist association in 1908, is often taken as the beginning of organised nationalism. Founded by Dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo, a retired Javanese doctor, Budi Utomo with intellectuals and Javanese officials as its members was an elitist society, the aims of which though cultural rather than political included a concern to secure an accommodation between traditional culture and the modern world. It also aimed at organizing schools on a national basis and took its inspiration from the
Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore and to some extent from Mahatma Gandhi.

Numerically, more important was Sarekat Islam, an Islamic Association of a very different Character founded in 1911. It was an offshoot of an Islamic revival among Sumatrans and Javanese, resulting from an intensification of Christian missionary enterprise. Sarekat Islam made its first appearance, however as a combination of Javanese traders against Chinese exploitation. Its four original aims were announced as the promotion of Indonesian commercial enterprise, mutual economic support, the intellectual and material well-being of Indonesians and the true religion of Islam. Under its charismatic Chairman, Omar Said Tjokroaminoto, the organization expanded rapidly claiming a membership of 2,500,000 by 1919. Later research suggests that the real figure was likely to have been no more than 400,000, but even with this greatly reduced estimate, Sarekat Islam was clearly much larger than any other movement of the time. “Islam was the bond and symbol of common action against other nationalities,” writes H. T. Colenbrander.

At its first Congress held at Surabaya in January 1913, its leader, Tjokroaminoto asserted forcibly that it was not directed against Dutch rule, and that it would pursue its aims in a constitutional manner. Its first nationwide congress was held in 1916 when representatives of 80 local societies with a membership of 360,000 attended and passed a resolution demanding self-government on the basis of union with the Netherlands. In 1912 the Indies Party, primarily a Eurasian Party was founded by E. F. E. Douwes Dekker; banned a year later, it was succeeded by another Eurasian Party, ‘Insulinde’. In 1914 the Dutchman Hendricus Sneevliet founded the Indies Social Democratic Association, which became a communist party in 1920 and adopted the name-Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia; PKI) in 1924.

Thus by the end of the world War I there was a variety of organizations in existence broadly nationalist in aim, though differing in their techniques and immediate goals and in the sharpness of their perceptions of independent nationhood. In the absence of firm party discipline, it was common for individuals to belong simultaneously to more than one organization and in particular, the presence of Indies Social Democratic Association members in Sarekat Islam enabled them to work as a “block within” the larger movement. The idea that the time was not yet ripe for communist parties to assume independent leadership of colonial nationalism later led the communist to formulate the strategy of cooperation with anti-imperialist “bourgeois” parties.
3.6.8 Rise of Socialist and Communist Ideologies

Meanwhile socialism had made its appearance not only among Indonesians but also among the Indos, or Dutch Eurasians. The Russians Revolution of 1917 had immediate effects upon the situation in Java. Sneevliet formed the Indies Social Democratic Club with revolutionary aims and strove to win over Sarekat Islam to Communism. At the National Congress of October 1917 at Batavia Tjokroaminoto changed his tone to one of hostility to the government, though he still recommended constitutional action. There was strong disappointment at the postponement of the establishment of the long promised Volksraad (People’s council) and with the limitation imposed by the Dutch upon franchise regulations. War was declared on ‘sinful capitalism’.

The P.K.I. with a large following among the trade unions, organized a railway strike in May 1923 which caused the government to amend the penal code by providing heavy penalties for action likely to dislocate economic life. But the policy of repression only encouraged the spread of revolutionary views. In 1925 a strike in the metal industry was forcibly suppressed. In 1926, encouraged by vague promises of assistance from Zinoviev and Bucharin, the communist leaders tried to start a revolution in west Java and Sumatra. The operations were described as carefully planned and widespread. Nevertheless they were easily suppressed, and before the measures of severe repression taken by the Dutch the whole revolutionary movement collapsed. The Communist party was banned, communist meetings prohibited and about 1,300 members of the party interned in New Guinea. Communism was not entirely suppressed, but its leadership of the Indonesian movement was ended and a new phase in the history of that movement began.

The failure of the revolutionary movement left Sarekat Islam as the main organ of nationalism, though by this time a multiplicity of parties had arisen—some local, such as Sarket-Ambon, Perserikatan-Minahase and the Sumatranen-Bond; others based upon the divisions of political parties in Holland; and still others, such as the Indo-European league and various Chinese societies, representing special communal interests. Sarekat Islam now began to pay more attention to education and economic conditions. It put great energy into the foundation of ‘wild’ schools and co-operative institutions. This kind of work, however, did not satisfy the aspirations of the discontented students. The way was left open for a new nationalist organisation, and in 1926 a ‘General Study Club’ was founded in Bandung, with a nearly graduated Engineer, Sukarno, as its secretary. The club began to reshape the idea of nationalism in a
manner calculated to appeal to Indonesia’s new urban elite. After the failure of the ideologically based movements of Islam and communism, nationalist thinking was directed to the idea simply of a struggle for independence without any pre-commitment to a particular political or social order afterward.

Such a goal, it was believed, could appeal to all, including Muslims and communists, who could, at least, support a common struggle for independence, even if they differed fundamentally about what was to follow. Nationalism, in this sense, became the idea that the young Sukarno used as the basis of his attempt to unify the several streams of anti-colonial feeling. The ideas of the ‘Bandung Study Club’ were reinforced by currents of thought emanating from Indonesian students in Holland. Their organization, reorganized in 1922 under the name of the Indonesian Union, became a centre of radical nationalist thought and in the mid-1920s students returning from Holland joined forces with like-minded groups at home.

Closely in touch with Moscow, failed to gain control of the movement and broke away to form the P.K.I. which joined the third International of Moscow. An outbreak of passive resistance in the Preanger in July 1919, coming after an ugly incident in Central Celebes in which the Dutch controller and some officials lost their lives, led to an enquiry, which showed that secret societies belonging to section B were involved and it was thereupon dissolved by the government.

The struggle was now between the P.K.I. and Sarekat Islam, and the religions question was the main issue. P.K.I.’s second congress in 1920 decided that Communism was just as much opposed to pan Islamism as it was to western domination. Communism, however, was not a mass movement, and the communists, though exceptionally energetic and intelligent, were few in member. Hence their tactics were to attempt to steal their influence from the leaders of Sarekat Islam and to win over the trade unions. And Tan Malaka, a communist leader exiled for inciting a strike of government pawnshop employees, went to Moscow and tried to persuade the Comintern to accept pan-Islamism.

When the sixth National Congress of Sarekat Islam met in October 1921 at Surabaya, Tjokroaminoto was under arrest because of his connection with underground activities, and Abdul Muis and Hadji Agus Salim, who presided in his place, carried a motion for bidding members of the Sareket to belong to any other party. This forced the communists out of the movement. But for five years Sarekat Islam fought a losing fight
against the relatively small group of communists who went ahead organizing Sarekats of their own, supporting strikes and making preparations for revolutionary action in parts of northern and western Java. In 1922, under the influence of young Indonesian graduates from Europe, who were discontented with their status in the Government services Sarekat Islam established relations with the Indian National Congress and adopted the policy of Non-co-operation.

The years from 1923 to 1926 saw a series of revolutionary attempts. The post–War depression, with its crop of industrial disputes, presented the extremists with excellent opportunities for bringing about the maximum dislocation of political and economic life in the hope that it would enable them to seize power. Moscow at that time regarded Java as a strategic centre of the highest importance. Through agents in Singapore contact was made between the P.K.I. and the Chinese Communist Party. For the time being, the communists became the most vital forces in the Indonesian movement and lawlessness and intimidation were the order of the day. Against this, Sareket Islam became increasingly hostile and turned more and more to religion as a means of combating communism.

The new nationalism required a new organization for its expression, and in July 1927 the Indonesian Nationalist Association, later the Indonesian Nationalist Party (Partai Nasional Indonesia; PNI), was formed under the chairmanship of Sukarno. It sought to rally all the existing nationalist organizations behind a big non-co-operation movement on the Gandhi model. Sukarno, however, while seeking to create a basis of mass support for the PNI, also attempted with some success to work together with moderate leaders and succeeded in forming a broadly based association of nationalist organizations. But when Sukarno began to show revolutionary tendencies he and two of his helpers were jailed in December 1929, and once more the extremist attempt to capture the nationalist movement failed; as a political force it came to an end for the time being.

New leaders interested in social service and social justice came forward. Ki Hadjar Dewantoro, popularly known as the ‘teacher of all the goods’, felt that education was the best means to strengthen Indonesians, and he was deeply influenced by the progressive theories of the Italian educational reformer Maria Montessori and by the Indian poet and philosopher Rabindranath Tagore. The first Taman Siswa schools were established in Java in July 1922 under his initiatives. While Dr. Sutomo, who as a young medical student had been associated with Dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo in founding Budi Utomo, directed the energies of the
National party into various types of constructive activity, and in particular the struggle to free the peasantry from the tyranny of the user.

Meanwhile Sukarno was tried, convicted, and sentenced to four years’ imprisonment. He was released at the end of 1931, but by then a lot of changes had taken place. The PNI dissolved itself and reformed as Partindo. A number of other groups came together to form a new organisation, The Indonesian National Education club, known as the new PNI. While Partindo saw itself as a mass party on the lines of the old PNI, the new PNI, under the leadership of Mohammad Hatta and Sutan Sjahrir, aimed at training cadres who could maintain a continuing leadership of the movement and who could thus prevent it from being so easily immobilized by the arrest of its leaders. In 1933 Sukarno was again arrested and exiled to southern Sumatra. Repressive action followed against other party leaders, including Hatta and Sjahrir, who were also exiled. In the later 1930s nationalist leaders were forced to cooperate with the Dutch, and such moderate parties as Partindo accepted People's Council membership. In 1937, a more radical party, Gerindo was formed, but it considered support of the Netherlands against the threat of Nazism more important than the question of independence.

War in Europe and the pacific changed the situation. The fall of the East Indies to the Japanese onslaught early in 1942 broke the continuity of Dutch rule and provided completely new environment for nationalist activity.

3.6.9 Disappointed Political System

Much of the trouble could be exhibited in the Indonesian political system which invited public criticism in the post World War I era and generated a powerful wave of nationalist feeling among the Indonesians to raise their united voice against the system under the Dutch. The trouble cropped up because of the result of disappointment at Dutch unwillingness to effect any real transfer of power. During the World War I, in response to insistent nationalist demands for a greater share in the demand, a scheme for a Volksraad (People’s Council) was passed by the Netherlands Parliament in 1916, and what has been called an experiment in self-government held its first meeting in May 1918. Half of its members were elected by local and city councils, and half were appointed by the Governor-General. It was in no real sense a representative body, it had a European majority, and its powers were limited to the offering of advice which the Governor-General could not accept without authorization from the Hague.
At its first meeting the disappointed deputies rejected a proposal to address a loyal cable to the queen in token of gratitude. And although under the constitution of 1925 its numbers were raised from 48 to 61 and it was given an elective majority, Indonesians only received 30 seats and its financial and legislative powers remained very slight, if indeed they can be dignified by the name of ‘powers’. The reformed Volksraad must be seen in relation to the general scheme of decentralization introduced by the Constitution of 1925. A new system of provincial government was devised above the residencies. As a first step Java’s 22 residencies were in 1929 combined so as to form three provinces, and each under a Governor assisted by a partly elected council with a non-European majority. Regency councils also were created, and these, together with the existing town councils, formed the electorates for both the Volksraad and the Provincial Councils. Outside Java, in areas where the political development of the population was considered too backward for any form of self-government, ‘governments’ without representative councils were established instead of provinces. The new system was a long time in taking shape and was only completed shortly before the Japanese invasion. It represented the utmost concessions the Dutch were prepared to make before the coming of the deluge.

The Dutch policy, like Conservative policy of England in Ireland in the nineties of the 19th century, was to ‘kill home rule by kindness’. The energy and enthusiasm in the cause of economic and social welfare shown by the Dutch administration was quite outstanding. Their comparative lack of success was due chiefly to the phenomenal rise in the population of Java and the opposition of private interests in both Holland and Indonesia. But the effects of the Great Depression of the early 1930s led them to encourage native industry; and the revival of trade and industry began, a spirit of greater cooperation began also to show itself between Dutch and Indonesians.

But though the political atmosphere was less heated, the Indonesian movement continued to cherish its own aims of economic self–sufficiency and political self-government with unabated fervour. In 1936 the Volksraad passed a motion asking the Netherlands government to call an imperial conference to discuss the method by which self-government should come into effect, and to fix a time limit. It was the characteristic of Dutch policy that no real response to this request was made until July 1941, when Queen Wilhelmina and her government were refugees in London. Under such a chastening experience it was only natural that she should promise to hold such a conference immediately after the War. But without undue skepticism the doubt could be expressed whether in 1941
the Dutch government had the serious intention of ever granting Indonesia the real self-government.

3.7 Japanese Occupation

The Japanese military authorities in Java, having interned Dutch administrative personnel found it necessary to use Indonesians in many administrative positions, thus giving them opportunities that had been denied them under the Dutch. In order to secure popular acceptance of their rule, the Japanese sought also to enlist the support of both nationalist and Islamic leaders. Under this policy Sukarno and Hatta both accepted position in the military administration.

Though initially welcomed as liberators, the Japanese gradually established themselves as harsh overlords. Their policies fluctuated according to the exigencies of the war, but in general, their primary object was to make the Indies serve Japanese war needs. The Nationalist leaders, however, felt able to trade support for political concessions. Sukarno was able to convince the administration that Indonesian support could be mobilized only through an organization that would represent genuine Indonesian aspirations. In March 1943 such an organization, Putera (Pusat Tenaga Rakjat; “Centre of the People’s Power”), was inaugurated under his chairmanship. While the new organization enabled Sukarno to establish himself more clearly as the leader of the nation and while it enabled him to develop more effective lines of communication to the people, it also placed upon him the responsibility of trying to sustain Indonesian support for Japan through, among other things, the *romusha* (forced labour) programme. Later in the year Indonesian opinion was given a further form in a Central Advisory Council and a series of local councils. At a different level, Indonesian youths were able to acquire a sense of corporate identity through membership in the several youth organizations established by the Japanese. Of great importance, also, was the creation in October 1943 of a volunteer defense force composed of and officered by Indonesians trained by the Japanese. The Sukarela Tentara Pembela Tanah Air (Peta; “Volunteer Army of Defenders of the Homeland”) was to become the core of the republic’s army during the revolution.

In March 1944 the Japanese, feeling that Putera had served Indonesian rather than Japanese interest, replaced it with a “Djawa Hokokai” (People’s Loyalty Organisation) which was kept under much closer control. Six months later the Japanese premier announced the Japanese intention to prepare the Indies for self-government. In August 1945, on the eve of the Japanese surrender, Sukarno and Hatta were
summoned to Saigon, Vietnam, where Terauchi Hisaichi, commander of the Japanese expeditionary forces in Southeast Asia, promised an immediate transfer of independence.

On their return to Jakarta (formerly Batavia) Sukarno and Hatta were under pressure to declare independence unilaterally. This pressure reached its climax in the kidnapping of the two men, for a day, by some of Jakarta’s youth leaders. After the news of the Japanese surrender had been confirmed, Sukarno proclaimed independence on the morning of August 17, 1945.

3.8 The Revolution

The proclamation touched off a series of risings across Java that convinced the British troops entrusted with receiving the surrender of Japanese forces that the self proclaimed republic was to be taken seriously. At the level of central government, the constitution adopted by the republican leaders was presidential in form, but a widely representative Central Indonesian National Committee became, in effect, an adhoc parliament. Sukarno, as president, agreed to follow parliamentary conventions by making his cabinets dependent upon their ability to command the committee’s confidence.

The spontaneous character of the Indonesian revolution was demonstrated by a number of incidents, notably in the struggle for Bandung in late 1945 and early 1946 and the battle of Surabaya in November 1945, in which Indonesian fighters resisted superior British forces for three weeks. Though the Dutch had expected to reassert their control over their colony without question and though they were able to play upon outer-island fears of the Java-based republic, they eventually were compelled to negotiate with republican representatives led by Sjahrrir, who by then was the Prime Minister. The Linggadjati Agreement (1946-47) by which the Dutch agreed to transfer sovereignty in due course of a Federal Indonesia, appeared to offer a solution to the conflict. The Dutch claimed that a federation was necessary because of the diversity of the Indies and the difference between heavily populated Java and the more sparsely populated outer islands. Differing interpretations, however, made the agreement a dead letter from the beginning. In July 1947 the Dutch, in an attempt to settle matters by force, initiated what they termed a police action against the republic. Its effect was to evoke UN intervention in the form of a commission known as the Good Offices Committee, and it ended in the precarious Renville Agreement of January 1948. In December 1948 a second police action was launched.
Meanwhile, the government of the republic faced some domestic opposition. In 1946 a left-wing plot was organized by followers of Ibrahim Datuk Tan Malaka, who opposed the policy of negotiation with the Dutch. This so-called July 3rd Affair was easily crushed. In September 1948 a more serious challenge in the form of a communist revolt (the Madiun Affair) was also defeated. The second police action aroused American concern. It also closed Indonesian ranks firmly behind the republic. In these circumstances, the Netherlands at a round-table conference at the Hague, finally agreed in August 1949 to transfer sovereignty over its colony (with the exception of western New Guinea) to an independent United States of Indonesia in December 1949; a decision about the ultimate fate of western New Guinea (Irian Barat, now Irian Jaya) was to be subjected of future negotiation.

3.9 Independent Indonesia

The initial federal constitution of 1949 was replaced in 1950 by a unitary but still provisional constitution. It was parliamentary in character and assigned an essentially figure-head role to the president. From the revolutionary period, Indonesia had inherited a multi-party system. The main parties after independence were the major Muslim Party, Masyumi (Masjumi); the Muslim Theologians’ Party, Nahdatul Ulama (NU), which seceded from Masyumi in 1952; the Nationalist Party (PNI); the Communist Party (PKI); the “national communist” party, Murba; the lesser Muslim parties, Perti and Partai Sarekat Islam Indonesia (PSII); and the Socialist Party (PSI). Until the first elections were held in 1955, a remarkable and technically successful experiment in the exercise of political choice by a largely non-literate population, confirmed the position of Masyumi, NU, PNI, and PKI as the country’s four leading parties.

In total, the rise of nationalism in Indonesia and subsequently the emergence of an independent Indonesia from the shackles of the Dutch imperialism is a long history passing through several important phases. Causes responsible for the rise of the same, as discussed above, seem to have been varied and complex demanding a scanning of the Dutch administration, their nurturing of the Indonesian political set up and their haphazard educational initiatives singing ultimately the swansong of their imperialism. If the causes could be proved fruitful, the time prevalent could not be left unnoticed. Time proved to be much ripened. The role of political association, leaving deepening impact on the communists and socialists, was a milestone for disseminating consciousness among the Indonesians. More importantly, the Indonesian political leaders like Dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo, Tjokroamintoto, Sukarno and Hatta etc. stood
unique pushing the nationalism into the climax and the country to the path of independence.

3.10 Rise of Arab World

The rise of Arab World or the Arab Nationalism was the direct outcome of the Turkish domination of Arab. The Arabs had never been able to reconcile themselves to the Turkish rule. They were also opposed to the right of the Sultan of Turkey to be the Caliph (or successor of prophet). Most of them felt that Hussein, the Grand Sheriff of Mecca and of the purest Arab descent, had a better title to that position.

On the outbreak of the First World War when the British repulsed the Turks from the Suez Canal, the Arab nationalism was stirred and they for the first time thought of overthrowing the Turkish rule. Lead in this direction was taken by Hussein, who dreamed up setting up an independent Arab empire stretching from the Mediterranean to Persian Gulf. He was encouraged in his designs by the Britishers, who wanted to exploit the Arab hatred of Turks to safeguard their interests in the near East. Britain offered every possible help to the Arabs with money, arms and supplies. In 1916 Hussein not only announced himself as the true caliph but also declared freedom of the whole Arab race. The Arab soldiers raised and trained by the Britishers did a good job during the war. In 1918, the Arab forces captured Damascus, the capital of Syria.

The peace settlement of 1919-1920 gave a shock to the Nationalism in Arab. The Allies powers contrary to their promise of granting independence to the Arab countries after war divided Arab area into four parts under separate governments. France received Mandate over Syria and Great Britain over Palestine and Mesopotamia (Iraq). Only Hedjaz was allowed to remain under Hussein as an independent Arab Kingdom.

With the peace settlement the nationalism in Arab took a violent shape and they started a struggle for political liberty as well as better standard of living. It created amongst the Arabs not merely a desire to break the bonds of imperialist chains by revolting against the political supremacy and commercial dominance of the foreign powers; it also created a desire among them to absorb the political ideals of the western powers. The Arabs tried to gain mastery of the western techniques with a view to drive out the Western powers. This marked the commencement of educational and social reforms and introduction of public welfare schemes in the area.
Another factor which gave rise to Arab nationalism in the inter-war period was the aggressive policy of the western nations. During the War, under pressure of circumstances the Western powers had made contradictory commitments to the Arabs and Jews, which could not be fulfilled after the war. For example, England had promised a homeland to the Jews in Palestine and also undertaken with the Arabs not to grant this state without their consent. During the inter-war period the problem of Palestine evoked much racial strife and blood-shed.

The strong rivalry among the powers over oil in the Middle East after World War I also promoted the Arab nationalism. The USA government felt that its own output of oil would not be able to meet the growing demands at home and she started looking for the oil in the Middle East. Soon she launched a violent protest against the San Remo Pact concluded between Great Britain and France in 1920 on the ground that the pact violated the assurance of equal economic rights and privileges of the Allied powers in the mandated territories. Similarly Soviet Russia developed interest in the Middle East. Thus, after the war, the Middle East became a theatre of acute international friction for the control of its oil. Sometimes the consuls and the political agents of these governments tried to exercise influence in the fields not meant for them. They organized medical services, settled disputes between tribal chiefs and in some cases acted informally as judges in local controversies. This created distrust in the mind of the Arabs and they developed a hatred for the foreigners.

The emergence of Turkey under Mustafa Kemal, the father of modern Turkey, as a powerful nation also gave impetus to Arab nationalism. Kemal had completely secularized the Turkish society and granted full freedom of conscience. He introduced a number of social educational and administrative reforms. As a result of his efforts an efficient, homogeneous and balanced Turkish society was created. This encouraged the Arab nations not only to challenge the western domination but also to undermine the native vested interest and feudalism.

Hence, the states of the Middle East began to fulfill the necessity of unity against western imperialism as well as against the aggressive attitude of the Jews. This dealing found its expression for the first time in the Saadabad pact concluded by Persia, Iraq, Turkey and Afghanistan in 1937. During the war, Great Britain wanted the Arab country to present a joint front. The creation of the Arab League in March 1945 was an extension of that effort. At a conference in Cairo, the representatives of Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Trans-Jordan signed the Arab League covenant. The main purpose of the Arab League was to improve the
mutual relations among the Arab states. The member states agreed to recognize sovereignty and independence of each other and to assist each other against the enemy. They also agreed to assist each other in the economic and cultural development of the Arab states. A council composed of the representatives of the Arab states was set up which took decisions by majority note. At least two meetings of the council were held every year. Although the league was formed by the signatory states, other Arab states were free to join it.

3.11 Problem of Palestine

The problem of Palestine which forms the axis of the Arab-Israel conflict is a story of a battle between the Zionists and the Palestinians for the possession of the same territory. In historical perspective, it is an unparalleled injustice to drive the sons of the soils- the Arab-Palestinians being driven out of their motherland. It is a long drawn battle between Zionist chauvinism and the Palestinian nationalistic upsurge for a separate homeland. To the Zionists, it is the question of Israel while to the Arabs, it is the question of Palestine. Some scholars have tried to project this clash as a clash between theocratic politics and indigenous nations; between the Jews representing the racial unity and the Arabs representing the secular and nationalistic ideal.

3.11.1 Early History

From time immemorial Palestine has occupied an important place in human manuals. It is the birth of three major religious Christianity, Islam and Hebrew of the world. The kernel of the issue is that the Jews claim this territory as of theirs on the ground that several thousand years ago, in the 12th century B.C., their ancestors had come and occupied the territory of Palestine then called Cannan. They had set up two small kingdoms Judea or Judah and Israel under the suzerainty of Cannan. However, after 500 years, in the 7th century B.C. they could not withstand the successive onslaughts and assaults of the Assyrians, the Babylonians and the Ancient Romans, and left the area and scattered throughout the world. Gradually Palestine turned to be the holy place of the Christian world. From 65 B.C. till 634 A.D. it formed a part of the Roman Empire and after remaining under the domination of the Christians for almost hundred years (1098-1187) she came under the Turkish domination. Thus, Palestine had been under foreign rule at different times.

But in the latter half of the 19th century while the unification movements were spearheaded in Europe, and “Germany for Germans” and
“Italy for Italians” became the popular watchwords, the Jews found no homeland for themselves. They aspired for a separate homeland in Palestine and the real tragedy for Palestinians started. As back as 1840 the idea was mooted that a special centre of hegemony be set up on neutral territory in the form of a racially “pure Jewish state”. The protagonists of the Jewish state called upon the Jews over the world together in Jerusalem and thus, the movement came to be known as “Zionism”. The chief aim of this movement was to rehabilitate the Jews in Palestine and to create for them an independent and sovereign state. So, it was a movement to set up a state through intensive colonialisation by driving out the local inhabitants and the process began.

The Jews never lost the hope of returning to the Promised Land. Even in the 19th century Jewish colonialisation in Palestine had started. But this movement acquired a more purposeful character with the founding of the world Zionist Organisation under Theodor Herzl, a native of Budapest in 1897- who described the programme as “peaceful colonialisation” of a “land without people” by “the people without land”. By the turn of the century the Jews population grew from 24,000 to 50,000. The Zionist leaders approached to the Sultan of Turkey, the Kaiser of Germany and the Government of Britain for help, but were disappointed. In 1904 Herzl breathed his last but the Zionist movement for a national fame in Palestine started by him gained momentum. Zionism as a national movement evoked opposition from the Jews themselves. In Britain the Jews community refused to compromise their British status by identifying themselves with Zionism. The socialists and subsequently the communist called it a reactionary movement. But these developments might not have created difficulty had it not been for the political issue that Zionism created by pressing its claim against the Arabs in Palestine.

3.11.2 The Problem of Palestine

During the period between the two world wars a complicated situation arose on the question of Palestine. In the language of Hall and Davies, “the history of Palestine during the twenty years’ armistice between the two European wars was confused, hectic and contradictory”. The problem of Palestine resulted from a number of complicating elements.

Firstly, Palestine, one of the smallest states in the Middle East, has been the place of a head-on-clash between two aggressive nationalisms, born at the same time and focused on the same area, the Arab nationalism and political Zionism.
Secondly, the traditional British interest in the Middle East and the Suez Canal in a background of growing nationalist sentiment in Egypt, and the creation of a large French mandate in Syria at the end of World War I led to the British insistence on retaining Palestine under their control. To the west of Palestine lies the Mediterranean Sea whose eastern part forms an important link in the British communications with Syria.

Thirdly, it involved the religious issues of a delicate nature because it has in its fold holy places of the Christians, the Jews and the Muslims. These religious issues, important in themselves, acquired a greater significance because of the presence of about 5 millions of Jews in the United States whose voting value was important for any presidential candidate and who constituted a source of considerable influence on the American official attitude towards the problem of the Jews. On the other hand, the British government was not merely interested in the Jews but also in the Arabs whose co-religionists constituted an extremely important minority in India. The British policy, therefore, always fluctuated between sympathy for the Jews and regard for the Arabs. After 1933 the persecution of the Jews in Germany, Poland and Rumania roused the conscience of the people all over the world and it became increasing by difficult to resist the Jewish immigration to the Promised Land. The German policy was double edged. On one hand, Hitler practically exterminated the Jews in all countries that he could control, and on the other, he encouraged the Jewish immigration to Palestine in order to create conflict between the Jews and the Arabs, and, thus creating problems for the British Government and paralyzing the western resistance in the Arab world.

Fourthly, Palestine was important from the economic point of view. The fact that from Iraq and Arabia oil can be taken out by a pipeline running through Palestine, very seriously reacted on the problem of Palestine. This became move important after 1945.

Finally, the international dispersion of the Jews, the anti-Jewish sentiment in the whole Arab World, the cultural advancement and the cooperative habits of the Jews and their organizing capacity, on the one hand, created a worldwide sympathy for them, and on the other, led to jealousies and bitterness in the Arab world. The Jewish birth rate is much lower than that of the Arabs and this fact was responsible for the Jewish insistence on the continuous and unlimited immigration in Palestine. These facts explain the keenness of the Jews to immigrate to Palestine and the corresponding resistance of the Arabs to the Jewish immigration. If the Arabs, therefore, could stop or considerably limit the immigration of
Jews they would secure increasing numerical preponderance, and consequently, dominant political power in Palestine. Moreover, the organizing skill of the Jews and their commercial talents enabled them to purchase more and more land from the Arabs who were less clever and much poorer. From 1920 onward the question of the land purchases always created serious problems and obstructed the prospects of a general settlement of the Palestine problem.

3.11.3 British Mandate and the Zionist Movement

In the third year of the war Zionist leaders played their cards with shrewdness and collaborated with Great Britain. Practically, Britain was compelled to satisfy the Jews for various reasons during the world war. For example, (1) Britain wanted to protect her interests in the such canal by establishing a friendly state near the canal; (2) Jews were strongly opposed to Soviet Russia; (3) Palestine is a holy place of the Jews. Britain, therefore, felt it as her moral responsibility to rehabilitate the Jews in Palestine. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, one of the Zionist leaders, succeeded in convincing the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour that a Zionist settlement in Palestine would be a political asset to the British Empire. Mr. Balfour issued the famous Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1917.

In the Declaration it was stated that “His Majesty’s government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavour to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. This Declaration was always interpreted by the Jews as a clear British commitment to a policy of handing over Palestine to them. Earlier, in 1916, in the Grey Memoranda to Petrograd, a lead had been made to win over the Russian Jews. The policy of supporting the Jews on the issue of Palestine, in short, was to a great extent, intended to win over the support of the worldwide Jews against the central powers.

On the other hand, the British Government had been making promises to the Arabs with a view to detach them from the Sultan of Turkey, an ally of the German Kaiser. In October 1915, the British High Commissioner to Egypt, Sir Henry McMahon gave assurances to Hussein Sheriff of Mecca that in return for his support to the Allies, the British government would guarantee independence of the Arabian peninsula and south of what is about the present border of Turkey would also be
included. This assurance was always treated by the Arabs as a British promise of making Palestine an independent Arab state. But the promise of a national home for Jews in Palestine singularly disappointed the Arabs. Yet even before the Arabs were assured of independence after the war and the Jews were promised of a national home in Palestine the Allied powers decided to divide the Arab countries among themselves by signing the Secret Sykes-Picot Treaty in May, 1916 – this secret agreement, therefore, was clearly a breach of faith with Hussein Sheriff of Mecca who knew nothing about it until eighteen months later, the Russian Bolsheviks made it public.

The Arabs, therefore, were puzzled at the Balfour Declaration to which we have referred, and which was regarded as a clear repudiation of pledges given to them. Within two years the British Government had promised Palestine which they did not possess, successively to the Arabs, the French and the Jews. Hussein Sheriff sought a clarification of the Balfour Declaration from the British Government. On February 8, 1918, it informed him that its support to the Jews went only “so far as it is compatible with the freedom of the existing population, both economic and political”. Palestine was assigned to Great Britain under the mandate system. In the mandate too, Britain had accepted contradictory commitments. Under Article II the mandatory state was to be held responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home and the development of self-governing institutions and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion. Under Article VI the administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population were not prejudiced, would facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and would encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish agency close settlement by Jews on the land. Now, both these obligations, the British Government themselves described in 1922 as ‘impracticable’.

The Arab-Jewish relation at the end of the war became bitter and several causes contributed to the increase of tension between them. The Jews in Palestine numbered 55,000 at the time of armistice but the new civil administration opened the flood gate for fresh immigrants. But the influx of the Jews in Palestine was intolerable to the Arabs. Fresh hostilities between the two communities began. Apart from the political ground, on economic ground also the Arabs opposed the Jews. Many Arabs lost their holdings by the implementation of new land laws and a considerable portion of their lands passed into the hands of the Jews.
Illiterate and poor Arab farmers could not stand the economic competition of the wealthier Jews and hence were thrown out of employment. The Arab cultivator untrained, improvident and devoid of capital, was no match for the Jew and found himself reduced, in his own country, to a position of galling inferiority. Thus the economic distress added further fuel to the Arab nationalist movement. The economic success of the Jews accounted for deterioration of Arab-Jewish relation.

From 1923 to 1928 the situation in Palestine was characterized by sullen resentment felt by both the Jews and the Arabs, the increasing Jewish immigration raising the Jewish population by 16%, the increasing land purchases by them and superficial peace and order. The Zionist organization which had been recognized under Article IV of the mandate as the appropriate Jewish public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine had, by 1928, been broadened into a Jewish Agency for Palestine. The constitutional concessions which were being given to Egypt, Iraq and Transjordan had whetted the desire of the Arab leaders in Palestine for independence. The two aggressive rival nationalisms, therefore, came to a bitter clash in 1928 in what came to be called as the ‘Wailing wall Dispute’ which resulted in provocative demonstrations, murder, loot and plunder. The Jews considered the ‘wailing wall’ as the last vestige of their temple while the Arabs considered this as their holy place. War between the two communities became almost inevitable and a series of head-on-clashes between the two took place between 1929 and 1933 in which many Jews lost their lives.

3.11.4 Attempts to solve the Palestine Problems

There is no doubt that Britain was eager to find out a better solution of the Palestine problem and to put an end to the Arab-Jew struggle. But the clash of conflicting interests made this problem very implicate. Firstly the question of Arab nationalism and Zionism was intimately connected with Palestine. Secondly, the interest of British imperialism was not the least insignificant. As a military base, Palestine was indispensable to Britain. The Jews demand was the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine. While on the other hand, the Arabs were determined to grab the whole of Palestine and to prohibit the influx of Jews there. To solve this thorny problem Great Britain appointed a series of commissions. In all, she appointed seven commissions in a span of twenty-six years.
The First Commissions was set up under pressure from the U.S. President Woodrow Wilson. This Commission known as the King-Crane Commission was an Anglo-American Commission. As the recommendations of this commission were opposed to the interests of the Jews, they were not made public.

With the establishment of British mandate over Palestine a terrible riot broke out. The Jews were mainly responsible for it. The Arabs resorted to violence in retaliation. To investigate the causes of the riot Britain appointed the Hay-Craft Commission, the second in the order in 1921. The Commission declared that the strong anti-Jewish attitude of the Arabs was the cause of the riot.

In 1922 a new constitution for Palestine was announced by Herbert Samuel, the First High Commissioner in Palestine. It provided for a High Commissioner, a party elected Legislative Assembly and a nominated executive committee. But neither the Jews nor the Arabs were satisfied with this arrangement because the Jews did not get the much promised Jewish state, while on the other hand, any plan of Jewish state was not to the likings of the Arabs. In 1922 the Churchill White Paper was issued. Churchill declared that the Balfour Declaration did not mean the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, out the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take and interest and pride. In other words Churchill made it clear that (1) Britain did not contemplate for the motion of a Jewish state over the whole of Palestine or to destroy the culture and language of the Arabs and (2) The political power of the Jews would be based on law and right.

To satisfy the Arabs, Britain prohibited Jewish immigration in Palestine for some time. Being satisfied with it the Arabs agreed to participate in the election of the proposed Legislative Assembly. But the Jews demanded that they would participate in the election only if they were given equal number of seats with the Arabs in the Assembly as a result for the legislative Assembly was abandoned.

From 1923 to 1928 the situation in Palestine became turbulent due to the increasing influx of Jewish immigrants of Palestine which brought the Palestinian polities into instability and the economy to jeopardy. Hence, animosity further heightened and a bitter clash set in between the Arabs and Jews in 1928 in the form of the “wailing wall dispute” leading to the murder, lost and plunder. The British Government, in accordance
with their traditional policy, appointed the Show Commission to inquire into the riots.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Show Commission the British Government appointed Sir John Hope Simpson Commission in 1930 to conduct an expert inquiry into the agricultural problems of Palestine and investigate the questions of Jewish immigration and land settlement. On the basis of the reports of the Show Commission and Hope Simpson Commission the British Government issued the Passfield White Paper, which provided for the limitation on the Jewish immigration, emphasized the double obligations of the British Government both to the Jews and to the Arabs, and provided for new Department of Development to control all disposition of land. It was suggested that all available land would be earmarked for the settlement of landless Arab cultivators. This white paper naturally caused heart burning among the Jews. The whole problem came to be reopened. The situation was aggravated by the terrible prosecution of Jews that Hitler started in Germany and the ruthless discrimination against them in Poland and Romania. The persecuted Jews started migrating towards Palestine. In 1932 the immigration figure was 9,000 and in 1935 it rose to 60,000. Sir Arthur Wauchope, the British High Commissioner, in an ordinance prohibited the sale of land of poor Arab families. Hence, fresh clashes took place between the Jews and the Arabs in 1933. Clashes took the shape of riots and the latter became unprecedented in 1935-36.

A Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel was appointed on July 29, 1936 to investigate the causes of disturbances and to make recommendations for the solution of the issue. The Peel Commission reported that the mandate was thoroughly unworkable. The Commission submitted its report in 1937 and observed that the Arab-Jewish problems were so complicated and their interests so conflicting that there was no other way to make a happy solution of the problem except a tripartite division of the Country- a Jewish state, an Arab state, and a British mandatory territory consisting of the area from Jaffa to Jerusalem. According to this proposal the Holy places were to remain permanently under British control while Galilee and the coastal plains were to form a Jewish sovereign state. The remainder areas were to be joined to Transjordan in an Arab state. The Commission also recommended the conclusion of a military treaty by Britain with the Arab and Jewish states. The scheme proposed by the Royal (Peel) Commission met with severe criticism from all quarters.
In 1938, England appointed another Commission under Woodhead to examine the practicability of the scheme suggested by the Peel Commission. During the course of its investigation fresh disturbance broke out in Palestine and strikes, murders and loots between the two communities became events of almost daily routine. A British Army was dispatched to Palestine for the maintenance of peace. In October 1938 Bethlehem and Jerusalem were occupied by the Arabs. The Arabs openly declared that they would continue the war until their demands were accepted by Great Britain. Meanwhile the Woodhead Commission submitted its report and decisively opposed the partition scheme. As a result the partition scheme was abandoned.

With a view to find out a peaceful settlement between the Arabs and Jews a conference was convened at London in February, 1939 where the Jew and Arab representatives were invited. But as the representatives refused to sit with the Jews, no solution for the Palestine problem could be found.

With the beginning of the year 1939 and the deteriorating international situation, the British Government was pressed hard to bring about some settlement of the Arab-Jews conflict. The British Government issued a white paper in May under which an independent Palestine was to be created after 10 years. This independent state was to be in treaty relations with Britain to ensure the safeguarding of the rights of the Jewish National home. It provided that during the next 5 years a total of 75,000 Jews would be allowed to get in Palestine and that no further immigration would be allowed without the consent of the Arabs. This new policy, favourable to the Arabs, was an expression of the British realization that in the event of a war with Germany the good will of the Arabs would be an extremely important element. The White Paper was vehemently condemned by the Jews. During the first phase of the war the tension between the Arabs and the Jews continued to mount up. The Arabs were largely Pro-Axis and the Jews were, of course, entirely anti-Fascist. Under the war exigencies British Government had to follow a policy of placating the Arab. Meanwhile, Germany, in order to embarrass the British Government and weaken her was efforts, was dumping a large number of Jews in Palestine.

When the Second World War broke out Palestine problem was shelved for the time being. At that time the British Government was worried about its defences in near East, and kept its hold over the oil supplies. Consequently it was not willing to displease the Arabs. With a view to conciliate the Arabs who were resentful of the British policies in
Palestine, the British Government recognized independence of Syria and Lebanon in 1941. During the War the Jews fully co-operated with the Allies and the Arabs showered more or less neutral attitude.

The wealthy and influential Jewish Community of the USA being vexed with the unyielding attitude of the British government convened a conference of the Zionists in New York in 1942. The conference criticized the British plan of 1939 and resolved to establish a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, to build up a Jewish army and to facilitate the unrestricted immigration of the Jews into Palestine. From this time the USA also became more interested in the Jewish affairs. In many states of America resolutions were adopted supporting the Zionists. But U.S. Government could not support these resolutions for military reasons.

3.11.5 Post-War Developments Leading to Partition

As early as May 1942, the Jews led by David Ben-Gurion adopted the Biltmore Resolution taken at a Zionist conference at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, of creating a Jewish state and Jewish army. In the meantime, various Jewish terrorist organizations such as the ‘Haganah’, the ‘Irgun’ and ‘Stern Gang’ intensified their activities.

The British Government attempted to gain the co-operation of the United States in solving the problem. The decline in the power of Britain at the end of the Second World War, the advent there of a Labour Government with a solid majority in 1945, and the consequent change in the British policy, the considerable interests of the American Administration in the Middle Eastern Politics- all combined to bring the USA into the Palestine Problem in 1945. The Truman administration of America was strongly pro-Jewish for domestic reasons and the Anglo-American Committee of April 1946 recommended the immediate entry into Palestine of 100,000 Jews and relaxation on the land transfer limitations. Britain, during this period, was actively engaged in forming the Arab League and owing to Soviet threats to her position decided to do nothing about the report.

Britain, however, found her position in Palestine increasingly untenable due to the arrival of thousands of Jewish refugees and the activities of the Jewish and Arab terrorists. So in April, 1947 the Palestine problem was referred by Britain to the General Assembly of the UNO. A Special Committee on Palestine by a majority vote recommended the partition of Palestine between the Arabs and the Jews. The Minority report submitted by three members (India, Iran, and Yugoslavia) recommended
the creation of a federated state of Palestine composed of Jews and Arabs, each to enjoy local autonomy. The Plan of partition was carried by a majority with Britain abstaining from voting and the Soviet Union favouring partition. The Arab state which voted against the plan decided to resist it by force. The Jews were jubilant and the Arabs felt resentful towards the United States for the pressure exerted by her for partition. The Assembly appointed a Commission to put the resolution into effect and called up the Security Council to assist in the implementation of the plan. But Britain had already decided to withdraw on May 14, 1948. The only powers left to execute U.N. Plan for partition were U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. But the two super-powers were distrustful of each other and the matter was left to the Arabs or Zionists getting ready for the final struggle.

On May 14, 1948 the British mandate was terminated. The Jewish National Council meeting at Tel Aviv proclaimed the Jewish state of Israel. The United States extended its recognition within few hours. But Israel found itself at war with its Arab neighbours as soon as it was born. Armies from Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan and Egypt invaded Israel on the next day. The outcome of the struggle was contrary to Arab expectations. The Arab armies, which lacked unified command, were beaten back. The Arab legion of Transjordan, however, gained notable success and this again aroused the anger of king Abdullah’s colleagues in the Arab League.

After intermittent hostilities between May 1948 and January 1949 armistice was signed through the efforts of the UNO. The U.N. had appointed count Bernadette as mediator in Palestine. And he gave his life in the attempts to bring peace in Palestine. He was replaced by Dr. Ralph Bunch, his associate, and when the truce was concluded the boundaries of Israel had extended to include nearly three quarters of Palestine.

The above discussion fully proves the observation of E. H. Carr that “the contradiction between the promise given to the Jews and the vague undertaking given to the Arabs, (Which was rightly or wrongly, assumed to include Palestine) laid up serious trouble for the future.

3.12 Freedom of Egypt

Egypt is one of the most important states of the Middle East with an area of 386,000 square miles and a heterogeneous population of about 22 millions. With a rapidly growing nationalist movement led by the largely inarticulate peasants, Egypt gradually became the natural centre for the increasing activities of the Arab league. It linked together the entire Arab
World in a common endeavour to assert itself as force in the international politics under the imperialist rivalries in the near and Middle East led by France and England. Of the total population, 60% is devoted to agriculture, and a large proportion of the agricultural population was, until 1952, small landholders, the rest being landless proletarian. The principal mineral products include phosphate rock, petroleum, asbestos, chromate and salt etc.

Egypt is surrounded by Libya in the west, Sudan in the south, the Mediterranean in the north and the Red Sea in the east. The Nile has divided it into two parts, viz. the western desert and the eastern desert. About 95% of the total population lives in the Nile Valley. Islam is the state religion of Egypt and Arabic is its state language. About 98% of Egypt’s total population is Mohammedan and the rest are Christians and Jews. Two waterways have given her special significance in the history of the Middle East, viz. the Nile and the Suez Canal. Egypt is called the ‘Gift of the Nile’. As the Sumerian civilization grew up on the bank of the Tigris and the Euphrates, the Indus valley civilization grew up on the bank of the Nile.

Strategically, Egypt constitutes the nerve-centre of the British lines of communication, and with the Suez Canal running through its territory, occupies a key position in the lines of defence and transport. The defence of Egypt and the conduct of War operation from the Egyptian bases have always played a vital role in the western strategy and this explains the anxiety of the British military leaders until 1939 and of the American Generals after 1945, that even if political reasons dictated evacuation of Egypt the right to reoccupy Egypt at once in the event of war must be presented and adequate bases must be maintained near at hand to ensure effective defence of the entire region. This consideration was one of the complicating factors in the problem of Palestine and it constantly stood in the way of a treaty acceptable to the Egyptian nationalist sentiment. The strategic importance of Egypt and the compelling consideration of safeguarding the Suez Canal led Churchill at the “blackest year of peril” in 1940 to denude England’s scanty defences against invasion in order to reinforce the defence of Egypt and it has often been said since, that this was a master-stroke of British strategy.

From the 16th century till 1919, Egypt was under the rule of Turkey. Though at the beginning of 19th century, Mehmet Ali, the Turkish Governor of Egypt took the title of Khedive and virtually made himself independent, legally he was under the suzerainty of the Turkish sultan. In 1798 Napoleon led an expedition to Egypt and established there a military
camp in order to invade India. The French supremacy in Egypt came to an end in 1801 due to joint Anglo-Egyptian efforts. In the interests of British imperialism the construction to the Suez Canal was completed in 1869 which at once raised the importance of Egypt in the international politics. Britain early realized the importance of Suez as a vital link with India. Taking advantage of the financial bankruptcy of Egypt during the seventies of the 19th century, Disraeli, the then British Prime Minister bought 176,602 shares of the Suez Canal from Khedive Ismail for £4 million in 1875. In 1882 following the anti-Foreign riots started by Arabi Pasha the British occupied the delta of the Nile and established their hold over the Egyptian Government. From that time till 1907 Egypt remained under the protection of Britain.

The British hold was extended over Sudan following another uprising under Mahdi Muhhammad Ahmed in 1881 which resulted in the extermination of General Gordon and his men. In 1899 an Anglo-Egyptian Condominium was established over Sudan. England became the controlling factor in Egypt. Her cause was well served by some able bureaucrats, prominent among whom was Baring (later Lord Cromer). He created a civil service, achieved financial solvency, abolished slavery, founded schools, built railways, dams, irrigation canals and completely regenerated Egypt. On Turkey’s entry into World War I Egypt formally repudiated Turkish suzerainty. On December 18, 1914 Egypt was proclaimed as a British protectorate, the pro-Turkish Khedive, Abbar Hilmi was deposed and Hussain Kamil, the prince, was made the sultan. On his death in 1917, his brother Fuad I, became the king of Egypt although British supremacy in Egypt remained unaffected.

3.12.1 Egyptian Nationalism

In 1917 the principle of self-determination announced by President Wilson exercised profound influence on the young Egyptians. They therefore started an agitation for independence under the leadership of Saad Pasha Zaghlul. At the close of the war Egypt was full of discontent due to the bad treatment of the British Army officers and civil officials who regarded Egypt as a British colony. Soon after the armistice, therefore, Saad Zaghlul, the popular leader of Egypt, led a delegation to the British High Commissioner and informed him of the Egyptian desire for complete independence and requested him for permission “to lead a Wafd (delegation) to Paris to lay Egypt’s claim to independence before the Peace Conference”. Zaghlul was allowed to go to Paris and present Egypt’s case before the Peace Conference. Meanwhile, however, Wilson had recognized
British protectorate over Egypt and the Paris Peace Conference, therefore, could not do much to meet Zaghlul’s demands.

The Egyptians had been gradually growing restless under the British Rule and nationalist movement had been developing steadily. Certain factors were at the root of this nationalist ferment viz., (1) during the First World War, Britain promised not to engage the Egyptians in the War. So, the Egyptians became discontented. (2) Natural hatred for foreign rule gave a further impetus to their nationalist movement. (3) The well publicized Wilson’s principle of self determination during the war inspired the Egyptians to secure their independence. (4) Centuries-old hostilities between the Mohammedans and the Christians urged the Egyptians to free themselves from the yoke of the Christian Masters.

After the World War, the Egyptians demanded their independence under the leadership of their popular leader Zaghlul Pasha. Zaghlul Pasha led a deputation to the British High Commissioner, Sir Reginald Wingate, and demanded the independence of Egypt and brought his permission to lead an Egyptian delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. Syria, Hejaz (Modern Saudi Arabia) and even Cyprus were given permission to attend the Paris Peace Conference. But the British government dismissed the appeal of Zaghlul Pasha and banished him to Malta in 1919. Consequently, as a protest a terrible anti-British riot broke out in Egypt. The British Government appointed a commission under the chairmanship of Lord Alfred Milner to investigate the situation as well as to suggest the status of Egypt. The Milner Commission recommended abolition of British protectorate on Egypt, complete independence for Egypt and the protection of the interests of Britain and other European countries in Egypt.

After considerable difficulties of February 28, 1922 Britain announced the conditional independence of Egypt, and the termination of the protectorate. Under this unilateral British declaration of independence, Egypt was declared independent and her sultan as the “king”. A British note, however, was circulated to the powers, emphasising that there had been no alternation in the status quo as sanctioned by the Treaty of Versailles under which all the signatories had recognized the British protectorate in Egypt and the transfer to Britain of the Turkish rights held under the convention of Constantinople for the protection of the Suez Canal. Four rights were reserved by the British for their own discretion until an agreement could be reached with Egypt: (i) The security of Communications of the British Empire in Egypt; (ii) The defence of Egypt against all foreign aggression on interference, direct or
indirect; (iii) The protection of the Foreign interest and minorities; and (iv) The Sudan. These reservations were interdependent and crystallized the British political and strategic interests.

The declaration was soon followed by the British pronouncement that “interference in the affairs of Egypt by any foreign power would be regarded by Britain as a menace to her own security”. The Egyptians did not like the Declaration that Britain made in 1922 because their independence was greatly limited by the reservations. But they were not in a position to oppose Great Britain. As Langsam writes, “the new constitution was promulgated according to which the British protectorate over Egypt terminated but the British military authority in Egypt remained unaltered. Britain took on her shoulders the responsibility of defending Egypt and protecting the interests of foreign countries. Criticising Britain’s Egyptian policy, the English historian Toynbee has observed that “the granting of independence to Egypt was so limited by these reservations that it amounted in fact to less than Dominion Status”. Practically, this new arrangement in regard to Egypt was something like the imposition of the Monroe-Doctrine over Egypt.

The Egyptian problems were attempted to be solved during the period between 1924 and 1936. The first parliamentary elections under the new constitution were held in January 1924. The Wafd Party came to power with a great majority and its leader Zaghlul Pasha became the Prime Minister. Soon after assuming office Zaghlul Pasha started negotiating with the Labour Government of Ramsay MacDonald of England regarding the complete independence of Egypt, withdrawal of British army from Egypt and union of the Sudan and Egypt. But the negotiations ultimately proved abortive. With a view to extract concessions the Wafd Party started a campaign of terror and murder. Meanwhile, on November 19, 1924 Sir Lee Stack, the Governor –General of Sudan and the Commander–in-Chief of the Egyptian forces was assassinated in the street of Cairo by an unknown person and in consequence troubles and riots broke out again in Egypt. War between Britain and Egypt seemed imminent. Britain sent an ultimatum to the Egyptian government demanding (1) Official apology; (2) Punishment of criminals; (3) Prohibition of all kinds of political dominations; (4) Suitable reparation and (5) Withdrawal of the Egyptian troops and officers from the Sudan. Zaghlul agreed to accept all the demands excepting the one concerning the Sudan. But Britain remained adamant and occupied Alexandria. As a protest Zaghlul resigned and King Fuad took the reins of the government in his own hands.
During the next few years there was a comparative slowness in the Egyptian national movement. This was largely owing to the sudden demise of Zaghlul Pasha, the father of Egyptian nationalism. He was replaced by Nahas Pasha to lead the Wafd Party. But this party had to face severe opposition from the King Fuad. The interference of the palace supported by important politicians and divines of El-Azhar enabled King Fuad, backed by imperialism to curb the Wafd. This kind of antagonistic attitude hardly put any impediments on the workings of the Party. In the General Elections to the Parliament in 1926, the Wafd Party got many seats, but the majority was won by Abdul Khalik Sarwat and his Liberal party. Sarwat formed a coalition government with Nahas Pasha. Sarwat went to London and held consultations with the British Foreign Secretary, Chamberlain. Ultimately they came to the conclusion that the British army would remain stationed for the defence of the Suez and Egypt, the Egyptian Foreign policy would be consistent with the British interests and Britain would support Egypt for membership of the League of Nations. But the Egyptians under Nahas Pasha started popular agitation against this agreement and as a result Sarwat resigned and Nahas formed the government of the Wafd Party.

3.12.2 British Declaration of 1929

In May 1929, the British government redefined her policy towards Egypt and made the following declarations. “Because the interest at stake are of supreme importance to the safety and well-being of the Empire, His Majesty’s Government reserved, by the declaration of 1922, certain matters for its own determination, but even in these cases it is desire of his Majesty’s Government to act with and, where possible, through the Egyptian Government, respecting, in the large measures, the liberty and independence which by the same declaration they conceded to Egypt”.

In 1929 the Labour Government came to power in Great Britain. It prepared a draft treaty and submitted to Egypt. Although this draft treaty marked a further step in the direction of Egyptian independence, it did not satisfy the nationalist leader Nahas Pasha. Nahas Pasha demanding the complete independence for Egypt rejected the draft treaty. Riots again broke out in Egypt in 1929-30 and the negotiations broke down. The King Fuad dissolved the parliament and the reactionary leader Sidky Pasha assumed the office of the Prime Minister. He also replaced the relatively Liberal Constitution of 1923 by an Amended Constitution of 1930. Sidky Pasha resorted to extreme form of repressive measures. As a result, an awful political anarchy continued till 1934. The nationalists attacked the Christians and thereby embarrassed the position of Sidky Pasha.
compelling him to resign his office. The king now, finding no other alternative, invited Nahas Pasha to form the ministry. Finally Nahas came to power once again and on his advice the king abrogated the constitution of 1930.

The deadlock between Egypt and Britain came to be resolved when in 1935-36 Mussolini embarked on his Ethiopian expedition. For certain reasons Egypt was able to put pressure upon Britain to effect a speedy political settlement; for example (1) Italian expedition of Ethiopia complicated the position of Britain. (2) Sympathy for Ethiopia was felt all over Egypt. Everywhere anti-British movement and riots grew in proportions. Hence, Britain endeavoured to secure the sympathy of the Egyptians. In 1935 on the advice of Britain, King Fuad restored the earlier constitution of 1923. Within next few months Fuad died and Farouk ascended the throne. The Wafd party also thought that in view of the possibility of Egypt turning into a battle ground it was better to come to some understanding with Great Britain.

3.12.3 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936

The Wafd Party won majority in the next election of May 1936 and Nahas Pasha was once again appointed Prime Minister. Negotiations were resumed between Britain and Egypt in 1936. The growing Fascist menace made Britain willing to satisfy the nationalists. Britain thought it wise to reach an agreement in view of a possible involvement in War with Italy. This happened to be the background of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty signed in August 1936 in London. According to its terms— (1) this treaty was to remain in force for twenty years. (2) the British military occupation of Egypt was ended, (3) Britain was allowed to maintain air bases and fly R.A.F. Planes over Egypt for training purposes, (4) the ground troops of Britain were allowed to be stationed in special one along the Suez Canal for a period of 20 years, and at the naval base of Alexandria for a period of 8 years, (5) all British troops were to be withdrawn from the interior of the country, (6) both agreed to help each other against any aggression, (7) the joint rule of Britain and Egypt was retained in the Sudan, (8) Britain agreed to send an ambassador to Egypt and also to support Egypt in becoming a member of the League of Nations, (9) Egypt undertook not to enter into any treaty with a foreign power which might be opposed to this alliance, (10) Britain too undertook to help Egypt to secure the abolition of the capitulations, i.e., the rights of ex-territoriality enjoyed by the nations of principal Foreign powers in Egypt, and (11) The status of the British High Commissioner was to be reduced to that of an Ambassador, but a
British Military Mission to train and equip the Egyptian army was established.

Though this treaty did not completely satisfy the national interests of Egypt, it resolved the Egyptian problems partially under the then existing circumstances. But the basic problem of Sudan remained unsolved. Egypt now regained its fiscal freedom by the abolition of capitulations. It was a step forward to Egyptian independence but still there was a long way to go before Egypt could achieve full freedom. In 1937 Nahas Pasha appointed in his place Mohammed Pasha—a liberal leader into the office of the Prime Minister. The Wafd Party lost now much of its popularity.

3.12.4 Egypt and the World War II

When the World War II broke out Egypt immediately broke off diplomatic relation with Germany. In 1940-41 the Italian and the German threats were serious and in co-operation with the British, the Egyptians began to fortify their country in the expectation of imminent hostility. But with the British victory in the memorable battle of El Alamein on November 4, 1942 the major danger had been overcome. In the beginning of the war Ali Mahir, the Prime Minister, was reputedly pro-fascist and anti-British. The British treatment of the Egyptians from 1940 onward was singularly tactless and roused the opposition of all sections of Egyptians.

On February 1, 1942 Cairo, the capital of Egypt staged demonstrations in favour of Ali Mahir who had been dismissed in June 1940 as a result of the British pressure on the king and replaced by Hussein Sirri, a supporter of the British. On February 2, 1942 Farouk dismissed Sirri partly as result of the popular demonstrations against him and partly because he had broken diplomatic relations with France under the pressure from the British Embassy. On February 3, Farouk consulted Mahir about the formation of a government. On February 5, 1942, Nahas Pasha formed the government on the understanding that Britain would not intervene in the internal affairs of Egypt for the rest of the war. Nahas loyally cooperated with Britain, but gradually his prestige declined in the country. By the end of 1944 Nahas had become useless for the British and they withdrew their support from him. Farouk, finding no British support to Nahas, dismissed him. Early in 1945 elections were held in which parties other than the Wafd secured a majority and Ahmad Mahir Pasha became the Prime Minister. On February 24, 1945 Egypt declared war on the Axis powers.
But in the meantime a terrible agitation against Britain started everywhere in Egypt. The Egyptians became restless under the torture of the British troops. Describing this situation General Naguib writes in his Memoirs- ‘Egypt’s Destiny’- “During the War we suffered countless humiliations at the hands of the British, who failed and still fail to understand that our national interests are not and can never be the same as theirs…. They molested our women, assaulted our men and committed acts of vandalism in public places.”

3.12.5 Post-World War II Developments

The anti-Wafd coalitions that ruled Egypt in alliance with palace between 1944 and 1945 had to face opposition from the extreme right and extreme left represented by the communists. In 1950 elections, however, the Wafd regained power and once again Nahas Pasha became the Prime Minister. At the end of the war Egyptian demand for the revision of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 became vigorous. As a result of this demand in 1946 the Sidky-Bevan Agreement was concluded. The agreement provided for withdrawal of the British troops from the Canal Zone and status quo in Sudan till the time was ripe for the Sudanese to decide their own form of government. According to the British view, the Sudanese were given the right of separation from Egypt by this agreement but the Egyptians were not prepared to accept this interpretation and so the treaty was not ratified. In the United Nations, Egypt accused Britain of maintaining troops in Egypt and following a hostile policy in Sudan. Egypt’s anti-British campaign reached its height during the Anglo-Iranian crisis in October, 1951.

3.12.6 The July Revolution and Freedom of Egypt

From 1951 onwards a series of crises took place in Egypt which ultimately resulted in the expulsion of Britain from the Egyptian soil and the nationalization of the Suez. The Egyptian denunciation of the 1936 agreement was followed by anti-British demonstrations which resulted in January, 1952 in mob attacks in Cairo and other towns on British buildings and residence. The king Farouk took this opportunity of dismissing Nahas Pasha. This was followed by a coup on July 23, 1952 organised by the “Committee of Free Officers”, a secret group headed by Major General Mohammed Naguib. The Revolutions deposed Farouk and subsequently his minor son Fuad II in whose favour he had abdicated. Thus Egypt became a republic.
The Revolutionary Command Council (RCC) declared an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal programme which included agrarian reforms and rapid industrialization. The former resulted in affixing maximum holding to nearly 208 acres and adoption of a scheme for a new high dam north of Aswan. In the political field a committee to redraft the constitution was appointed but in the meanwhile all political parties were dissolved. The new constitution virtually concentrated all power in the RCC. Soon however, Naguib was replaced by Gamal Abdel Nasser as the leader of RCC. Naguib was deprived of power and put under house arrest.

In July 1954 the new government under Nasser reached another agreement with Britain. It abrogated the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian agreement and provided for a total withdrawal of British troops within twelve months. Britain, however, was given the right to return its base only in case of an attack, by any country except Israel, on any member of the Arab League or Turkey. So far the problems of Sudan and Suez were concerned, the new government signed an agreement with Britain which stipulated that Sudan was to pass through a transitional phase before deciding whether it should join with Egypt. In December 1955 the Sudanese chamber proclaimed independence and was promptly recognized by UK, USA and Egypt. After independence Ismail al-Azhari became the President of Sudan.

Thus from 1919 to 1945, Egypt was fully controlled and her resources were thoroughly exploited by Britain. The governments were made or marred as a result of British pleasure or displeasure. Politicians, with a few exceptions, and the king, were a tool of British diplomacy. Throughout this period the masses were full of discontent. A militant nationalism stimulated by the impulse of the war, by the promises of the British and by the widespread activities of the Wafd Party became the characteristic feature of the Egyptian politics during this phase. This period also witnessed the emergence of the Wafd as the most powerful factor in Egyptian politics. The Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 was only an indication of the growing weakness of the British domination in relation to Egypt and a proof of the fact that she will not be able to control the Egyptian destiny for long. The Second World War intensified the Egyptian nationalism, increased the Egyptian grievances against the British high-handedness and sharpened the Egyptian desire for political independence and social progress. And since this could be achieved by the British evacuation and the elimination to the institution of monarchy which had become a hot-bed of intrigues, in 1945, the Egyptians pursued this double policy of expelling the British from the country and putting it on the road to a Republic.
3.13 Foreign Policy of USA

The foreign policy of the United States of America, like that of any state is shaped largely by geographical and historical considerations, by her political and social system, by her economic strength and military power, by her relative power position, by the policies of other states and by the world environment in which she lived. In the American Hemisphere, from the beginning of the 19th century, the United States had been making frantic efforts to establish a home of security. Earnest May observes, “The U.S. Foreign policy is the result of a long past, a churning present and a vision for the future”. The past foreign policy of USA was a glaring ‘Monroe Doctrine’ enunciated in 1823 having its principles- “America for Americans and she was not to interfere in the European affairs and the European powers were not to interfere in the European affairs and the European powers were not to intervene in the domestic affairs of USA”. Commercial expansion, capital investment, and opposition to European penetration in the hemisphere had been the recurring theme of the American policy in the region, so that the United States with its huge economic and industrial power and tremendous military strength would exert a decisive influence on the fortunes of this vast region.

3.13.1 Bases of American Foreign Policy

This attitude of the USA took the shape of imperialism towards the fag end of 19th century in 1899. From 1899 till America entered into the World War –I, she underwent an ambiguous mixture of foreign policy to which the historian Samuel Flagg Bennis tactically interprets in the following factors-1) Sovereign independence of nations 2) Continental expansion 3) Avoidance of collision with Europe 4) the non-colonisation principle 5) Non-interference in the internal affairs of any action 6) Non-transfer of western possession from one to another 7) Self determination of people, 8) Freedom of the seas for the neutral ships in time of war and freedom of navigation in international rivers, 9) Freedom of international trade and lastly, 10) the feeling of anti-imperialism.

After 1919, the foreign policy of USA took a new dimension and a new orientation which included some new principles like pacifism, anti-imperialism, and isolationism from European affairs, disarmament and opposition to mandate system of the League of Nations. Hans J. Morgenthau, therefore, rightly observes, “American isolationism in inter war period was different from old isolationism existed in between 1898 to 1919”. Her foreign policy differed from region to region. While she was isolationistic towards European countries, was cooperative towards the
President Wilson, whom the European nations had chosen to be the leader to lead them to a war to end all future wars and to bring them to the pinnacle of prosperity, was not voted to power in the Presidential election of 1920. But it was W. G. Harding, the leader of the Republican Party who became the President of USA in 1920. Had there been the emergence of Democratic Party with its leader Wilson again in 1920 to the Presidential post, the foreign policy of USA would have been different. While Wilson’s policy was internationalistic, the policy of Harding was traditional. By that time, the USA was the leader of the European nations who clandestinely needed the help and assurance of the United States.

After the World War I, the European nations had been overburdened with inter-allied war debts amounting to 27 billion dollars lent by them from USA. In the war Germany had cost an innumerable loss to the European nations who, in the Treaty of Versailles, demanded heavy reparation from Germany which was economically at that time a pauperized state. Hence, Germany was to seek the help of USA for repaying the war loss to the European nations, who in turn, were to repay the debts taken from the USA. So, had the USA remained isolationistic, it would not have got her debts repaid by the European nations. The term “isolation” was not the proper measure at that time to define the fate of the USA as well as of the world. But Harding lacked this kind of retrospection, could not visualize such circumstance and let the USA to be isolated from European affairs. He was of the opinion that Europe could manage its own affairs without American aid and therefore, the US should not adopt the policy of intervention but should adopt a new policy for European politics for the next few years. It would be wrong to assume that the Republicans adopted the policy of complete isolationism. Their policy could more appropriately be called as one of “Cooperation without entangling alliance”.

### 3.13.2 Relations with Europe

The foreign policy of the US towards Europe can rightly be categorised into three phases- first phase from 1919 to 1923, second from 1923 to 1933 and third from 1933 to 1941. The period from 1919 to 1923 only witnessed the complete isolation of USA not only from the League of Nations but also from the European nations. Questions are obviously raised, if in between 1919-23, USA’s policy was isolationistic towards
Europe, then how could the Washington Conference be convened in Washington in 1921-22 among France, Japan, Britain and the USA with the USA herself as the leading power to respect each other’s holdings in the Pacific; how could she conclude Five Power Treaty with Britain, France, Italy and Japan regarding relative naval strength of the signatory states and decide the equations of their naval strength, i.e., 5:5:3;1.75:1.75: respectively; and lastly how could she sign a nine Power Treaty with Belgium, China, France, Italy, Japan, Britain Netherlands and Portugal for the preservation of equal commercial rights in China. They were convened by USA not for the complete violation of isolationism, but were the necessary means or safeguards to strengthen American isolationism and she was less reluctant to undertake international commitments.

The next phase of ten years, from 1923 to 1933 was the amazing period of not complete isolationism, but comparative isolationism. America took interests in the problem of Europe because she had to collect a lot of debts from various governments of Europe which naturally involved her in the reparation problem. USA helped Germany to make economic recovery through the Dawes Plan and Young Plan. Although the USA could not become member of the League due to non-ratification of the treaty of Versailles by the American Senate, she started co-operating with the League in its attempts for disarmament, betterment of labour conditions and other human problems.

Specifically, she took keen interests in naval disarmament for which she convened a Disarmament conference at Washington which fixed ratios for the great powers in capital ships and aeroplane carriers. In 1927, President Coolidge called another conference at Geneva to extend the principle of limitation to smaller crafts such as cruisers, destroyers and submarines, but ended in total fiasco. Also the USA participated in the naval conferences held at London in 1930 and 1932. The American representatives also took part in the General Disarmament Conference held at Geneva in February 1932. Similarly, USA attended the London Economic Conference of 1933, which though, mainly an economic conference, also examined the possibilities of mutual understanding of the different countries regarding restrictions of armaments.

The last phase of the period from 1933 to 1941 was the period of gradual abandonment of isolationism. President Franklin D. Roosevelt who came to power during this period wanted to wholeheartedly co-operate with Europe and turn off isolationism. Europe in the meantime experienced the meteoric emergence of great fascist heroes, Adolf Hitler in
Germany and Benito Mussolini of Italy. Three Neutrality Acts were passed by Roosevelt as to under what circumstances the USA could co-operate with European nations. In August 1935, first Neutrality Act was passed to forbid the export of US arms and ammunitions to any part of a belligerent nation. In 1937 the second Act was passed laying down the principles to extend the help to all the nations equally, not partially. By the third Neutrality act of 1939 it was decided that in case of war between the two foreign states, the President could name the states through proclamation which provided that it was unlawful for the US vessels to carry any passengers or articles or materials to any state named in the proclamation.

In 1937, USA took another step in this direction by adopting the principle of ‘cash and carry basis’ for the sale of armaments which indicated the gradual abandonment of her isolationism. By 1937-38 after the Sino-Japanese War, President Roosevelt in his “Quarantine” Speech at Chicago urged the European nations for the mass boycott of the international aggression.

In 1934 USA entered into International Labour Organisation (ILO) as a member which was the direct violation of its neutrality. In 1937, President Roosevelt signed Rome-Berlin Axis, otherwise known as the Anti-Comintern Pact with Italy and Germany with a view to refraining them from the Communist influence of Russia. By that time, Roosevelt had come to prognosticate the inconvenience of the World War II and the Fascist and Nazi imperialism. Therefore, in 1941 he said openly, “The world cannot survive half fascist, half free. Any anti-Nazi is worthy of getting American help”. This shows that Roosevelt was anti-communistic and was not the “Soviet spy” or the “Commy” as the businessmen criticized him.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was further admired for his ‘Four Freedom Speech’ made in 1941 which were 1) Freedom of Speech, 2) Freedom of Religion, 3) Freedom from Fear and 4) Freedom from Want; according to which the Americans were authorized to get freedom of press and speech and to propagate any religion they liked and also they were guaranteed to security and safety from the onslaughts of any foreign power. It was such because USA had remained isolated from Europe and nobody was there to threaten USA. The freedom of want revealed that USA was capable of maintaining herself economically without any scarcity being felt and therefore, USA remained isolationistic without taking any aid from the foreign nations. But in 1941 when Japan bombarded the Pearl Harbour of USA, American isolationism ended and she not only declared war against
Japan, but also against Germany and Italy who were allies to her previously.

3.13.3 Relations with the Far East

The Far East was more important to the USA than any other part of the World. America’s relations with the Far East began to develop since the coming of Commodore Perry to Japan in 1853-54. America’s interests began to develop in the Far East since her occupation of the Hawaii Islands in 1878 and the enunciation of her ‘open door policy’ in regard to China in 1899. The U.S. armed forces had been deployed in the Far East since 1899 and practically when Japan threatened America’s interests in the Far East, the latter joined the Second World War. Until the end of 19th century, the chief aim of America’s Far Eastern Policy was to secure trade rights like other countries. She was not in favour of expansion or military intervention in China like other Western countries.

Since the beginning of 20th Century, economic interests, trade and commerce of the U.S. in the Far East began to grow enormously. Her influence in the Pacific grew in volume after her occupation of the Philippine Islands, Hawaii Islands and the Panama Canal Zone. During the period between 1900 and 1931, America’s Far Eastern Policies in relation to the Philippines, China and Japan were largely influenced by her economic interests and strategic considerations, Japan’s territorial expansion and the nationalist movement in China. The motive behind the Open Door Policy as enunciated by the United States was to maintain equal economic rights of all countries in China by preserving the territorial integrity of the latter against the aggressions of the European countries, Russia and Japan. In order to suppress the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900 the United States cooperated with the imperialists. After this rebellion, the US stationed her armies in Peking and Tientsin in order to protect her own interests. In 1901, America intervened in the Manchurian crisis in favour of China. After the Chinese Revolution of 1911, the volume of American trade in China increased enormously.

But in the meantime, Japan had also entrenched herself strongly in the Far East. As a result, America and Japan came nearer to each other in this region. In the Far East, America assumed the role of western countries’ spokesman. Until the first decade of 20th century the United States had no reason of dispute or hostility with Japan. Rather cooperation between the two continued upto that stage. When Russia was defeated in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05, the U.S. President remarked, “Japan is playing our game”. The best example of the US-
Japanese cooperation was the Taft-Katsura Agreement concluded in 1905. But after this, the relations between the two began to deteriorate and bitter tension between them developed when the Japanese labourers began to migrate to USA.

According to the Root-Takahira Agreement of 1908, Japan pledged to support the Open Door Policy of America in relation to China and to maintain the Chinese territorial integrity. In return, the USA acknowledged Japanese adventures in Manchuria. During the First World War, the United States had to face various difficulties in the Far East. According to the Lanshing–Ishii Agreement of 1917, the USA had recognized Japan’s special interests in China. The American participation in the Siberian intervention (1918-19) was partly intended to prevent the Japanese penetration in Siberia and South Manchuria. In 1920, the United States joined the Four-power consortium in order to protect China against the competitive commercial and financial claims of the powers particularly Japan. The American-Japanese conflict continued at the Paris Peace conference and at the Washington Conference.

The goodwill that was generated by the generous American help to the Japanese in the Yokohama Earthquake in September 1923 was dissipated by the anti-immigration legislation of 1924. The Mukden incident of 1931 brought fresh stresses and strains. America attempted to follow an impossible policy- a policy of acting independently of the League; reserving full independence of judgement as to each step to be taken, yet endeavouring to support the general objective of the League, namely, the preservation of peace in Manchuria, and a policy of not seriously annoying Japan to the point of starting a war and yet aimed at saving China as far as possible. The only result of this was the so-called Stimson’s principle of non-recognition which only implied a sort of diplomatic coercion on Japan without backing it with force. Thus when Japan was challenging the basic principles of the American Far Eastern policy, the United States refused to make armed intervention in support of China and in opposition to Japan.

After 1931 the USA strengthened her naval power in the Far East and increased the defensive strength of the Pearl Harbour and other pacific bases, liberalized her policy towards the Philippines and officially recognized the Soviet Union. Still the United States never contemplated the total destruction of the Japanese power in Asia. America’s policy of appeasement towards Japan as evinced at the Brussels Conference, antagonised China, worried Russia and encouraged Japan in her expansionist activities. Truly speaking, America’s aim was to reduce Japan’s power in the Far East, although she could not proceed further in
this direction in fear of Soviet Russia. In 1937 the Marco Polo Bridge incident took place but the U.S. policy did not move to more than moral condemnation of the aggressor and ineffective diplomatic protests, and it appeared that China’s territorial integrity was not so vital as to be worth fighting for. Internal politics, the pacifist wood, the possibility of a two-ocean war with a one-ocean many and the preservation of Japan against communism paralysed the American Policy during this phase.

However, Japan’s attack on the Pearl Harbour in December 1941 compelled the United States to declare war on Japan. The United States actively participated in the War against Japan. When America dropped atom bombs on the two Japanese cities, Japan unconditionally surrendered to America in August 1945. The American armies marched into Japan and the civil and military administration of Japan was put in the hands of Douglas MacArthur, the American Army General. Thus, America’s undisputed supremacy was established over defeated Japan.

3.13.4 Relations with Latin-America

The continued effort of the United States to dominate and penetrate in Latin America expressed itself in the so-called Pan-American movement. There seems to be at least five elements to bring out the real motive of this movement.

First, there are the vital interests, political, economic and strategic, of the United States of America. These interests have been to organize and arm the hemisphere for defence; to resist any outside attempt to use any part of it for direct or indirect military operations, i.e., espionage, the construction of submarine bases, propaganda, sabotage etc.; to obtain bases for military and naval forces; to acquire the available raw materials for the expanding American economy, such as the oil of Mexico and Venezuela, the tin of Bolivia, the wheat of Argentina and the coffee of Columbia; to achieve hemispheric unity both for political and military ends; to obtain military aid from Latin America by organizing, arming and training of local troops for use in actual combat; and to maintain peace in the area as an essential means of achieving some or all of these objectives. These objectives were expected to be realized sometimes by inter-American congresses and conferences, and the doctrine of equal sovereignty or of non-intervention, and sometimes by pronouncements like the Monroe Doctrine, the Policy of Big Stick and the Good Neighbour Policy, involving the use of diplomatic economic and military weapons.
Secondly, there is the important element of a marked backwardness of the South American region, which is characterized by a chronic political instability, a feudal economy and a static and immobile social structure. None of the South American countries even could claim to be highly industrialized and all of them were producers of raw materials. The economic and social life was dominated by the large estate. The racial diversities caused by the presence of the Indian, the Negro and the White have led to social disharmony and tensions. Economic uncertainty, political insecurity, mass illiteracy, unscrupulous leadership, corrupt administration have resulted in intrigues, military coups, radical politics and have invited foreign aggression and American intervention.

Thirdly the strong position of the United States and the extreme poverty and backwardness of South America has resulted in a strong sentiment of anti-Americanism in the region which is responsible for repeated shifts in the American policy and which has disturbed the smooth progress of regional security system. The anti-American sentiment in Latin America goes back to the middle of the 19th century and its main cause was the war between the United States and Mexico provoked by the incidents involved in the annexation of Texas. Nevertheless, relations improved and the first, inter-American conference was held in 1899. But the economic expansion of the United States and the operation of ‘Dollar Diplomacy’ led to the American military intervention in the Caribbean and provoked “the most virulent of all Latin American reactions” in the beginning of the 20th century. The contrast between the richness of North America and the poverty of the South, the sharp differences in the culture of the Anglo-Saxon and Protestant North and the Latin and Catholic South, and the basic divergence between the so called spiritual attitude in the South and “the crass, coarse and corrupting zeal for money” in the North, have been some of the other sources of the anti-American feeling which is much older than either communism or fascism.

Fourthly, Latin America, as the phrase itself indicates, has been an arena of power-rivalry, at least since the beginning of the 18th Century. Britain, Spain and France up to the 19th Century and Germany and Russia in the 20th, have been keenly interested in the markets and materials of South America. The Monroe Doctrine was only an American notice served on the European powers to keep their hands off the American hemisphere, and since 1823, the United States had never missed any opportunity to asserting its own monopolistic rights in the region and the warding off the European powers from an area which it regarded as an exclusive American sphere. From 1920 onwards one of the reasons of unhappy relations between the United States on the one hand, and Russia and
Germany on the other, was the communist and Nazi activities in the confused and chaotic conditions prevailing in Latin America.

Finally, there has been the persistent disunity in South America which has been responsible for mutual differences and conflicts among the Latin American countries themselves. It is true that from 1920 to 1945, except for the Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay in the thirties, the Latin American Republics have never fought against each other seriously. Nevertheless, the local differences and jealousies have been creating serious tensions and tended to obstruct the attempts at a regional security system. In short, four centuries of colonial existence in the hands of Spain, Portugal, France and Britain, the absence of traditions and techniques of self-government, the difficulties in the adjustments to the status of independent self-governing nations, the colonial patterns of land ownership, the corrupt and exacting landed aristocracy, army and clergy, the traditions of ‘caudillos’, the chronic frustration of primal needs and social aspirations, and the consequent reliance upon violence, have created a very complex situation in Latin America. The normal reliance of United States on Latin America for sugar, petroleum and coffee, rubber, sisal, antimony, nitrate and copper etc, has lent to the American policies an imperialist complexion. About 50% of the American imports from Latin America consist of strategic raw materials and about 70% of the total American requirements of these raw materials are met by Latin America. Whereas in 1914 the United States had no banking concern in Latin America, by 1921 as many as 54 American banks had sprung up, and by 1931 the American capital investment had gone to $5,000 million.

The American Policy towards Latin America has followed through seven phases: (i) The Monroe Doctrine, (ii) Dollar Diplomacy, (iii) Active Intervention, (iv) Big Stick, (v) Good Neighbour, (vi) Honest Broker, and (vii) Equal Status and Equal Partnership in an American organization. These phases do not fall in a clear chronological order except that after 1933 the policy of Good Neighbour sponsored by F.D. Roosevelt had led to a general reconciliation between the North and South, although economic conflicts continued to create bitterness.

3.13.5 The Pan-American Conferences

The first Pan –American conference met in 1889 at Washington and discussed the projects of a customs union, a common silver currency, and a system of arbitration for the settlement of inter-American disputes. It failed. With the advent of the 20th century, the anti-American sentiment
mounted up, and the entry of the US in the World War I met with a mixed reaction, so that eight states declared war. Only five severed their diplomatic relations with Germany, and as many as seven remained neutral. Between 1890 and 1919 three Pan-American Conferences met but they did not achieve much success. The American failure to join the League of Nations was regarded by Latin America as a positive proof that American imperialism was in no mood to accept any external control.

In 1923, the fifth Pan-American conference met at Santiago de Chile where opposition to the United States was expressed in rather sharper tones, for, the US blocked a Uruguayan proposal for the creation of an American League of Nations based on the absolute equality of its members. The Latin American countries therefore drew the general conclusion that the United States still regarded the Monroe Doctrine as a right of protectorship over the Southern republics. Nevertheless, the conference appointed a Commission of Jurists to codify American International Law in order to limit American action.

In 1925, the American marines from Nicaragua were withdrawn, and the firm American grip on her economic life imposed by the Treaty of 1912 came to be relaxed after Nicaragua had fully repaid the American loans. The American marines, however, were again dispatched in 1926 when revolutionary activities occurred in Nicaragua, on the plea of protecting American lives and property and of establishing, peace conditions. In 1928 Stimson was sent as an “honest broker” to mediate between the rebels and the regime. Elections were arranged under American auspices and its results were accepted by both parties. But the policy of “Honest Broker” was put to a more severe test in Mexico where in 1928 President Plutarco Calles had announced the expropriation of foreign oil concessions. He US complained of the spread of Bolshevism and pressed for anti-communist measures. The American ambassador to Mexico, W.D. Morrow, mediated and achieved a settlement under which the competence of the Mexican Supreme Court to adjudge the right of the American oil concerns was recognized. Mexico confirmed all oil concessions granted before 1917 and dropped the 50 year limitation on foreign held concessions.

In 1928, the sixth Pan-American conference met at Havana and it immediately condemned the American high tariffs and the American intervention in Nicaragua. A resolution that no American state should intervene in the interval affairs of another failed. The United States took the plea that “if there was a breakdown of Government, if sovereignty
faltering in a Latin American state, intervention to protect the lives of the
US was justified.

In 1929, President elect however undertook a tour of Latin America in order to improve the relations and establish better understanding. But the economic crisis and the stock market crash of 1929-30 adversely reacted on Latin America, for all short term loans were called in and the unsold surpluses of the Latin American grain, meat, cotton and coffee accumulated. Economic discontent was accompanied by new wave of revolutions. The US, in order to protect its own industries, raised tariffs on the import of sugar, the principal export of Cuba for which the US was the main market. Cuba, therefore, was hit hard by the Hawley- Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 under which tariffs had been raised. In 1930-31 the Forbes Commission recommended the withdrawal of the American marines from Nicaragua and the American ambassador to Cuba recommended the policy of equality.

In October 1931, the Dominican Republic and Brazil announced the suspension of interest payment on their foreign debts. But even this was not used as a pretext for intervention by the United States. The new regimes thrown up by revolutions in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile and Peru were recognized by the US. In 1931 the famous Clark Memorandum announced that “the Monroe Doctrine was no longer to be regarded as an instrument of violence and operation against Latin America, but was what President Monroe had doubtless intended it to be a guarantee freedom and territorial integrity”. As a result of the economic depression, the American exports fell down from $ 900 million in 1929 to $ 200 million in 1932 and in 1930-33 there was a veritable epidemic of debt default by the Latin American countries. Yet no American intervention followed.

In 1931 Mexico joined the League of Nations and its representatives condemned the Monroe Doctrine as an “infantile to cloak tutelage on the part of the United States over Latin America”. In 1932 Argentina rejoined the League and justified the step on the ground that the Monroe Doctrine was “a unilateral political declaration,” not “a regional agreement”. In December 1933 the seventh Pan –American conference met at Montevideo where Roosevelt in his inaugural address announced the policy of the Good Neighbour. Secretary Hull announced that “no Latin American Government need fear any intervention on the part of the United States under the Roosevelt administration” but that the United States signed a proof containing this new policy and it was unanimously ratified by the American Senate in 1934. This fact indicated the beginning of a non-partisan American foreign policy towards Latin America. Encouraged by
this development Roosevelt went further and finalized the treaty for the withdrawal of the American marines from Haiti, a treaty which had been under negotiations during the Hover regime. Thus by the end of 1934 all American armed forces had been withdrawn from the soil of the Latin American republics.

With regard to Cuba, the United States had been enjoying a right of intervention under the Platt Amendment of 1902 named after Senator Orville H. Platt of Connecticut. Roosevelt introduced a change here also, even though a serious revolutionary situation developed in Cuba in 1933. The regime of President Machado was followed by a radical regime of Martin which the United States refused to recognize. But when a more conservative government was established by Col. Mendieta, Roosevelt at once recognized the government and abrogated the Platt amendment, thus removing the limitations on the Cuban Sovereignty. The Hawley-Smoot Law of 1930 was replaced by the Jones-Costigan Act establishing quotas for sugar imports and thus gave Cuba a chance to dispose off a substantial part of its sugar in the United States under a system of reduced –tariff duties.

During 1932-35 the Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay was brought to a close by the League intervention and the active mediation of the United States. The helplessness of the League of Nations to arrest the development of the Chaco War without the active assistance of the United States undermined the faith of the Latin American countries in the League system. In 1934-35 the European situation was fast deteriorating as a result of the Italian rape on Ethiopia and Hitler’s repudiation of the Versailles Treaty. Roosevelt, therefore, started moving towards a closer understanding in the American hemisphere as the sheet-anchor of American defence in the event of a general war, and he suggested to the Government of Argentina that another conference be called to consider the ways and means of safeguarding the peace of Americans. Thus in December 1936 the eighth Pan-American conference was called at Buenos Aires, Argentina.

In the opening session of the Buenos Aires conference, Roosevelt pointed to the “need of common consultation against the West, which driven by war madness or land hunger, might seek to commit acts of aggression against us”. But the distrust in Latin America of the intentions of the North was still profound, and it was with great difficulty that a non-committal resolution, pledging mutual consultation in the event of the threat to the peace of the Americas was accepted. No machinery to implement this resolution was, however, instituted. But the Buenos Aires
convention incorporating the above mentioned resolution was in itself a
great advance, even though no definite obligations were entered into and
no specific plans of action were set forth. A proposed embargo, by which
the main provisions of the recent neutrality legislation of the United States
would have been extended to Latin America, was not allowed.

In 1937-38 fresh difficulties cropped up in the path of the Good
Neighbour Policy. President Lazaro Cardenas of Mexico nationalized the
railroads in 1937 and expropriated 13 American and 4 Brazilian oil
companies involving a capital of $400 million in 1938 and in both cases
compensation was promised. Nevertheless, the oil interests concerned
were extremely skeptical of Mexico’s intention or her capacity to pay and
they engineered a boycott of Mexican oil abroad. This turned Cardenas to
Germany and Italy which had the necessary tankers ready to transship
the oil. Even in the face of this provocation Roosevelt continued the policy
of Moderation and restraint and did nothing to prejudice the prospects of
the ninth Pan-American conference which was scheduled to be held in
December 1938 at Lima.

At the Lima Conference Argentina took up the unassailable, but
from the American point of view an inconvenient, plea of avoiding “foreign
entanglements”. Roosevelt’s persuasions, however, succeeded and the
conference decided to create a machinery of consultation to implement the
Buenos Aires convention. The Lima Agreement provided that in case of
possible Aggression or threat to peace the foreign ministers of the
American states would meet in the various capitals in turn at the request
of any one of them. Any such threat was declared to be a matter of
common concern and was to be met by measures which each government
deemed to be appropriate. The Lima Agreement was apparently made
possible by compulsive force of German aggression in Europe.

In September 1939 World War II had broken out and in September –
December the tenth Pan-American conference met at Panama. It
discussed and developed a machinery for the inter-American financial and
economic cooperation. Summer Welles told the 21 American Republics
assembled at Panama that they could not permit their security and their
legitimate economic interests to be jeopardized by belligerent activities in
close proximity to the shores of the new world. He therefore, proposed to
establish a “Safety Zone”. In October 1939, Final Act was passed which
carried 16 declarations and resolutions relating to peaceful settlement of
disputes and the vital need for unity in the American hemisphere. A
declaration of Panama was issued which set up a “Neutrality Zone”
extending out to 300 to 1000 miles in sea in which they asserted no
belligerent acts could be committed. This was ridiculed by many as a “Chastity belt” and was indeed a remarkable repudiation of the principle of the freedom of the seas and the long-established rule of international law which permits a three-mile limit of maritime Jurisdiction. No country cared for this declaration and the first important naval battle of the Second World War fought within the Zone on December 13, 1939.

The eleventh Pan American Conference met at Havana in 1940 where the principle of regional collective security took a move definite shape in the declaration that “any attempt on the part of a non-American against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against the states which signed this declaration”. An agreement was also concluded for the administration of any European territory in the Caribbean that might be in danger of falling in the hands of Germany. An elaborate code was drawn out to meet such a contingency and the United States was unanimously authorized to adopt suitable measures. While the Havana declaration clearly implied an obligation to take common action to meet a common threat, it did not contain any provision for action other than such measures “as might be determined upon at the time the actual attack was made and the consultations held”. But the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbour at once brought the issue of regional defence down to more definite terms. Many of the Latin American States at one declared war on Japan and all of them adhered to the Washington declaration of January 1, 1942 under which they undertook to remain united till the end of the war and not to conclude separate peace with the enemy.

The twelfth Pan-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, therefore, met in a more confident atmosphere and it resolved that all American States must sever diplomatic relations with the Axis powers. It reaffirmed the declaration of Havana and set up an emergency Advisory Committee entrusted with the duty to discover and suppress subversive activities, and an inter-American defence board consisting of the military and the technical representatives to recommend measures necessary for the defence of the continent. The Rio Conference also recommended a programme for the development of strategic raw materials and the closest economic collaboration during the war period.

In 1944, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were published and the American states had now to decide whether they should permit their regional system to be absorbed in the security system of the proposed United Nations or maintain it intact and develop it further. The decision
on this was taken in the thirteenth Pan-American Conference meeting at Mexico City in February–March 1945. On March 6, the American states announced their intentions to conclude a treaty of regional defence and to recognize the existing system so as to make it a more effective instrument for the solution of the inter-American problems. Under the Act of Chapultepec of March 6, 1945 they asserted that “any attempt whether by the American or non-American state, against the integrity or the political independence of an American republic shall be regarded as an act of aggression against the others”. This was a considerable improvement on the Havana Declaration because now the possibility of aggression by an American state as well as the possibility of an attack from outside was envisaged, and further because a series of steps was listed that might be taken to implement the Act. Neutrality was practically abandoned and the principle of collective action against aggression came to be accepted. Thus the Act of Chapultepec constituted “a tremendous step forward in the development of an American public law”. Soon after the conference the United States secured such amendments of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as would recognize the right of collective self-defence for the American states in the event of an armed attack which the new Security Council of the United Nations might fail to prevent.

Thus, by 1945, the suspicion of Latin America with regard to the policies and intentions of the North had been considerably overcome. Secondly, agreement on the principle of common resistance to a common threat had been reached. Thirdly, and elementary machinery of regional security had also been established. Fourthly, World War II had intensified the Latin American desire for greater independence and better standards of living and this created some fresh problems for the Post-war period. Fifthly, the increasing tension between the USA and the USSR obliged the USA to re-evaluate the economic and strategic value of Latin America, to strengthen the America regional security system and the policy of renewed intervention. Finally, this led to a fresh phase of anti-Americanism, and a fresh wave of revolts and coups in Latin America.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the American Foreign Policy during the interwar period was not one of isolation to Europe, but was the gradual abandonment of isolation because had the USA been isolationistic towards Europe, she would not have taken active part in the various activities of the League; in playing her leading role with regard to disarmament and collective security; and involved herself in the Dawes and Young Plans for bringing about a solution to the reparation problem. Similarly, her foreign policy towards the Far East was not based on full cooperation, rather on partial cooperation because had USA been cent
percent cooperative towards the Far East, she could have refrained Japan from attacking Manchuria of China in 1931 which strained Sino-Japanese relations. Moreover, policy of USA towards the Latin American status in the interwar period was the gradual withdrawal of domination rather than the policy of full-fledged domination because had it been so, she would not have taken peaceful measures under the leadership of the President Franklin Roosevelt. Therefore, truly it can be said that American foreign policy during the inter-war period alternated between isolationism and internationalism.

3.14 Foreign Policy of USSR

The foreign policy of Soviet Russia, like that of any other country, has been aiming at the enhancement of the security and welfare of the state. It has to a great extent been determined by the country’s location, climate, historic traditions, ideology as well as the relative strength of the other centres of powers. At the initial stages the Soviet Foreign Policy was also influenced by suspicion towards Western Europe. This attitude arose out of the continuous aggression and attempt to crush the Russian revolution during the years 1917-21, as well as their refusal to give recognition to the communist government of Russia.

3.15 Bases of Russian Diplomacy

In order to follow the course and nature of Soviet Foreign relations during the period between 1917 and 1945, an examination of the fundamentals of her foreign policy is essential.

Firstly, it is argued that soviet foreign policy since 1917 was merely the continuation of the Tsarist Policy of expansionism, that foreign policy was never original but that it was always determined by unchangeable geographical and historical factors, and that the various moves of the Soviet diplomacy were just another expression of the imperialist urge of Russia.

Secondly, it is urged that the Russian Foreign Policy was guided by communist objective of world revolution and inevitability of communism, a head-on clash and world conquest, that all talk of peaceful coexistence was a mere deceit, a clever trick to elude the adversary; that the basic instruments of the Soviet policy were class warfare; that the short-term strategy and tactics used by the Soviet Union only hided the ultimate aim which was to precipitate the disintegration of the non-communist states. According to this view the Soviet Foreign Policy was opportunistic,
unscrupulous and imperialistic and Soviet diplomacy applied the doctrine of class struggle to international relations.

Thirdly, it is argued that Soviet Russia was historic Russia plus Marxism. These two streams, flowing from opposite directions mingled into one as a result of the confluence brought about by the situation in which Soviet Russia found herself. Once the Revolution was stabilized, the historic derive for expansion could not be denied by the communists in power. And the historic fields of Russian expansion were central Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East and the Far East. These lands were predominantly agrarian; hence, communism must make its supreme appeal to the peasants.

Fourthly, it is sometimes suggested that since Russia had dictatorship, the struggle for power within the country was inevitable, and the Russian policy, therefore, was most unpredictable and inconsistent. Soviet diplomacy, as Winston Churchill put it, was “a riddle wrapped up in a mystery inside an enigma”- the great sphinx of the contemporary world.

Fifthly, it is said that the Russian foreign policy was “neurotic” and that it stemmed, like all neuroses, from a basic anxiety- “a feeling of being isolated in a world conceived as potentially hostile”. Thus the neurotic tends to be aggressive and seeks safety through being tough and strong and through gaining power and control over others so that they may not hurt him. This involves him in a private cold war against people around him. Offensive seems to him to be the best defensive. Thus the neurotic regards others as his enemies and assumes that others regard him as their enemy. Thus it is argued that the doctrines of “capitalist encirclement”, the “struggle of opposites”, “antagonistic contradictions”, non-antagonistic contradictions”, “revolutionary vigilance”, etc. were all reflection of the neurotic trait of Russian foreign policy.

Sixthly, there is a more sober view that since every subsequent phase of the Russian Revolution moved towards the fusion of communism with nationalism and the communist party gradually evolved into a national government, the Russian Foreign Policy bore the imprint of this fusion. Socialism became more nationalistic gradually and the Bolsheviks gradually discovered that they could save communism only by nationalizing it. It is only on this logic that one can understand the role of the Comintern, the Russian ambition to impose itself on lesser powers, the national communist regimes as in Yugoslavia, and the National Communist uprisings as in Hungary or Poland in 1956.
Finally, there is a communist view that the Russian Foreign Policy is characterized by a constructive approach, by a desire of peaceful co-existence in all spheres by the objectives of preserving world peace and fighting out aggression. It is argued that communists never believed in the proposition that Revolution could be exported to another country or that one state should interfere in the internal affairs of another. What Marx, Lenin and Stalin always emphasized was that revolution in each country had to develop according to its particular circumstances and that therefore to foist revolution on immature people would be disastrous for all concerned. No communist party, it was contended could afford to take instructions from Moscow. On the other hand, it is further argued, the western powers from the very beginning viewed the rise of communism with hostility and contempt, tried hard to stifle the Soviet Republic, supported Fascist regimes against them, had helped activity counter-revolution everywhere and had assisted the forces of aggression, violence and war. It is stressed that like any other independent and sovereign state, the supreme interest of Russian Foreign Policy was the interest of the U.S.S.R and therefore, it is wrong to criticize the Soviet Union for joining Germany in August 1939 or Japan in April 1941.

**3.16 Phases of Russian Foreign Policy**

We can divide the Russian foreign policy in several phases, specifically four phases-first from 1917 to 1921, second from 1921 to 1934, third from 1934 to 1938 and the last one from 1938 to the end of Second World War.

### 3.16.1 First Phase

In the first phase, the relations of Soviet Union with the western powers were strained because of several reasons. Firstly, the Bolshevik Revolution produced for the west an embittered ideology of world socialist revolution to which they could not at all acclimatize themselves.

Secondly, Russia’s withdrawal from the war and the conclusion of a separate peace with the central powers at Brest-Litovsk on March 3, 1918 were bitterly resented in the Allied countries. Under this treaty Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Courland, Livonia, Estonia were ceded to Germany. The independence of Finland, Ukraine and Georgia was recognized by Russia. This treaty not only enabled Germany to impose the Treaty of Buftea (March 5) and the Treaty of Bucharest on Rumania (May 7) but it also rekindled the war enthusiasm of the Germans who now got the fertile lands of Ukraine, access to the oil wells of Azerbaijan and Rumania and
the way open for the intensification of anti-British activities in Persia, Afghanistan, and India. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk led the western powers to build up the fiction that the Soviet Government deliberately concluded peace with the Germans to enable them to concentrate all their forces against the Allies in the West.

Thirdly, the Russian repudiation of the Czarist debts and the Russian decrees nationalizing the foreign industrial enterprises created a perpetual source of friction. The hostile attitude of foreign powers, quite clear within a month of the revolution, led to the cancellation of foreign debts, on December 24, 1917, to the suspension of payment of interest on State Bonds and of dividends on shares, the cancellation of state loans, the annulling of bank shares, and nationalization of all joint stock companies. All these steps were bound to aggravate the Soviet relations with the West.

Fourthly, the Civil war in Russia and subsequent western support to the white anti-Bolshevik forces with munitions and technical aid brought tension between Russia and the west. By November 16, 1917 France, Britain and the USA had demonstrated their hostility to the Bolshevik regime and stopped all supplies, by April 5, 1918 the United forces of Britain, France and Japan landed at Vladivostok and by May 1918 open hostilities and began. The civil war and the intervention came to a victorious end only towards the end of 1920. The civil war, intervention and blockade resulted in unprecedented sufferings and privations to the Russians. The counter-revolutionary intervention made the social revolution more savage and suspicious than it would have been otherwise. If from the Russian point of view the years 1917-21 were years of intervention and terror, from the western point of view these were the years of all-out revolutionary offensive by Russia against the “bourgeois world”.

3.16.2 Second Phase, 1921-1934

During 1921 and 1934 Soviet Union adopted a policy of “defensive isolationism”. Based on the estimate that the Soviet Union was hopelessly weak as compared to the west and might be attacked by them, the Russians carried on a strategic retreat and concluded non-aggression pacts with Turkey in 1925, Germany in 1926, Lithuania in 1926, Iran in 1927, Afghanistan in 1931, Poland, Finland, Latvia and Estonia in 1932. She was particularly very much adamant not to allow Germany to fall in the western trap and therefore, concluded with Germany in 1922 the Treaty of Rapallo. Moreover, in order to make her national economy strong
and stabilized, she saluted with the capitalist countries and made trade agreements with Britain 1920-21. But due to the activities of the Comintern, the European powers continued to be distrustful of Russia as before.

These years witnessed the building up of the Soviet economy under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin both of whom were in favour of peaceful co-existence from the very beginning. For reasons of security Soviet Union always stood for total and universal disarmament, save unqualified support to the Pact of Paris of 1928, sponsored the Litvinov Protocol in 1929 and concluded hundreds of bilateral and multilateral international agreements based on neutrality and non-aggression. She also repeatedly expressed her desire to be a member of the League of Nations provided it would not antagonize the international peace and security. Though Russia cherished to live in peace and avoid all sorts of international threat or war, the western powers were hell-bent on restoration of capitalism in Russia. At the Geneva Conference of 1922 they were given a rebuff and at Locarno in 1925 a bold bid was made by the west to bring Germany back into its orbit in an anti-Soviet crusade in order to provide a reply to the Rapallo Treaty of 1922.

3.16.3 Third Phase, 1934-38

During this period the Soviet foreign policy underwent a further change. She abandoned her policy of defensive isolation and instead adopted the policy of co-operation with the west. She was forced to adopt this policy because of the aggressive policy of Japan in the Far East culminating in her occupation of Manchuria in 1932 and the rise of Hitler and his Nazi party in Germany. This crated a danger to two-front attack on Russia. For this reason Soviet Union felt increasingly the need for the cooperation of the western countries. Besides, with the success of the five year plans in Russia not only the living standard of the people improved, the liberal principles also gained currency. This led to the policy of rapprochement with the west. She also became keen to conclude treaties of non-aggression mentality and friendship with the socialist and liberal powers to protect the communist movement against the fascist powers.

In 1933, Russia concluded non-aggression pacts with Afghanistan, Estonia, Latvia, Persia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Turkey and Czechoslovakia. In that year she also resumed her diplomatic relations with China and recognized the territorial settlements of the Treaty of Versailles. After the withdrawal of Japan and Germany from the League, Russia not only joined it in September 1934 as a permanent member but
also became one of the staunch supporters of collective security through the League.

This period also marked the beginning of co-operation between France and Russia. The rise of Hitler in Germany had posed threat to both Russia and France who decided to cooperate with each other as a matter of experiences. The first beginning in this direction was made before the rise of Hitler when the two countries had concluded a non-aggression pact in 1932. In 1935, a Mutual Assistance Pact was concluded between France and Russia, and between Russia and Czechoslovakia by which these countries were to aid and assist each other in case of unprovoked aggression by any European state.

During this period not only diplomatic relations were established between USA and Soviet Russia, but a treaty was also concluded by which both the governments agreed to preserve the territorial integrity of each other and to prohibit subversive activities and propaganda against each other. This treaty was made possible by the rise of Japan, a common foe, in the Far East. The USSR agreed to allow religious freedom to American visitors to settle all financial questions through normal diplomatic channels.

3.16.4 Final Phase, 1938-1945

The final phase from 1938 to 1945 was a critical phase for Russia as she involved herself into the catastrophic World War II. The Munich Act of 1938 which has been called as “a time-shed between two epochs in the foreign policy of the USSR” marked a turning point in the foreign policy of Russia since she was not invited to attend the same which raised suspicion in her mind about the sincerity of her allies. When Austria was captured by Germany on March 17, 1938, Russia proposed the west to take action against her which was turned down with deaf ear. Moreover, to be free from the possible attack of Germany and Italy, especially of the Fascist leaders, Hitler and Mussolini, Russia proposed a triple alliance between her, Britain and France on April 17, 1939 which was also drastically rejected by the western powers. Russia also concluded a Non-Aggression Pact with Germany on August 23, 1939 by which she was determined to remain neutral in the war between Germany and western powers. This shows that Russia’s intention was the restoration of peace and avoidance of war as far as possible.

After the Russo-German Pact of August, 1939 Russia reverted to aggressive attacks and violated treaties with Finland, Estonia, Latvia
Lithuania, Poland and Rumania and all the Baltic States. The fall of France in June 1940 and the possibility of collapse of the British army before the German army, prompted Soviet Government to maintain association with Germany and Japan. Consequently, she continued her co-operation with Germany and concluded a non-aggression pact with Japan in April 13, 1941.

Though Russia concluded a non-aggression pact with Germany she could visualize it fully well that a clash with Germany was inevitable. Hence she continued to prepare for her defence at a pretty fast pace. Such apprehensions of Russia came out true when Germany launched an attack against her on June 22, 1941 declaring that the latter had violated the provisions of the Pact of 1939. Thus the Soviet Russia was also involved in the World War II. Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain immediately declared “The Russian danger is, therefore, our danger”. Russia on her part signed the Atlantic Charter and all other declarations in relation to the war-polity of the Allied powers in the hope of getting cooperation of the west. Although co-operation between Soviet Union and Allied powers began but none could completely rely upon the other. The Soviet victory in the battle of Stalingrad perplexed the Allies. It convinced them that Russia was capable of winning the war without the support of the Allies. Consequently from November 1943 onwards the Allies started maintaining secrecy from Russia in all matters. U.S.A. concluded a treaty with France and England and opened negotiations for an armistice with Bulgaria without the knowledge of Russia. It became evident at the conferences of Yalta, San Francisco and Potsdam in 1945 that an unbridgeable gulf had been created between Russia and the Allies. The cold war, which started between Soviet Union and the western powers after 1945, was to a large extent the extension of the distrust which had prevailed between Soviet Union and the Western powers right from 1917.

3.16.5 Russia’s Relations with Middle East

The hostility felt by the East towards the West and the aspiration for liberation from the colonial and semi-colonial condition made Soviet approaches to the Middle Eastern countries easy. The signature of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement in 1920-21 however, restrained Soviet policy in this region. The famous historian E.H. Carr observes, “The substance of Soviet Policy throughout the period after 1921 was to seek collaboration with national governments in Asia and to extend Soviet influence over these governments, but to pursue this policy as far as possible by gradual and unobtrusive methods which would not destroy or
prejudice opportunities of profitable economic relations with the western capitalist world”.

The chief aims of Soviet foreign policy in the middle East since the First World War had been- (1) to establish her hold upon the straits of Turkey, (2) to keep open the Mediterranean for Russia, (3) to secure a warm water port on the Persian Gulf, (4) to share the oilfields of the Middle East with the Western powers and (5) to challenge the western domination in the middle East. The economic backwardness, and political uncertainty of the Middle East, rise of extreme nationalism, hostile attitude of the people of this area to western imperialism, clash of interests and rivalries among the middle eastern countries, etc- all these had influenced Soviet policy in this region.

Soviet Union signed a treaty with Afghanistan on February 28, 1921 and the latter also signed another treaty with Britain the same year. Thus a balance between the two Great Powers was struck. In Persia, Anglo-Soviet rivalry was strongly pursued and Soviet Union backed Riza Khan, the rising star to finally establish a monarchy. With Turkey, Soviet Union signed a Soviet-Turkish Treaty in March 1921 and gave a moral and material support to Mustafa Kemal to drive out the Greeks. At the Lausanne Conference Soviet Union gave support to Turkey’s claim to close the straits to warships. Ultimately, it was agreed “that no single power might send in at any one time a naval force larger than the largest force of any one Black sea country”. In 1925 on the Mosul dispute Soviet Union lent its support to Turkey against Anglo-French powers and concluded a treaty of friendship and neutrality. But the Lausanne conference had decided the demilitarization of Dardanelles much to the dislike of Turkey and the Turks demanded revision especially after 1934 when Mussolini declared that Italy’s future lay in Asia and Africa. Russia favoured a conference at Montreux. The Montreux convention signed in 1936 conceded Turkish right to fortify the straits and close them to all foreign warships, at times of war, unless acting under League covenant. This convention was concluded definitely to the satisfaction of Soviet Union.

In between 1939-41, i.e., in the period of dangerous collaboration Germany was allowed transit of duty free goods from Persia. This period also saw a Nazi pressure on Turkey, Yugoslavia and Greece. It was a war of nerves in which Turkey received full-fledged support from the Soviet Union. But she was now more inclined towards Britain and France. In 1941 Turkey signed non-aggression pact with Germany and was glad about German successes in northern zone of Persia to forestall German designs on Persia. Russian forces now took control of all the regions in the
Turkish-Persian border. Turkey joined the Allied powers a few weeks before the end of the Second World War and thus became however, belatedly Russia's war-time ally.

3.16.6 Soviet Relations with the Far East

Centring on certain events and influences, the Far Eastern policy of Soviet Union gradually developed. Firstly, this region was suitable for the expansion of communism due to economic backwardness, political unrest and extreme poverty of the people. Secondly, Soviet ideology of self-determination and sovereignty of all states earned popularity there. Thirdly, Soviet Russia had vested interests in Asia as three-fourths of her territories lay in Asia. Fourthly, the historic traditions of Russia in the Far East largely influenced her foreign policy in this hemisphere. Fifthly, strategic importance of the Far East also greatly influenced Soviet Russia's foreign policy.

Generally, the history of the Far East means that of China and Japan. So the Far-Eastern policy of Soviet Russia has veered round China and Japan.

3.16.7 Russo-Chinese Relations

Till 1917 Russia and China were friendly to each other for both geographical and commercial reasons. The Russian Revolution of 1917 had its impact upon China. At the beginning of the Russian revolution, China severed her diplomatic relations with Russia; took part in the Siberian expedition along with the Allies; gave shelter to many counter-revolutionaries known as white-Russians and occupied Outer –Mongolia and Singkiang. According to the Sun-Joffee Treaty of 1923 and the Russo-Chinese Treaty of 1924, China agreed to quit Outer-Mongolia temporarily, Russia recognized Chinese sovereignty over Outer-Mongolia and agreed to withdraw the Soviet away from there. In 1944 Outer-Mongolia was turned into a Soviet republic. Soviet Russia also renounced all the privileges secured from China during the Czarist regime.

Friendly attitude of Soviet Russia towards China inspired the Chinese. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the nationalist leader of China, expected much help from the revolutionary Russia. In 1920 Soviet Russia and Nationalist China officially recognized each other. In 1920 the Communist Party was established in China. Next year the Soviet diplomat Joffee, came to China and discussed with Sun-Yat-sen about the independence and sovereignty of China and Russo-Chinese relations on the basis of the principle of co-
existence. In 1924 Lev Karakhan came to China and signed the End-Soviet-Treaty. According to its terms (1) all the treaties concluded between the czarist government and the former Chinese government were abrogated, (2) both the parties agreed to suppress in their own countries the activities opposed to their mutual interest, (3) agreed to establish mutual relation on the basis of justice and equality, (4) Soviet Russia recognized Outer-Mongolia as a part of China, and (5) Russia abandoned her all claims of Boxer indemnity.

So from 1924 the Russo-Chinese relations began to improve. From Russia, Michael Borodin and other experts came to China and re-organised the Kuomintang Party. Due to the endeavour of the Russian military leaders the Whampoa Military Training Centre in China was set up.

After the death of Lenin in 1924 a change came in the Soviet Policy towards China. Stalin was in favour of maintaining friendship with both the communist party and Kuomintang party of China. On the other hand, Trotsky opposed it and was in favour of abolishing capitalism from China. After assuming power in 1926 Chiang Kai-shek began to suppress the communists. The Russian experts were driven out of China and Russian influence began to dwindle. By 1929 the Russo-Chinese relations deteriorated further. The Chinese attacked the Russian embassy and closed down the Russian business establishments. Both the countries created war tension by mobilizing troops on the frontiers of each. Meanwhile Japan made an attack upon Manchuria in 1931. Russia got alarmed and jointly with China took care to preserve our interests in the Far East. As a result, diplomatic relations between the two countries were resumed in 1932.

When in 1935 Russia organized the ‘United Front’ against Japan, the Chinese Communists joined the Kuomintang government. After the formation of the Tokyo-Berlin Axis in 1936, Japanese attack upon North China began the next year. At such a juncture, a non-aggression treaty was concluded between Russia and the Chiang Government whereby (1) both the states agreed not to attack each other and (2) in case of the third party’s attack upon either of the signatory states the other promised not to give any sort of help to the aggressor. Apart from this, Russia agreed to help the Chiang Government with arms and money. But China was alarmed when the Russo-Japanese non-aggression treaty was concluded in 1941. Because by this treaty Russia recognized the Pro-Japanese Manchukuo and Japan gave recognition to the Outer-Mongolian Republic created by Russia.
The German aggression upon Russia improved again the Russo-Chinese relations and Russia supported the Chinese claim over Manchuria, Pescadores and Formosa. But at the Yalta Conference, Stalin demanded Port Arthur and Manchurian Railways. Chiang Kai-shek had to yield at last under the pressure of America. The Russian army occupied Manchuria and Russia recognized Chiang’s Nationalist Government.

3.16.8 Russo-Japanese Relations

From the very beginning of the Russian Revolution, Japan along with the western powers looked upon the Soviet government as her enemy. Japan joined the western powers in their expedition against Soviet Russia and occupied Vladivostok. Between 1818 and 1922 Japan failed on many occasions in her attempt at occupying East Siberia. In 1920 Japan occupied Sakhalin. Russia got alarmed at Japan’s territorial expansion. Hence Russia opened negotiations with Japan. The Treaty of Peking between the two states was signed on January 20, 1925. Under its terms (1) diplomatic relation between them was established, (2) both agreed to refrain from aggressive activities against each other, (3) both agreed to accord special rights and privileges to the citizens of each other, and (4) all treaties concluded between Russia and Japan between 1905 and 1907 were abrogated. Through peace between Soviet Russia and Japan remained undisturbed from 1925 to 1931, mutual suspicion between the two continued.

The Russo-Japanese relation deteriorated during 1932 to1939. The Japanese creation of Manchukuo caused much apprehension to Russia. However, after an understanding with the USA in 1933, Russia joined the League of Nations. In order to strengthen herself against Japan, Russia began to mobilize her army on the Manchurian frontier and established close relations with USA and China.

Meanwhile, hostilities between Russia and Japan began when both the countries mobilized their forces on the frontiers of Siberia and Manchuria. The hostilities became intense when two Russian battleships were destroyed by Japan on the Amur River in 1937. On the other hand, hostilities also began between Manchukuo and Outer-Mongolia, the two satellites of Japan and Russia respectively. In the Sakhalin also they came into clash. In short, some sort of cold war continued between Russia and Japan during this period. Disregarding the Russian proposal for a non-aggression pact Japan entered into the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany in 1936. In reply to it Russia concluded a non-aggression treaty with China in 1937. As a result, the frictions between the two countries
went deeper and in July 1938 they came to a major clash. Japan was defeated.

Japan became worried at the conclusion of the Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact in 1939. Next year Japan signed with Germany and Italy the Rome-Berlin Axis. In 1940 Germany resolved to attack Russia and put pressure upon Japan to declare war on Britain. Japan became alarmed at the prospect of German invasion upon Russia. For a few years before in 1938 Japan had already tasted the weight of Russian military strength. Japan’s motive was only to occupy some parts of the British and French empire in Asia. Japan realized that in case of attack of Japan and Germany upon Britain and Russia respectively she was sure to enter into the war against both the USA (friend of Britain) and Russia (Germany’s enemy, while a friend of Britain). Under such circumstances, for her own security Japan concluded a Treaty of Non-Aggression and Neutrality with Russia whereby it was resolved that both parties would maintain mutual friendship and if one was attacked by a third power the other would remain neutral. Besides, both the signatories pledged to maintain the status quo of Manchukuo and Outer-Mongolia. Russia and Japan were both satisfied with this arrangement. Russia was assured of Japan’s neutrality in case she was attacked by Germany. On the other hand, Japan was also assured of Russia’s neutrality in case of the latter’s involvement in a war with the western powers.

In 1941 the pre-planned attack of Germany upon Russia began. Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister urged Japan to attack Russia. Ribbentrop assured Japan of Germany’s help if she started war on United States. When Japan bombed the Pearl Harbour in December, 1941 Germany joined Japan.

In spite of being bound by a treaty, Russia and Japan were suspicious of each other from 1941 to 1945. In 1942 Japan again joined the Anti-Comintern Pact. Russia failed in opposing it. At the Yalta Conference Russia agreed to declare war on Japan within two months of Germany’s surrender. On April 5, 1945 Russia repudiated her Treaty of Neutrality with Japan and on August 8, 1945 declared war on Japan. In a few days the Russian troops occupied the chief cities of Manchuria and on August 14, Japan surrendered to the Allies.

To conclude, the foreign policy of Soviet Union was a blunder of its own. Nobody could conceive of a clear-cut idea about her policy as it lacked frankness and fluctuated in between “splendid isolation and peace” and “sudden aggressiveness”. Russia developed bitter relations with the
western powers due to the communistic influence on her policy. The elements of communism mooted out a strong background in determining the Russian foreign policy which posed a menace to the world peace. Her policy was highly responsible for raising the mounting discontent between the communist and the non-communist countries which snowballed into the catastrophe of the Second World War.

3.17 Foreign Policy of Great Britain

The foreign policy of Great Britain in the inter war period was not the continuation of the preservation of “Balance of Power” and “Mastery over the seas” what it was there before the First World War, but was largely guided by the “colonial imperialism”. After the war England’s foreign policy was largely influenced by the principles of the protection of commercial communities and colonial empire, maintenance of European peace and order, maintenance of naval supremacy, avoidance of war and above all, belief in the democracy and in the internationalism of the League of Nations. The policy of England towards Europe, i.e., “maintenance of power and balance of power” was the only fundamental concept of her foreign policy which was not an innovation, but a following of the past.

3.18 Factors of British foreign policy

There were certain factors that characterised British foreign policy during the two world wars. Let us discuss them.

3.18.1 Protection of Colonial Interest

England wanted to continue her colonialism that had been the main factors or criteria since time immemorial. The continuation of colonialism proved to be a benefactor for England since her economy greatly depended upon her relations with her colonies.

3.18.2 Balance of Power

Britain, by virtue of her manpower tremendous wealth, far-flung empire, superior industrial technique and unquestionable naval supremacy had been able to pay the role of “an honest broker”. Therefore, she refrained herself from the intervention in the internal affairs of Europe and decided to adopt the policy of appeasement in 1928. The policy France adopted during 1919 to 1933 brought Hitler to insurgency and policy between 1933 and 1938 made the World War II inevitable. Therefore, Britain was no more to be convicted in this sphere.
3.18.3 Splendid Isolation

Till 1914 Britain had been adopting the policy of “Splendid isolation”. But after the war was over, England got ruined economically and possessed no military and naval supremacy because the U.S.A. superseded Britain. England in order to get herself out of the jolts of the economic depression, no more wanted to isolate herself totally. Hence, historians opine that no more Britain followed the policy of ‘Splendid isolation’ but followed the “pathetic isolation”.

3.18.4 Increasing Dependence on British Commonwealth

To regulate international relations peacefully and promote economic recovery, social co-operation and an international balance, Britain had to depend on British Commonwealth.

3.18.5 Increasing Dependence on the U.S.A.

The USA then claimed laurels with her military and naval strength and showed confidence with her sound economy. Moreover, her splendid policy of isolation became a source of attraction of the smaller and other powers of the world. Hence Britain wanted to reflect her foreign policy in the light of the policy of isolationism of USA.

3.18.6 A Support for the Course of Peace and Disarmament

During the inter-war period Great Britain sincerely took active part in various Disarmament conferences held in and outside the League of Nations from 1923 to 1934 and supported measures for disarmament. By the Locarno Pact of 1925 in which she joined, the frontiers of Belgium, France and Germany were guaranteed. In the Four Power Pact of 1933 Britain also agreed to maintain peace to safeguard the decision which might be taken by the league. In the Naval Conference of London of 1930, England was one of the three powers which agreed to restrict the size of their submarines and battleships. She even got Finland evacuated ahead of the schedule.

3.18.7 Economic Recovery and Increase in World Trade

After 1923 England had to take volume of trade and her trading affairs flourished to an unprecedented degree when she recognized Russia in 1924 and granted sovereignty to the old dominions such as Canada, Austria and New Zealand. Though it abandoned the Gold standard, it
exploited the Middle Eastern oil depots, especially petroleum, the “Black Gold” to a large extent.

All these factors brought about a change in the foreign policy of Great Britain. Henceforth the chief aim of the British foreign policy was to secure co-operation of the Commonwealth Countries, strengthen friendship with U.S.A., make disarmament policy effective, which was essential for her world-trade and economic revival, and support to the world organisation for regulating international relations peacefully.

3.18.8 Relations with France

Although Great Britain and France had fought together during the First World War, soon differences cropped up between the two. At the time of peace settlement, England and U.S.A. had persuaded France to give up her claims to Finland by promising her a guarantee against possible German aggression. But as U.S.A. could not accept the Treaty of Versailles, due to Senate’s refusal to ratify the Treaty, she backed out from this guarantee. England also felt that she was not in a position to give this guarantee alone, hence, followed suit. France naturally felt aggrieved and the relations between the two strained.

The attitude of the two powers towards Germany was also different. While France wanted to completely crush Germany so that she may not be able to attack her again. Great Britain considered a prosperous Germany essential for civilization. As Germany was a good customer of British goods she was keen to restore Germany to her normal, conditions in the interest of her trade. In 1923 when the French and Belgium troops entered the Ruhr valley, Britain did not approve of the action.

During the years 1924 to 1929, Great Britain tried to meet almost all the demands of France. She met the French demand for security by guaranteeing the status quo in Finland against possible aggression from Germany. Germany renounced all designs to recover Alsace-Lorraine and was even welcomed into the League of Nations as a member. However, the public opinion in England did not feel happy over this subordination of British Foreign policy to the interests of France. The Englishmen particularly did not like the prestige enjoyed by France in the league. They expected their government to play the role of an impartial arbiter, between France and Germany, and not that of shining record to France. Consequently, in 1929 the British Government violated the truce of Locarno.
When Hitler came to power in Germany England did not feel perturbed and continued her old policy of isolation. England felt to check France from gaining predominance, the revival of Germany was essential. That is why, Great Britain two months after the Stresa Conference of April 1935 (where England along with France and Italy had denounced Nazi rearmament and the implied threat to peace in Europe), entered into the Anglo-German Navy Treaty with Germany by which Germany was permitted to have a navy to the tune of 35% of the British naval strength. This open recognition to the illegal German rearmament by Great Britain was greatly resented by France which described it as ‘a stupid’ and perfidious betrayal of the Stresa Front.

During the Abyssinian war also the two powers took opposite stands. While England favoured stiff attitude towards Italy, France did not want to annoy Mussolini. Therefore, France refused to support England wholeheartedly. France enforced the economic sanctions recommended by League also half-heartedly. Moreover, on the occasion of the Munich Crisis in September 1938 the two countries acted together and gave a guarantee to Poland, Greece and Rumania. After this, France began to lean more and more towards England. When Hitler attacked Poland in 1939, both England and France declared war against Germany on the question of Danzig.

3.18.9 Relations with Russia

Although Great Britain and Russia entered the First World War as allies, after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1937, she started negotiations with the central powers and signed an armistice at Brest-Litovsk in March 1918. After the War, England entered into a trade agreement with Russia with a specific understanding that she would stop all propaganda against Britain. However, Soviet Russia did not keep her word and continued to follow a policy inimical to the British interests and encouraged general strike in England. This greatly offended the British sentiments.

On the occasion of Munich crisis, Soviet Russia offered to join hands with Britain to fight against Hitler but the offer was not accepted by Great Britain. After the annexation of Czechoslovakia by Hitler in March, 1939 efforts were made to bring Great Britain and Russia together but these efforts did not yield any result. On August 23, 1939 Soviet Union entered into a non-aggression pact with Germany by which the relations between Soviet Union and Britain remained cool till Soviet Union was attacked by Germany in 1941. Then the two countries became partners in a common war with Germany.
3.18.10 Relations with Italy

England's relations with Italy in the years immediately following the Peace Agreement were quite cordial. In fact the two became the guarantors of the provisions of Locarno Pact of 1925. The two countries joined hands at Stresa Conference in April 1935 to denounce Germany’s programme of rearmament. But after the Abyssinian war the relations between the two became bitter. The British condemnation of the Italian action was greatly resented by Mussolini. This drove Italy into the arms of Germany. During the subsequent years Great Britain made many efforts to win back Italy but with little success. Even on the eve of the outbreak of the World War II England sent Chamberlain and Lord Halifax to Rome, but without any result. When the war broke out Italy fought on the side of Germany.

3.18.11 Relations with Germany

The attitude of Great Britain towards Germany in the post world war period was one of sympathy. England wanted Germany to be strong to check the French hegemony, and to secure a market for British goods. England pleaded fixation of reparations according to German capacity of payment. When France occupied the Ruhr valley, the British Government expressed its disapproval of the action. England even tried to bring Germany into the League of Nations. It was mainly due to the efforts of Great Britain that Germany was admitted to the League Council. This sympathetic attitude of Great Britain towards Germany continued even during the initial years of Hitler’s rule. Great Britain considered Hitler’s dictatorship in Germany as an insurance against communism. Therefore, England preferred to develop friendly relations with Germany rather than with Russia.

In 1935 England concluded the Anglo-German Navy Treaty with Germany by which Germany was permitted to have navy to the extent of 35% of the British naval strength. This implied recognition of Germany’s right to rearm herself in violation of the Peace Settlement.

In 1936 when Germany and Italy jointly intervened in the Spanish Civil War on the pretext of liberating Spain from the influence of the Communist Russia (who was supporting the Government of Spain), Great Britain did not intervene. She even did not make any effort to check the war through the League. Instead, a “Committee of Non-Intervention was formed in London in 1936 for the maintenance of peace in Europe. This committee instead of settling the issue complicated it and thus provided
time to Germany and her ally Italy to establish General Franco’s Government in Spain. When Soviet Union suggested the withdrawal of foreign volunteers from Spain, the proposal was not supported by Great Britain. Thereby, Great Britain approved the foreign intervention in the Spanish Civil war.

Similarly, when in 1938 Hitler decided to occupy Austria and Czechoslovakia, England helped the cause of Germany by making Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretary resign from the cabinet because of his anti-Fascist views. Again when the US President, Roosevelt proposed a conference of neutral status for the preservation of world peace, Great Britain opposed the proposals and thereby failed an important attempt at maintenance of world peace. Again when Kurt von Schuschnigg, the Austrian Vice-Chancellor appealed to Britain for help against German attacks, England was not willing to take any action which might expose England to dangers. Similarly, when Germany undertook an expedition against Czechoslovakia, Russia proposed to call a conference of the Western States against Hitler, the proposal was summarily rejected by Chamberlain. England during the Czech crisis, however, tried everything possible to preserve the peace. It pleaded to Germany to be less rigid in her demand regarding Sudetenland, put pressure upon Czech Government to accept the German demand so that she might not go ahead with her plan of Czech attack, and impressed on France to adopt a less rigid attitude on Czechoslovakia so that Czechs might not go to war on the basis of Franco-Czech Treaty.

The Munich Pact was drafted almost on the basis of what had already been decided at a conference by England, France and Germany. The Czechoslovakian episode marked a remarkable change in the British Foreign Policy. For the first time, Great Britain after World War I undertook a commitment to central Europe by accepting the obligation to guarantee to protect the remnant of Czechoslovakia. This responsibility developed on Great Britain as a member of the International commission which was set up under the Munich Pact.

The Czech episode was an outstanding example of the British policy of appeasement towards Germany. In the first instance, England along with France, forced Czechoslovakia to cede the portions demanded by Germany. But when Chamberlain met Hitler with the letter of consent from the Czech Government, Hitler increased his demands and wanted occupation of Sudeten land by 1st October, 1938, and refused to give German security for the rest of Czechoslovakia unless demands of Poland and Hungary were accepted. For the time being Chamberlain felt quite
embarrassed. But ultimately on the intervention of Mussolini a meeting of the representatives of Britain, France, Italy and Germany was arranged at Munich, which resulted in the Munich pact. This pact instead of establishing peace gave impetus to the aggressive designs of Hitler, Britain kept isolated because she was not in favour of going to war over the fate of a country (Czechoslovakia) which did not concern her directly. Further, Hitler's demand for self-determination of the students did not appear unjust to the British.

Within one year of the Munich Pact the German armies captured Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia in violation of the Pact of Munich. Chamberlain for the first time denounced Hitler's adventurism and proceeded to accord guarantees to Poland against Germany and Greece and Rumania against Italy, Britain also started negotiations with Russia, but these negotiations could not make much progress due to certain demands of Russia which Britain refused to comply with. This pushed Russia closer to Germany and resulted in a Non-aggression Pact between the two.

Even at this stage, Chamberlain continued British policy of appeasement towards Germany. As late as July 1939 Britain attempted to conclude a twenty-five year defence pact with Germany and offered to provide large loans and returns her colonies to Germany in return for a promise that Hitler would not invade Poland. But all these efforts failed. In September 1939 when Hitler invaded Poland, England declared war against Germany in fulfillment of her obligations. Thus the British policy of appeasement towards Germany failed to prevent war and secure peace in Europe.

From the above discussion it is evident that the policy of appeasement pursued by Britain towards Germany destroyed the European balance of power, annihilated the framework of security and led to the Second World War. If the British Government had been able to act with more vigour and strictness, Hitler's designs would have been checked. But the British were dipped in by clever tactics of Hitler, who always posed himself as a crusader of communism. Again, if England had concluded an alliance with Italy, Germany would not have raised her head. An alliance with Italy could not be concluded because of the arrogance of Anthony Eden, the Foreign Minister of England.
3.18.12 England and Disarmament

During the inter-war period Great Britain sincerely supported all efforts for disarmament. She not only summoned a number of Disarmament Conferences but took an active part in making them a success. By the Locarno Pact of 1925, not only the frontiers of Belgium and France with Germany were guaranteed, but Germany agreed to refer all disputes that might arise between her and other parties to the pact. Great Britain was one of the signatories to the Four Power Pact of 1933 which enjoined on the members the duty “to consult together on all questions pertaining to them and, within the framework of the League of Nations, try to maintain peace and safeguard the decision which may be taken by the League”.

In the Naval conference of London of 1930 England was one of the three powers who agreed to restrict the size of their submarines and battleships (other two being USA and Japan). Even Finland was evacuated by the Allies in 1930 under the influence of Great Britain, though they were entitled to keep the same upto 1935.

3.18.13 England and the League

Though England had taken an active part in the establishment of the league, she did not take any active part in its work. That was probably because the League was dominated by France and her allies and England became indifferent towards it. Further she embarked on policy of isolation from European politics as far as possible. Even at the time of Abyssinian war England was forced to adopt a stiff attitude towards Italy by the pressure of public opinion. At that time, the economic sanctions imposed by the League of Nations were enforced mainly at the insistence of Great Britain.

From the above discussion it is evident that during the inter-war period England adopted a policy of shameful escape from war. Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister admitted the failure of British policy and observed on September 3, 1939 in his speech before the House of Commons: “This is a sad day for all of us, and to none is it sadder than to me. Everything that I have worked for, everything that I hoped for, everything that I have believed my public life has crashed into ruins. There is only one thing left for me to do; that is to devote what strength and powers I have to forwarding the victory of the cause for which we have to sacrifice so much. I cannot tell what part I may be allowed to play
myself; I trust I may live to see the day when Hitlerism has been destroyed and a liberated Europe has been re-established”.

But actually, the foreign policy of England from 1928 to 1938 took a new dimension with the adoption of the policy of appeasement which meant to please somebody else with sanctions not out of own pocket, but from the natural resources of the nation available. Historians characterize the policy of appeasement “as a double-edged weapon”. Kingsley Martin rightly has acclaimed that “appeasement is the policy of cutting your nose to spite your own face”. Similarly, to quote Morgenthau, “appeasement theoretically may be from a point of strength or weakness, but practically it weakens appeasers against the appeased”.

It is in this background that we will analyse the British policy of appeasement during the inter-war period which rested on five bases. In the first place, there was the all important threat of Bolshevik peril or the Soviet Communism. Not to take the risk of direct affront with Russia for her infiltration of Communism into the political arena of European powers, Britain sought for the mediators upon whom it would delegate such serious risk. And Japan under Hirohito, Italy under Mussolini and Germany under Hitler who condemned communism as “bluff, comedy speculation and a blackmail”, emerged to gratify the situations, to heal the wounds who would successfully exploit this fear and panic, and covered their aggression with the thin guise of anti-communism. Hence England adopted a policy of appeasement towards Italy, Japan and Germany.

Secondly, this policy was based on calculations of the balance of power though eventually it ended in complete fiasco of that balance which it intended to achieve. With this reasoning Britain allowed Germany to rearm, to condemn the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno, and to annex Austria, Czechoslovakia and Memel; allowed Japan to annex Manchuria and encouraged Italy to conquer Ethiopia. But this balance of power was destroyed when she could not retain that diplomatic initiative which was the basis of her world supremacy. The truth is that any policy of appeasement, in a sound balance of power hold good without which appeasement degenerates into servility.

Thirdly, the sharp differences between Britain and France in practically all spheres their concepts of the League, their views on security, disarmament and separation and finally their views on the question of German recovery and above all, their mutual hatred, envy
compelled Britain to appease the enemies of France and to get their support.

Fourthly, appeasement was almost predetermined by the precarious state of her economy, by her own indecision in policy and by sundry embarrassments within the empire. Her worsening and growing economic condition created the imaginary fear of communism which led her to support Germany, Italy and Japan and to isolate France. In political tranquility, democracy only develops and flourishes. Britain wanted to solve the problems by the fascist leaders of Italy and Germany which proved to be suicidal because the problems posed by them were not solved by Britain.

Finally, the basis of appeasement was the inability of the British ruling leaders to have through idea of the character and ambitions of those with whom they had to deal. Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister and the architect of the British appeasement had firm convictions that Germany, Italy and Japan would render help at the outbreak of the World War II who were virtually vacillating and oscillating in the concept of communism in order to infuse the indomitable spirit of their supremacy into the minds of the peoples of the world to which England was unknown. On September 3, 1939 when Britain was dragged to the war, Chamberlain realized the true objectives of their policies.

Thus, the British policy of appeasement taken under the super guidance of Chamberlain that utterly failed to prevent war and secure in Europe was a suicidal one. It not only destroyed and shattered the European balance of power but also annihilated the framework of security and therefore, compelled the European nations to drag themselves to the conundrum and cacophony of the Second World War.

3.19 Foreign Policy of France

One of the important and persistent single factor which determined the foreign policy of France in the inter war period was ‘search for security’. Although France had emerged victorious out of World War I, she was aware of the potential danger from Germany. This feeling persisted because as Langsam puts it, “Twice within the living memory of men had the pounding of German military boots been heard on the French soil and the citizens of Third Republic were fearful of still another incursion”. During the peace settlement of Paris, France had insisted on physical guarantees.
A major part of the French foreign policy has been dealt in the First Chapter on ‘French Search for Security’ (Refer Unit I, 1.21 to 1.23.10). And the rest relevant portions are dealt here.

The rise of Hitler in Germany in 1933 and the Nazi programme created a terrible reaction in Europe which led to the rise of a new set of alliances among the European states for security against Germany. In the words of Gathrone Hardy, “It was natural that the reappearance of Germany supposed to be animated by the ideals of the Main Kampf and the Nazi programme should produce immediate reaction in Europe”. With the emergence of Hitler, French Security was rendered weak. In January 1934, Poland entered into a non-aggression pact with Germany and thereby, weakened the position of France vis-à-vis Germany. In 1936, Belgium also succeeded in winning over Yugoslavia to her side.

3.19.1 Franco-Russian Treaty, 1935

The direct effect of the rise of Hitler was the rapprochement between France and Russia. In 1932 a non-aggression treaty was signed between the two. Hitler’s rise to power in 1933 produced great anxieties for Russia for immediately after capturing power. Hitler carried on a strong anti-communist propaganda. In the ‘Mein Kampf’ Russia was considered to be the most suitable region for expansion of Germany. So Russia became anxious to preserve the terms of the Versailles Treaty. Seeking this opportunity, France displayed her promptness to resist Germany’s possible attack by securing Russia’s entry in the League of Nations. Practically due to French efforts Russia joined the League in 1934. But Russia did not feel content about her own security simply by joining the league. She also showed her eagerness to make an alliance with France. As a proper measure of security against German aggression, England proposed a treaty of mutual assistance between France, Russia and Germany. France and Russia became delighted when Germany refused to accept the plan and they entered into a treaty of mutual assistance in May, 1935.

3.19.2 Franco-Italian Treaty, 1935

In 1935 France also concluded an Alliance with Italy. Ever since the Paris Treaty of 1928, the relations of France and Italy had been bitter. The rivalry between the two expressed itself in the struggle for pre-dominance in the South Eastern Europe. With the emergence of Hitler France adopted more compromising attitude and agreed to readjustment of colonies in Africa in favour of Italy. The rapprochement between the two
became easy when in 1934 the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss was assassinated by the Austrian Nazi Party, and the anti-German attitude of the two countries brought them together in January 1935 when the Franco-Italian treaty was signed. By this treaty the two powers agreed to discuss their differences and to encourage the neighbours of Austria to conclude non-aggression treaties with Austria, to check Germany’s efforts to remilitarize herself.

Thus at the end of 1935 France stood in a very peculiar situation. Gamelan, the Chief of the General Staff of France summed up French position thus: “If France commits herself definitely to Russia, Germany will reply by occupying the left back of the Rhine, if Italy emerges weakened from her current difficulties in Abyssinia that means Anschluss, if there is war between Britain and Italy in the Mediterraneanean and we come in, Germany is prepared to move against us. Only the closet understanding between France and Britain can keep the peace from now on”.

3.19.3 France and the Spanish Civil War

From 1936 to 1938 France was involved in her domestic problems and could not take an active part in the foreign affairs. Both France and England were keen to follow the policy of neutrality. Both these powers treated the Spanish Civil war on internal matter of Spain and set up on “International Non-Intervention committee” consisting of U.K., France, Germany, Italy and Portugal. The Committee was to ensure that powers did not supply war material to either side. But this agreement proved ineffective. Italy and Germany continued more or less openly to send arms to the insurgents. The attitude of “neutrality” on the part of England and France was also dictated by their national interests. They had thought that fascism alone could counter communism and therefore, favoured the rise of Franco to power. But so far as the outcome of the Spanish civil war was concerned it was disastrous for France. The war gave France a third fascist power on her border, i.e., Spain next to Germany and Italy. It paralysed French action and served to enhance the internal strife in French politics between the Right and Left.

3.19.4 Franco-British Alliance

In April 1938 the famous Franco-British Alliance was concluded, which was one of the most sweeping engagements of its kind since World War I. By this alliance the two powers not only agreed to accord complete
diplomatic corporation but also agreed to establish a unitary command of the British and French Military, Naval and Air Forces.

3.19.5 Issue of Czechoslovakia

In September 1938 when Hitler committed aggression against Czechoslovakia France was willing to go to war. She even tried to win over the British government to her point of view. But Lord Halifax, the Foreign Minister of England, counseled pressure on the Czechs. Ultimately the French followed the British lead and agreed to put pressure on the Czechs to make maximum concessions to Hitler. On September 25 and 30, 1938 the representatives of Germany, France and England met at Munich and decided the area of Czechoslovakia to be handed over to Germany. It may be noted that at the Munich Conference neither Czechoslovakia nor Russian representatives were present.

3.19.6 The Munich Pact

The Munich Pact was one of the greatest follies of French diplomacy. She had not only the defence advantage of 35 well-equipped divisions in Czechoslovakia, but also had her alliance and prestige in Eastern Europe. Commenting on Munich Pact Churchill observed: “France and England had to choose between war and dishonour. They chose dishonour. They will have war”. Churchill proved right because soon after Hitler seized the rest of Czechoslovakia, Memel and even attacked Poland. France was thinking in terms of establishing peace through conference even when the German troops embarked on Polish aggression. However, Lord Halifax took the stand that there could be no conference without cession of hostilities in Poland. Ultimately, France was forced by Britain to declare war against Germany on September 3, 1939.

3.19.7 French Appeasement

It has been said that for 16 centuries French history is identified with her struggle for self-preservation and that for 16 centuries self-preservation had dictated to the French statesmen a policy which has endured through numerous social and political upheavals. Since 1919 the German menace loomed large on the French horizon and hypnotized the French policy makers, even though Germany emerged from World War I prostrate, exhausted and internally disrupted. The search for security exhibited on almost hysterical nervousness and a sort of pathological obsession. Even at the Paris Peace Conference the question of which dominated Clemenceau’s thoughts was how the settlement could best
serve the permanent interests of French security. The programme which
he pursued was “restitution, reparation, and guarantee”. Restitution
implied the recovery of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. Reparation
meant that Germany should compensate for the losses and damages done
to France and should contribute to the reconstruction of the devastated
areas. Guarantee implied that Germany should fulfill its obligations and
that the Allies must establish some material and diplomatic guarantees
for French security.

France used several means and policies to ensure her future
security. With the breakdown of these policies, one by one, by 1933,
France also followed the appeasement policy.

3.19.8 Bases of French Appeasement

The bases of the French appeasement are not far so seek. In the
first place, this was the expression of the weakness and irresolution in the
economic, social and political life of France. Although by 1939 the
population had increased to 42 millions, the birth rate was steadily
decreasing. Her economic problem was aggravated by the German to pay
reparations. The Government resorted to unrestricted printing of money to
meet its expenses on a vast rebuilding programme, with the result that a
serious inflation set in and depressed the France to one-tenth of its earlier
value and pushed up the taxes. The morale of French Army was not very
high and the material at the disposal of the soldiers was insufficient.
Between 1934 and 1938 Germany spent four times as much as France on
national defence. Again, France did not keep up her armed force up to the
trim and ignored aviation and tanks. The High Command was infused
with outmoded military theories.

The French people were suffering from a sort of schism: political
parties were not united, social classes were opposed to each other, fifth
column had corroded the nation to the core, and Fascism was thriving
throughout France, so that important political and military leaders had
developed admiration for Hitler and Mussolini and a hatred for
democracy. The French bourgeoisie had been converted to the view that
the salvation of France lay in developing the authoritarian system as
maintained in Germany, Italy and later in Spain. The France democracy
and the French political institutions had thoroughly degenerated. The
democratic tradition was over-powered by anti-democratic forces.

Secondly, the French had developed terrible horror of war and this
became an important source of appeasement. France had lost more men
in World War I than any other country, and the number of young men brought up in the horror of war by a sad, disabled father or a miserable widowed mother was larger in France than in Germany where, as a result of defeat in war and harshness in peace, a great number of young Germans had been brought up “in the cult of revenge”. The French men, therefore, developed a psychology that “the worst international agreement was better than the best of wars”. In short, the fact of a diminishing and ageing population, the memory of the blood-letting and the dread of another great war with its staggering losses, the failure of the peace settlement to give France security, the confession of military inferiority had all produced in her people the Maginot mentality. The French opinion was, therefore, so firmly attached to peace that it would no longer approve recourse to preventive violence to meet the menace of the new militarism that Hitler had brought in Germany. For instance, the French refusal to act against Nazi Germany in its very inception drove Poland into a Non-Aggression Pact with Hitler in 1934. The whole emphasis of France was on the defensive and this naturally bred appeasement.

Thirdly, a more important source of appeasement was the tremendous fear of communism and of communist Russia. If the French Left was pacifist and more interested in social reforms than in national security, the Right was more afraid of the Left and of Socialism than of Fascist aggression. This explains the French surrender from 1933 onward. The corner-stone of any scheme of French security was obviously a firm alliance with the Soviet Union without which could have saved France from German aggression. The Nazi Revolution in 1933 for a while seemed to have brought the French Government to a sensible course of action when they concluded the Franco-Soviet Pact in May 1935. But such was the obsession and fear of communism that no co-operation was really possible between a Fascist-inclined France and the Soviet-Union. France, therefore, allowed the Fascist power to destroy, stone by stone, the entire structure of her security and, by her policy during the Ethiopian crisis, the Spanish Civil War, the Anschluss, the Munich and Prague, undermined the Franco-Soviet Pact and destroyed its spirit.

Even though the Italian conquest of Ethiopia would threaten the French position in the Mediterranean, even though the German remilitarization of the Rhineland would render the defence of Czechoslovakia and Austria almost impossible; even though Franco’s success in Spain would establish a hostile regime on the south-eastern frontier of France and a hostile Spain controlling the Balearic Islands, could sever French and a hostile Spain controlling key-stone of French Imperial power; and even though the partition of Czechoslovakia would
kill the Franco-Soviet Pact, the French Government continued to sell the interests of France for the sake of the interests of the class which they represented. Thus, a large class of Frenchmen in their dread of communism appeased the Fascist aggression with a view to divert it against Communist Russia, and to save their own class privileges. Even after the Second World War broke out, the effort was made to transfer the German fire towards Russia.

Fourthly, the source of French appeasement was the French desire to have the Italian friendship at any price. The revival of Germany put a premium on Italian friendship so that when in 1933 Mussolini proposed the Italo-Anglo-Franco-German combine, Daladier consortium, and in so doing, France lost Poland. In January 1935, the Franco-Italian Agreement was signed under which France gave Mussolini green signal with regard to his conquest of Ethiopia. Similarly, in the Spanish Civil war the French effort was to humour Mussolini and to retain him in the supposed anti-German Front. Thus, one by one the bases of the French security had been destroyed by 1936. The little Entente was in ruins; a formal agreement with Britain was yet a dream; the United States remained isolated; the German menace was growing; and internally the Popular Front that came to power in June 1936 had disintegrated. France had lost her freedom of action and her power to intervene on behalf of her eastern allies. When Edouard Daladier, the French Prime Minister put his signatures on the Munich Pact on September 30, 1938, by one stroke of pen he killed the whole framework of French security by alienating the Soviet Union and by making German invasion of Poland a certainty. When Bonnet signed with Ribbentrop the Franco-German declaration of friendship on December 6, 1938, he accepted a cheque from Germany on a bank that never existed. France lost both Italy and the Soviet Union. In 1939, Germany and the Soviet Union invaded the French ally, Poland in 1940, Germany and Italy had a Joint feast of France.

Finally, the gradual undermining of the bases of the French security made France, more than ever, dependent on Britain and rendered her unable to follow a strong line of her own. With a sense of defeatism and fatalism and with a mood of escapism the succeeding French Governments abdicated their leadership to the British Government. The Fascist Ideology had captured the heart of a large number of Frenchmen. Right wing and paramilitary formations had sprung up throughout the country. The economic and social policy of France became more and more reactionary and came to be directed more and more against the popular front in general and communism in particular rather than against Fascism in general and Hitlerism in particular. Having acquiesced in
Chamberlain’s lead in respect of the Franco-Soviet Pact, the French Government followed him equally readily in his precipitate guarantee to Poland and the half hearted search for Russian support from March 1939 onward. Even when Germany had invaded Poland, Bonnet, the French Foreign Minister was willing to purchase peace through an international conference which eventually France declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939 it was much against her wish. And when Germany invaded France in 1940 France collapsed like a house of cards. Her leaders deserted her and joined hands with Hitler.

In short, from 1920 to 1924 France followed the policy of vindictive fulfillment of the Treaty of Versailles and this contributed to the growth of the Nazi movement in Germany. From 1924 to 1932 France attempted conciliation with Germany and this resulted in a partial German economic recovery. From 1933 to 1936 France pursued the policy of appeasement based on “principle” and this resulted in Germany repudiating the treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Locarno. From 1936 to 1938 France followed the policy of appeasement based on “necessity” and this resulted in the abdication of French leadership to Britain. From 1938 onward France had ceased to be a major force in European diplomacy.

3.20 Foreign Policy of Germany

The Treaty of Versailles, supposedly the magnum opus of the peacemakers agglomerated at Paris, bereft Germany in economic wreckage, military paralysis and other political humiliation. Added to this, the Weimer Republic that was imposed on the Germans, utterly failed to alleviate the conditions of Germany. The grievances of the Germans were coupled with the endemic economic depression which added to cacophony of Germans’ discontent. Moreover, Germany, the so-called important transshipment centre, situated at the heartland of Europe had been a problem in the history of Europe during the last four hundred years. Within a short period of forty-four years, since the occurrence of Franco-Prussian war, extreme nationalism of the ultra German patriots plunged the globe into the convulsion of the World War I. Yet, the war ended disastrously for Germany and after the collapse of her military machinery, Kaiser William II, the German emperor fled to Poland and a provisional democratic government was established under the Socialist leaders Friedrich Ebert and Philipp Scheidemann to manage the affairs of the state. The Provisional government met at Weimer on February 6, 1919 and drafted a new constitution and Germany became a republic thereby.
From 1919, right up to the meteoric emergence of Hitler, it was the chief aim of the German diplomacy to regain her admission into the family of nations. This goal was urgent as a protective measure for the weakened state and necessary for the revival of trade. While some German statesmen preferring to look eastward advocated alliance with the Bolsheviks and defiance of the treaty restrictions, some other preferring westward proposed the fulfillment of treaty obligations and reconciliation with the former enemies.

From 1919 to 1923 Germany had to face a critical situation. Her relation with France was more than worse and the French army had already entered Germany before the occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. The Separatist movement of the Rhineland instigated by France increased bitterness between the two. Germany demanded the whole of Upper Silesia and in 1921 the people of Silesia by a plebiscite noted for its union with Germany. Upon Poland’s opposition to Germany’s demand, the issue was placed before the League of Nations. The League gave two-thirds of Upper Silesia to Germany leaving the principal industrial and mineral resources on the Polish side. This was naturally resented by the Germans.

The other aspect of Germany’s foreign policy during this period was the payment of reparation to the Allies. In 1922 Germany concluded the Treaty of Rapallo with Soviet Union whereby the normal diplomatic relation between the two was established; both sides renounced their respective demands against each other and agreed to mutual commercial exchange. Through the treaty of Rapallo an attempt was made by the signatories to break the hostile ring around Germany and Russia. So, this treaty caused anxiety in the western states particularly in France. France occupied the Ruhr of Germany in 1923. Germany as a protest started passive resistance against France and France ruthlessly tried to suppress it.

At this turn of events, Britain came forward to settle a compromise between Germany and her enemy. It should be remembered that from the very beginning Britain was sympathetic to Germany. And for this reason Britain did not participate in the occupation of the Ruhr with France and Belgium. Meanwhile, with the change of the French Ministry the situation in France also took a turn and she agreed to withdraw her army from the Ruhr. The French Minister Briand and the German Minister Stresemann favoured a policy of co-operation between the two states. The aim of Stresemann was to recover the prestige of Germany in European politics by breaking her isolation. For this purpose a compromise with France was essential. In 1925 Germany concluded the Locarno Pact with Britain,
France, Italy and Belgium. The Franco-German relations improved and the next year Germany joined the League Council as its permanent member. France became composed of her security and the establishment of peace in Europe seemed feasible. By 1927 foreign troops from the different parts of Germany were withdrawn and the Allied Military commission was dissolved. In 1928 Germany signed the Pact of Paris on equal terms with other powers. According to the recommendations of the Young Commission the amount of reparation from Germany was reduced and all kinds of international control upon German economy were abolished. Only the disarmament problem remained unsolved. Germany was indirectly given the right to reason.

The Weimer republic was saddled with financial difficulties due to adverse balance of trade, inflation reparation, profiteering unemployment and deficit budget. On 1922 the dollar-Mark ratio stood at 1:7000. It was further enhanced by the French occupation of Ruhr on the pretext of Germany’s future to make reparation payment according to schedule. But the Ruhr occupation secured the Dawes plan for Germany consequent upon which the French withdrew from Ruhr and Germany secured foreign loan. German recovery was effected by the introduction of rationalization, development of coal and steel industry and the invention of synthetic products such as quinine, indigo and menthol. U.S. loans helped the recovery of German industry and shipping. In 1929 the Young Committee granted German a further loan of 300 million dollars and in the Lausanne conference of 1932 the reparation payments virtually ceased. But Germany’s economic prosperity entirely depended upon foreign loans and it collapsed as soon as foreign loans stopped due to the Great Depression of 1929-31.

In domestic politics, the Weimer republic failed to secure for Germany a stable government due to the growth of a number of splinter parties. The Weimer republic had coalition government from the very start. In these coalitions mostly the Social Democrats shared power with the Rightists and as a result soon the balanced fitted in favour of Rightists. In 1925 after the death of Ebert, Hindenburg was elected President and he remained as such till his death in 1934. The economic crisis of 1929-31 had its repercussions in German domestic politics and in 1930 elections the extreme parties gained round. The Nazis of National socialists increased their number in Reichstag to 107 and the number of communist representatives increased from 55 to 77. But in the Reichstag no political group could command majority, which resulted in a series of unstable ministries that governed through emergency decrees.
In May 1932 President Hindenburg dismissed the Heinrich Brüning ministry and appointed Franz Papen to form the 'Baron’s Cabinet'. In the July election the Nazis secured 230 seats as against 133 Socialists, 99 Centrists and 89 Communists, and in November election the Nazis had lost 34 seats. The German parliamentary system now reached a deadlock due to the refusal of the Nazis and communists to form coalition. Hindenburg was assured by Papen that Hitler could easily be controlled. When Schleicher failed in his efforts to obtain parliamentary support for his government, Hindenburg, frustrated and tired, asked for his resignation. On January 30, 1933, Hindenburg appointed Hitler Chancellor of a new Cabinet in which only two other Nazis, Wilhelm Frick and Hermann Göring, held offices. Immediately afterwards Hitler ordered a fresh election on the eve of which the communists were ruthlessly suppressed on the pretext of the burning of the Reichstag. The Nazis gained 288 seats in the election and Hitler assumed dictatorial power by the ‘Enabling Act’. Hindenburg died in August 1934 and all the Presidential powers were usurped by Hitler.

In foreign policy Hitler pursued the same technique which had given him so large a success in internal affairs. But while his tactics changed like that of an opportunist, he never changed the aim of his foreign policy. As regards the methods to be observed for the fulfillment of the objectives of the German foreign policy, Hitler stated “reliance on force and the rejection of compromise should be the keystone”. The new government professed to take rather than receive; to tear up treaties by a unilateral repudiation of its obligations rather than to modify them by amicable negotiations; to launch attacks without warning; and to keep the nerves of Europe on edge by creating an atmosphere of tension. Bullock has observed, “Hitler had only one programme, power; first his own power in Germany and then the expansion of German power in Europe. The rest was window dressing,” Therefore, rearmament for Germany was essential. The alliance with Italy, Japan and Germany was necessary for breaking down the resistance of the two antagonists, Britain and France. The anti-communist alliance and the possible war with Bolshevik Russia in the name of an anti-communism was another essential part of Nazi foreign policy.

But the launching of such an aggressive policy would have created troubles for Germany by uniting all enemies of Germany. Sensing this difficulty Hitler proceeded very diplomatically and declared “The German Government and the German people are united in the will to pursue a policy of peace, reconciliation and understanding, as the foundation of all decisions and all negotiations.” He stopped condemnation of the Versailles
Treaty and directed his hostility against Bolshevism. This more proved quite helpful to Germany because USA, France and Britain took to immediate steps against Germany.

3.20.1 Withdrawal from the League

The war preparations of Nazi Germany began from 1934. The Reich Cabinet formed the Reich Defence Council and entrusted it with the power of preparing secret war plans. Hitler had no faith in the ideals of the League of Nations. He considered German’s membership of the League Council as the chief obstacle to his foreign policy. He had no interest in disarmament. In October 1933 quitting the Disarmament Conference, he announced his desire to withdraw from the League as well. He declared with all frankness, “The former German Governments joined the League Council with the hope that it would preserve the German interests and would re-establish the prestige of the Germans on equal footing with victorious states, but instead of fulfilling that hope the League Council has been showing humiliating and malicious attitude towards Germany. Hence it is not honourable for a self-conscious nation like Germany to stay in the League Council”. Hitler’s declaration gave the signal of a new danger in Europe. Many of the Western statesmen realized the justness of Germany’s grievances and felt the necessity of a compromise with Germany. Hitler made no mistake in availing fully the opportunity of such sentiment of the western statesmen. In fact, the withdrawal of Germany from the League was the first phase of her aggressive designs because from that time Germany’s war preparations began.

3.20.2 Polish-German Non-Aggression Pact

Under the Versailles Treaty, Poland was given a large share of German territories, i.e. Danzig, Silesia, Posen etc. Hitler’s coming to power naturally caused alarm in Poland. On January 26, 1934 Hitler unexpectedly entered into ten years’ Non-aggression Pact with Poland. His real motive was to weaken the defensive measures of France by separating Poland from the friendship of France. Poland on the other hand, by concluding the Non-aggression Pact with Germany got an opportunity to strengthen her defence against Russia and also to maintain balance of power between her two neighbours Germany and Russia.

3.20.3 Attempt on Austria by Force

The Anschluss of Germany and Austria had been an important phase of the history of Germany. Hitler after assuming power in Germany
became anxious to complete the Anchluss and it was the chief aim of his foreign policy. He openly encouraged the subversive elements in Austria to bring about the fall of the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss who was deeply opposed to Anschluss and to strengthen the Nazi movement in Austria. Being alarmed by such activities of Hitler, Britain and France and Italy issued a joint declaration in 1931 whereby they pledged to preserve the independence of Austria by all means. Dollfuss, in the meantime resorted to ruthless repression of the Nazi terrorists. The later also became more active. On July 25, 1934 a party of the terrorists entering the Chancellor’s Office at Vienna with arms arrested the ministers on the spot. They isolated Dollfuss from his colleagues and then killed him. This incident led to popular uprisings in other parts of Austria. Of course, the Austrian government soon suppressed the popular uprisings with strong hands.

Mussolini sent armies in batches to help the Austrian government. Thousands of the Austrian Nazis took shelter in Germany. Hitler advised the Austrian Nazis to organize revolution without bloodshed. But Hitler criticized the Austrian Nazis when they paid no heed to his advice. At this thus failed Hitler’s first attempted coup in Austria. As a result, (1) Europe was saved from a great crisis, (2) Anti-Nazi attitude was strengthened everywhere, (3) France got the opportunity of strengthening her defence against Germany in Eastern Europe, (4) Soviet Union joined the League of Nations, (5) Alliance between France and Austria was concluded in 1935, and (6) Italy by reestablishing friendly relations with France joined the anti-German group.

3.2.0.4 Occupation of Saar by Germany

The Treaty of Versailles stipulated that the future of the Saar in Germany would be decided by a plebiscite to be held in 1935. Till 1933 three parties had been playing dominant role in the Saar politics the Catholic Centre, the Social Democrat and the Communist. The first one subsequently merged with the local Nazi Party and came to be known as ‘Deutsche Front’. The latter two parties were bitterly opposed to the Nazi Party. Hitler started terrorist movement in the Saar and in many ways terrorised the voters. As a result, hostility between France and Germany became inevitable. However, a treaty signed between the two by which (1) both sides agreed to refrain from any kind of repressive of retaliatory activities in the Saar, (2) a tribunal would be set up to investigate into the cases of repressive activities of the both; and (3) both sides agreed to place their mutual disputes before the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The League fixed January 13, 1935 as the day of plebiscite in the Saar. But the Nazis continued to interfere in the politics of the Saar and the
Deutsche Front continued its propaganda in favour of Germany. On that day the plebiscite was peacefully held and the people of the Saar voted for their union with Germany. Hence, Germany got back her Saar after fifteen years.

3.20.5 Anglo-German Naval Treaty, 1935

When the military laws were passed in Germany in 1935, Europe terribly reacted. To pacify Europe, Hitler declared that Germany stood for a just and honest peace in the sphere of international relations; he promised to honour the independence of Austria; and promised to respect the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno Pact. Thus, Hitler tried to remove the suspicions of the western states about Germany’s military preparations. Meanwhile, on June 18, 1935 Hitler concluded a naval treaty with England whereby he secured England’s consent to the increase of the German naval strength. In the words of Ribbentrop, Germany’s special ambassador in London, “It (Anglo-German Naval Agreement) meant the repeal of the armament provisions of the Versailles Treaty officially agreed to by Britain”.

3.20.6 Remilitarization of Germany

On the day when Germany withdrew from the League of Nations, she also withdrew from the Disarmament conference which was held at Geneva. In 1935, Germany made conscious to the world that she had prepared a German Air Force and announced the Law for the Reconstruction of National Defence forces, in complete violation of the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler took the next step in the direction of rearmament in March, 1936 when he sent his troops to remilitarise Rhineland by violating the terms of the Locarno Pact.

3.20.7 Intervention in the Spanish Civil War

A civil war broke out in Spain in 1936 in between the Popular Front which was then leading the government and National Front headed by General Franco. While Soviet Union helped the ruling government, Mussolini and Hitler both helped General Franco. This war also created an unfriendly Fascist State in the border of France and paralysed her action. It served to strange Italy further from the Anglo-French powers and drove Mussolini to the arms of Hitler and the latter reaped the results. On October 21, 1936 Galeazzo Ciano on behalf of Italy and Konstantin Neurath on behalf of Germany signed a Protocol for Italo-
German Co-operation. Mussolini described it as an Axis round which European powers 'May work together'.

3.2.0 Formation of the Axis

On the issue of Austria’s independence Hitler and Mussolini had differed. But with the break-out of a bitter dispute between Britain and Italy on the issue of Ethiopia, Italy drew closer to Germany. So, the Ethiopian crisis strengthened Hitler’s Policy in regard to Austria. And Italy too gradually drifted away from the side of the western powers. Hitler apprehended that the relations between Italy and the western powers might improve again upon the repudiation of the sanctions against Italy by the League of Nations. But again fortune smiled upon Hitler. And on the issue of Spanish Civil war both Italy and Germany came closer to each other.

In the meantime, in November 1936 Hitler concluded the Anti-Comintern Pact with Japan. The signatories agreed to mutual exchange of facts about the activities of the communists; mutual co-operation in taking measures against them and non-conclusion of any kind of political treaty with Soviet Russia. Next year in 1937 when Italy stepped into it the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis came into being. Britain, France and Russia remained in the opposition group.

3.2.9 Anschluss of Austria with Germany

On July 11, 1936 on Austro-German agreement was concluded by which (1) Germany recognized the sovereignty of Austria; (2) both the states agreed not to interfere in the internal affairs of each other as well as in the affairs of the Nazis of Austria and (3) Austria confirmed herself as a German state. Practically, this treaty transformed Austria into a state under Germany and gave Hitler a free hand in effecting the Anchluss. By this treaty Italy, Austria and Hungary came within the orbit of Germany and the Anschluss of Austria became almost certain. On March 14, 1938 Hitler himself entered Vienna triumphantly. He dissolved the Austrian Parliament and ordered Anschluss of Austria with Germany.

No respect was shown towards the National sentiments of the Austrians. Austria was considered a conquered territory. The administration of Vienna was entrusted to the German police force. As a result of the occupation of Austria, Germany reaped certain advantages (1) Germany obtained direct communications with Italy, Hungary and Yugoslavia; (2) Germany obtained military and economic supremacy all
over south-eastern Europe; (3) Germany’s manpower and military strength increased; (4) Germany’s hold over Austria’s natural resources improved her economic conditions and (5) the foreign trade of the neighbouring states like Hungary, Yugoslavia and Rumania henceforth became closely linked with Germany.

The annexation of Austria produced reactions in Europe. According to the opinion of the conservatives of England, the Anschluss of Austria with Germany strengthened the western defence against Soviet Russia. According to others it was the greatest achievement of the principle of self-determination. Mussolini was alarmed at the success of Hitler’s aggressive policy, though he openly supported Hitler. Poland became worried at the success of Germany. Russia equally became nervous and appealed to the western powers to strengthen their common front against Germany. But still there was no response from the western side. The occupation of Austria enabled Germany to assume a stiff attitude towards Czechoslovakia and to extend her influence in the Balkan.

3.20.10 Attack on Czechoslovakia

The destruction of Czechoslovakia was one of the Hitler’s aggressive policies. In November 1937 at a meeting of the German generals, Hitler discussed his plan of conquering Czechoslovakia along with Austria. Next year, Hitler informed Italy and Hungary, the allies of Germany, about the plan of his attack upon Czechoslovakia as well as about the partition of Czechoslovakia between Germany, Italy and Hungary.

Hitler had certain reasons to conquer Czechoslovakia like: (1) democratic Czechoslovakia was a strong supporter of the League of Nations and as an ally of France and Soviet Russia, Czechoslovakia belonged to the anti-revisionist group and as such a symbol of the Versailles systems; (2) the powerful army of Czechoslovakia had been a cause of Germany’s anxiety; (3) from the strategic point of view, Germany required her hold upon Czechoslovakia and (4) Czechoslovakia had 3/4 millions of German inhabitants, known as Sudeten-Germans who were hostile to the Czechs, although the condition of these Sudeten-Germans compared favourably with that of the other social minorities in Czechoslovakia. The rise of the Nazis in Germany stimulated national feeling and separatist activities among the Sudeten-Germans who demanded complete autonomy.

In the meantime, Hitler felt the necessity of lessening the antagonism of the western powers. Firstly, he tried to convince the
western powers about the fairness and justness of demands of the Sudeten-Germans for autonomy. Britain supported this argument of Hitler. Secondly, Hitler succeeded in securing the support of Poland and Hungary by offering them the prospect of getting some parts of Czechoslovakia. Thirdly, Hitler made attempts to prevent any kind of anti-German front by playing on the western fear of Russia. Fourthly, he began to provoke the Sudeten-Germans against the Czech government, and fifthly, Hitler continued his military preparations to destroy Czechoslovakia within the stipulated time. September 27, 1938 was fixed for the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Inspired by the Nazi propaganda, the Sudeten-Germans rose into an armed revolt on September 10, 1938 and Germany started mobilizing her forces and threatened to go to war. The British and French Governments advised the Czech government to transfer the Sudeten area to Germany. But Hitler wanted it to be done before October 1, 1938. He announced that if the Czech government failed to fulfil his demands before September 28, Germany would invade Czechoslovakia. The French government proposed to Hitler that some parts of the Sudetenland would be transferred to Germany before October 1, and the rest would be handed over before October 10 at the request of the British government. Accepting that Hitler invited Neville Chamberlain and the French Prime Minister Edouard Daladier in Munich for a conference where the Munich Pact was signed.

### 3.20.11 The Munich Pact

The conference in Munich was held on September 29, 1938 and was attended by Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany. After a good deal of discussion the Munich Pact was signed on September 30, 1938 by which:

1. between October 1 and October 10 the withdrawal of the Czech army from the Sudetenland would be completed;
2. a commission composed of representatives of Germany, Britain, France, Italy and Czechoslovakia would determine the process of the withdrawal of the Czech army from the Sudetenland;
3. between October 1 to 10 the occupation of the Sudetenland by Germany would be completed. The five-power commission would determine the territories in which a plebiscite was to be held and till that time the territories would remain occupied by an international force and
4. in a four weeks time the Czech government would release the Sudeten-Germans from the military and police force.

This pact was a clever act of diplomacy on the part of Hitler. He duped away Chamberlain, the British Prime minister by giving him an assurance that if his demands on Czechoslovakia were met, he would follow a policy of peace. Once the claim of German minorities was
established, Poland and Hungary also came out with their respective demands. While Poland demanded Teschen, a part of Czechoslovakia with some ethnic affinity with Poland, Hungary demanded an area inhabited by the Magyars. Both these countries ultimately succeeded in getting these areas and Czechoslovakia became a thin strip of land.

The Czechoslovakian republic gained political consolidation and administrative unity after the transfer of the Sudetenland to Germany and Czechoslovakia’s two units Slovakia and Ruthenia were granted autonomy. Still, Germany’s provocations against the Czech government continued unabated. Hitler invited Emil Hacha, the Czech leader to Berlin where he was forced to sign a document by which Czechoslovakia was placed under the protectorate of Germany. On March 15, 1939 the Nazi troops occupied Czechoslovakia.

### 3.20.12 Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact and Germany’s Invasion of Poland

War was now imminent because both the camps were making fervent preparations. But Hitler felt that before the next major turn of events took place, an understanding with Soviet Russia was essential. Soviet Russia was completely disgusted with the western powers after the Munich Pact since she was not invited to attend the same. Taking advantage of this, Hitler concluded a Non-Aggression Pact with Soviet Union on August 24, 1939. Under this Pact (1) the Neutrality Agreement signed between the two in 1926 was confirmed; (2) both sides agreed to refrain from aggressive activities against each other; (3) if one was attacked by a third party both promised not to give any kind of assistance to the aggression; (4) both side agreed to settle all mutual problems and disputes by peaceful means and also agreed not to participate in any kind of alliance against the interests of one another and (5) the pact was to remain in force for ten years.

This pact was a masterpiece or legacy of Hitler’s diplomacy because he was able to ward off Germany against any possible attack by the Soviet Union if he launched his designs on Poland. Germany occupied Memel and on March 22, 1938 made demands on Poland for the return of the Polish Corridor. Poland which had annexed Czech territories now found herself in grave danger. On August 20, 1938 Germany renewed demands on Poland. The French and British guarantee to Poland was extended. In the words of David Thompson “the idea of Nazi-Soviet Pact was born of the Franco-British guarantee to Poland”. The Pact now encouraged Hitler to attack Poland on September 1, 1939 which resulted in the nemesis for
Germany and in the outbreak of the Second World War. Robert Coulondre and Neville Henderson, the French and British ambassadors to Berlin respectively, gave ultimatums to Hitler that unless the German troops withdrew from Poland, both France and Britain would declare war against Germany. But Hitler rejected the ultimatums and the world relapsed into the state of anarchy.

To conclude, the foreign policy of Germany in the interwar period amply bears the testimony to the foreign policy of Hitler. The foreign policy of Germany was the monument rather than the legacy of Hitler’s desire to expand the territory of Germany to a great extent. It was due to the indomitable spirit and military prowess of Hitler that Germany was dragged to such a commendable posture. Hitler can ever alone be held responsible for the outbreak of the World War II. Had Chamberlain and Daladier, the British and French Prime Ministers respectively, decided to take advantage of “the unity of sentiment and purpose between Britain and Russia against Hitlerite Aggression”, there could have been a chance of saving the peace which they desired. The sacrifice of Czechoslovakia meant in the words of Churchill “the liberation of twenty five German divisions which threatened the western front, in addition to which it would open for the triumphant Nazis the road to the Black sea. It is not Czechoslovakia alone which is menaced, but also the freedom and democracy of all the nations”. Therefore, the saying “Hitlerite Aggression” is the root cause of World War II, is a misnomer.

3.21 Let Us Sum Up

Thus, we came to know that there were several factors that worked together for the rise of nationalism in Indo–China. Nationalism got a wider shape and dimension in Vietnam in comparison to Laos and Cambodia. The post-War period saw the rise of political parties taking their inspiration from developments in the outside world. While some of the educated youth got stirred by the Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination and Gandhian cult of Swaraj movement in India, some others imbibed the teachings of the Cantonese communists. The uncompromising rebuff of the moderates naturally opened the way for the rise of revolutionary groups. The struggle had become one for national independence, and the communists now took the lead under Ho Chi Minh whose self-effacing, firm and intelligent leadership gave a definite shape to the Vietnamese national movement.

The rise of nationalism in Indonesia and subsequently the emergence of an independent Indonesia from the shackles of the Dutch
imperialism is a long history passing through several important phases. Causes responsible for the rise of the same seem to have been varied and complex demanding a scanning of the Dutch administration and their nurturing of the Indonesian political set up. The role of political association, leaving deepening impact on the communists and socialists, was a milestone for disseminating consciousness among the Indonesians. More importantly, the Indonesian political leaders like Dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo, Tjokroamintoto, Sukarno and Hatta etc. stood instrumental pushing nationalism into the climax and the country to the path of independence.

Thus from 1919 to 1945, Egypt was fully controlled and her resources were thoroughly exploited by Britain. Throughout this period the masses were full of discontent. A militant nationalism stimulated by the impulse of the war, by the promises of the British and by the widespread activities of the Wafd Party became the characteristic feature of the Egyptian politics. The Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 was only an indication of the growing weakness of the British domination in relation to Egypt and a proof of the fact that she will not be able to control the Egyptian destiny for long. The Second World War intensified the Egyptian nationalism, increased the Egyptian grievances against the British high-handedness and sharpened the Egyptian desire for political independence and social progress. And since this could be achieved by the British evacuation and the elimination to the institution of monarchy which had become a hot-bed of intrigues, in 1945, the Egyptians pursued this double policy of expelling the British from the country and putting it on the road to a Republic.

The American Foreign Policy during the interwar period was not one of isolation to Europe, but was the gradual abandonment of isolation; was not based on full cooperation, rather on partial cooperation; and was the gradual withdrawal of domination rather than the policy of full-fledged domination. Therefore, truly it can be said that American foreign policy during the inter-war period altercation between isolationism and internationalism.

The foreign policy of Soviet Union was a blunder of its own. Nobody could conceive of a clear-cut idea about her policy as it lacked frankness and fluctuated in between “splendid isolation and peace” and “sudden aggressiveness”. Her policy was highly responsible for raising the mounting discontent between the communist and the non-communist countries which snowballed into the catastrophe of the Second World War.
The British policy of appeasement taken under the super guidance of Chamberlain that utterly failed to prevent war and secure in Europe was a suicidal one. It not only destroyed and shattered the European balance of power but also annihilated the framework of security and therefore, compelled the European nations to drag themselves to the conundrum and cacophony of the Second World War.

France during this period in her ‘quest for security’ followed the policy of vindictive fulfillment of the Treaty of Versailles and this contributed to the growth of the Nazi movement in Germany. From 1938 onward France had ceased to be a major force in European diplomacy. France pursued the policy of appeasement based on “principle” and this resulted in Germany repudiating the treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Locarno. The basic principle of seeing herself secured from all respects failed utterly.

The foreign policy of Germany was the monument rather than the legacy of Hitler’s desire to expand the territory of Germany to a great extent. It was due to the indomitable spirit and military prowess of Hitler that Germany was dragged to such a commendable posture. Hitler can ever alone be held responsible for the outbreak of the World War II.

3.22 Key Words

Anschluss: Political union of Austria with Germany achieved through annexation by Adolf Hitler in 1938. Mooted in 1919 by Austria, Anschluss with Germany remained a hope (chiefly with Austrian Social Democrats) during 1919–33, after which Hitler’s rise to power made it less attractive.

Archipelago: An expanse of water with many scattered islands.

Belligerent Nation: Nation belonging to or recognized as a state at war and protected by and subject to the laws of war.

Budi Utomo: The first Nationalist Association of Indonesia originated through the efforts of Mas Wahidin Sudirohusodo (1852–1917), a retired Javanese physician who, attempting to elevate Javanese
people through the study of Western knowledge as well as their own cultural heritage.

Cacophony: Harshness in the sound of words or phrases.

Catastrophe: Devastation.

Caudillos: A Spanish or Latin-American military dictator.

Chastening: To cause to be more humble or restrained.

Comintern: Communist International.

Condominium: A government operating under joint rule.

Conscription: Recruitment/Mobilisation.


Conundrum: Problem/Challenge/Riddle.

Covenant: A written agreement or promise usu. under seal between two or more parties esp. for the performance of some action.

Dollar Diplomacy: Foreign policy created by U.S. president William Howard Taft (served 1909–13) and his secretary of state, Philander C. Knox, to ensure the financial stability of a region while protecting and extending American commercial and financial interests there.

Dominion Status: Kind of a status conferred on the colony, whereby the colony was recognized as an autonomous entity with allegiance to the British crown.

Espionage: Spying/Surveillance.

Gerindo: Name of a Radical Party in Indonesia.

Good Neighbour Policy: Popular name for the Latin American policy pursued by the administration of the U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Insulinde: A Eurasian Party calling itself Insulinde, a poetic name for the East Indies coming into being in 1913 in Indonesia.

Maginot mentality: A defensive kind of mentality inherited by France from the World War I by which the French relied primarily on their Maginot Line for protection against a German offensive.

Mandarinate: The office or status of a mandarin (Mandarin - a public official in the Chinese Empire of any of nine superior grades).

Monroe Doctrine: Cornerstone of U.S foreign policy enunciated by President James Monroe in his annual message to Congress in December 2, 1823.

Partindo: A mass party on the lines of the old PNI (Partai Nasional Indonesia) the Indonesian Nationalist Party formed under the chairmanship of Sukarno in July 1927 in Indonesia.

Platt Amendment: U.S. Army Appropriations Bill passed in March 1901, stipulating the conditions for withdrawal of U.S. troops remaining in Cuba since the Spanish–American War, and molding fundamental Cuban–U.S. relations until 1934. Formulated by the Secretary of War, Elihu Root, the amendment was presented to the Senate by Senator Orville H. Platt of Connecticut. By its terms, Cuba would not transfer Cuban land to any power other than the United States.

Policy of Big Stick: Policy popularised and named by Theodore Roosevelt (US President during 1901 to 1909) that asserted U.S. dominance when such dominance was considered the moral imperative.

Protectorate: Territory/Colony.

Regency: An administrative district in Russia.

Romusha: Term used for forced labour in Indonesia.
Sarekat Islam: An Islamic Association of Indonesia with nationalist aims.

Sullen: Gloomy/Grim.

Tardy: Delayed/Slow.

Volksraad: People’s Council of Indonesia.

Wailing Wall Dispute: The Jews considered the ‘wailing wall’ as the last vestige of their temple while the Arab-Palestinians considered this as their holy place. War between the two communities became almost inevitable and a series of head-on-clashes between the two took place between 1929 and 1933.

Whettened: To make keen or more acute.

Zionism: A movement of the Jews throughout the world to stand in solidarity to gain their rights in the Middle East, specifically in Palestine.
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4.0 Objectives

This Unit focuses on the issues of the Disarmament, Appeasement, Spanish Civil War and the Second World War. After reading this Unit you will be able to know:

- the details of the different Disarmament Attempts made by the League of Nations after the World War I to save the world from the perils of another global war and how far they succeeded in restoring world peace;
- how the Policy of Appeasement was followed by the countries like Great Britain, France and the USA towards both European and Asian countries to help create a defensive ring around them to save them from the fold of a global war if set in;
- the causes, nature and impact of the Spanish Civil War that broke out in 1936 and why it is told to be a ‘Tiny World War’; and
- the causes, course, nature and consequences of the Second World War.

4.1 Introduction

The First World War was one of the greatest catastrophes that befell upon the human civilization taking into account the unscrupulous use of mechanical arms and ammunitions and large scale loss of life and property, both civilian and military. The production and use of huge destructive armaments by different countries with their ideological conflict and political rivalry shook the very foundation of human civilization. Disarmament was taken to be an effective tool of reduction or elimination of armaments so as to restrict the means of military attack by one nation against another. The League of Nations took the baton in her hands in this regard launching under guidance different disarmament attempts to shed the post-war tensed nations the fear of another global war to the tune of World War I.

Largely dissatisfied on the allied powers due to different reasons, the aggressor countries like Germany, Italy and Japan resorted to a series of aggressions upon other countries. Threat of Russian communism stood as a serious challenge before England, France and the USA which compelled them to be passive towards such activities, encouraged the aggressors directly or indirectly. Hence, during the thirties of the 20th century England, France and the USA followed the policy of appeasement to solve their foreign policy dilemmas. It is said that this policy was based on wrong assumptions and should have been abandoned as soon as the
designs of Axis powers became clear. It was a folly to have persisted with this policy after 1937 when the designs of Nazi Germany became clear. By their inaction Britain and France created a situation under which the democracies had to go to war under much worse conditions.

At the threshold of 1930 there dawned a new phase of world crisis or “collapse of peace. The trend of aggressive power politics could be exhibited in Japan’s aggression on Manchuria; Italy’s rape on Ethiopia; and Germany’s high-handedness and onslaughts on Czechoslovakia, Spain and finally on Poland which brought the European peace to a virtual whirlwind and the whole world tottered on the brink of a global warfare. Nobody even had ever thought of “Spanish Civil War” or the so-called “Little World War” confined only to the outskirts of a tiny country like Spain which would come about in 1936 dragging and relapsing Italy and Germany on one hand and Soviet Union, Britain and France one the other to her menace-packed heartland and would be a prelude to the World War II.

Right from the Treaty of Versailles the scope of another global war seemed prominent. The aggressive imperialism in 1930’s precipitated the cause to an immediate holocaust. The aggressive attitude fostered by the aggressor nations like Germany, Italy and Japan challenged the-then European peace and paved the way for the world to head towards the cataclysm of a global war. However, it is futile and sheer blasphemy to say that the self-styled Aryan superiority of Hitler, the myth of a nation state of Mussolini and Japanese militarism were the only causes to bring about this global war. It were also the loopholes of the peace treaty of Versailles, the acrimony of the western powers for Bolshevism that prompted them to pursue the policy of appeasement and above all, the inherent polemic tussle between democracy and totalitarianism, all these went a long way in opening the curtain of the World War II.

4.2 Problem of Disarmament

Ever since the dawn of history mankind has been in the process of producing armaments to protect itself from the attack either of the animals or his fellow-human beings. Today man has to think differently for the survival and preservation of the civilization, the legacy of many hundred years of human endeavours. This involves, directly or indirectly but definitely, the question of disarmament. The last two wars brought home to many the horrors of war. And it is said that the last two wars were nothing compared to what the next one is likely to be. The horrors and devastations in the last war, the invention of Atom, Hydrogen and
later of Megaton bombs have shaken the very foundation of human civilization. The production and use of huge destructive armaments by different countries, the ideological conflict and political rivalry have been the cause of natural jealousy and distrust, leading to the feeling of gross insecurity. The general feeling has been that the answer to all this lies in the disarmament. Thus the question of disarmament has assumed a vital and cardinal problem today.

Generally the term disarmament is used for reduction or elimination of armaments so as to restrict the means of military attack by one nation against another. But disarmament means, as Cohn says “a process of creating condition which makes it difficult or impossible for nations to break or endanger the peace and not as a bargaining process to reduce the cost of preparing for war”. In other words the problem of disarmament is not merely a problem of liquidation of armaments but it is a problem of organising the world community and removing distrust and suspicion from the mind of the men.

4.3 Need for Disarmament

The importance of disarmament for the interest of international peace and security and for the welfare of all nationalities and states cannot be denied. According to the advocates of the principle of disarmament, armaments are the basic cause of all rivalries amongst the states. In most cases, a state increases its arms and ammunition on the plea of greater security. As a result, its neighbours also concentrate on the increase of their military strength. In this way begins a competition in military arms and ammunition, and which in consequence leads to mutual fear and distrust in international politics. Militarily well-equipped states begin to consider each other as very powerful aggressors and consequently the competition in armaments takes a terrible shape. Further, the arms race creates psychological tensions. The states involved in the arms race try to form pacts and alliances for their own security and as a result, a condition of war is created.

But on a closer analysis it can be argued that the preparation of military arms is not the chief reason of war, actually fear or danger of war leads to military preparations. According to Sharp and Kirk, “Arms are caused by the danger of war for more than war is caused by the presence of arms”. It cannot be denied that competition in armaments at length makes war inevitable. But this competition is born out of certain particular factors, for example apprehension about security and war
preparations. Preparation of arms and weapons will continue as long as war will be considered as the final means of satisfying nationals interests.

The necessity of disarmament cannot be denied even from the humanitarian point of view. Extensive preparations of arms and expansion of army put much burden on national economy and hamper the internal development of a state.

After the First World War, the problem of disarmament was intimately connected with the problem of security. Any plan for promoting international peace must include a scheme of disarmament. The reduction of armaments of all countries to the lowest point consistent with the domestic safety was mentioned in the U.S. President Wilson’s Fourteen Points. In Article 4 of Wilson’s Fourteen Points it was said, “Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety”. In the peace treaties concluded after the First World War (except the Treaty of Lausanne) the application of the principle of disarmament was made compulsory for the central powers. Of course, no such corresponding obligations were imposed upon the Allied Powers. The part-V of the Versailles Treaty provided for a general limitation of Germany’s arms along with her disarmament and forbade her from military activities. It was also stated in the same part that Germany was to follow strictly the military provisions of that treaty.

The League Covenant was drafted on the basis of Wilson’s Fourteen Points. The League Covenant provided for the applicability of the principle of disarmament upon all states beside the central powers. It was said in Article VIII of the League covenant that for international peace, every state would reduce national armaments to the lowest point consistent with its domestic security. Paragraph 2 of Article 8 stated that the League Council would prepare the plan for such reduction in consideration of the internal condition and geographical position of every state. In Para-4 of that article it was stated that after the acceptance of the plan by the states, the limits of armament fixed therein could not be exceeded without the permission of the League Council. In Para-3 of Article 8 it was stated that the Plan formulated by the council would be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years. In Para-6 of that article it was provided that the member states of the League would interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their military arms, naval and air force. The article 9 of the League covenant provided for a permanent commission for the execution of the military, naval and air provisions. In one world, the responsibility of the settlement of the disarmament problem was in a
general way entrusted to the League Council. As the problem of disarmament was tackled through the League Council during the inter-war period, so also outside the League framework different states made efforts on many occasions in this direction.

4.4 Earlier Attempts at Disarmament

The idea of international control and reduction of military forces was first mooted in the Treaty of Westphalia signed in 1648 which stipulated that all existing fortifications be demolished and no new fortifications be erected. The first systematic proposal for reduction of armaments was mooted by Czar of Russia in 1816 in his proposals to the British Government to reduce all types of armed forces. But these proposals were not received seriously. France also made proposals for reduction of armaments in the years 1863 and 1869 to the great powers. The other powers which made proposals in this regard include Great Britain (1870) and Italy (1877). But all these initial efforts failed to make any mark.

In 1898 the Czar of Russia addressed a note to the governments of Europe to meet at Hague and devise a scheme for reducing their arms. This proposal was welcomed and the First Hague Conference was held at The Hague. The conference was attended by the representatives of 28 states. A committee of military and naval experts was appointed to study the problem. The committee felt that the time was premature for limitation of armaments. The conference, however, adopted two declarations (1) prohibiting the discharge of projectiles and explosives from the air and (2) the use of asphyxiating gas and expanding bullets. The conference also drew up a convention for the Pacific Settlement of disputes.

The second Hague Conference was held in 1907 and was attended by 43 states. The conference apart from prohibiting use of poison or poisoned weapons during the war also recommended that the governments should seriously examine the question of reducing military expenditure. But the efforts of both the Hague Conferences proved unsuccessful. The concept and attempt of disarmament got a concrete shape and dimension after the devastating effects of the World War I under the auspices of the League of Nations.

4.5 Disarmament Attempts inside the League

From January 1920 the League covenant became effective and since then the League council proceeded to put the principle of disarmament
into practice. In May 1920 the Permanent Advisory Commission was set up to advise the League Council on the military affairs. In the first meeting of this Commission held in August 1920 a Committee of Assistance was appointed for the army, navy and air force. In 1921 the Council appointed a Temporary Mixed Commission for disarmament. The Commission prepared the draft of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance. It continued to work in co-operation with the Permanent Advisory Commission. The majority of the members of this commission were civilians. The commission during its tenure made four important efforts for disarmament.

- It made an effort to fix the land forces of the countries according to their national needs. This proposal was, however, rejected.

- It tried to extend the principles of the Washington Conference of 1922 to the non-signatory powers. This treaty made an effort to limit the naval armaments of the great naval powers of the world. This too failed.

- It prepared the draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance for international aid to victims of aggression. This treaty recommended arms reduction within two years and made an indirect effort to institute ‘collective security’ as a basis for the reduction of armaments. This treaty was also rejected by certain great powers.

- The commission produced the Geneva Protocol of 1924, which was an indirect approach to the problem of disarmament. This Protocol proposed to extend the area of compulsory arbitration and imposed sanctions against aggressor states. It thus created an atmosphere of security in which disarmament projects could be hopefully undertaken. This too was rejected.

When in 1925 the Lacarno Pact was signed, the conditions for the settlement of the disarmament problem became more favourable. The French demand for security against possible attack of Germany was confirmed and the signatory states opined in favour of making effective the principle of disarmament as accepted by the League of Nations. Apart from this, the international situation became favourable for the discussion of the disarmament problem when Soviet Russia and U.S.A. joined the disarmament commission. Taking advantage of the favourable international situation the League council appointed the ‘Preparatory Commission’ for the reduction of armaments. In November 1927 the Preparatory Commission formed a ‘Committee on Arbitration and Security’
to consider measures capable of giving all states the guarantees of arbitration and security necessary to enable them to fix the level of their armaments at the lowest possible figures in an international disarmament agreement. It was in a section of the Preparatory Commission on December 3, 1927 that Litvinov surprised the world by proposing complete, universal and immediate disarmament. After six years of hard labour the commission adopted a draft convention which formed the basis of the world Disarmament Conference which eventually met in February 1932.

This draft convention provided that (i) the military personnel of states would be subject to limitation without regard, however, to the size of each state’s trained reserves and that the period of service for conscript forces would be limited; (ii) land war material was to be subject to budgetary limitation; (iii) naval war material would be limited in accordance with the terms of the Washington Conference (1922) and the London Naval Conference (1930); (iv) air armaments would be restricted according to horse power; (v) chemical and bacteriological warfare would be abolished; and (vi) a permanent disarmament commission would be established.

However, upon the failure of the preparatory commission to arrive at a final settlement, the League Council convened the world’s first Disarmament Conference at Geneva in February 1932. Representatives of 61 states attended the conference. The draft convention already prepared by the preparatory commission was placed before the conference. From the very beginning controversies amongst the representatives arose:

- Germany demanded that the general disarmament proposal and the principle of collective security as adopted in the League covenant should be recognized first. Besides, Germany demanded either to maintain her army and armaments in proportion to those of her neighbours or the reduction of armaments of all states to the level of Germany’s armaments as settled by the Treaty of Versailles. On the other hand, France did not agree to reduce her armaments and military equipments until she received guarantee of her security against possible attack on Germany. In short, Germany insisted on equality and France on that of security. The Franco-German rivalry complicated the disarmament problem.

- Difference of opinion also cropped up on the question of the power of the Permanent Disarmament Commission. France demanded that the Permanent Disarmament Commission would be given the right
of temporary investigation. On the contrary, Britain proposed that the commission should be given the right of investigation only when any signatory state would suspect an infringement of the rules of Disarmament.

- The U.S. President Hoover proposed for a division of land army of all states into two, police-force for internal security and defence force for resisting foreign aggression. The U.S. President insisted on the reduction of the latter by one-third of its existing strength. But Britain and France could not agree to it.

- The British Prime Minister MacDonald presented a plan for the reduction of armaments and military personnel of all states and for specifying the allotments for each state. Besides this, MacDonald also proposed for a total prohibition of heavy cannon, tank and poisonous gas as offensive armaments. The French representatives insisted on the recognition of all armaments excepting the heavy tanks as defensive armaments. On the other hand, the German representatives demanded total prohibition of all sorts of offensive armaments.

After the two years of deliberation, in spite of differences mentioned above the Conference reached general agreement regarding prohibition of certain weapons such as bombs from aeroplanes or balloons, and bacteriological weapons and chemicals etc. The other points of agreement included the necessity of arms limitation, international supervision of arms business and publicity of arms budget.

In the meantime, the international situation took a turn which greatly jeopardized the efforts at disarmament. In 1931, Japan attacked Manchuria to the complete unconcern of the British and American governments. The worldwide economic crisis in some countries added to the general feeling of insecurity. On December 18, 1933 Germany in a memorandum pointed out that while she was genuinely discharging the disarmament obligations embodied in the Treaty of Versailles, the other heavily-armed states either had no intention of disarming or did not feel in a position to do so, and that if these states did not undertake not to exceed the present level of their armaments. Germany would also not abide by her obligations. The emergence of Hitler and his determination to rid his country from the security of the peace terms, made disarmament rather impossible. In October 1933, Germany withdrew from the Disarmament Conference. With her withdrawal the great effort for international disarmament practically came to an end.
The Disarmament Conference again assembled in May 1934. But a deadlock had set in due to disagreements between France and Russia on one hand, and England, Italy and the USA on the other. Russia and France put much stress upon security while England, Italy and USA put importance upon disarmament. On June 11, 1934 the Conference was adjourned which never met later. Thus all attempts at solving disarmament problem through the League failed utterly.

“By the beginning of 1937” observes Schuman, “all treaties imposing quantitative restrictions on the three great naval powers were at an end. In March, London announced plans for constructing 2,38,000 tons of new battleships....... Washington followed suit and Tokyo struggled desperately to keep pace with her wealthier rivals in naval race which was far costlier and more dangerous than that which preceded 1914. On April 28, 1939 Hitler denounced the Anglo-German Naval Pact of 1935 on the ground that Britain’s alliance with Poland was hostile to the Reich and a violation of the purpose of the agreement. Disarmament had become a memory”.

4.6 Disarmament outside the league

Like the attempts through the League, attempts outside the League framework as well were made to bring about a successful solution of the disarmament problem.

4.6.1 Peace Treaty between Russia and Finland (1920)

In October 1920 a peace treaty between Russia and Finland was signed. Under its terms, both the parties agreed not to raise fortifications in some parts of their territories and Finland agreed to reduce her armaments. By the convention of 1922, both the powers pledged to restrict military strength in their respective frontiers.

4.6.2 Washington Conference (1921)

After the World War I, Japan emerged as a mighty naval power in the Far East. On the other hand, the growth of Japanese supremacy in the Pacific caused anxiety to America. As America had to confront the rivalry of Japanese naval power, she became active to avoid as far as possible any naval conflict with Japan by limiting the naval power of the interested countries in the Far East. The U.S. President, W. G. Harding, convened a conference in Washington in 1921 the purpose of which was
also to settle the Sino-Japanese dispute and to end the Anglo-American naval rivalry.

The Washington Conference produced seven treaties of which two dealt with naval disarmament: (1) According to the Five-Power Treaty, concluded between USA, Britain, Japan, France and Italy, the ratio of the naval power of the signatory states was determined. This treaty fixed the total tonnage at 525,000 for USA, 525,000 for Britain, 315,000 for Japan and 175,000 each for France and Italy. The signatory powers pledged not to raise any kind of defensive measures along their coastal region. (2) Another Five-Power Treaty between Britain, America, Japan, France and Italy outlawed the use of poisonous gas in warfare and restricted the use of submarines. The latter treaty of course, remained unratified. Apparently, the naval-power resolutions adopted at the Washington Conference might appear as a very important step in the direction of international disarmament, but in reality the conference achieved very little success.

Firstly, it was due to the opposition of France that the number and tonnage of destroyer, cruiser and other type of battleships could not be determined. Actual naval disarmament could not be effective merely by limiting the number of battleships.

Secondly, eventual competition of naval power was not possible to be avoided simply by determining the number of battleships, because besides battleships other types of armaments and equipments were also helpful in the naval warfare. But no such comprehensive plan was adopted by the Washington Conference.

Thirdly, no plan of naval disarmament alone could achieve success in the field of world disarmament without an overall plan of reducing the land and air armaments. And that was the most important defect of the Washington Conference.

Fourthly, the supremacy of Japanese naval power in the Pacific remained unaffected as she was permitted to maintain naval power almost to the level of Britain and America.

Fifthly, the Conference broke up without accomplishing anything towards the further limitation of naval armaments. Instead, the suspicion between Britain and America was rendered which had subsided temporarily after the signing of the Washington Pacts. “Before long” writes Langsam, “the suspicion in America changed to indignation and anger”.
4.6.3 Moscow Disarmament Conference (1922)

In December 1922, at the invitation of Soviet Russia, a disarmament conference was held in Moscow. Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland attended the conference. The purpose of the conference was to adopt some sort of a permanent measure between Russia and her neighbours. But this too ultimately failed to produce any tangible result.

4.6.4 Geneva Conference (1927)

As the Washington Conference failed to achieve success, the U.S. President, Coolidge convened a Second Naval Conference in Geneva in 1927. While England and Japan welcomed the proposal of Coolidge, France and Italy rejected it on the ground that, (1) the smaller states were not invited to join this Conference, (2) France and Italy considered disarmament problem as a mixed and complicated problem and its solution was not possible only by controlling the naval power; and (3) the League of Nations had already organized a commission to discuss the disarmament problem (1925). Under such circumstances, a conference of three powers instead of five was held in Geneva (England, Japan and USA). The Anglo-American differences assumed a violent shape no sooner the talks began and consequently the conference utterly failed at length.

The U.S.A. was in favour of determining the number of cruisers to be kept by different countries instead of limiting the size of cruisers. But England insisted on a large number of small cruisers, for (1) a large number of cruisers were essential for maintaining the communications in the vast British empire, (2) Speedy cruisers were essential for the protection of British merchantmen and naval bases all over the world. On the other hand, USA was in favour of large cruisers for the protection of her vast coastal region. Practically, it was due to the difference of opinion between Britain and America on the issue of cruiser and their mutual suspicion that the Geneva Conference broke down and the relations between the two states temporarily deteriorated. The British Prime Minister MacDonald came to Washington to remove the suspicion and the difference between the two countries and his visit improved the situation to some extent.

4.6.5 Pact of Paris (1928)

The Kellogg-Briand Pact or the Pact of Paris was signed on 27 August, 1928 by 15 states like the USA, Australia, Belgium, Canada,
Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Poland and South Africa. It was a multilateral agreement attempting to eliminate war as an instrument of national policy. It was the most grandiose of a series of peacekeeping efforts after World War I. It is said that the pact of Paris was “born of American initiative and French courtesy”. By the end of 1930 the pact had around 63 signatory states.

Hoping to tie the United States into a system of protective alliances directed against a possible resurgence of German aggression, the French foreign minister, Aristide Briand, first suggested a bilateral nonaggression pact in the spring of 1927. The U.S. secretary of state, Frank B. Kellogg, prodded by the American “outlawry of war” movement and supported by those who were disappointed at the failure of the United States to join the League of Nations, proposed that the pact be converted into a general multilateral treaty, which the French accepted.

As a result of Kellogg's proposal, nearly all the nations of the world eventually subscribed to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, agreeing to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to settle all international disputes by peaceful means. The signatories allowed themselves a great variety of qualifications and interpretations, however, so that the pact would not prohibit, for example, wars of self-defence or certain military obligations arising from the League Covenant, the Monroe Doctrine, or post-war treaties of alliance. These conditions, in addition to the treaty's failure to establish a means of enforcement, rendered the agreement completely ineffective. It has been the shortest Pact ever signed by so many states.

**4.6.6 London Naval Treaty (1930)**

As the British invitation in January 1930, the representatives of the USA, Japan, France and Italy met at a conference in London. After three months of long deliberations, Britain, America and Japan signed the London Naval Treaty. France and Italy refused. The Anglo-American dispute was settled. By this treaty Britain and America got the right of increasing the number of small and large cruisers respectively although the party in aggregate naval power of the two countries was maintained. The resolution about small cruisers and destroyers as adopted by the Washington Conference was now modified in favour of Japan to give her the right to increase the number of small cruisers and destroyers. According to the term of this treaty the signatories pledged to preserve this treaty unaltered until the end of 1936.
But the London Conference could not settle the disputes between France and Italy. France did not agree to maintain the member of cruisers, destroyers and submarines on parity with Italy. France argued that, (1) France required more cruisers, destroyers and submarines for the protection of her colonial empire; (2) Italy’s supremacy would be established in the Mediterranean if she was allowed to maintain a naval power equal to that of France and in that case French security would be endangered; and (3) Italy did not require mathematical parity with France as her coastline was smaller than that of France. Of course, France proposed that she would agree to a parity with Italy in respect of naval power only if Britain and America undertook the responsibility of the Mediterranean security. But Britain and America refused to do so. As a result, France and Italy refused to sign the London Naval Treaty.

Being abandoned by France and Italy, the London Naval Treaty almost lost its importance. It could not achieve any success in the matters of naval disarmament. The real purpose of the treaty was completely failed when the three signatory states extorted the right of reservation for themselves.

4.6.7 Angora-Protocol (1930)

Turkey seeing Italy establishing cordial relations with the Balkan states like Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania and Greece wanted to play a vital role. After making up with her neighbours, she led the movement for calling the Balkan conferences in 1930, 1931 and 1932 in which some of the differences between Greece and Bulgaria were patched up. On October 30, 1930 Greece and Turkey signed the Angora (historic name for Ankara) Protocol to prevent competition in naval armaments. The Protocol also provided for a mutual guarantee of their common frontiers, joint consultations on matters of common interests and publicity to be given to each other on the issue of negotiation with any other Balkan state.

4.6.8 Anglo-German Naval Agreement (1935)

When the International Disarmament Conference of 1932-33 failed and when Germany proceeded on her plan of remilitarization, Britain became alarmed and concluded a naval treaty with Germany in June 1935. It is known as Anglo-German Naval Agreement. Britain agreed to allow Germany the right to increase her battleships by 35% of the British naval power and to build ships of various types. In fact, with a view to protect her interests against the possible aggression of Germany, Britain concluded this treaty with the former.
One last effort at disarmament was made before the nations reverted to the full fury of jungle warfare. This was the Five-Power London Naval Conference on December 9, 1935, attended by USA, UK, France, Italy and Japan. In view of the forthcoming expiration of the treaties for the limitation of armaments of 1922 and 1930, U.S.A., U.K. and France signed a Treaty on March 25, 1936 providing for “the limitation of naval armaments and for the exchange of information concerning naval construction”.

Under this treaty, capital ships were limited to 35,000 tons and a provision was made that none of less than 17,500 tons would be laid down prior to January 1, 1943. Aircraft carriers were limited to 23,000 tons. Light surface vessels were limited to 8,000 tons and submarines to 2,000 tons. Escalator clauses had been inserted which opened the way for departure from even these limited restrictions. Both Japan and Italy had refused to sign this treaty. Japan gave notice of termination of the Washington Naval Treaty on December 31, 1936. The London Naval Treaty of 1930 was to expire on the same date. The Treaty of Versailles had been unceremoniously buried. The signatories of the Naval Treaty of 1936 availed themselves of the escalator clauses from the very outset. Thus by the middle of 1937 the movement of disarmament during the interwar period had come to a dead end and the world was heading fast towards another and more horrible Armageddon.

4.6.9 London Naval Conference, 1935-36

The representatives of Britain, America and Japan met once again at a conference in London to limit the naval armaments. But at this time the international condition was not at all favourable for such a conference. An uneasy atmosphere had been prevailing since the Japanese aggression upon Manchuria in 1931 and Germany’s remilitarization of the Rhineland in violation of the Treaty of Versailles. At the background of such circumstances, the London Conference was convened in 1935-36. Japan demanded naval armaments equal to that of all states. But Britain and America did not agree to that. In fact, the representatives of the conference were no longer enthusiastic about naval disarmament when Hitler began military preparations in the Rhineland. They only agreed to maintain the ratio of the naval armaments according to the previous treaty (1927), to preserve the size of battleships as before, and to exchange advance information regarding the construction of battleships. Practically speaking, due to the mounting tension in the sphere of international politics the London Naval Conference of 1935-36 was bound to fail.
4.7 Causes for Failure

There are different reasons why the disarmament attempts undertaken by the League outside failed. Let us discuss them.

Firstly, it may be observed that although efforts were made by the League of Nations as well as outside the League to effect disarmament, much progress could not be achieved due to the attitude of different states. Almost all the states were interested in strengthening their position rather than in reducing the weapons. For example, France wanted that effective security arrangements must precede disarmament. She wanted a firm commitment from USA and Great Britain regarding the defence of European frontiers. Similarly, Japan wanted parity in naval armaments with other naval powers at the London Naval Conference and when her demand was not met, she withdrew from the conference. Again, she resorted to armed attack of Manchuria in violation of her international obligations. Germany under Hitler was also very keen to wipe out the humiliation pitted on her by the Treaty of Versailles. To undo the harm done by the Versailles Treaty she resorted to armament at the earliest available opportunity. She pleaded for arms equality with other leading powers and when it was denied to her, she left the Disarmament Conference in 1933. Likewise the fascist regime of Italy and the Communist regime of USSR were more interested in promoting their national interests and strengthening their respective position in the world than reducing the tension through disarmament.

Secondly, the failure of the League to deal effectively with states like Japan, Italy, Germany etc. who resorted to arms in violation of their obligation under the covenant of the League, proved another stumbling block in the way of achieving disarmament. This failure on the part of the League convinced other members that they could not put much reliance on the international body and they must raise their own forces to meet any unforeseen eventuality effectively. This desire particularly became strong after Germany embarked on the path of rearmament.

Thirdly, difference of opinion among the members of the Disarmament conference on various issues also created complications. This difference particularly existed between England, France, U.S.A. and Germany. While France argued that it was dangerous for the people to lay down arms until the total police power of the world was sufficient to guarantee the safety of the individual countries. Britain on the other hand took the stand that the pressure of great armaments makes the nations feel unsecure. By reducing the armaments their confidence will increase.
This impose was the chief cause of inaction and led to the failure of the draft treaty of mutual assistance and the Geneva Protocol. Similar differences existed between the attitude of Germany and France. While France insisted on ‘superiority in armaments over Germany’ on the ground of security, Germany demanded equality in respect of armaments and demanded restoration of her original position. These differences contributed greatly to the failure of efforts at disarmament.

Fourthly, another difficulty in the way of disarmament was the difficulty in arriving at an accepted distinction between aggressive (offensive) and defensive (non-aggressive) weapons. While England considered submarine as an aggressive arm, most of the other states considered it defensive weapon, because it was the mainstay of the naval defence. This point has been beautifully presented by Strausz-Hupe and Passy in their book ‘International Relations’ thus: “Defensive and offensive are relative terms which have no meanings if used in an absolute sense. The same weapon can have offensive if used against one opponent, and defensive value if used against another. In a war against Italy or Spain, the French army of 1939 would have had offensive character. The same army, however, in its war against Germany proved to be no less than a defensive force”.

Fifthly, another cause for the failure of disarmament was that the statesmen focused their attention solely on the reduction of armaments and war equipments. They paid no attention to the economic, psychological and political conditions prevailing in various countries on which the successes of disarmament problem largely rested. The actual reduction of arms should have been preceded by psychological disarmament. In the presence of mutual distrust and suspicion, fear and hatred everywhere, no disarmament could be possible.

The above discussion leads us to the conclusion that in spite of the best efforts of the League of Nations and some of the members outside the League, the problem of disarmament could not be solved. The chief obstacle in achieving effective results was the sense of insecurity prevailing among different nations of the world.

4.8 Disarmament, 1939-45

During the course of the World War II Churchill and Roosevelt declared eight principles for a better future of the world (the Atlantic Charter). One of these principles was to disarm the aggressor nations pending the establishment of wider and permanent system of general
security and at the same time to aid and encourage all practicable measures of lightening the burden of armaments for all peace-loving peoples. There was nothing new in this approach. This had been tried after World War I. The declaration of the United Nations at Washington on January 1, 1942 was confirmation of the Atlantic Charter. On August 19, 1943 Churchill and Roosevelt reached on atomic agreement pledging their countries never to use the atomic bomb against each other or against third parties except by mutual consent. The Yalta Conference on February 11, 1945 resolved on a complete disarmament of Germany and this was implemented by the Potsdam Conference Protocol of August 1, 1945 which provided for the abolition of all German armed forces, destruction of all German armaments, and elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production. Even in these provisions there was nothing new- same lack of realism as in 1912 and same repulsion from bitter facts.

But when on August 6, 1945 an atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, the movement of disarmament assumed a new significance. The atomic era ushered in. It was the most momentous discovery yet made, for, now man learned to use the powers locked in the core of the atom itself. This knowledge represents the brightest hope and the most deadly dangers of the recent time. On the one hand, we now see the possibility of unlimited energy and unlimited water, fertilizer, transport, food and other biological products. Most of the world’s desert belt comprising at least twice the cultivable area could now become as fertile as Egypt is today, and beyond that lies the possibility of artificial food production through micro-organisms or even without them. On this showing all the exhausting trial, want and poverty that afflicts most of the population of the world may come to an end. Humanity may then leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom. On the other hand, there is possibility of wiping out whole cities, poison rivers, lakes and wells. Inland cities thousands of miles away from enemy aerodromes can be instantly converted into pillars of fire.

In the words of Frederick L. Schuman “Each power sought safety in matching its potential enemies regiment for regiment, bombing-plane for bombing-plane, battleship for battleship. In this there could be no security but only the promise of disaster”. He also has pointed out observing the causes of the failure of the various disarmament conferences that, “the letters of failure written large over the portals of successive disarmament conferences during the two decades after Versailles became letters of impending catastrophe for western world”.

To conclude, a broad survey and a critical review of the various disarmament programmes taken in and outside the League prove that they were only in pen and paper without being translated into reality. The balance of power, the balance of terror, the conspicuous absence of a monolithic international authority, and above all, the hostility among the nations made the disarmament conference, a mere mockery. However, in the interest of the entire humanity and not on the basis of their diplomatic prestige points, the world diplomats should make the noble mission of riding the world of the constant fear of war a great success. The classical Greeks perished because they fought against each other, if the legendary story of the Mahabharata is to be accepted, then the Kurukshetra war which was the culmination of internecine war, perished the Vedic civilization. So those war-mongering monsters who gave the slogan that “if you want peace, be prepared for war” hardly realised the fact that “those who live by sword must perish by sword”. So, to save the world from the catastrophe of the ignominious collapse of the world war which was tottering on the brink of the doomsday different disarmament attempts showed the escape route to the fear-stricken human civilization.

4.9 Policy of Appeasement

A series of steps taken by the British, American and French policy makers during the thirties of the 20th century to solve the foreign policy dilemmas has been termed as the policy of appeasement. During this period the aggressor countries in spite of their aggressive activities one after another did not face any resistance from any quarter. The indifference and callousness of the big powers towards these aggressive activities inspired the aggressors. In complete disregard to the League Covenant, Germany, Italy and Japan resorted to a series of aggressions upon other countries. Inaction and passive attitude of England, France and the USA towards such activities encouraged the aggressors directly or indirectly. As a result, the aggressors agreed for territories became widened which ultimately culminated in the World War II.

Britain, France and USA had no doubt sufficient power to desist the Fascist countries from aggressive activities. But instead of doing that they indirectly allowed Germany, Italy and Japan to flout all international agreements and to disregard the rules of international morality.

4.10 Reasons for Adoption of Appeasement Policy

Many factors were responsible for the adoption of the policy of appeasement.
4.10.1 Fear of Communism

All the three powers, Great Britain, USA and France were very much frightened for communism. They felt that Bolshevism was a greater threat than the designs of Germany, Italy and Japan. They therefore deliberately encouraged Germany to strengthen herself to check the Russian menace and diverted her attention to Russian Bolshevism. Hitler could sense this fear of the western powers and fully exploited it by declaring that he was fighting against the Bolshevism. Each advance of Hitler and Mussolini was considered an important step in arresting the progress of communism in the world.

4.10.2 Balance of Power

Another reason which prompted the democratic powers to follow policy of appeasement towards Germany, Italy and Japan was that they felt that Japan, Soviet Union and Germany would check each other, thereby maintaining a balance of power. They thought that Germany and her allies would destroy Russia which would rid the world of communist danger. Therefore, Germany and Italy were encouraged to infringe the treaty and commit aggression. This attitude of the democratic powers actually endangered the balance of power by allowing Germany and her allies to become more powerful.

4.10.3 Economic Depression

The economic depression of early thirties, which adversely affected the economies of almost all the countries of the world including those of England, France and USA was also responsible for the policy of appeasement towards Germany and Italy. As a result of this depression numerous social and economic problems cropped up in these countries which took the first attention of the governments there. The problems of inflation, depression and unemployment were serious problems and would have threatened existence of these countries if not immediately tackled. Therefore, these governments had to adopt a policy of indifference towards Germany and Italy out of sheer necessity.

4.10.4 Belief in Limited Appetite of Dictators

Another factor which prompted these powers to adopt the policy of appeasement (this particularly applies to Britain) was their faith and belief that the dictators had a limited appetite. They felt that Germany and Italy had genuine grievances and if these grievances were satisfied they would
not disturb the peace of Europe. This belief was based on utterances of Hitler from time to time. For example, when Hitler reintroduced conscription in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, he promised to keep up the Locarno Pact. Similarly when he violated the Locarno Pact, he declared that he had no further territorial ambitions.

4.10.5 Selfish Interests of England, France and USA

The three powers followed appeasement policy towards Germany, Italy and Japan for selfish reasons also. For example, England adopted policy of appeasement towards Japan in Far East to check the Soviet influence and preserve the interests of her nationals in China. She appeased Italy to secure her cooperation against Nazi Germany. Similarly Great Britain followed policy of appeasement towards Germany partly because of British differences with France and partly because she saw in Germany an effective check against Russian expansion. France followed appeasement towards Italy to use her as a bulwark against Germany. She was compelled to follow appeasement towards Germany because of her dependence on Britain. USA adopted policy of appeasement towards Italy and Germany because she was not interested in involving herself in European affairs and wanted to concentrate her attention in the Far East, where she was facing a strong rival in Japan.

4.11 British Appeasement

The chief aims of British foreign policy since the middle of the 17th century had been to maintain her supremacy over the seas singly or jointly with other naval powers; to oppose the establishment of one or more countries’ mastery in Europe and to project democracy everywhere. The main purpose in establishing her supremacy over the seas was to ensure security of the British Isles and her colonial empire as well as to maintain her imperial communications in different parts of the world. By maintaining balance of power in the field of international politics, Britain intended to oppose the rise of any system of alliances detrimental to the interest of the British Empire. Another aim of the British foreign policy was to protect her commercial interests and to maintain world peace for that purpose.

The World War I jeopardised British supremacy in Europe to a great extent. The events like the unification of Germany in 1871, the rapid industrial expansion of Germany, the rise of Japan as a military power in the Far East, and the emergence of USA as chief commercial rival of Britain etc., all these had been causing Britain’s anxiety even in the 19th
century. Yet, on the strength of her manpower, vast empire, better system of industrial production and supremacy over the sea, Britain had been able to maintain her isolation from the field of international politics in the 19th century while maintaining her hold over the continent.

But after the World War I, USA and Japan emerged as her strong rivals. Defeat of Germany in the world war, troubles in Russia as the result of the great Revolution, extinction of Austro-Hungarian empire, weakness of France and frustration of Italy etc., all these made it difficult for Britain to continue her world trade by preserving the peace policy of the pre-war period. Meanwhile, the peoples of Asia and the Middle East had been gradually becoming violent against the imperialist countries and their freedom movements had been gradually gaining ground. The influence of the Russian Revolution had been extending far and wide making difficulties for the colonial powers. In the economic sphere also the volume of industrial production and export trade of Britain had been gradually dwindling and she had to confront the commercial rivalry of USA. On the other hand, her relations with the British Commonwealth states were also undergoing a great change as they were aspiring to play their role in the world politics.

4.11.1 Basis of British Appeasement

The policy of British appeasement could base on certain factors. They were:

Firstly, Britain had an intense fear of communist Russia and communism. The clash of interests between Britain and Russia in the Middle East, China and Europe, activities of the Comintern and the British apprehension of communist uprising in Britain etc. all these made Britain hostile to Soviet Russia and hence led her to assist the anti-Soviet countries by all means. Taking advantage of Britain’s Russo-phobia, Japan, Italy and Germany proceeded on their aggressive activities successfully.

Secondly, another aim of the British policy of appeasement was to preserve the balance of power in the sphere of international politics. Britain expected that Japan, Soviet Union and Germany would check and exhaust each other by their mutual conflicts enabling Britain thereby to maintain her isolation. Britain also expected that Germany and her allies would destroy Soviet Russia which in turn would eliminate communist influence from Britain as well as from the whole world for ever. The aim of British diplomacy was to assist Germany by all possible means in the
event of Russia’s victory ever the fascist countries. And for that reason, Britain indirectly encouraged Germany to infringe the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno Pacts as well as to make military preparations. In fact, Britain did not put any resistance against the German aggressions in Austria and Czechoslovakia and even indirectly supported Japan in occupying Manchuria. She also acquiesced in Italy’s occupation of Abyssinia. Truly speaking, Britain indirectly helped the Axis powers to endanger the balance of international politics.

Thirdly, the reason of British appeasement was the strong difference between France and Britain on the issues of collective security, disarmament, reparation etc. The harshness of the Treaty of Versailles in respect of Germany had created a sympathy in Britain. Britain felt that the influence of communism would easily spread in Germany if the latter was driven to despair, whereas a reasonably strong Germany would help to maintain the balance of power in Europe by putting a check upon Russia’s expansionist moves.

For all these reasons, Britain stood for a revision of the Treaty of Versailles in favour of Germany, for making some concessions to Germany as regards reparation and for allowing Germany to rearm. Besides, Britain preferred regional security to worldwide collective security by lessening the rigidity of the League covenant. Britain was not in favour of entering into any sort of military alliances or commitments in Eastern Europe. But France seriously differed from Britain in all these respects. Ultimately the policies of France prevailed during the period between 1919 and 1933 and that contributed to the rise of Hitler. But from 1933 onwards the British policies prevailed over those of France and that ultimately led to the outbreak of the World War II. Hitler took the full advantage of western countries, fear of Russia and that of Anglo-French differences. Nazi Germany was able to isolate France from the support and sympathy of Britain in the same way as she made Russia isolated in the international politics with the support of Britain and France. After 1937 Britain continued her policy of appeasement towards Germany on the pretext of gaining time for war preparations.

Fourthly, the internal weakness of Britain following the world war was another cause of her appeasement policy. It was due to her own economic crisis and her fear of communism that Britain was compelled to support Germany, Italy and Japan and also to help in the economic resurgence of Germany.
4.11.2 Appeasement towards Japan

The British appeasement policy towards Japan rested on: Firstly, Britain firmly believed that Soviet influence and dominance would be strengthened in Inner Mongolia, Manchuria and China in the event of the weakness of Japan. Secondly, Japan would concentrate her attention on South Asia if China put up resistance to the advance of Japan and in that case the British interest in that region would be endangered. Thirdly, the co-operation of Japan was essential for the preservation of the interests of the foreign nationals in China where the nationalist movement had been steadily growing. Britain apprehended that she would suffer a great loss in the Far East if any kind of military measure was taken against Japan. Hence, on these considerations Britain endorsed Japan’s aggression and occupation of Manchuria. But Japan fully exploited the apprehensions of Britain and endangered the interests of the British inhabitants and merchants in the Far East and at the same time continued her aggressions in China with more violence.

4.11.3 Appeasement towards Italy

With regard to Italy, the British appeasement was based on several factors. (i) There was a general hatred of war which meant armaments; (ii) The French agreement with Italy, in January 1935, had weakened the British hands; (iii) The noncommittal attitude of the United States had rendered impossible any effective economic sanctions against Italy and (iv) the British appeasement towards Italy was powerfully motivated by her desire to retain Italian friendship as against Nazi Germany. For all these reasons, adventures seriously challenged the League of Nations and threatened the strategic and economic interests of Britain in the Mediterranean. Though at the beginning of this expedition Britain took a bold stand against Italy, yet later she did not hesitate to satisfy Italy’s aspirations.

Another glaring example of the British appeasement was the Hoare-Laval Agreement concluded in 1935. But in fact, British appeasement instead of appeasing Italy roused the latter’s suspicion and hence pushed her more and more into the arms of Hitler. Italy might have remained attached to anti-German camp had not Britain and France proposed any action against Italy in the League of Nations. In short, in spite of all efforts British appeasement towards Italy failed and it was evident in the growing friendship between Italy and Germany.
4.11.4 Appeasement towards Germany

With regard to Germany Britain since 1919 had been in favour of lenient treatment and that even before Hitler’s rise to power Germany had made full use of the Anglo-French differences with regard to the scaling down of reparations, evacuation of the Ruhr, and secret rearmament. The Stresa Front, following the adoption of conscription by Hitler on March 16, 1935, was punctured by the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of June 18, 1935, which was in pursuance of the line adopted by Ramsay MacDonald and by Si John Simon. The same policy continued in the face of Hitler’s flagrant breach of the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Locarno on March 7, 1936. Same year the fascist aggression took place in Spain on the plea of saving the Peninsula from the Red danger. Both Italy and Germany sent their technicians, the specialist weapons, aircraft and pilots, and divisions of regular ground forces.

In support of their interventions in Spain, Germany and Italy announced that their chief aim was to liberate Spain from the influence of communist Russia. Britain under the spell of her Russo-phobia believed in the pretexts of Germany and Italy. For the maintenance of peace in Europe without interfering in the Spanish Civil War a “Committee of Non-Intervention” was formed in London in 1936. Practically speaking, in order to appease Germany Britain formed the “Committee of Non-Intervention” instead of preventing the Spanish Civil War through the League of Nations. But this committee increased the complications instead of setting the problem. Soviet Union suggested the withdrawal of all foreign volunteers from Spain. But this proposal failed to get support of the Western States, particularly of Britain. According to the Anglo-Italian Agreement concluded in April 16, 1938, it was resolved that the Italian forces would remain in Spain until the end of the civil war. Britain, in fact confirmed the foreign intervention in the Spanish Civil War indirectly.

By 1938 Hitler has resolved to occupy Austria and Czechoslovakia. In February 1938, anti-Nazi Eden was removed from the Ministry of Chamberlain. That was another example of Chamberlain’s appeasement policy. President Roosevelt proposed a conference of neutral states for the preservation of world peace. But Chamberlain by opposing the proposal failed the last attempt of maintaining the world peace. The observation of Churchill on this episode is notable, “Mr. Chamberlain with his limited outlook and experience of the European sense should have possessed in self sufficiency to wave away the preferred hands stretched out across the Atlantic leaves one, even at this date, breathless with amazement”. The British government even refused to offer any advice to Austria, when the
Austrian Chancellor Schuschnigg appealed to Britain for help against Germany.

After the occupation of Austria when Germany began her Czechoslovakian expedition, Chamberlain resolved to give no assistance to Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia was bound by the Treaty of Mutual Assistance with France and Russia. Russia proposed to call a conference of the western state against Hitler, but Chamberlain again refused to agree to it. The stand that Chamberlain took in the German-Czechoslovak dispute was based on the following considerations viz. (1) to lessen the rigidity of Germany’s demand regarding Sudetenland to be acceptable to Czechoslovakia (2) to put pressure upon the Czech government to accept Germany’s demand so that Germany might give up her plan of Czechoslovakian expedition, and (3) to put pressure upon France to accept the British stand so that Czechoslovakia might not dare to ignore Germany’s demand altogether on the strength of the Franco-Czech Treaty. Though France was determined to adopt a stiff attitude in regard to Germany, she was unable to make it effective under the pressure of Chamberlain.

On September 15, 1938 Chamberlain came to Germany and met Hitler and the latter demanded self-determination for the Sudeten-Germans. Chamberlain supported Hitler’s demand and wanted time for the decision. At a conference with Bonnet and Daladier in London, Chamberlain proposed that there was no other alternative than to agree to the demands of Hitler for world peace. Almost unwillingly France agreed to the proposal. The draft of the Munich Pact was prepared in this conference attended by Hitler, Chamberlain, Mussolini and Daladier. It was decided that after the cession of the Sudetenland to Germany, the rest of Czechoslovakia would be assured international guarantee. It marked a remarkable change in the British Foreign Policy after the World War I. It was under duress that Czechoslovakia complied with the proposal of Britain and France. Chamberlain met Hitler again with the letter of consent of the Czech Government. Hitler increased his demands. He demanded that (1) by October 1, 1938 Germany would occupy Sudetenland, (2) Germany would not guarantee the security of the rest of Czechoslovakia until the demands of Poland and Hungary were accepted. Chamberlain felt embarrassed. But in order to propitiate Germany, he advised Hitler to occupy Sudeten territory by October 19 and to meet the Czech representatives at a conference.

Hitler agreed to meet the representatives of Britain, France and Italy when Mussolini intervened in this affair at the request of Chamberlain.
The conference was convened at Munich and Munich pact was agreed on September 30, 1938. Certain portions of Czechoslovakia inhabited by the Germans were surrendered to Germany and a decision was taken to hold a Plebiscite under the supervision of an international Commission in the rest. Practically, Chamberlain Daladier returned from Germany by ensuring the destruction of Czechoslovakia and by shattering all hopes of peace in Europe. Immediately upon his returning to England, Chamberlain boastfully announced that he had brought “Peace with Honour”. Both Chamberlain and Daladier were received with immense enthusiasm in their respective countries for the so-called peace they had achieved with honour.

But subsequent events, truly speaking, proved the futility of such claim. He failed to establish peace because very soon Germany swallowed up the mutilated state of Czechoslovakia by flouting Munich Pledge, and Poland and Hungary also received some parts of Czechoslovakia. The Munich pact did not bring honour to Britain nor to France because it registered their shameful surrender to the ever increasing demands of the aggressor. In fact, the Munich Pact instead of establishing peace gave more impetus to the aggressive designs of Hitler and by it Czechoslovakia was thoroughly deceived. Britain and France did not display good tactics by refusing Soviet Russia’s proposal of collective resistance to Hitler.

The British and French support to the Munich Pact was based on the following considerations- Firstly, even with the help of Soviet Russia it was not possible to strengthen Czechoslovakia militarily for Poland and Rumania were not at all prepared to permit the Soviet army a passage through their territories. Secondly, Britain was not in favour of being dragged into a war or dispute over the fate of a country that did not concern her directly. On September 27, 1938 Chamberlain has expressed openly his unwillingness to fight Germany over the question of Czechoslovakia. France had not that amount of courage to go to war with Germany single handed in case of Britain’s aloofness. Thirdly, Britain and France had not the least doubt about the superiority of the German air force. And they were not sure of Russian support in the event of war with Germany. Fourthly, Hitler’s demand for self-determination of the Sudetens was not unjust. Of course, at the same time Britain and France ought to have realized the truth in the perspective of Nazi ideology and policy that Germany would not stop after the occupation of Sudeten land. Fifthly, the British colonies strongly refused to participate in the Czech-German hostility.
Some European historians have blamed Chamberlain’s policy of appeasement for the ultimate break-out of the Second World War. It was the Czechoslovakian issue that could not be handled preponderantly by Chamberlain, nor Britain. Chamberlain’s public declaration of 27 September 1939 that “we cannot in all circumstances undertake to involve the whole British Empire in war simply on her (Czechoslovakia) account”, doubtless, encouraged Hitler on his aggressive design vis-à-vis Czechoslovakia. The Munich Pact never brought “Peace with honours” as Chamberlain boasted of. It was in reality a defeat of British diplomacy. He was deceived at last by Hitler. He ought to have known that Hitler did not mean that he said. The subsequent successful attack and occupation of Czechoslovakia by Hitler gave further incentive of Fascism and Italy and Japan to veer round Nazi-Germany. Thus war-situation deepened further.

It is true that there was the prospect of the Soviet Union of joining the war in September 1938 on the side of Britain and France. But unfortunately, Britain did not put trust on the Soviet Union. They were more afraid of the danger from communism than from Hitler. Thus a brilliant chance of bringing the Soviet Union into the orbit of the western diplomacy was lost and the Soviet Union for its own security joined hands with Germany. The result was the Russo-German non-Aggression Pact (23 August 1939). Having detached the Soviet Union from the side of the western politics, Hitler became more aggressive and ultimately he made an invasion upon Poland. Thus the Second World War began. As a matter of fact it was only after the occupation of Prague in March 1939 that Britain and France ended their appeasement policy and prepared for war but that time Hitler went a long way to provoke a global war.

### 4.12 French Appeasement

Political independence and territorial security of France had been the chief aim of the French statesmen since long. The French fear of Germany did not disappear with the fall and disruption of Germany in the World War I. On the contrary, the German menace loomed large in the French hearts. And for that reason in the Paris Peace Conference in main thought of the French Prime Minister, Clemenceau was to make French security well settled and permanent. But peace terms could not satisfy France, Britain and America only promised to pressure the security of France against the future attack of Germany. But neither Britain nor America was enthusiastic ‘enough’ to respect their pledge to France. So, the French fear of Germany remained as it was before, and her demands were not fully accepted by the Allies. Apart from this, after the world war
the economic condition of France became all the more deplorable. Hence, after the war France adopted several means to ensure her future security.

Firstly, France began to safeguard her eastern frontier.

Secondly, in order to keep Germany perpetually weak France opposed the move for a revision of the Treaty of Versailles; she refused to reduce the amount of reparation from Germany as well as to reduce her own armaments; and to make the collective security system as decided by the Treaty of Versailles effective.

Thirdly, France by entering into defensive alliances with more than one state tried to secure military help from them. Even in the time of peace, France endeavoured to maintain the system of alliances which was formed against Germany during the war. But after the war, more of the big Allied powers were eager to enter into any kind of military alliance with France. Russia by this time had embraced communism and USA had detached herself from the sphere of international politics. Japan and Italy were not at all satisfied with the Versailles settlements and so they were not at all prepared to preserve the territorial arrangements as done by the Treaty of Versailles. In such condition, France laboured hard to enter into some sort of alliances with Britain as well as to build up a system of regional alliances with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania. But during the interwar period, France failed in all her efforts to conclude a treaty of mutual assistance with Britain. However, with regard to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania her efforts bore fruits. As a result, France became slightly assured of her own security.

Fourthly, to ensure the security of Europe against Germany France continuously offered her support to make the League of Nations strong and effective.

Fifthly, but due to the repeated failure of her policy and plan, France took shelter under appeasement policy after 1933. The League of Nations failed to ensure the French security. Britain was not at all willing to undertake any responsibility in Europe. In fact, the foreign policy of France almost failed. Hence France was compelled at last to make reconciliations with Germany and Italy.

4.13 Bases of French Appeasement

The French appeasement was based on certain factors: Firstly, it was based on economic, social and political weakness of France. To meet
the expenses of the economic programme the government had to issue a paper-currency on a wide scale. As a result, a terrible inflation had set in, and the value of France went down. The morale of the French army sank low and the war materials were insufficient. The military expenditure of Germany between 1934 and 1938 was four times greater than that of France. The French people had been suffering from extreme frustration at that time; there was lack of unity among the political parties; class struggle had assumed a violent shape; everywhere in France fascist tendency had been rapidly developing and her military leaders were being inspired by the ideals of Hitler and Mussolini. Even the middle class people of France had developed hatred for democracy and admiration for dictatorship.

Secondly, terrible horror of war was another cause of the French appeasement policy. Countless French men and women had lost their lives in the World War I and the rest suffered material devastation. So, the French people were afraid of war. For these reasons, France became very much eager to maintain peace and security instead of war. Out of such attitude naturally developed appeasement mentality to the enemies in order to disarm their hostilities.

Thirdly, another reason of French appeasement was the French fear of communism and of communist Russia. The leftists in France were more eager for social reforms than for national security, while the rights on the other hand, were more alarmed at the progress of socialism than at the possibility of fascist aggression. Both Daladier and Bonnet were more interested in saving France from the influence of communism than in resisting fascist pretensions. So France felt the urgency of concluding alliance with Soviet Russia as defence against German attack. In the words of Cot, “It is a historical fact that without a Russian alliance France had always been defeated in Europe, but when allied with Russia she had always been victorious”. France concluded a treaty with Russia (1935) after the Nazis came to power in Germany. But the French fear of communism was so strong that any sort of collaboration between the two states was practically impossible. Hence the French Government continued appeasing the fascist states even at the cost of French interests. Even after the outbreak of the World War II, France did not cease to instigate Germany against Russia.

Fourthly, another reason of French appeasement was the French eagerness to secure Italian alliance. By concluding the Franco-Italian Agreement of 1935, France practically made the Italian expedition of Ethiopia smooth. In the Spanish civil war also, France made no hesitation
in propitiating Mussolini. Thus by 1936 France destroyed her own system of security. In 1938 by becoming a party to the Munich Pact France enraged Soviet Russia and made the German invasion of Poland almost certain. By forming an alliance with Germany in 1938, France also lost the confidence of Italy. So in her effort to appease Germany, France lost the friendship of both Italy and Russia.

And finally, with the gradual destruction of the structure of French security system she became more and more dependent on Britain. The affairs of Czechoslovakia and Poland bear the testimony to France’s surrender to Britain. Even when Germany began her invasion of Poland, Bonnet showed his eagerness to make peace with Germany. On September 3, 1939 France almost against her will declared war on Germany. When France fell in 1940 her leaders did not hesitate to join Hitler at the cost of their country’s interests.

In short, by putting much importance upon the terms of the Treaty of Versailles during the period between 1920 and 1924 France followed the policy of vindictive fulfillment and contributed to the growth of the Nazi movement in Germany. From 1924 to 1932 France attempted conciliation with Germany and this resulted in a partial German economic recovery. From 1933 to 1936 France pursued the policy of appeasement based on “principle” and this resulted in Germany repudiating the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Locarno. From 1936 to 1938 France followed the policy of appeasement based on “necessity” and this resulted in the abdication of French leadership to Britain. From 1938 onward France had ceased to be a major force in European diplomacy.

### 4.14 American Appeasement

The contribution of America to the success of the Allies in the First World War was enormous. American money and war materials helped the allies in gaining victory. As a result, after the end of the war the United States had emerged as the economic leader of the world and she was allowed to play a very important role at the Paris Peace Conference. During the period between 1917 and 1921 America continued her intervention in the internal affairs of Russia and did not accord official recognition to the Bolshevik government of Russia till 1934. In Europe, the United States paid more attention to disarmament, reparation, war debts etc. and participated in many international conferences. But America was interested more in the Pacific than in Europe. To maintain the balance of power in the Far East, America convened the Washington Conference. Although in the decades following the First World War, the
United States tried to remain on good terms with the European powers, ultimately she had to participate in the Second World War in December 1941 passing through the policy of appeasement.

4.15 Bases of American Appeasement

The American appeasement was based on certain factors.

Firstly, the similarity between the economic system of USA and that of the fascist states was the chief bases of American appeasement. The main object of the economic policy of USA and Germany as well as of Italy and Japan was to protect their own capitalists and industrialists against the competition of foreign states. So it is conceivable that such economic policy was strongly opposed to the economic policy of Soviet Russia and for this reason on the other was almost impossible. Moreover America had much sympathy for the fascist states and never hesitated to utilize them against Russia.

Secondly, Roman Catholic Church was another factor in the U.S. Policy of appeasement during the period between the two world wars. Roman Catholic Church was opposed to all progressive reforms in the internal sphere. In foreign affairs, this church was antagonistic towards communism in general and Soviet Russia in particular and sympathetic towards the fascist states of Italy, Spain and Germany, the Vichy France, Poland and Austria. USA is the home of a large number of catholic citizens and their important role in the presidential elections naturally influences the foreign policy of America. Hence America’s sympathy for the fascist states can be presumed.

Thirdly, another reason of American’s policy of appeasement was the American industrialists’ fear of communism. They considered each success of Hitler and Mussolini as an important step in arresting the progress of communism in the world.

Fourthly, the US Government considered the progress of Russia and Communism as a threat to the prevailing social and economic systems of America. For that reason after 1932, the US Government continued its support to the fascist regimes of Italy, Germany, Japan and Spain.

4.15.1 Appeasement towards Italy

USA got an opportunity of keeping herself isolated from the European politics when Italy invaded Ethiopia and the Neutrality
Legislation of 1935 was enacted prohibiting the sale of war materials and banning loans to the warring states. By this land America practically treated both the aggressor and the aggrieved on an equal footing. In other words, the United States refused to give any help to the aggrieved country against the aggressor. But in spite of the Neutrality Legislation, the American businessmen continued to help Italy in various ways. When in 1935 the King of Ethiopia appealed to Roosevelt for help, the later instead of responding to the appeal advised the former “to get the dispute peacefully solved”.

4.15.2 Appeasement towards Japan

The United States, during the period between 1917 and 1920 had been instigating Japan to occupy the Siberian military base of Russia. In the Paris Peace Conference the opposition that Woodrow Wilson made to Japan was not due to any American aversion to Japan but Japan’s threat to the American interests in the Far East. The fact that the United States put pressure upon England to abandon the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 was again not due to American aversion to Japan but to deprive Japan of the English naval help. Apart from this, the United States continued to support Japan directly or indirectly in every adventure of the latter during the interwar period. When in 1931 Japan attacked Manchuria, the United States refused to cooperate with the west in resisting Japan. She also refused to lend her naval power against Japan because she was more interested in preserving her trade and commerce with both Japan and China. In fact, Charles Dawes, the American special representative to Geneva, was friendly towards Japan and was strongly opposed to any measure being taken against Japan. Such attitude of the United States baffled all chances of arresting the aggressions of Japan in the Far East.

Another instance of the U.S. appeasement towards Japan was the Neutrality Legislation passed in 1935. Under this legislation, the U.S. Government ordered all the U.S. citizens to quit China. When in 1937 Japan started fresh offensive in China over the “Marco-Polo Bridge incident” even then the United States refused to take any effective measure against Japan. Ultimately the U.S. policy of appeasement completely failed in spite of all her efforts to propitiate Japan by persistently following the open-door policy in Eastern Asia. When eventually Japan attacked the Pearl Harbour in 1941, U.S.A. was awakened to the danger and declared war on Japan. Lack of coordination between the policy and actions of the United States in the Far East is perceptible. On one hand, though the US was under commitment to check
Japanese imperialism in Asia, she did never endeavour to make that effective and on the other, China was continuously inspired by the U.S. to resist Japan. Secondly, the U.S. considered Japan as her strongest rival in the Pacific, while at the same time, she was much eager to reduce the military power of Britain and France. Thirdly, U.S.A. could have averted possibility of the world war by opposing the advance of Japanese imperialism but the American statesmen could not rise equal to the occasion.

4.15.3 Appeasement towards Spain

The U.S. Policy of appeasement reached its climax during the Spanish Civil War. It was not expected that the U.S. neutral policy, would be applied in the civil war of any country. But with the outbreak of the Spanish civil war, Roosevelt amended the “Neutral Policy” and declared that it could be applied in civil strifes as well. As a result both the Spanish Government and the rebel leader General Franco were deprived of the supply of war materials from America. Thus once again a duly recognized Government and the rebels were placed on the same level. In this affair U.S.A. took resort to a policy of “nonintervention” as followed by Britain and France. Thus the U.S. Government straightway refused to help a democratic and friendly state against the rebels supported and instigated by Hitler and Mussolini. The cause of the U.S. appeasement towards General Franco was the supposed sympathy of the Spanish Government towards communism, the sympathy of American Catholics towards Franco, and fear and suspicion of America with regard to Soviet Russia.

4.15.4 Appeasement towards Germany

The political condition of European began to deteriorate very fast after 1937. When the weak and vacillating policy of Britain and France had been encouraging the fascist states to offensive activities it was only America that could have saved the world from another catastrophe. But like Britain and France, America also complicated the internal situation by following appeasement policy. The U.S. Secretary of State, Cordell Hull sent to all the countries his famous “Eight Pillars of Peace”. But it produced reverse effects. Mussolini and Hitler became more convinced that the United States would continue her policy of nonintervention in European Affair. Three days before the signing of the Munich Pact, Roosevelt by a telegraphic message advised Czechoslovakia, Germany, Britain and France to solve the European problem by peaceful means and reminded them to their responsibilities under the Pact of Paris of 1928. Besides, Roosevelt separately sent to Hitler and Mussolini on appeal for
peace. In reply to that Hitler occupied Prague and Memel in March 1939. In spite of his apprehension of the outbreak of a war at any moment, Roosevelt proposed to Hitler and Mussolini for disarmament and trade conference with a view to reduce international tension. But both of them turned down the proposal outright.

Meanwhile, upon the announcement of the Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact, Roosevelt requested Hitler once again to make a settlement with Poland. While Poland accepted the proposal Hitler refused. On September 1, 1939 Germany invaded Poland and on September 3, 1939, Britain and France declared war on Germany. The same day Roosevelt declared America’s neutrality in the European war. But ultimately, in order to defend the democratic countries of the world against the Axis offensive, the United States entered into the World War II.

4.16 Impact of Appeasement Policy

As a consequence of this policy of appeasement Germany accomplished Anschluss (Union with Austria) and occupied Czechoslovakia. Ultimately England and her allies realized the inadequacy and inefficacy of this policy. On March 17, 1939 Chamberlain declared British resistance “to the almost of its power to any power which attempted to dominate the world by force”. She proceeded to give guarantees to Poland, Greece and Rumania. At home she announced the adoption of military conscription. In May 1939 while giving a guarantee to Turkey declared, “No more deadly mistakes could be made than to assume that Britain and France were not in earnest and could not be relieved on to carry out their promises”.

The critics of the policy of appeasement say that this policy was based on wrong assumptions and should have been abandoned as soon as the designs of Axis powers became clear. It was a folly to have persisted with this policy after 1937 when the designs of Nazi Germany became clear. However, the defending of the policy of appeasement was necessary to postpone the war to gain time for the western powers to gear themselves up for the inevitable struggle. By pursuing this policy after 1937 Mr. Chamberlain played for time and provided the western world the time necessary for preparing themselves the struggle against the Fascist powers. This argument is quite sound and logical. No doubt the Western powers got the time to increase their military strength. But Germany and other Axis powers were not sitting idle. The time went more in favour of the Axis powers rather than the Allies. Germany was able to effect relatively more increase in number and quality of her army. Further, the
Allies were robbed of the Czech Army of twenty-one regular divisions. If war had started on October 1, 1938 it was most certain that Germany (as subsequent facts and Nuremberg trial revealed) would have been quickly defeated. By their inaction Britain and France created a situation under which the democracies had to go to war under much worse conditions.

From the above discussion we should not conclude that the World War II was solely due to the policy of appeasement followed by the Democracies (Great Britain, France and USA) towards Germany and her allies. No doubt, by following this policy these powers allowed the Fascists countries the time to increase their strength and thereby offer stiffer resistance, which made the victory difficult. But to presume that if the western powers had followed a different policy, the World War II could have been averted shows complete lack of understanding of the German and Japanese character. The seeds of the Second World War were sown in the Treaty of Versailles which harshly treated Germany and gave rise to the spirit of revenge. Likewise Japan was curtailed at the Washington Conference of 1921, but she refused to accept a secondary position and wanted to dominate Far East. Italy, though fought on the side of the Allies during the First World War did not get good treatment and many of her aspirations remained unfulfilled at the Paris Peace Conference. In the inter-war period she worked feverishly to get the Treaty of Versailles modified in her favour. Therefore, it is wrong to assume that Second World War could have been averted if the western powers had not followed policy of appeasement.

Frederick L. Schuman observes, “The peril could probably have been averted by coming to terms with Russia for a Grand Alliance to checkmate the Axis. The Tory leaders of the past years were never willing to do this, since they seem to regard any extension of Soviet Power as more dangerous to Britain than any extension to German Power”.

4.17 Spanish Civil War

Rightly from the Treaty of Versailles, the ‘Damocles Sword’ of another global war loomed large in the horizon of mankind. Though the phase of consolidation or the “period of pacification” as termed by E. H. Carr prevailed excellently for a decade, it came to an abrupt end at the threshold of 1930 and thereby dawned a new phase of crisis or “collapse of peace” as termed by G.M. Gathrone Hardy. The trend of aggressive power politics could be exhibited in Japan’s aggression on Manchuria; Italy’s rape on Ethiopia; and Germany’s high-handedness and onslaughts on Czechoslovakia, Spain and finally on Poland which brought the
European peace to a virtual whirlwind and the whole world tottered on the brink of a global warfare. Nobody even had ever thought of “Spanish Civil War” or the so-called “Little World War” confined only to the outskirts of a tiny country like Spain which would come about in 1936 dragging and relapsing Italy and Germany on one hand and Soviet Union, Britain and France on the other to her menace-packed heartland and would be a prelude to the World War II. However, the causes of the Spanish Civil War are subject to scholarly polemics and erudite skirmishes. Many factors worked underneath for the rise of civil war in Spain.

Spain formed a part of the Roman Empire before it was conquered by the barbarians in 406 AD. In 720 AD, it passed under the Arab Muslims and remained under their domination till 1422. By 16th century she developed into a first rate power and became a rival of England in the race of colonization. But due to her internal conflicts and conventions her decline started and during the next three hundred years she remained a third-rate power. With the dawn of the 20th century Spain started consolidating her strength and vigour. When the First World War broke out Spain remained neutral, though the population was divided in its support of the two parties. While the clergies, army, bureaucracy, etc. had pro-German leanings, the intellectuals and the working classes were pro-Allies. The policy of neutrality proved beneficial for Spain.

4.18 Causes of the Civil War

Various causes were held responsible for the outbreak of the Spanish Civil war. Let us discuss them.

4.18.1 Social and Economic Weakness

Spain began to decline after playing an important role in the history of Europe till the end of the 17th century. As a result of the industrial revolution, the middle class people of other European countries had been playing an important part in politics, but democratic society could not be established in Spain due to the absence of this class. The social condition of Spain was weak and discriminating like that of France or Italy of the medieval age. Local strife and social divisions were acute due to the existence of diverse languages and racial groups. National unity was also lacking in Spain like medieval France and Italy. The possibilities of reviving national unity were little as the Catholic Church and the monarchy became weak. Besides, Spain was economically underdeveloped. By 1933 almost half of the agricultural land passed into the hands of the big landlords; of the rest about 33% and 13% passed into the
hands of the big tenants of farmers respectively. The number of landless farmers was about two million. The standard of living of the ordinary Spaniards was very low. In the language of Gasset “The Spanish society was suffering from a severe case of public immortality”. Almost all the sections of Spain, the army, the clergy, the nobility, the monarchy and political parties were inefficient and corrupt.

4.18.2 Weak Political Forces

After the World War I, Spain stood at her crossroad. It was a tragic combination of three main political forces lacking coherence among themselves which worked in Spain (1) People demanded for the establishment of a Parliamentary form of Government and for the end of monarchy. The Republican Socialist Revolutionary Society was at work for the revolution and replacement of the emperor; (2) The military committees which were purely non-political and pro-monarch, capturing all the arms and ammunitions were enjoying the patronage of the kings and were trying to perpetuate the rule of the monarch; (3) The people of Catalonia were feeling that a step motherly treatment was being meted out to them and therefore, they were wanting cession from the mainland. The administration had a difficulty in keeping these three forces together and making the country run smooth. It was less civilized, losing almost the economic, political and the cultural unity and integrity. Violence was inculcated, ingrained in the national blood of Spain.

4.18.3 Revolutionary movement after World War

Though Spain gained much by assuring a neutral stand during the world war, political corruption, illiteracy, revolutionary conspiracy all these created a very unhappy situation in Spain and a deadlock had ensued in the parliamentary administration. A frightful anarchy developed in Spain due to the movement of the Republican-Socialist, anti-national unity movement in Catalonia, and the rebellion of the Riff tribes in Spanish Morocco. Each of the political parties of Spain had been disgusted with the existing administrative system. Meanwhile the situation was further aggravated when the Spanish army was severely defeated by the Riff tribes in the Battle of Annual (Anwal) in 1921. These tribes of Morocco had given the greatest challenge to the Spanish government. The people raised a battle cry of protest against the inefficient rule of the king Alfonso XIII whom the public held responsible. Hence the civil war the ultimate outcome.
4.18.4 Impact of the Dictatorship

The Spanish government failed utterly to render protection to the Spaniards from the constant aggression of the Riff tribes of Morocco. The Spaniards had no option but to hold the king responsible for the same. In 1923 Miguel Primo de Rivera, the military governor of Catalonia, rebelled and established dictatorship in Spain. The middle class supported his dictatorship in fear of Bolshevik revolution in the country. The general public never supported this kind of military administration. They on one hand, had been subjugated by the kingship and had felt restless, and on the other, they had been aspirant enough to experience a democratic form of government. In 1930 Rivera resigned being unable to tide over the internal crisis. The king ordered for the General Election. Hence the Spaniards did not get satisfaction out of the establishment of the military rule. The same kind of unruly situation prevailed as it was there during the reign of Alfonso XIII- the economic exploitation of the landed gentries, the social hierarchy jeopardising a healthy and harmonious social links among the Spaniards and the high handedness of the priests claiming the church to be everything in every aspect of arresting their innumerable social, political and economic problems, hegemonised the administration perpetuating the autocratic interests of the ruler. So instead of a relief, tensions geared up.

4.18.5 Convening of the Republic

In 1931 the Municipal Elections were held in which the Republicans won over by a crushing majority. Also the election of the Constituent Assembly was held on June 28, 1931 which showed a definite landslide for republicanism and in the courts, the Spanish Parliament the socialists with 117 seats became the largest single group. The Republicans and the socialists protested the king in every respect. Due to the smouldering discontent against the monarchy, the king Alfonso XIII had no options but to abdicate the throne. After his abdication, the Republican leader Alcalá Zamora proclaimed a Republic in Spain and he was elected to the Presidential post. The king now became in emigrant. Zamora brought about three major reforms to the distorted political atmosphere of Spain- (1) The Spaniards were granted a liberal and enlightened constitution, (2) The women of Spain were franchised to cast their vote in the election, and (3) anti-clerical and anti-church reforms were brought about which asserted that the people of Spain were free to worship any God they liked. The superiority of the church and the high-handedness of the priests were smashed into oblivion. The church was rationalised. This reform laid
down the principle that nothing stood between the soul and God. The church was tolerated but was not indispensable for the realization of God.

Moreover, the Republican government attempted to introduce social and economic reforms in Spain. But due to the world-wise economic depression the government failed to affect any reforms. Like Japan and Germany, in Spain also the Rightist Party grew strong due to the economic crisis. In 1933, Zamora’s government split into- (i) Liberals and (ii) the Roman Catholics and Royalists. Zamora’s reforms were seriously opposed by the Catholics and the Royalists. The Liberals in the meantime, had become very unpopular. Virtually, two prominent political groups played their role in the Spanish politics of 1933- the Rightists and the Leftists, the former constituted of the Catholics and the Royalists, broadly known as the National Front headed by Jose Antonio, the son of Primo de Rivera, an influential writer of the day. And the latter constituted of the extreme Republicans, the socialists and the communists, popularly known as the Popular Front. While the former wanted the revival of monarchy the latter wanted the total abandonment of the then existing socio-religious fabric.

In the election of 1933 the Rightist Party gained majority and formed the government. The socialists began to oppose the Rightist Party. Everywhere strikes, murders, and peoples risings created an alarming situation. All attempts failed to effect any compromise between the Rightist and the Leftists. Under such circumstances the Parliament was dissolved in 1936 and fresh elections were ordered.

4.19 Beginning of the Civil War

In the General Elections of February 1936 to the Cortes, the Popular Front won over its rival by more than 4,00,000 votes. Manuel Azana became the new President. The popular Front proceeded to put into practice the new President. The popular Front proceeded to put into practice the revolutionary ideals of Spain. The supporters of the Popular Front started attacking the Rightists. As a result of the clash between the Popular Front and the National Front (Rightists), internal condition of Spain grew worse. State finances were chaotic and peace and order were frequently threatened. Moreover, the new President Manuel Azana had to face the phalanx and the Army. Strong measures to check the restive elements hardened the position for the ruling government. The attempt of the government to steer a middle course failed to quell disturbances and the fascists after careful preparation staged a military revolt in July 18, 1936. Originally, the choice of the counter-revolutionaries fell on General
Sanjurgo who was plotted to death on his way to Spain in a plane crash. General Francisco Franco who had been exiled to Canary Islands for his anti-republican attitude now took up the leadership of the rebel army.

Taking advantage of the internal dissensions in July 1936, General Franco, the commander of the troops in Spanish Morocco proclaimed a military rebellion, raised the banner of revolt against the government of the Popular Front and crossed into Spain with his Moorish army and thus the civil war began. He overran the extreme South and the whole of Western Spain without much opposition. However, by July 21, 1936 Franco had been able to control most of the portions of Spain except some of the portions of southern part, eastern and the mining areas of Basque. Shortly the rebels were in the suburbs of Madrid, the government withdrew to Valencia and the full of the capital seemed imminent. In October 1937 the capital of Spain was shifted from Valencia to Barcelona. In January 1938 even Barcelona fell victim to the rebels. As soon as in July 1936 the Spanish army under the leadership of General Franco revolted, the civil war began. In the south and western parts of Spain Franco and his rebels having achieved success formed a government. Madrid however remained under the control of the Popular Front.

During the war thousands of loyalists met their graveyard and the whole of Spain passed under the authority of Franco. By April 1939 the civil war came to an end.

4.20 Nature of the Civil War

Before examining the attitude of the various powers towards the Spanish Civil War, it is desirable to know its significance or nature. E.H. Carr says, “The Spanish Civil War might not, in other circumstances, have been an international event. The causes which made it one were of two kinds. In the first place, Italy was fresh from her Abyssinian victory which had thrown into relief the strategic importance of the Mediterranean waters. Secondly, the notion had grown up since the first world war that a country whose internal organization was based on a certain political theory was expected to encourage and assist the triumph of the theory in other countries”. This policy was pursued by Soviet Russia prior to 1927 and was adopted later by other countries. In 1933-34 Germany and Italy tried to do this in Austria. In 1936 Germany and Italy treated the Spanish civil war on somewhat unconcerning grounds as a struggle between communism and fascism. And so they thought it appropriate to support Franco and his followers. Within a few weeks, the Spanish Civil War threatened to divide Europe into two camps. Italy, Germany and Portugal
openly sympathized with the insurgents and the Soviet Union with the Spanish Government. Portugal decided to help General Franco in fear of the birth of another Bolshevik state in Europe. Italy and Germany hoped that Fascist Spain would strengthen their influence, while France and Soviet Union Russia expected certain advantage if the revolutionary ideals achieved success in Spain.

The attitude of the different powers towards the Spanish Civil War needs to be highlighted in order to study deep the nature of the civil war.

4.20.1 Attitude of Italy and Germany

Italy and Germany treated the Spanish Civil war as a struggle between communism and Fascism and decided to support the rebels. Soon after Franco’s rebellion Italian soldiers poured into Spain to fight on the side of the rebels. Italian aeroplanes assisted him in the transportation of his troops from Morocco. Likewise Germany contributed thousands of aviators and technicians to Franco. In short they did everything within their power to overthrow the democratic government.

Since 1933 Mussolini had been taking interests in the Spanish affairs. In March 1933, he welcomed a monarchist deputation from Spain in Rome and promised to help them against the existing government. The victory of the Leftist Party in the election of 1936 alarmed Mussolini and he expressed his anxiety over the future of Spain to Hitler. Hitler became certain of annexing Austria as soon as he realized Mussolini’s apprehensions about Spain. Mussolini and Hitler hence offered military help to Franco. The motives behind Mussolini’s eagerness about Spain were that from Spain the French industries at Marseilles could be easily bombed. Italy’s supremacy in the Mediterranean could be easily established and blockade against Britain could be easily effected. Hitler was glad to see Mussolini’s involvement in the Spanish affair for it would bring about a direct hostility between France and Italy.

Hence, it would be wrong to assume that Italy and Germany decided to support Franco solely on ideological grounds. Their self-interests also warranted this action. As Italy wanted to consolidate her position in the Mediterranean, a friendly Spain could be of much help to her in eliminating the British and French control of Western Mediterranean. The Spanish promise of bases in Europe, Africa, Spain and the Canary islands was also helpful to Italy to weaken the grip of the British on the straits of Gibraltar. Germany saw in the emergence of Spain under Franco, the problem for France of keeping watch on all her frontiers. This would
reduce the French concentration on the German frontier, and thus weaken her position. Germany also expected to get bases from where she could check the British fleet in the Atlantic.

Moreover, General Franco was more and more apt to have the help and assistance from Hitler and Mussolini. He had a genuine confidence on the dynamic personalities of Hitler and Mussolini who had then had the meteoric emergence to the limelight of European politics by virtue of their intellect and will. Franco believed that by taking the aid and assistance of such powerful dictators he would easily overthrow the popular Front government out of power. He also thought that if France could help the Popular Front, Germany and Italy being the enemy of France would help him since he was opposing the popular Front. In addition to this, from the strategic point of view, it was the utmost duty of Spain, especially of General Franco to make ally with Italy and Germany as she was situated to the south and south-west of France, Germany situated to the north-east of France and Italy to that of its east. Franco thought, if France at any time involved herself in the war of the Popular Front, it would be suicidal for her as the three allied powers Spain, Italy and Germany encircling France from three major sides would attack it simultaneously.

At the beginning the Republican government of Spain had the initial advantage, but with the ever increasing assistance from Italy and substantial aid from Germany, the insurgents seized power in South and North-West Spain. The military uprising, however, was quelled for sometime by the Popular Front Government in Central, North and Eastern Spain including Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao.

4.20.2 Attitude of Portugal

The king Salazar of Portugal thought it wise to extend help to General Franco who then was supported by two invulnerable dictators Mussolini and Hitler. He thought that if Franco did or did not succeed in the civil war, he might attack Portugal situated to the west of Spain, with the help of Germany and Italy. Moreover, Salazar was frightened of the Bolshevik ideologies and that is why, never wanted the birth of another Bolshevik State in Europe, i.e. Spain. He, therefore, wanted to help Franco and allowed Mussolini and Hitler to prepare their naval and military bases to fight against the Popular Front putting constant pressure and tension from the western side of Spain.
4.20.3 Attitude of Soviet Russia

Of all the big powers, Soviet Union alone supported the Spanish Government under the Popular Front. She did this not because she had much sympathy for the Spanish Government but because she was dreadful of the rise of the Fascist regime in Spain. The Soviet Government had trade relations with the Spanish Government too. Further, Soviet Union wanted to baffle relations with the Spanish Government too. Further, Soviet Union wanted to baffle the designs of Hitler and Mussolini. But Russia, unlike Italy and Germany, did not send any regular troops to Spain to fight on the side of the government. She only offered to sale of arms for “cash on the board”. But as Spanish government had not much of money, it could not procure sufficient arms from Russia. But it cannot be denied that on many occasions the Spanish government was able to smash the plans of the rebels only with the support and equipments of Russia.

Soviet Union adopted two basic principles to render help to the Popular Front Government (1) Soviet agents were appointed to try to strengthen the hands of the Popular Front government in Spain; (2) the Soviet government openly called for the non-interference in the affairs of Spain. She appealed to the external nations not to involve themselves in the domestic issue of a sovereign country, i.e. Spain.

4.20.4 Attitude of Great Britain and France

Great Britain and France both were keen to follow the policy of neutrality. Both of them treated the Spanish war as an internal matter of Spain and set up an “International Non-Intervention Committee” consisting of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Portugal. The committee was to ensure that the powers did not supply war materials to either side. But this agreement proved ineffective. While Italy and Germany continued, more or less, openly to send arms to the insurgents, Soviet Union sent the same to the Popular Front Government. The attitude of “neutrality” that England and France wanted to follow was also dictated by their national interests.

Britain had vested interests in Spain. A section of British people was in favour of helping Franco lest he might endanger Britain’s interests. But the Labour Party and the trade unions of Britain were in favour of helping in legal government of Spain. France thought that Germany and Italy would refrain from intervening in the Spanish Civil War if she took a neutral policy. Further, both these countries had started feeling that
Fascism alone could counter communism and therefore favoured the rise of General Franco to power. Moreover, England sought to safeguard her control over Gibraltar by appeasing Franco. As France wanted to win over Italy’s friendship against Germany and Italy was supporting Franco, France was left with no other choice but to follow the policy of non-interference.

4.20.5 Attitude of U.S.A.

The USA as a capitalist country was opposed to communism ideologically. The Italians and the Germans had tried to make the world believe that they were trying to save Spain from Russian communism and therefore, the then American President Roosevelt did not interfere in the Spanish question. But as a rich capitalist country America welcomed the emergence of the Fascist states in Europe which could counter the communist menace. This attitude of USA was evident from the incident of 1938 when the Italian bombers aided the Spanish capital, Patrick Cardinal Hayes publicly prayed for the success of General Franco.

4.20.6 Attitude of the League of Nations

The attitude of the League of Nations was as unhelpful to the Spanish government as that of England and France. In fact, League could not be anything more than what London and Paris would make of it. On a number of appeals from the Spanish Government, the League adopted a resolution on December 12, 1936 calling upon all members to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of another state. Nowhere a reference was made to Spain, although it could be implied so. However, the League Assembly adopted a resolution on October 2, 1937 which declared that there were veritable foreign corps on Spanish soil and urged upon the members to immediately and completely withdraw them. This resolution of the Assembly had no effect because Italy and Germany refused to withdraw their volunteers, and the rebels continued their conquest of Spain. The volunteers of Italy and Germany left Spain only few weeks after Franco and his rebels had won a decisive victory.

4.21 End of the Civil War

For sometime it appeared the civil war in Spain might spread into a general war. To avert a general war, twenty-seven European States including the big powers preferred to remain neutral in the Spanish affairs so that the Spanish Civil War might not spread outside her own hemisphere. According to the terms of the Non-Intervention Committee of
1937 the signatory states promised not to give any kind of help to either parties in the civil war. But practically Italy, Germany and Russia continued their help to the rival parties. Under such circumstances the Non-Intervention Committee strictly prohibited the entry of the battleships of Germany, Italy, Britain and France to Spain and ordered the withdrawal of foreign volunteers from Spain. But Italy and Germany disobeyed the order and their volunteers only quit Spain few weeks after the end of the civil war. When Franco and his rebels won success in 1939, the civil war came to an end. Hundreds of thousands of Spaniard took shelter in France. The Non-Intervention Committee got dissolved. General Franco set up a Fascist State in Spain.

4.22 Recognition of New Regime

Italy and Germany had accorded recognition to the Franco Government as back as November 18, 1936. Subsequently these powers had also pleaded for grant of belligerent status to the rebels, with a view to impose an effective blockade upon Loyalist ports and deprive the Spanish government of all assistance from aboard. The Franco regime was recognized by England and France on February 27, 1939 and U.S.A. on April, 1939. Soon after these, democratic powers rushed with aid and loans to the Franco regime.

4.23 Impact of the Civil War on Europe

The Spanish civil war had far-reaching consequences.

Firstly, the attitude of the western Democracies convinced Hitler and Mussolini that they were blurred by the concept of communism and war which encouraged Italy and Germany to go ahead with their programme of conquests.

Secondly, the Spanish Civil war paved the way for the Rome-Berlin Axis in October 1936 which ultimately strengthened both of them to flout the Peace Settlement of 1919. The unity that was exhibited in them after the signing of Rome-Berlin Axis encouraged them to go more aggressive and the outcome resulted in the Ethiopian attack of Italy and Czechoslovakian attack of Hitler. Moreover, Italy’s involvement in the Spanish conflict restrained her from being drawn into the net of the western powers.

Thirdly, the outcome of the Spanish Civil war was disastrous for France. The rise of General Franco to the Spanish politics under the
banner of fascist help from Italy and Hitler in a state closely neighbouring France, her south-Western border put her under constant fear and tension. France also anticipated that such kind of fascist rise in Spain would have its course dynamically on the internal politics of France creating political turbulence and strife between the Right and Left. The French anticipation came out true. The Spanish civil war paralysed the French action and served to enhance the internal strife in French politics between the Right and the Left.

Fourthly, it was Hitler who profited much in the Spanish Civil War. It not only served to weaken the democracies and bring Italy closer to Germany, but also encouraged Hitler to launch his further aggression and insurrection. It was his attack on Czechoslovakia and Austria that asked the other European powers to intervene which resulted in a European war which further paved the way to the Second World War. The chief beneficiary out of this civil war was not Mussolini but Hitler. While Mussolini was engrossed in Spanish affairs, Hitler extended his sphere of influence in the Balkans at the cost of Italy.

Fifthly, the Spanish Civil war was a major political victory for the Axis and dawned with democracy in retreat everywhere before advancing fascism. Just before the withdrawal of Italian and German volunteers, Spain signed in 1939 the Anti-Comintern Pact originally negotiated by Germany and Japan. “Thus did the Little World War”, as said by Langsam “end in victory for the Axis”. It cannot be denied that the civil war solidified and strengthened the position of the fascists everywhere in Europe and weakened that of democratic states of Britain and France.

And finally, the failure of the League of Nations to deal with the Italian and German interference in the internal affairs of Spain not only undermined the prestige and dignity of the League but also gave a death blow to the system of collective security.

From the above discussion it is evident that the Spanish Civil War “assumed many of the aspects of a European Civil War” as observes E. H. Carr “fought on Spanish territory”. While considerable numbers of Italian and German troops were fighting on the side of the insurgents, the contingents of Russians, anti-Fascist Italians and anti-Nazi Germans, as well as volunteers from other countries were fighting on the side of the Spanish Government. The participation of Italy, Russia, Germany and Portugal in the Spanish Civil War was not dictated by ideological motives alone. The interests of these powers were the main motivating force. While Italy saw in a friendly Spain the possibility of checking British naval
power in the Mediterranean, Germany saw in it the reduction of French forces on the Franco-German frontiers. Russian motives are less implicit. The chief reason for the Russian support of Spanish government was that Franco was being supported by the Germans. The policy of neutrality followed by Franco and England, and the policy of isolation followed by USA in this war, were also dictated by self-interests of these countries. But the results of the war demonstrated that all these powers had miscalculated the future and wasted their energies. Though Spain sympathized with the Axis powers during the Second World War, she on the whole observed fairly correct neutrality.

However, highlighting the immense potentialities of the Spanish Civil war, Brinton, one of the potent figures of Spain opines, “The Spanish Civil War was an immortal catalyst for the world”. Also Elizabeth Wiskemann in her work” Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis”, tracing out the importance in the personality and career of that dynamic hero of Spain, General Franco, says, “When most European dictators were busy constructing castles in the air, General Franco was the sole statesman with his feet firmly planted to the ground”.

To conclude, the advent of Spanish Civil War to the European heartland marked a turning point in the history of the world which ushered in an unprecedented upsurge of containing rivalry among the power-mongering nations of Europe. It had its far-reaching consequences in the labyrinth of Spain and also in the nook and corner of the world. As if the sleeping volcano of Spanish Civil War emitted out its liquid lava of discontented rivalries to the periphery of the international power politics in which some of the European powerful nations plunged and relapsed themselves for the catastrophe of a world war. Had not Italy and Germany helped General Franco, and Soviet Union the Spanish Government of the Popular Front, the domestic war of Spain would not have taken such an inconceivable dimension, to the extent of a “Little World War” as said by the historian Langsam. Therefore, it would not be a folly to say that the Spanish Civil war of 1936 was a trial balloon of international power politics which was to usher in the thunderous outbreak of the global war of 1939.

4.24 The Second World War

In the Wilsonian estimate, the First World War was a “war to end all wars” and U.S.A. fought the war to save democracy for the world. The subsequent treaty of Versailles that was signed at the Paris Peace Conference and the League of Nations that sprang up from the provisions
of the treaty of Versailles were to act as the hallmark of status quo of Europe and solid bedrock of European peace. The Treaty of Versailles was the beginning of another global war, for towards 1939, the entire Europe got ready for another world war, the war-syndrome was beaten enveloping the world in a cataclysm of World War II and plunged the humanity into a catastrophe of most inhuman type. No doubt, the naked invasion of Hitler on Poland acted as catalyst for the war. However, it was not the principal cause of the war, as the Sarajevo murder was not the chief cause of the World War I. Many factors worked underneath for the onset of the World War II.

Right from the Treaty of Versailles the scope of another global war seemed prominent. The aggressive imperialism in 1930’s precipitated the cause to an immediate holocaust. Japan’s rape of Manchuria, Italy’s aggression on Ethiopia and Germany’s high-handedness and onslaughts on Czechoslovakia, Spain and finally on Poland, brought the European peace to a virtual whirlwind and the world headed towards a global war. However, it is futile and sheer blasphemy to say that the self-styled Aryan superiority of Hitler, the myth of a nation state of Mussolini and Japanese militarism were the only causes to bring about this global war. It were also the loopholes of the peace treaty of Versailles, the acrimony of the western powers for Bolshevism that prompted them to pursue the policy of appeasement and above all, the inherent polemic tussle between democracy and totalitarianism, all these went a long way in opening the curtain of the World War II.

4.25 Causes of the War

The Marxist scholars and believers in Leninism uphold the view that the highest stage of capitalism is imperialism. Under the principle of the capitalistic set up, with its chaotic competitions, planless production, unnecessary duplication, useless vocations and huge unemployment, war was a necessary concomitant. The capitalism expands and the capitalistic nations search for new colonial satellites for their raw materials, sale of finished goods and investment of their profit. Naturally, out of competition war is fought amongst the nations and the Second World War is such a war.

The other theory advocated by Sir Norman Angel is that the World War II was an inescapable corollary of anarchy of sovereign states. Each nation for its own safety resorts to armed strength and claims a kind of security which it attempts to deny others.
Each nation believes in the sanctity of its own laws and pays scant respect to the laws of others. Scant respect paid to the majesty of International Law to regulate the interest of nations, is therefore, another cause which results in occasional international disorder. Militarism holds sway and it ultimately leads to the eruption of a destructive war, which precisely happened on the eve of World War II.

However, besides these two theoretical observations which acted as the undercurrent causes of World War II, there are innumerable causes and circumstances which drove the world into the vortex of war.

4.25.1 Provisions of the Treaty of Versailles

An important cause of the war lay inherent in the cryptic provisions of the Peace Treaty of Versailles. As a peace treaty, the Treaty of Versailles was an abysmal failure which differed from other peace conferences held prior to it. Here at, the election manifesto of Lloyd George that, “We shall hang Kaiser”, the vindictive tone of the Paris Press that, “No pardon to the defeated foes” found its echo in the provisions of Paris Peace conference. With one passionate spirit people everywhere raised the slogan that Germany never again should be allowed to become a threat to the peace of Europe. The politicians attempted to translate this sentiment in the causes of the Treaty of Versailles. Therefore, the spirit of revenge was the bulwark of the Paris Peace Conference. Germany lost all her colonies, her military strength was crippled and thus, the treaty of Versailles only became a dictated peace.

The elements of dictation were more apparent than in any provision of the peace treaty of modern times. Germany complained against the Allies, for while all German colonies were taken away, they did not adhere to their principle of “a free-open minded and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims”. She was disarmed without similar reciprocal disarmament on anybody’s apart. Above all, the economic strangulation of Germany by imposing upon her a staggering amount of indemnity was indefeasible. Secondly, the unnecessary humiliation to which the German delegation was subjected at Versailles where they were treated no better than criminals and were escorted in and out of the Conference Hall, and the denial of the opportunity to them to express themselves fully on the terms of the treaty, had far-reaching psychological consequences. All this led to the Germans to look upon the treaty of Versailles a dictated peace upon the vanquished.
Thus, these events of dictation and humiliation gave rise to the spirit of revenge and Germany started looking for an opportunity to violate this treaty. While the Weimer Republic could not come to the hopes and expectations of the people, the Nazis made the promise of paradise for the people and Hitler emerged as the messiah. He repudiated the provisions of this peace treaty and thus the kernels of the World War II were contained within the explosive provisions of the treaty of Versailles.

Besides Germany, Italy was also highly provoked by the provisions of the Paris Peace treaty and it is cynically told that Italy had won war, but lost peace. Prof. F. L. Schuman well observes that “At the peace Conference, Italy found her claim thwarted by Wilsonian idealism, by Serbian aspirations in the Adriatic, by the French and British reluctance to permit Italy to dominate the Mediterranean. All Italian patriots felt that Italy had won the war but had lost the peace. Italy despite her gains emerged from the Conference as an unsatiated state”. So, she also wanted to repudiate the provisions of the Paris Peace Treaty and thus, the stage was set forth for Benito Mussolini to hold the sway of militarism.

No doubt, Japan could get hold of the League of the German territories, but her wishes and aspirations were thwarted at the Washington Conference. So she also wanted to revive herself and emerge as a powerful nation in the Far East. Though the treaty of Versailles was the magnum opus of the peacemakers assembled at Paris, it procreated conditions that entailed another great war after an interlude of twenty years.

4.25.2 Rise of Extreme Nationalism in Italy, Germany and Japan

Another cause of the war was the rise of extreme nationalism in Italy, Germany and Japan coupled with sheer communism and jingoism which ultimately sounded the death-knell of the European peace, heralding thereby the destructive World War II. In Italy the rise of extreme nationalism in the shape of Fascism made an apotheosis of war and imperialism. Mussolini, the fascist leader, glorified war and echoed the sentiment that “war alone brings up to their highest tension all human energies and puts the stamp of nobility upon the people, who have the courage to meet it”. He declared his watchword that “war is to man what maternity is to woman” and “international peace is a coward’s dream” and “Imprison is the immutable law of the nation”. Therefore, he also did not demur to plea that “Everything for the state, nothing against the state, nothing beyond the state and outside the state nothing”. He also advocated the fiery catchword that “Italy must expand or perish”. Thus,
Mussolini’s chauvinism or jingoism found its manifestation in the apotheosis of Italian nation. Under Mussolini’s hegemony, Italy began to think of reviving the glory of the old Roman Empire and embarked on an avowed mission of imperialism. She annexed Abyssinia and in Spain, the Italian volunteers placed General Franco in the saddle which was a rehearsal of the World War II. To strengthen her position Italy joined the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1937 and concluded a ten years’ alliance with Germany in 1939. Both the countries agreed to help each other if any one of them was involved in war.

In Germany, the extreme nationalism found its chauvinistic crystallization in the shape of Nazism under Hitler who created a myth of Aryan superiority and paid little attention towards the international obligations and treaties. Hitler said in the 'Mein Kampf' that “State frontiers are made by men and changed by men”. Germany’s conquest of Austria coupled with the dismemberment at her hands of Czechoslovakia, the murder of democracy in Spain and finally, Germany’s unprovoked assault on Poland were the veritable symptoms of German chauvinism and extreme militarism.

Japanese imperialism was also another factor contributing to the outbreak of the Second World War. Though she had gained her upper hand in the treaty of Versailles, her designs were thwarted at the Washington Conference. In her determined bids to emerge in the Far East, she attacked Manchuria in 1931 and occupied it despite the League’s opposition. Though Japan had signed the Nine-Power Treaty at Washington in 1921, her leaders could not forget the fact that the occupation of Manchuria by Japan would strategically afford them a peculiarly favourable base for the offensive and defensive operations against any powerful country like China or Russia.

Hence, the extreme nationalism that emerged like thunder across the European firmament could wreck the European peace and World War II became imminent.

**4.25.3 Failure of the League of Nations**

The utter failure of the League of Nations to maintain the status quo also heralded the war. Peace settlements at Paris culminating in the establishment of the League could not bear the expected dividends in the time to come widely hailed as an era of peace. It was from the very outset, denigrated as a “dishonoured daughter of a disreputed mother”, because the treaty of Versailles with which the covenant was appended, was an ill-
fated document combining with it contempt, vengeance, idealism of Wilson, imperialism of Lloyd George and materialism of Clemenceau. It combined the prejudices of others and while America left, it was seriously crippled. Further, it lacked coercive authority and taking advantage of League’s efforts, the League suffered a series of reverses which culminated eventually in its eclipse. Japan’s attack on Manchuria, Italy’s rape of Ethiopia, and Germany’s aggression on Poland wrote the doomsday of the League.

To quote Lipson, “The reign of international law was brought to an abrupt close. The prevailing fashion of the unilateral repudiation of treaties rode roughshod over the sanctity of covenanted agreements. From a dream of universal peace, men suddenly awoke to the crude realities of naked aggression. Almost overnight, the political landscape of Europe was transformed and the stage was set forth a fresh chapter in history, the retreat from Versailles”. While Germany, Japan and Italy went on flouting the treaties, the small nations could not trust the efficacy of the League of Nations and thus, the utter failure of the League to act as the torch-bearer of peace drove the world into the cauldron of another global war.

4.25.4 Failure of Disarmament Efforts

Article 8 of the League Covenant asked the members of the League to take steps for the reduction of national armaments. But since the collective security system proved to be myopic and the nations could not pin faith on the system of collective security, that is why, they made a horrible rat-race for rearmament in violation of Article 8 of the covenant. Even Germany which was virtually clipped for rearmament entered into the arms race and in 1935 introduced conscription. Germany called upon the Allied Powers to disarm themselves in the same way as they had made others to disarm. But the attitude of France was “Security first disarmament afterwards”. The refusal of the Allied Powers to disarm themselves gave Hitler the opportunity to arouse the national sentiment of his countrymen by asserting that “rearmament was the only way to power and fulfillment of national aspirations”. It was the German rearmament under the Nazis that ultimately led to the war of 1939.

4.25.5 Discontents of National Minorities

There was grave dissatisfaction amongst the national minorities on account of the iniquitous terms of peace imposed on the vanquished nations. President Wilson of America had clearly envisaged that the peace treaty of Versailles must be founded on the principle of self-determination
but when the peacemakers grappled; with the problem they found
themselves led away by considerations of economic necessity, military
defence, religious and political traditions and punishment of defeated
nations. In some areas, the national minorities were intermixed. Political
considerations of the peacemakers resulted in the inclusion of several
nationalities within the boundaries of the state carried out by the peace
treaties. As a result fierce discontent developed among the minority races
in many states. The intermixing of two nationalities in one state gave
Hitler a convenient opportunity to bargain with the western democracies
and this led Hitler ultimately to annex Austrian Sudetenland and finally
the invasion of Holland on the ground of alleged Polish maltreatment of
minorities. This sparked the World War II.

4.25.6 Conflict of Ideologies

Conflict of ideologies between dictatorship on one hand and
democracies on the other led to inevitable clash. Germany, Italy and
Japan propounded one kind of ideology, while Great Britain, France and
the United States propounded the other. In between these two kinds of
ideologies stood the proletarian dictatorship of Soviet Union. Mussolini
described the conflict between dictatorship and democracy thus, “the
struggle between the two worlds can permit no compromise -Either we or
they”. Basically the difference these two ideologies lay in the difference
of the attitude of the state to the individuals. In the case of democracy, the
individual plays a great role in state activities, while in a totalitarian state,
the individual is not counted at all. He is to be merged in the state and
sacrificed for the sake of the state. In between the two world wars, the
democratic states were designated as the “Haves” and they had no
expansionist aims. On the other hand, the Axis Powers were designated as
the ‘Have not”. They demanded more space under the sun. Japan was
land-hungry and she desired expansion in the Far East. The same was the
case with Germany and Italy. Germany not resented over the loss of her
former colonies, was also demanding more territories for her national
prestige and economic prosperity. Hence the conflict between the different
kinds of ideologies ultimately made the global war inevitable as there was
no point of compromise.

4.25.7 Economic Factors

Economic factors also lay at the root of the Second World War. It
was a struggle for raw-materials, markets for exports and colonies for
growing population. Germany, Italy and Japan took the lead in voicing
their economic grievances. Germany was thoroughly frustrated at the
redistribution of territories after the war. She was deprived of all that she had and Italy also felt that she was not rewarded justly by the victors. Like Germany and Italy, Japan also was poor in natural resources and at the same time she was facing the problem of ever-increasing population. In fact, Germany, Italy and Japan were unsatiated countries. Common economic factor brought Germany, Italy and Japan together; and they embarked upon a course of aggression which ultimately led to a global war in 1939.

### 4.25.8 Policy of Appeasement

The last but not the least factor that went a long way in heralding the war was the policy of appeasement pursued by the western democracies towards the Fascists, arch-militarists and first rate imperialists. The western democracies were very much obsessed with the phobia of Bolshevism and made a calculation that the rise of Nazism and Fascism would eat into the vitals of Bolshevism. Therefore, the western democracies pursued a policy of appeasement towards Germany, Japan and Italy and while they flouted the provisions of the peace treaty of Versailles, the western powers did not try whole-heatedly to checkmate the forces of militarism. However, it was bad analogy and the western democracies failed to understand the simple truth that it was impossible to set limits to fascist aggression and tyranny. Thus, the policy of appeasement that pondered to the imperialism of Hitler and Mussolini sang the swansong of the treaty of Versailles and heralded the war.

### 4.26 Rise of Two Rival Camps

As before the First World War more than one rival system of alliances divided the whole world into two main armed camps, the same was true on the eve of the Second World War. By 1937 two systems of alliances grew up in the international sphere. On one hand there was the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis of the ‘unsatiated states’ like Germany, Italy and Japan while on the other was a system of alliance popularly known as the Allies. No sooner had Britain and France taken the side of Poland than the Second World War broke out.

Hence, the above mentioned causes were held responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War.

### 4.27 Course of the War

From the point of view of military importance, the course of the Second World War may be divided into several phases.
4.27.1 First Phase (September 3, 1939- June-22, 1941)

During this phase Germany occupied Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France and Greece one after another. In this period Mussolini being inspired by Hitler’s success after success abandoned his neutral policy and in collaboration with Hitler attacked France. In this period differences between Germany and Soviet Russia began to widen more and more.

4.27.2 Second Phase (June 22, 1941- December 8, 1941)

During this phase expeditions of the Axis powers and Japan continued in Africa and the Far East respectively and the American naval base of Pearl Harbour in the Pacific was attacked by Japan.

4.27.3 Third Phase (December 8, 1941- November 8, 1942)

By this time Japan, Germany and her allied powers had completed their conquests of the Netherlands, the East-Indies, and North-Caucasus.

4.27.4 Fourth Phase (November 8, 1942 – May 7, 1945)

This period constitutes a story of mounting strength of the Grand alliance, the thinning of the rank of the Axis Forces, the fall and occupation of Italy, the acute shortage of men and material in Germany, the dirty intrigues of the military generals of the Third Reich and the ultimate suicide by Hitler in the banker of the Chancellery in Berlin in April 30 and the unconditional surrender of Germany on May 7, 1945.

4.27.5 Last Phase (May 7, 1945 – September 2, 1945)

During this period atom bombs for the first time were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the two cities of Japan and Japan unconditionally surrendered to America.

4.27.6 The Manhattan Project

Reference is made to the use of the Atomic Bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the US on August 6 and 9, 1945. How did the bomb actually develop is one of the most exciting stories in the history of the Second World War. In 1941 President Roosevelt created the office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD) to coordinate and direct the entire range of war-related research in collaboration with scientists in Britain.
and Canada. The Manhattan Project was the baby of OSRD. On September 17, 1942 General Groves was appointed chief of the “top priority, top secret Manhattan Project” and he drafted captains of industry and Nobel-prize winning scientists, coaxed some $2 billion in secret funds from the Treasury. And congressmen “voted” for such items as this without having the slightest idea of its presence in the military budget. The project, therefore, embodies the spirit of American Militarism. Groves went about his murderous designs efficiently. A team led by J. Robert Oppenheimer undertook the designing of a workable bomb that would fit inside the new B-29 long-range bomber.

The work was rigidly compartmentalized and done in utmost secrecy and sense of urgency. Not one scientist knew what the other was doing and each had a code name so that Fermi was “Henry Farmer” and the bomb was “the beast” or only “it” and the British atomic programme began in 1941 was the “Directorate of Tube Alloys”. Stimson was the only official in the Government who was kept informed of all the aspects of the project and he revealed to a few top Congressional leaders who could pilot money bills through Congress without debate. On July 16, 1945 at a site (in New Mexico) dubbed “Trinity” the first plutonium bomb, code-named “Fat Man” (because its bulging shape resembled Churchill’s) was successfully tested. The U-235 bomb (code named “Little Boy” and used on Hiroshima) was never tested because the scientists were confident that it would work. The choice of target seems to have been determined by the blind hatred the Americans had developed for the Japanese, indeed for the Asians. The “Little Boy” was ready by August 1, 1945 and the “Fat Man” (used on Nagasaki) by August 6.

The fateful directive was issued by Groves and Army Chief of Staff George C. Marshal on July 25, asking for bombing Hiroshima, Korkura, Niigata and Nagasaki after August 3, 1945. At 8.15 AM plus 17 seconds on August 6 the bomb was released on Hiroshima. Hiroshima died and with it died the soul of America, and the spirit of those who fought for the freedom of the 13 colonies. On August 9, at 11 AM, the “Fat Man” annihilated Nagasaki. On August 15, 1945 the Japanese Emperor accepted defeat and on September 2, 1945 the surrender was formally signed on board the battleship Missouri in Tokyo Bay. Victory over Japan (V-J) finally was achieved and with that the Second World War came to an end.

From the military point of view the Second World War was characterized by the continuous success of the Axis powers in the beginning; later the successful counter-attacks of the allies and finally the
discomfiture of the Axis powers and their collapse. From the diplomatic point of view, the Second World War was characterized by mutual suspicion and lack of faith amongst the Allies; mutual; suspicion of Soviet Russia about the west on the other.

4.27.7 War in Poland and the Baltic Region

Without any formal declaration of war when Germany attacked Poland in September 1, 1939, the Second World War broke out. The whole world was amazed at the speedy march of Germany. The German armies fell upon Poland like a swarm of locusts and the German air force destroyed the whole country. Meanwhile, with the attack of the red armies upon Poland the defence of the latter completely broke down. Though Russia advanced the plea of protecting the minority, the white Russians of Poland, yet her chief motive was to occupy some parts of Poland. Russia was opposed to the existence of an independent Poland. Hence Poland was partitioned between Germany and Russia.

Russia next proceeded to safeguard her north-western frontier by extending her influence upon the Baltic States. In fear of Russian attack Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania concluded mutual assistance pacts with Russia and surrendered their naval and air bases to Russia. Russia too asked Finland to deliver to Russia some territories on both sides of the Frontier between Finland and Russia, and to conclude a non-aggression pact with Russia. Finland accepted all demands excepting one relating to strategic base. Being dissatisfied with it Russia attacked Finland on November 30, 1939 and Finland fell. In June 1940 Russia occupied and annexed Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

4.27.8 War in Western Europe

When Germany was continuing operations in Poland, Britain and France remained almost inactive in Western Europe. Britain ceased sending troops to France. Hence, Germany got an opportunity of mobilizing her army in Western Europe. Having completed the conquest of Poland, Hitler placed before Britain and France his so-called ‘Peace-Plan’. Upon the rejection of the same by Britain and France, Germany announced her determination to continue the war.

Hitler attacked both Norway and Denmark on the pretext of protecting them from the evil design of the allies. Denmark could not offer any effective resistance and fell victim to Hitler’s aggression on April 9, 1940. Norway too fell within a month. The easy fall of Denmark and
Norway created a strong reaction in Britain against the Chamberlain Ministry. As a result, Chamberlain’s government fell and Churchill, the leader of the Conservative Party formed the Ministry.

In May 1940 Germany’s invasion of Luxemburg, Belgium and the Netherlands began. Earlier Germany by concluding treaties with Holland (1926), Luxemburg (1929), and Belgium (1935) had pledged to protect their territorial integrity and neutrality. Hitler began his expedition on the plea that the Allies had been trying to violate their neutrality. Despite Britain and France’s resistance German armies broke through. Holland surrendered. The German armies swooped down upon the Allied forces and the Allied forces left Denmark. France was the next target of Germany. In the Battle of Somme an all out resistance of France failed. Taking the advantage of the helpless condition of France, Italy declared war on her. On June 10, 1940 the fascist army crossed the Alpine frontier. Four days later the Nazi troops entered Paris unopposed, the resistance of France completely collapsed and the French Prime Minister, Paul Reynaud resigned. In his place Henry Philippe Petain was appointed Prime Minister. On June 21, France signed the armistice with Germany. The French Government signed the Treaty of armistice with Germany in the same railway compartment where Germany had appealed for armistice to the Allies in 1918.

4.27.9 War in Britain

By the middle of 1940 almost the whole of Western Europe from the Arctic Sea to the Pyrenees fell at the feet of Nazi Germany. After the fall of France, Britain had to continue war against Germany single handed in Western Europe. In September, 1940 the historic battle of Britain was fought. Britain won the final victory and the German airpower almost collapsed. As a result Britain assured of her security from future German aggression.

4.27.10 War in the Balkan Region

Due to the continuous success of Germany the Balkan states changed their policy towards the Axis powers. Hungary and Rumania were reduced to German protectorates. The Nazi army secured the right of entry into Bulgaria in 1941. Yugoslavia came to terms with the axis. But the Yugoslavs violently reacted against the pact with the Axis and an anti-Axis government was formed. On the other hand, Greece also became determined to defend herself against Germany. Hence the Nazi army began military operations against Yugoslavia and Greece simultaneously.
Being supported by Britain, Greece opposed the enemy with immense valour, but ultimately the Nazis occupied both Yugoslavia and Greece. The British Navy had to make a hasty retreat.

As the course of the war continued in favour of the Axis, Turkey changed her policy. In the beginning of the war Turkey was bound with Britain and France by military pacts. But after the fall of France and with the establishment of German hegemony in the Balkan region, Turkey concluded a non-aggression treaty with Germany in June 1941.

4.27.11 War in Eastern Europe

The most remarkable event of the Second World War was the surprise attack of Germany upon Russia. In 1939 the Non-aggression Pact between Germany and Russia was signed. Hitler’s motives were to avoid war on two fronts of Germany, to deprive Poland of Russian help and to continue war uninterrupted in Western Europe. But completely defying this pact Germany attacked Russia. The chief aims of Germany in attacking Russia in the German Frontiers, to check the progress of communism in the world and to occupy Ukraine, Russia’s granary and the petroleum of Baku.

Although clash of interests between Germany and Russia arose over the Balkan and Baltic affairs, Russia did not fail to maintain friendly relations with Germany. Russia confirmed the occupation of Belgium, Norway, and Yugoslavia by Germany and recognized the pro-German government of Iraq. But in spite of that Hitler began preparations for his historic expedition of Russia. He concluded a non-aggression pact with Turkey, secured co-operation of Rumania and Finland and ordered the German armies to invade Russia. The Russo-German war began on June 22, 1941 as soon as 150 divisions of the German armies marched across the frontiers of Russia. Italy, Rumania, Slovakia, Hungary and Finland joined Germany.

In the first five months of Germany’s Russian expedition the mighty German armies created a remarkable sensation in the world by continuous success. The Nazi armies besieged Leningrad and threatened Moscow. In spite of heavy loss, the Russian Red Army continued to resist the enemy with immense vigour. Adopting the ‘scorched-earth policy’, the Russian army began to retreat after destroying all that might be useful to the enemy.
The situation took a turn after November, 1941. The German army was forced to retreat as soon as the Red Army launched counter offensive. Yet the might German army occupied different parts of Russia. By December, 1942, the German army occupied the whole territories of the Western frontier of Russia, Crimea and Ukraine in the south and Caucasus in the east. In the historic Battle of Stalingrad Russia won victory. On February 2, 1943 the German general Von Paulus surrendered and the German forces began to retreat. By April 1944 the Russian forces advanced as far as the Prewar Polish frontier. The whole world was amazed at the success of the Red Army of Russia.

4.27.12 War in Africa and the Near East

When Germany was busy establishing her supremacy in Western Europe, Italy had been continuing the Mediterranean and African expeditions. In 1940 after attacking Libya, the Fascist army invaded Egypt. Two months later the British army recovered the whole of Egyptian coast by launching counter attack and occupied the eastern part of Libya. But in cooperation with the American forces began fresh offensive against the Axis. Eritrea, Italian Somaliland, and Abyssinia were occupied by the British forces. Italy lost her East African Empire by the end of 1941. After resisting the attack of the Axis in the Suez area, the British forces advanced towards the Near East. They occupied Iran and Syria and assured independence to the latter.

4.27.13 U.S.A. and the Second World War

With the outbreak of the war in Europe the United States had assumed neutrality. Though the Americans were not in favour of participating in the European war, they were sympathetic towards the democratic states to the world. So, immediately after the outbreak of the war, the U.S. Congress lifted the ban upon the export of armaments from America and followed the policy of “cash and carry”.

Gradually, it became impossible for the United States to continue her neutrality when the European war assumed a gigantic turn. The Americans gradually became more eager to assist Britain in all possible ways consequently; in March 1941 the U.S. Congress empowered the U.S. Government to help the warring states with armaments against the Axis by enacting the Lend Lease act. This legislation turned America into the ‘Arsenal of Democracy’. Within a few days the U.S. forces captured Greenland, Iceland and Dutch Guiana. As the U.S. merchantmen were indiscriminately attacked by the German submarines, the U.S. naval
forces were ordered to ‘shoot on sight’ the ships and submarines of the Axis. Practically from November 1941 the United States with her huge armaments proceeded to help the allies against Hitler.

In August 1941 Roosevelt and Churchill met the historic North-Atlantic Conference. In this conference both the leaders announced the Eight-point programme of war aims for the Second World War, like Britain and the U.S.A. would not occupy foreign territories; for economic development, equal trading rights of all countries, victors or vanquished would be recognized and the principle of de-militarization would be applied upon the aggressor states etc.

4.27.14 War in the Far East

Meanwhile, relations between Japan and America began to deteriorate very fast. Upon the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan in 1940, the United States became hostile towards Japan. On becoming the Prime Minister of Japan Tojo Hideki proposed a treaty with the United States. In reply to it the U.S. Government proposed that (1) Non-aggression Pact was to be concluded with the states whose interests were involved in the Far East, and (2) the Japanese armies were to be withdrawn from China and Indo-China. As Japan rejected this proposal, war between the two became almost inevitable. While the European States were heavily entangled in Europe, Japan had been advancing rapidly in the Far East. Japanese advanced in the East Indies threatened the U.S. interests there. As such a juncture, the U.S. Government invited Japan to a conference at Washington. While the talks between the representatives of these two powers were going on, all of a sudden Japanese air force attacked the American naval base of Pearl Harbour in Hawaii islands. Following this Japan declared war on Japan in 1941. In February 1942, Japan occupied Singapore and next made occupation of Java, Burma, New Guinea and the Andaman.

4.27.15 War in Mediterranean

In order to disrupt the British communication in the Mediterranean, a party of the German troops began to proceed through the Balkans and another party through North Africa. The German forces occupied the Balkans and the strategic island of Crete. Under the commandership of the German General Rommel a joint Italo-German army launched heavy attacks upon the British forces in the British army to retreat towards Alexandria. In June 1942 a fierce battle was fought between Montgomery and Rommel at El-Alamein. The German offensive suffered disaster. The
battles of Stalingrad and El-Alamein were two epoch-making events in the Second World War.

As this stage the U.S. entered the theatre of the Mediterranean war. The U.S. commander Eisenhower was appointed the Commander-in-Chief to the Allied forces in Western Europe. The Allied troops landed along the coast of Morocco and Algeria. The Vichy government of France did not put any resistance to the Allies. Being enraged at such behaviour of the Vichy government, Hitler annexed the unoccupied zone of France. Meanwhile, the Allied forces proceeded as far as the frontier of Tunisia after occupying French North Africa. In May 1943, about 75 thousands German soldiers in Tunisia surrendered to the Allies. This proved to be another turning point in the history of the Second World War.

4.27.16 War in Italy

After the reserves of the Axis powers in the battles of Stalingrad and Tunisia, Mussolini for the security of Italy advised Hitler to conclude treaty with Russia. But Hitler refused. At this time internal situation in Italy was fast deteriorating and public opinion against the Fascist government had been mounting. Meanwhile, on July 10, 1943 the Anglo-U.S. forces attacked and occupied Sicily. The most important outcome of this battle was the fall of Mussolini. On July 25, 1943 Victor Emmanuel III, the king of Italy dismissed Mussolini and commissioned Badoglio to form a non-Fascist government. In September 9, Italy surrendered to the Allies unconditionally. Fall of Mussolini completely unnerved Hitler. In September 1943 the U.S. army under the generalship of Clerk marched into the western part of Italy. On the other hand, an English force attacked Italy from the Adriatic coast. A fierce battle was fought at Salerno, Naples and Monte-Cassino. On June 4, 1943 Rome passed into the hands of the Allies.

4.27.17 War in France

After the fall of Italy, the Allis next made preparations to attack Germany. It was more convenient to attack Germany through France. For self-defence Germany raised strong fortifications along the coast line. The U.S. Commander Patton succeeded in a break-through in France and proceeded towards Paris. The German army began to retreat towards the German frontier. On August 25, 1944 the Allied troops entered Paris.
4.27.18 War in Germany

After the recovery of France the Allies attacked Germany from three sides, the Russian army from the east and the Allied forces from the side of Italy and France. Fall of Germany became eminent and her allies began to desert her. Rumania, Finland and Bulgaria concluded peace with Russia. The German defence broke down, and by April 1945 Russia occupied Warsaw, Budapest and Vienna. In the meantime, the Allied forces freed Belgium and Holland and marched into Germany. The German army forced the U.S. forces to retreat for the time being. In April 1945 the Russian forces and the Allied forces completely besieged Germany and Germany became divided into zones. On May 2, the Russian army entered the city of Berlin. Everywhere the German army suffered severe reverses. The Nazi leaders began to commit suicide one after another. On May 1, 1945 the news of Hitler’s death was announced. The Nazi leaders like Joseph Goebbels and Heinrich Himmler committed suicide. Hermann Goering, Joachim Ribbentrop and Julius Streicher were taken into custody. In Milan was attacked and killed by an anti-Fascist mob. Germany surrendered to the Allies unconditionally.

On May 7, 1945 the German representatives signed the treaty of unconditional surrender. On May 8, 1945 the news of the Allied victory in Europe was announced.

4.27.19 War in the Pacific

In June 1942 Japan reached the highest peak of her power. After that America proceeded to restore her power and interests in the Pacific. The course of war in the Pacific took a turn when America won the naval battle of Midway on June 6, 1942. The U.S. Admiral Fletcher inflicted a severe defeat upon the Japanese army. As a result of the defeat, the islands of Hawaii became secured. The U.S. Army occupied the Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands after six months’ fighting. As a result, Australia’s security also became assured.

The U.S. Commander General MacArthur launched a fierce attack upon the Japanese army in October, 1942 in the Philippines Islands and recovered the whole of the Philippines. Next began heavy air-raids upon the cities of Japan. On August 6 and 9, 1945 atom bombs were dropped upon the two cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki of Japan. On August 8, Russia declared war on Japan. Japan unconditionally surrendered to the U.S. Army. With the surrender of Japan the Second World War came to an end.
4.28 War Time Conferences

Though the ‘Peace Treaties’ by which World War II was concluded, were signed in 1945, they were based on declarations and decisions arrived at by the statesman of the world at the various conferences held during after the war. For a proper understanding of the Peace settlement, it is desirable to have an idea of these conferences.

4.28.1 Atlantic Charter, 1941

A beginning in this direction was made in August, 1941 when President Roosevelt of U.S.A. met the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill in the mid-ocean and issued the famous Atlantic Charter. The Charter outlined the aims of the allied powers. It assured to respect the rights of all peoples to self-determination, to promote the enjoyment by all of free access to markets and raw materials of the world, to promote universal disarmament and peace and laid emphasis on international co-operation. In 1942 the United Nations declaration was issued by which U.S.A., U.K. Russia and China pledged themselves to employ all their resources for the destruction of the Axis Powers and their Allies.

4.28.2 Casablanca Conference

In January 1943 the Casablanca Conference attended by Roosevelt, Churchill and their military staff, decided to attack Sicily and then Italy. It also decided to demand unconditional surrender from the Axis powers.

4.28.3 Moscow Conference

In 1943 the foreign ministers of U.S.A., U.K. and Soviet Russia met at Moscow and thrashed out important questions regarding co-ordination of the Allied efforts to deal with the problems likely to arise after the defeat of Germany. It was decided that democratic principles should be encouraged in Italy and the Italian people granted freedom of speech, religious worship, political belief, press etc. Austria was to be liberated from German domination. As German forces were perpetuating cold-blooded mass executions in the countries they had over-run, a strong warning was given to them. They were told that all those responsible for the atrocities would be punished by the states concerned according to their laws.
4.28.4 Cairo Meet

In November 1943, Churchill, Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek met at Cairo in Egypt and decided to deprive Japan of her territories seized in the two world wars and created an independent Korea.

4.28.5 Teheran Conference

In November-December 1943, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin met at Teheran, and finalized the plan for final assault on Germany. It was decided that if Turkey declared war against Germany, the Soviet Union would protect her against a possible attack from Bulgaria. The conference also approved the eastern frontier of Poland. The Allied powers also agreed to keep close touch with each other with regard to future operations.

4.28.6 Dumbarton Oaks Conference

In 1944 the representatives of the U.S., Britain and China met a conference at Dumbarton Oaks near Washington. The purpose of the conference was to set up an international organisation. As Russia and China refused to sit together at the same conference, the representatives of the United States, Britain and Russia at the outset opened the talks. The Chinese representatives stepped in when the Russian representatives walked out of the conference. At the Quebec Conference in September 11, 1944, Roosevelt and Churchill arrived at an agreement on the occupied territories of Germany.

4.28.7 Yalta Conference

In February 1945, Franklin Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin met for the last time at the Yalta Conference and took important decisions regarding the setting up of a new international organization, which ultimately emerged in the shape of the United Nations Organisation. The Yalta Conference also agreed to destroy German militarism and eliminate Nazism from Germany. Germany was to be divided into occupation zones by the victorious powers. Poland was given territorial concessions. Russia was drawn into war by agreeing to declare war against Japan within three months of the fall of Germany. The Allied Powers also declared their intention to set up democratic governments in the liberated areas. It is sometimes laid that Yalta was another Munich. This does not seem to be correct because at Yalta, Churchill and Roosevelt did not make any concessions to an aggressor. They simply conceded some Chinese and Japanese assets to Russia, to win her co-operation in the subjugation of
Japan. Even China was not betrayed. She not only continued to receive regular war supplies from the Allies, but was also allotted a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council.

4.28.8 Potsdam Conference

The Potsdam Conference was the last in the series of the war time Conferences of the Allies. In August 1945 Harry Truman, Clement Attlee and Joseph Stalin attended this Conference which reached an agreement on the establishment of a council of Foreign Minister representing Britain, France, Soviet Union, the U.S.A. and China. The council was to draw up peace treaties for Italy and other minor Axis nations in Europe. The decisions taken at Potsdam in regard to the reorganization of Germany and Europe as follows:

- To reorganise the political life of Germany on the basis of democracy and to make arrangements for enabling Germany to participate peacefully in the international politics.

- The German education was to be left under the control of the Allies; Militarism and Nazism were to be completely eliminated so that Germany might not disturb world-peace in future.

- The law courts and judicial system of Germany were to be reorganized in accordance with the principles of democracy and equal rights of all citizens irrespective of nationality, religion, and race were to be assured.

- Germany was to be completely disarmed and all military training centres and Nazi institutions were to be dissolved.

- All specialized factories in Germany producing armaments were to be held at the disposal of the Allies; the Nazi Party was to be dissolved and the officials of the Nazi government were to be dismissed.

- The trial and punishment of the German war-criminals were to be held at the International Court.

- Local self-government was to be introduced by decentralizing the administrative system of Germany. Democratic parties were to be allowed to take part in politics and to be encouraged throughout Germany; principles of representation and election were to be
introduced in the political life of Germany and no central German Government was to be allowed for sometime to come.

- The economic system of Germany was to be left under Allied control; a reasonable amount of reparation was to be collected from Germany and an allied Commission was to be entrusted with the task of collecting the reparation.

- The naval force of Germany was to be distributed equally between Russia, Britain and the U.S.A. and her submarines to be destroyed.

- During the period of occupation, Germany was to be treated as a single economic unit. To this end common policies were to be followed in regard to Germany’s import, export, agriculture, price control, currency, transport and communications.

- As Russia incurred greatest loss by the aggressions of Germany, she would be entitled to a half of reparation collected from Germany. The reparation was to be collected with an eye to the internal economic condition of Germany.

Though a provisional government was established in Poland in accordance with the decision of the Yalta Conference, it could not form a stable government through a general election. This issue was discussed at Potsdam and the provisional government of Poland was directed to hold a free general election immediately.

4.29 Peace Treaties after World War II

As per terms of the Potsdam agreement, the Council of Foreign Ministers met for the first time in London in September-October 1945. At the Potsdam Conference it was agreed that the decisions about peace would be made by foreign ministers of big powers and the treaties would be finalised by the nations which had signed the surrender terms. However, at the London conference the foreign ministers decided that France and China should be given no vote since they were not directly concerned. There were also sharp differences over the question of boundaries between Italy and Yugoslavia and reparation to be paid by Italy. In view of these differences the London meeting ended in a stalemate.

Effort was made to end this stalemate at the interim meeting of Foreign Ministers of United States, England and Soviet Union at Moscow
in December 1945. These ministers were able to evolve a procedure for the preparation of peace treaties. But in April and May 1946, when the Council of Foreign Ministers again met at Paris, the old differences once again surfaced. However, ultimately after about 15 months of preparatory work the Council was able to give final shape to the peace treaties with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland and Rumania. In its next meeting held at New York, the Council of Foreign Ministers in giving final shape to five treaties which were ultimately signed on February 10, 1947 at Paris.

**4.29.1 Treaty with Italy**

This Treaty contained 90 articles and 17 annexes. By this treaty Italy was to give to France small districts in the regions of Little St. Bernard, Mont Thabor, Mont Cenis, Tende and La Brigue. She was to transfer of the Adriatic islands of Cres, Lošinj, Lastovo and Palagruža; of Istria south of the river Mirna; of the enclave territory of Zadar in Dalmatia; of the city of Rijeka and most of the region known as the Slovenian Littoral, to Yugoslavia; remaining parts of the province of Venezia Giulia were to become free territory under a statute approved by the Security Council. Greece got Rhodes and Dodecanese islands from Italy. Italy was also forced to give up her sovereignty over Africa and recognize independence of Albania and Ethiopia.

Italy was to demilitarise her frontiers with France and Yugoslavia. Her army, navy and air force were considerably reduced. The army of Italy was limited to 2,500,000 and 200 tanks. Her navy was cut to two battleships, 4 cruisers and 16 torpedo boats. Her air force was reduced 200 fighters and 150 planes of other kinds. Italy was required to pay reparation of 260 million dollars to Yugoslavia, Greece, Ethiopia, Albania and USSR. Thus Italy was subjected to quite humiliating terms and she had no option but to accept these terms.

**4.29.2 Treaty with Bulgaria**

The Treaty consisted of 38 articles and 6 Annexes. The treaty resorted to the frontiers of Bulgaria as on January 1, 1945. Bulgarian army strength was cut to 53,000, the navy to 3,500 and the air force to 5,200. She was required to pay 45 million dollars to Greece and 25 million dollars to Yugoslavia as war indemnity in kind for 8 years. She was not given an outlet to the Aegean Sea, but she succeeded in receiving south Dobruja from Rumania.
4.29.3 Treaty with Hungary

The Treaty consisted of 42 Articles and 6 Annexes. It restored her frontiers of January 1, 1938 with certain minor changes in her boundaries. She had to give to Yugoslavia three villages west of the Danube. Her army and air force were limited. She was required to pay a war indemnity of $200 million to Soviet Union, $45 million to Greece and $50 million each to Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

4.29.4 Treaty with Rumania

The Treaty consisted of 40 articles and 6 annexes. By it Rumania’s frontiers of January 1, 1941 were restored. Her army and air force were reduced. She was to pay a war indemnity of $300 million to Soviet Union in kind in eight years. She was compelled to deliver Bessarabia and Bukovina to Russia and Southern Dobruja to Bulgaria. But she regained Transylvania which under Axis pressure, she had to give to Hungary in 1940.

4.29.5 Treaty with Finland

This Treaty consisted of 36 Articles and 6 Annexes and restored to Finland’s frontiers as on January 1, 1941. Finland surrendered Karelian Isthmus, and the islands of the Gulf of Finland to Russia. As Russia abandoned her claim upon Hango, Finland in return gave Russia the lease of Porkkala-Udd for fifty years. Finish army, navy and air force were reduced. Besides, she agreed to pay $300 million to Russia as compensation as well as to reduce her armed forces.

4.29.6 Treaty with Austria

A peace treaty was signed with Austria on May 15, 1955 after prolonged negotiations lasting over nine years. The treaty consisted of 38 Articles. It was agreed that Austria was to be evacuated by the occupation forces and restored as a sovereign state on the basis of a pledge of neutrality. Her economic independence was also guaranteed. The return of Hapsburgs and her union with Germany (Anschluss) was forbidden. Austrian armed forces were limited. She agreed to deliver 1 million ton of oil annually to USSR for a period of ten years. Moreover, she was also to supply industrial and consumer goods to Russia in discharge of her debt of $15,000,000.
4.29.7 Treaty with Germany

After the fall of Germany the country was divided into four zones, each of which was occupied by one of the occupying powers. As regards Berlin, it was placed under joint occupation of the four powers and each was assigned a sector of the city. With a view to co-ordinate the policies, an Allied Control Authority was set up for the entire country. It worked through the Control Council consisting of the Commander-In-Chiefs of the four powers- Great Britain, France, USA and Soviet Union.

Although the ultimate object of the treaty was to bring about the unification of Germany and give her an independent status, due to differences among the controlling powers this could not be achieved. In 1947, Great and USA established economic unity of their two zones. Soon France also joined them. Thus the four zones were converted into two zones- the western Germany under Great Britain, France and USA and the eastern Germany under Soviet Russia. Thus Germany was caught in the struggle between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American bloc. Each wanted to use it as a bulwark against the other.

4.29.8 Treaty with Japan

As a result of conference held at San Francisco from September 4, to 8, 1951, peace was concluded with Japan in 1952. While Burma, India and Czechoslovakia refused to attend the conference, USSR, Czechoslovakia and Poland refused to sign the treaty. By the terms of the treaty Japan agreed to support and apply for membership of UNO, renounce title to Korea, Formosa, Pescadores and Kurile islands mandated to her after World War I. Japan was also to accord most favoured nation treatment to the Allied Nations for a period of four years. Japan was to pay reparations in the form of labour and raw material. This was done to save her from the burden of foreign exchange. The Allied Powers on their part agreed to recognize full sovereignty of the people of Japan over Japan and its territorial waters. Occupation forces were to be withdrawn from Japan, but the foreign defence forces were to be maintained. Japan was also given choice to conclude treaty either with Red government of China or with the Kuomintang Government.

Russia and her allies did not accept the terms of peace treaty with Japan because they had refused to sign the peace treaty at San Francisco, which meant that they were still at war with Japan. However, in course of time, relations between USSR and Japan became formalized and Russia
even agreed to support Japan’s admission to the U.N. India entered into a separate treaty with Japan in 1952.

**4.30 Difficulties in Conclusion of Peace Treaties after World War II**

At the beginning of 1945 there was a general hope that the task of peacemaking and peace treaties would be easy one as compared to 1919 because the major fundamentals had already been discussed and decided at the various conferences held during and after World War II (viz. Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam). Before 1919 no such formal conferences had been held, though President Wilson issued his famous Wilsonian Points. However, as the negotiations progressed it became evident that the task of arriving at the peace settlement was not so easy. The following reasons were responsible for this:

- After World War I the task of drafting the peace treaties was entrusted to a conference composed of delegates from a large number of states. But in 1945 the task was entrusted to a Council of foreign Ministers, containing representatives of the five major powers i.e. U.S.A., U.K., USSR, France and China. All these representatives had ‘Veto’ power; consequently, even small differences could not be reconciled.

- During the Peace Settlement of 1919 almost all the statesmen who had participated in the war took part in the peace negotiations as well. In 1945, however, when the peace negotiations were at the final stage Roosevelt of U.S.A. died and Churchill of England was defeated. Similarly in China, Chiang Kai-shek was in a precarious condition, and the French government led by Georges Bidault lacked power of decision. Thus the settlement was finalized by persons who had not taken direct and active part in the war, or the deliberations of the various conferences held during the war.

- Mutual bickerings of the big powers regarding booty of war were also responsible for the difficulties in negotiation of peace in 1945. As against 1919 when France alone wanted maximum booty to counter any future German designs, in 1945 almost all the powers (U.S.A., U.S.S.R, Britain and France) wanted maximum share of booty. Further, the objectives of Russia and other Western powers clashed. While Russia was keen to have permanent security so that there was no repetition of another war against her from any quarter, U.S.A. and other western countries were scared of the Red peril and
were determined to check it. Therefore, no agreement could be reached, even on the basic principles.

- After World War I, there were no dissensions within the Victor’s Camp (except very mild differences between France and England) and they could take a united stand against the Vanquished Powers and arrive at a mutually acceptable peace settlement. After World War II, however, the things became very complicated. Soon after the war a cold war started between U.S.A. and other western powers on the one side and USSR on the other side. This cold war was the direct outcome of the psychological fear of the two and was based on mutual hatred of each other’s system. U.S.A. with a view to save the western democracies from the dangers of Communist expansion embarked on plans for European Recovery through Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine. She also launched military alliances to check Russia. This naturally gave cause for suspicion and mutual hatred, which greatly hampered the task of peace-making. For example, Russia refused to sign the treaty of San Francisco, along with other allies. As a result, she formally remained at war with France till 1956 when the Russian foreign Minister formally declared that the war with Japan has come to an end.

Thus we find that although lot of preliminary work had been done for the peace settlement after world war (both during and after the war) yet the task of peace-making was not all smooth. This is proved by the fact that peace treaty with Austria could be concluded after protracted negotiations lasting over nine years and Germany could not be united and her problem continues to defy solution to this day.

### 4.3.1 Results of the Second World War

An extensive and so devastating a war like the Second World War had never occurred before in the world history. The war was brought to a close in 1945. By some way or other almost all the countries of the world were drawn into this war and consequently sustained loss.

Though the issues which ultimately culminated in the Second World War terminated at the end of the war, yet a new set of issues cropped up after the war which has not yet been finally settled. During the war the allies had issued declarations time and again about the future reconstruction of the world. The representatives of the allied powers had met in the number of conferences and discussed the future of the nations freed from the Axis domination as well as the future peace and security of
the world. Langsam observes, “The optimists were; certain that future peace would be assured by the continuance, after hostilities ceased, of the unity that characterized the difficult war years”.

Firstly, it has not been possible to ascertain even today the magnitude of the loss both in human and material resources on account of the Second World War. Of the victorious states, Britain, France and Russia particularly sustained incalculable loss. Comparatively the loss of America was less. Of the defeated powers the loss of Germany and Japan was by far the heaviest.

Secondly, the most remarkable result of the war was the end of the wartime alliance and co-operation among the allies. The United States, Britain and France had entered the war against the Fascist powers in close collaboration with Soviet Russia. The western powers including the US and USSR went closer to each other, but after the end of the war the war-time cooperation and friendship among the Allies dried up. Soviet Russia and the United States emerged from the war with more power and influence. Since the end of the war antagonism and dispute between Soviet Union and the western powers grew up in place of war-time co-operation and understating. Under the leadership of these two powers the world was split up into two rival blocs vying with each other for world leadership. The antagonism between these two rival blocs was termed ‘cold war’ or a battle of nerves.

Thirdly, after the war, Europe lost its dominance over the rest of the world and it turned into a problem-ridden continent; various problems that arose simultaneously at the close of the war undermined the political unity and cohesion of Europe and the rival blocs kept it divided. As an outcome of the war various problems cropped up which demanded immediate solution. The more pressing of these included: the rehabilitation of the millions of refugees; the economic and cultural reconstruction of Europe; the capture and trial of the war criminals; the elimination of Nazism from central Europe; the creation of an atmosphere conducive to the development of democratic institutions in Germany and the neighbouring regions; the drafting of peace treaties with the former enemy states; the problem of atomic bomb and its reaction on international relations; reparation, restoration of world trade; territorial readjustment; the rival claims of different races; disarmament and the rising nationalism in Africa and Asia.

Fourthly, there has been a great reorientation of the balance of power of the preceding period as a result of the World War II. The power
and position of Germany and Italy in Europe underwent a great transformation; France, being reduced to a problematic state became weak, and the former power and prestige of Britain was greatly undermined. On the other side, Soviet Russia and the United States emerged from the war as the leading powers of the world. Germany lost her political integrity and remained divided into two parts. In Eastern Germany a Communist regime was established while a Democratic Federal Republic was established in Western Germany. Consequently, mutual enmity of the two parts of Germany and the question of their unification created complications.

Fifthly, the situation in Europe was made worse by ideological considerations. Immediately after the war, almost everywhere in Eastern Europe there began communist movement. Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Finland all came within the Soviet orbit. The independence of states like Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania etc. disappeared and Russian domination was established in this hemisphere. Again as an outcome of the war Italy was reduced to a third-rate power. She lost her African colonies and was compelled to surrender some parts of her own territory to Yugoslavia and Greece. Besides, monarchy got abolished in Italy and a republican government came into being. France got back the two principalities of Alsace and Lorraine. But the former power and prestige of France was largely undermined. Immediately after the war anarchy and disturbances had swept Italy and France and communist activities had assured a violent form in these two countries. But at least in France and Italy the electorates rejected communism and the ideals of democracy triumphed.

Sixthly, the impact of the world war also fell upon Asia and Africa. Most of Asia was involved in the World War II. Throughout the continent the post-war years witnessed a restless and surging nationalism that aimed at bringing to an end the Asiatic colonialism of the weakened western powers. During the period between the two world wars revolutionary movements in the Asian countries against the mastery of Europe assumed great proportions and in many cases the ruling western powers were compelled to concede various facilities to their governed. But after the war the nationalist movements in the Asian countries were transformed into armed revolts and many countries of this continent secured political independence or right of self-rule one after another. Consequently, the structure of European Mastery collapsed.

In August 1947, independent India and Pakistan came into existence; in 1949 Indonesia achieved independence; Burma and Ceylon
also gained independence; and Malaya and Singapore too became independent. Four independent states came into existence in French Indo-China, viz. Vietnam, Vietminh, Cambodia and Laos. In 1949, Communist rule was established in China. Korea was divided into two parts; in Northern Korea communist regime was established in collaboration with China and Russia. In South Korea and influence of the United States gained ground. An independent Jewish state was born in the Middle East. Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon etc. gained freedom. In Egypt monarchy was replaced by a republic.

Like Asia, Africa also felt the impact of the World War II. After the war, countries like Sudan, Tunisia, Libya, Algeria etc. were freed from the fetters of western domination. The most remarkable impact of the world war upon the continent of Africa was the rising nationalism in the areas inhabited by the Negroes. The Negro countries like Gold Coast (modern Ghana), Cameroon, Mali, Nigeria, Somaliland, Congo, and Tanganyika etc. also achieved independence.

Seventhly, as an outcome of the world war everywhere in the world socialism made a remarkable progress. In the under-developed countries of Asia and Africa serious attempts were made to formulate economic plans based upon socialistic principles. In the Asian and African countries the Governments took great interest in regard to political and economic reconstruction.

And finally, as an effect of the Second World War everywhere internationalism and idea of world federation gained popularity. The split up of the world into two main rival camps after the world war and large scale productions of atomic weapons rose much apprehension in nations’ minds that complete annihilation of civilization would be certain if a third world war breaks out. Hence, as a measure to prevent such eventuality, if at all happens in future, the idea of a world federation gained currency.

To sum up, this war was the outcome of the follies of victories, the miscalculations of democracies, the economic crisis of the thirties, which became the bulwark for the emergence of Fascism and above all, the aggressive aptitudes of the Nazis, who tried to establish their monstrous regime over the rest of the world. No doubt, the genesis and kernel of the World War II lay like a dead volcano in the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which had the Achilles’ heel in it. Defeated Germany, disappointed Italy and ambitious Japan blazed a trail and blew the siren of the new age of imperialism that exhibited its cankers to eat into the vitals of the European peace. The Treaty of Versailles which was the
magnum opus of the Paris Peace-makers was a “mill-stone around the neck of Weimar republic”. The developments of European polities after 1930 demonstrated the fact that the peace-makers had created a peaceless Europe. And thus, the Treaty of Versailles was but the beginning of the end which culminated in the World War II with the German imperialism in its epilogue. While the people stood bereft of peace and as breathless spectators of tragedy, the Second World War broke out, inserting the last nail in the coffin of the League and drowning the world into the dreaded catacomb of a destructive global war.

4.32 Let Us Sum Up

To establish peace and reduce the rat-race for armament in the post-First World War era the League of Nations shouldered the responsibility of organising different disarmament conferences under its aegis. But all such attempts proved to be myopic. The balance of power, the balance of terror, the conspicuous absence of a monolithic international authority, and above all, the hostility among the nations made the disarmament conferences, a mere mockery. The issue of the diplomatic prestige points of the world diplomats counterweighed the interest of the entire humanity in almost all conferences from the Washington in 1921 to London in 1935.

The policy of appeasement followed by the Democracies (Great Britain, France and USA) towards Germany and her allies could not stop the World War II to set in. No doubt, by following this policy these powers allowed the Fascists countries the time to increase their strength and thereby offer stiffer resistance, which made the victory difficult. But to presume that if the western powers had followed a different policy, the World War II could have been averted shows complete lack of understanding of the German and Japanese character. The seeds of the Second World War were sown in the Treaty of Versailles which harshly treated Germany and gave rise to the spirit of revenge.

The Spanish Civil War marked a turning point in the history of the world which ushered in an unprecedented upsurge of containing rivalry among the power-mongering nations of Europe. It had its far-reaching consequences in the labyrinth of Spain and also in the nook and corner of the world. As if the sleeping volcano of Spanish Civil War emitted out its liquid lava of discontented rivalries to the periphery of the international power politics in which some of the European powerful nations plunged and relapsed themselves for the catastrophe of a world war. It proved to
be a necessary rehearsal to the final drama staged in 1939 under the title ‘World War II’.

The Second World War was the outcome of the follies of victories, the miscalculations of democracies, the economic crisis of the thirties, which became the bulwark for the emergence of Fascism and above all, the aggressive aptitudes of the Nazis, who tried to establish their monstrous regime over the rest of the world. No doubt, the genesis and kernel of the World War II lay like a dead volcano in the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which had the Achilles’ heel in it. Defeated Germany, disappointed Italy and ambitious Japan blazed a trail and blew the siren of the new age of imperialism that exhibited its cankers to eat into the vitals of the European peace.

4.33 **Key Words**

**Achilles’ heel:** A vulnerable point.

**Apotheosis:** Deification/The perfect example.

**Armageddon:** Vast decisive conflict or confrontation.

**Bacteriological Warfare:** Use of Biological weapons in war, like chemical, radiological and nuclear weapons, commonly referred to as weapons of mass destruction.

**Blasphemy:** Irreverence toward something considered sacred or inviolable.

**Bulwark:** A strong support or protection.

**Cataclysm:** A momentous and violent event marked by overwhelming upheaval and demolition/An event that brings great changes.

**Catacomb:** A complex set of interrelated things.

**Catalyst:** An agent that provokes or speeds significant change or action.

**Concomitant:** Something that accompanies or is collaterally connected with something else/Accompaniment.

**Corollary:** Consequence/Result.
Duress:          Compulsion by threat/Unlawful constraint.

Epilogue:        A concluding section that rounds out the design of a literary work.

Ignominious:     Humiliating/Shameful.

Indignation:     Annoyance/Resentment.

Internecine:     Mutually destructive.

Magnum opus:     A great work/The greatest achievement of an artist or writer.

Military
Conscription:    Recruitment or mobilisation of army personnel.

Noncommittal:    Ambiguous/Unrevealing.

Phalanx:         A body of troops in close array.

Polemic:         An aggressive attack on or refutation of the opinions or principles of another.

Rat-race:        Competitive activity or rush.

Russo-phobia:    Fear of communist influence of Russia.

Scorched-earth
Policy:          By mid-July, 1940 the Germans began to be hampered by the scorched earth policy adopted by the retreating Soviets. The Soviet troops burned crops, destroyed bridges, and evacuated factories in the face of the German advance.

Vichy:           France under the regime of Marshal Philippe Pétain from the Nazi German defeat of France to the Allied liberation in World War II (July 1940–September 1944).

War-syndrome:   Sign or symptom of war.

*****