

Meden School Curriculum Planning

Subject	History	Year Group	11	Sequence No.	3	Topic	Conflict and Tension 19-39
----------------	---------	-------------------	----	---------------------	---	--------------	----------------------------

Retrieval	Core Knowledge	Student Thinking
What do teachers need retrieve from students before they start teaching new content ?	What specific ambitious knowledge do teachers need teach students in this sequence of learning?	What real life examples can be applied to this sequence of learning to development of our students thinking, encouraging them to see the inequalities around them and 'do something about them!'
<p>What were the different alliances during WW1? What happened during WW1 that you can remember from year *?</p> <p>Why did the Treaty of Versailles happen?</p>	<p>End of the war 1917 -USA joined- provided Britain & France with equipment & fresh troops -Russia left Nov 1917 (revolution) 1918 -Germany suffering starvation (due to blockades), mutinies & influenza outbreak -Germany surrendered 11th Nov (signed Armistice). Kaiser abdicates!</p> <p>The Paris Peace Conference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan 1919-Paris Peace Conference. • 32 countries sent delegates. Defeated countries & Russia (Communist) not invited. • Major decisions taken by "Big Three" • This is where they come up with the ideas for the different peace treaties. <p>The 'Big Three'</p> <p>Woodrow Wilson-USA</p> <p>-idealist -priority=world peace -Germany to be punished but not too harshly or will seek revenge – 'Fourteen Points' (self-determination; freedom of seas, LON) -Lenient because USA hadn't suffered much in the war.</p> <p>Wilson's Aims at the Paris Peace Conference New standards into public life – trustful and open relations between countries</p>	<p>Through the knowledge gained in this topic students will learn about how the events that have occurred in the past can be linked to events in the current day. They will make links historic treaties and organisations and modern day treaties, organisations and issues. They will get a chance to look at British values and debate current issues in the world arena how they are similar/different to the time period they are studying:</p> <p>They will do this through the following questions/activities:</p>

	<p>European borders reorganised according to self-determination Faith in the creation of a peace keeping organisation – the League of Nations</p> <p>Georges Clemenceau-France</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make Germany Pay/revenge French public demanded this. - Had seen Germany invade France twice in his life. - Get Alsace Lorraine back as was lost in 1871 in Franco-Prussian war - France was severely damaged in WW1 (1.4 million men killed, lost 60% young men, industry and 4,000 sq. mile farmland damaged) <p>Clemenceau’s Aims at the Paris Peace Conference Security for France – prevent another attack on its frontiers v Keep Germany weak, make it difficult to recover Disarm them Gain back Alsace and Lorraine v Reparations – Germany to pay France for the cost of the damage France had suffered in the war</p> <p>David Lloyd George- GB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compromise between the two. - Like Wilson, don’t punish Germany too harshly as wanted to continue to trade - lost 1 million men from across their empire = British public anger. - won an election campaign in Dec 1918 promising to ‘squeeze the German lemon until the pips squeak’ and to “hang the Kaiser”! Probably only said it to win election. <p>Lloyd George’s Aims at the Paris Peace Conference Maintain supremacy of navy Prevent settlement being too harsh – Germany may turn to communism and they needed the German economy to recover as Britain depended on their trade for money</p>	<p>Are their issues with countries suffering starvation from war in the current day?</p> <p>Does the USA still follow the policy of trying to maintain world peace today?</p> <p>Is it right to want a country to pay for a war they started? Can you think of any modern day examples?</p>
--	--	---

<p>What were the aims of the Big Three?</p> <p>Why were the 14 points important to Germany? How similar were the real terms compared to the 14 points?</p>	<p>Germany made peace with Russia in 1917 at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Russia had been forced to give large amount of land and money to Germany. This gave the Allies some idea of how Germany would treat the defeated nations if it had been victorious</p> <p>Wilson's 14 Point Programme This was his plans for: the creation of a League of Nations to guarantee peace, right to self-determination for all countries, reduction of arms to reduce likelihood of war and attempts to avoid rivalry and secrecy by ensuring freedom of the seas and no secret treaties</p> <p>Key points of the 14 points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. End of secret treaties 2. Freedom of the seas 3. Reductions in armies and weapons 4. Future of colonies to be decided fairly 5. German troops to leave Russia 6. Belgium to be restored to independence 7. Alsace and Lorraine back to France 8. People of Austria-Hungary to be given independence 9. Serbia to be restored 10. An independent Poland to be set up with a port – Danzig 11. Formation of an association of nations to guarantee peace – League of Nations <p>The Treaty of Versailles, June 1919</p> <p>Territorial changes West Europe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alsace-Lorraine back to France • Anschluss forbidden (unite with Austria-Hungary) • Saar coalfields under protection of League – after 15 yrs plebiscite would be held • Eupen & Melmedy given to Belgium • North Schleswig given to Denmark • Poland became an independent country • Polish Corridor given to Poland (separating Germany from East Prussia) so they had access to the Port of Danzig = Germany lost 10% of its land & 12.5% of its population 	<p>Are countries right to try and disarm countries and ban them from certain technologies such as nuclear. Iran and North Korea for example.</p> <p>Is compromising the best way for peace?</p> <p>Do you know of any countries in the world that still follow communism? If so it is right to be continually fearful of Communist ideas?</p> <p>What land has Russia taken recently that can be argued to belong to another country?</p> <p>Why do countries often not agree on policies that guarantee peace?</p>
--	---	---

<p>Why were Germany horrified by the Treaty of Versailles?</p>	<p>Military Restrictions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Army limited to 100,000 • No conscription allowed • No tanks, subs or aircraft • Navy: 6 battleships, only 15,000 men • Rhineland demilitarised <p>War Guilt (article 231) Germany forced to accept responsibility for the war – accepting blame for war meant you had to accept paying costs of war.</p> <p>Reparations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £6.6 billion • Set in 1921 • To be paid over 42 years <p>League of Nations Set up to keep international peace. Germany banned, Russia not allowed. One of Wilson's 14 points</p> <p>German reaction: Horrified & humiliated. Wanted revenge in the future.</p>	<p>Are any countries still under the control of other countries? Is this right for modern day?</p> <p>Are harsh punishment correct or does it create resentment?</p>
--	--	--

<p>What were the terms of the TOV?</p>	<p>Key objections included:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Objection</th> <th>Right to object?</th> <th>Wrong to object?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Diktat - peace was dictated to them</td> <td>Not invited to Paris Peace Conference to decide peace terms. "Winners" peace terms</td> <td>They were given 3 weeks to object. They had treated Russia the same at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 1917</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount of land lost - 10% of land and population</td> <td>Against principles of self-determination. G lost 72,500km land and 1.5 million people. East Prussians cut off from Germany and under another country's rule. Putting Germany's colonies under mandate of other countries seen as unfair</td> <td>Polish corridor contained mainly Polish people, not Germans so this was fair. Germany did same to Russia at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 1917 and France in 1871</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Military restrictions - too small an army</td> <td>Need an army for protection and to stop civil war in its own country. All countries were meant to disarm as mentioned in 14 points yet Germany was only one actually doing it by 1919.</td> <td>Demilitarisation was meant to protect France who had been invaded twice.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>War Guilt</td> <td>Germans angry at being blamed for Kaiser's war, not theirs. Germany had a new government, Weimar Government, was it fair to blame a new government for the old government's mistake? Other countries had been equally involved and to blame.</td> <td>New democratic German government was only set up after the war was lost</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reparations - £6.6 billion</td> <td>Too much for Germany to pay - war had been costly for Germany too. Lost industrial land in the treaty so would struggle to make money to pay reparations. Longer reparations went on, longer it would take G to recover and Br needed them to trade with.</td> <td>France had suffered much damaged to agricultural and industrial lands in the north and needed compensation. Germany had done the same to France after Franco-Prussian War in 1871 and Russia in 1917</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Objection	Right to object?	Wrong to object?	Diktat - peace was dictated to them	Not invited to Paris Peace Conference to decide peace terms. "Winners" peace terms	They were given 3 weeks to object. They had treated Russia the same at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 1917	Amount of land lost - 10% of land and population	Against principles of self-determination. G lost 72,500km land and 1.5 million people. East Prussians cut off from Germany and under another country's rule. Putting Germany's colonies under mandate of other countries seen as unfair	Polish corridor contained mainly Polish people, not Germans so this was fair. Germany did same to Russia at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 1917 and France in 1871	Military restrictions - too small an army	Need an army for protection and to stop civil war in its own country. All countries were meant to disarm as mentioned in 14 points yet Germany was only one actually doing it by 1919.	Demilitarisation was meant to protect France who had been invaded twice.	War Guilt	Germans angry at being blamed for Kaiser's war, not theirs. Germany had a new government, Weimar Government, was it fair to blame a new government for the old government's mistake? Other countries had been equally involved and to blame.	New democratic German government was only set up after the war was lost	Reparations - £6.6 billion	Too much for Germany to pay - war had been costly for Germany too. Lost industrial land in the treaty so would struggle to make money to pay reparations. Longer reparations went on, longer it would take G to recover and Br needed them to trade with.	France had suffered much damaged to agricultural and industrial lands in the north and needed compensation. Germany had done the same to France after Franco-Prussian War in 1871 and Russia in 1917	<p>Is putting sanctions on countries correct or does it punish ordinary civilians?</p>
Objection	Right to object?	Wrong to object?																		
Diktat - peace was dictated to them	Not invited to Paris Peace Conference to decide peace terms. "Winners" peace terms	They were given 3 weeks to object. They had treated Russia the same at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 1917																		
Amount of land lost - 10% of land and population	Against principles of self-determination. G lost 72,500km land and 1.5 million people. East Prussians cut off from Germany and under another country's rule. Putting Germany's colonies under mandate of other countries seen as unfair	Polish corridor contained mainly Polish people, not Germans so this was fair. Germany did same to Russia at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 1917 and France in 1871																		
Military restrictions - too small an army	Need an army for protection and to stop civil war in its own country. All countries were meant to disarm as mentioned in 14 points yet Germany was only one actually doing it by 1919.	Demilitarisation was meant to protect France who had been invaded twice.																		
War Guilt	Germans angry at being blamed for Kaiser's war, not theirs. Germany had a new government, Weimar Government, was it fair to blame a new government for the old government's mistake? Other countries had been equally involved and to blame.	New democratic German government was only set up after the war was lost																		
Reparations - £6.6 billion	Too much for Germany to pay - war had been costly for Germany too. Lost industrial land in the treaty so would struggle to make money to pay reparations. Longer reparations went on, longer it would take G to recover and Br needed them to trade with.	France had suffered much damaged to agricultural and industrial lands in the north and needed compensation. Germany had done the same to France after Franco-Prussian War in 1871 and Russia in 1917																		
<p>Were the British reaction of the people similar to that of Lloyd George?</p>	<p>Allied Reaction to the ToV: Britain: Reaction of the People:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Britons had little sympathy towards Germans because of wartime propaganda. Civilians had suffered food shortages too. Britons were ready to make Germany pay! • During the general election, politicians based their campaigns on their promises to be harsh on Germany • When the Treaty was signed the general feeling in Britain was that it was fair, but could have been much harsher. • On his return from Versailles Lloyd George was greeted as a hero- the streets outside the railway station were lined with people waving and cheering. Reaction of Leader: • Lloyd George, said that "we will have to fight another war in 25 years' time, and at three times the cost!" 																			

<p>Why would France want the harshest of punishments from what you can remember about WW1 in year 8?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lloyd George was concerned that the loss of German land and people to Poland would cause huge problems in the future, especially if those people were determined to be part of Germany once again. • Lloyd George also felt that reparations were too harsh as Britain would lose an important trade partner. • Lloyd George was pleased that the British Empire gained extra colonies and now covered 1/3 of the globe. Also, the German navy was restricted so that Britain could 'rule the waves' without competition <p>France: Reaction of the People:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the fighting took place in France and the country was badly affected by the war >>the French were determined to make Germany pay! • French people pleased that there was no longer a German threat in the Rhineland and that they would be receiving reparations. They were also given control of the Saar area for 15 years, Germany's rich coalfields helping them financially • However, many were furious at the Treaty and thought it should have been much tougher • Shortly after the Treaty was signed there was an election in France in which Clemenceau was voted out <p>Reaction of the Leader:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clemenceau was angry that Germany was allowed to retain an army and felt the Rhineland should have been completely taken away from Germany • Felt the Saar should have been given to France permanently • Thought the reparations total of £6,600 million was too small a sum. <p>USA: Reaction of the People:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • America only joined the war in 1917 and so many people in the US felt that the Treaty was unfair on Germany. Many thought that Wilson had helped Britain and France become more powerful and rich at Germany's expense • They also favoured isolationism- felt the US should not get involved in affairs in Europe • Had wanted a fair treaty that guaranteed peace in the future, but felt they had got the opposite <p>Reaction of the Leader:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In American politics, ToV was used to criticise Wilson, by his rival party, the Republicans. The Treaty was ratified (accept or give consent) by the Senate. Republicans argued that 	<p>Should public reactions be taken into account when making governmental decisions?</p>
--	---	--

<p>Why did the USA not join the LON?</p>	<p>since the Treaty had not been based on the 14 Points it was not in America's best interests and they refused to ratify it. This meant that American could not join the League of Nations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson feared a harsh treaty would result in America being dragged into another war. • Apart from the creation of the League of Nations most of Wilson's 14 Points were ignored • In 1924 Wilson died from a stroke, leaving the Republicans to dominate American politics for the next decade, based on politics of isolationism. <p>Other treaties:</p> <p>The other peace treaties St Germain - Austria. Land to Italy, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland. Army 30,000 no conscription, no navy. No anschluss with Germany. Reparations but amount not fixed.</p> <p>Neuilly - Bulgaria. Land to Yugoslavia, Greece and Romania. £100 million. Army 20,000, no conscription, no air force, 4 battleships.</p> <p>Trianon - Hungary. Land to Romania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Austria. Reparations not fixed. Army 30,000, no conscription, 3 patrol boats.</p> <p>Sevres - Turkey. Land to Greece and all European land except area around Constantinople. Army 50,000 7 sail 6 torpedo boats.</p> <p>Lausanne. Turkey regained some land from Greece, control of Dardanelles, Bosphorus straits and armed forces. Reparations cancelled.</p> <p>Part 2: The League of Nations and International Peace</p> <p>The League of Nations Wilson's idea (one of his 14 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision to bring world peace by working together and solving problems • Based in Geneva, Switzerland (neutral country during WW1) 	
--	---	--

<p>How many members were there? What was the aim of the LON?</p>	<p>Covenant 26 laws that all members agreed to follow Disarmament – avoid future arms races Registration of all treaties to avoid secret alliances Collective security (if one state attacked another, all members would join together and act against the aggressor)</p> <p>Membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42 founder members. 59 member countries by 1930s, defeated countries & Russia not allowed to join. • USA failed to join- Most Americans hated the idea and pursued policy of isolationism (wanted no more involvement in Europe) • Seen as a 'League of victors' <p>Structure: → Assembly- each member country sent a representative. Met once a year at HQ in Geneva. Decisions had to be unanimous! Discussed general topics e.g. revision of treaties, admission of new members.</p> <p>Council- smaller group of 5 permanent members (Britain, France, Italy, Japan and later Germany). 4 non-permanent members elected for a 3 year period. Met several times a year & in emergencies Aim was to resolve disputes by negotiation if possible. Had the power to veto decisions.</p>	<p>What system is similar to that of the LON?</p>
<p>What was some of the flaws of the structure of the LON?</p>	<p>Secretariat- international civil service- record keeping, etc. Not always effective.</p>	
<p>Who were the 4 permanent members?</p>	<p>Permanent Court of International Justice- court of 15 judges chosen from LoN countries. Set up in the Hague in Holland (neutral). Dealt with disputes between countries over international law e.g. terms of treaties. Aimed to settle disputes peacefully. Had no means of enforcing its decisions, relied on goodwill of member countries to enforce decisions.</p>	<p>Is it right that in the United Nations certain countries (Britain, France, USA, China and Russia). Have more power.</p>
<p>What powers did the LON have to stop countries?</p>	<p>Agencies to deal with world's major problems e.g. health and disease, slavery, refugees, labour. Hope that if world problems were tackled e.g. slavery then there wouldn't be conflict</p>	<p>Does the policy of unanimous decisions ever truly work?</p>

<p>What success and failures did the LON agencies have ?</p>	<p>Powers If a country ignored the League's decision, then the League could take action: 1) Moral sanctions turn opinion against the guilty country 2) Economic sanctions league members refuse to trade with guilty country 3) Military force Member countries' armed forces could unite against the guilty country</p> <p>Commissions/Agencies The League set up commissions or agencies to improve working conditions and cure diseases</p> <p>International Labour Organisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim: Bring workers, employers and governments together to improve working conditions • Success: 1928- 77 countries agreed to set a minimum wage. In Tanganyika, Africa, slave labour was used to build a new railway, the conditions led 50% of workers to die, the League challenged this and reduced the death rate to 4% • Failures: 1919- tried to stop children under 14 from working; was ignored by most member nations because they thought it would cost too much <p>The Permanent Central Opium Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim: To stop the creation of and distribution of opium- opium was legally used as a painkiller but some drug companies also sold it illegally • Success: Blacklisted 4 large companies that were involved in trading illegal drugs • Failures: Some historians claim that key members of the League were not really dedicated to stopping the sale of opium, as they made large amounts of money from it <p>International Agreements</p> <p>The Locarno Treaties, 1925</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In early 1920s the relationship between Germany and France was still hostile, France invaded Germany when it failed to make reparation payments in 1923 	<p>How has the WHO helped deal with diseases such as the Coronavirus?</p> <p>What countries have recently been subject to sanctions? Are sanctions better than war?</p> <p>Is there more that needs to be done to combat the issues of slavery and the living wage around the world and in the UK?</p>
--	---	--

<p>Why did the Locarno and Kellogg Briand pact undermine the LoN?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1925, German foreign minister, Gustav Stresemann, invited Fr foreign minister to meet and improve relations. Since Germany wasn't a member of the LoN the meetings were organised independently • Signed 7 treaties collectively known as the LT • Terms: Germany accepted the borders set up in the ToV; also signed by Britain, Italy, Belgium and Czechoslovakia- agreed not to go to war with any of the others and if one of the countries broke the treaty they would support the country and invade • Failure? Treaty marked the failure for LoN- should have been at the forefront of international peace but had nothing to do with it. <p>The Kellogg- Briand Pact, 1928</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65 countries met in Paris • Terms: agreed not to use war as a way to solve disputes (signed by Germany and USA=not member of the LoN) • Failure? Once again individual countries acted independently of the League, making it look like a place where countries air their problems and not a place where practical solutions could be found <p>Success and failures of the LoN in the 1920's</p> <p>Success:</p> <p>The Aaland Islands 1920 Dispute between Finland and Sweden over Islands. The Islands were owned by Finland, but were heavily populated by the Swedes. League settled the issue peacefully, in Finland's favour.</p> <p>Failure:</p> <p>Vilna 1920 Lithuania asked the League to intervene in order to seize Vilna as its capital. The city was largely populated by the Polish population. Poland ignored the claims of Lithuania, the League stayed calm.</p> <p>Success:</p> <p>Upper Silesia 1921 Dispute between Poland and Germany.</p>	<p>Has the United Nations been useful in solving conflicts recently or not? Why do you think this is the case?</p>
---	---	--

	<p>Plebiscite in 1921 that decided the division of the territory was tight, the riots followed. The League was asked to intervene. The territory was divided between Poland and Germany. Germany got most land, but the part given to Poland contained the rich industrial area of Silesia, so the Germans were embittered by this loss.</p> <p>Failure:</p> <p>Invasion of the Ruhr 1923 The League was unable to prevent France and Belgium from invading the Ruhr after Germany failed to pay its second reparations installment.</p> <p>In fact, France did not even consult the League before it took action.</p> <p>Failure:</p> <p>Corfu Crisis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1923 a group of Italian surveyors working in Corfu were murdered • Mussolini blamed Greece and demanded compensation and when Greece refused to pay he attacked the island • Greece turned to the LoN • Response: told Mussolini to remove his troops from Corfu and demanded another international body, the Conference of Ambassadors, to deal with the incident • Greece was forced to pay compensation and apologise to Italy • Consequence: Mussolini did withdraw his troops. In this instance when a larger country had threatened a smaller one with military action, the LoN had proved they could be ignored and overturned by other international groups <p>Failure</p> <p>Greece v. Bulgaria 1925 Disputes over Macedonia. The League ordered Greece to withdraw its troops and to pay compensation for the damage caused. Greece thought this was hypocritical of the League after the Corfu crisis.</p>	<p>Is it still easier to deal with smaller countries than larger countries? Why do you think this is?</p>
--	--	---

<p>What Were the successes and failures of the LON of nations during the 1920's?</p>	<p>It is often argued that the LON was successful in dealing with smaller countries and less successful in dealing with powerful countries such as Italy.</p> <p>Strengths and weaknesses of the League</p> <p>Strengths Goodwill from most people towards it (everyone keen to avoid war) Most major countries had joined & defeated countries could later on Idea was good – idea of countries working together to avoid war and keep peace. Agencies carried out good work: tackled key diseases and slavery Had some successes</p> <p>Weaknesses Absence of USA: undermined League's power (USA was the major trading partner of many countries- trade sanctions would have been much more effective if USA stopped trading with a country)! Not allowing Germany to join (until 1926)- increased bitterness! Seen as club of victors. Japan left in 1933; Italy left in 1937 (both permanent Council members)! Germany left 1933. No permanent army (relied on member countries armies) Little real power- relied on goodwill & persuasion Power of veto – Council could just veto decisions they did not like so problems not resolved. Disarmament was a hope not a reality- due to self-interest of member countries Hatred & rivalries remained</p> <p>Manchurian crisis</p> <p>Failure 1) The Manchurian Crisis 1933 Japanese expansion into Manchuria & China</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Manchuria= province of China- had raw materials that Japan lacked. Wall St Crash meant Japan was keen to gain resources to trade goods and recover economy. Japanese army wanted an empire.</p> <p>China weak at the time- in chaos since 1911 revolution</p> <p>Japan owned South Manchurian railway o Ideal opportunity for Japan to seize full control of Manchuria while China in no position to act!</p> <p>Sep 1931- explosion on railway- Japanese blamed on Chinese= excuse to take over the area!</p> <p>Feb 1932- Japanese set up a puppet government in Manchuria</p> <p>L of N reaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China appealed to the League but Japan claimed it was simply restoring order. The League had to act carefully as Japan was a leading member of the League! The League told Japan to withdraw its troops but Japan refused! • The League set up a Commission of Inquiry under Lord Lytton. Took a whole year to issue report! Lytton said Japan had acted unlawfully & Manchuria should be a self-governing state. Japan ignored this & renamed Manchuria 'Manchukuo'. By 1933 they controlled all of Manchuria. • Later 1933 – League of Nations formally condemned Japan’s actions • Japan ignores this and leaves the League! • In 1937 Japan launched a major invasion of the rest of China! <p>This showed the League’s weaknesses:</p>	<p>Why is Ukraine desirable for Russia that is similar to the Manchurian and Abyssinian crisis?</p>
--	--	---

<p>Why did Manchurian crisis show a failure of the League of Nations?</p> <p>How did the LON respond to the Manchurian crisis?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership limited power of sanctions: Economic sanctions would've been useless as Japan's main trading partner was the USA who wasn't a member. USSR could have sent troops to resolve the issue but they had not been allowed to join. • British self-interest - she was worried about taking any further action in case British trade in Asia was harmed. • No formal army made the League weak – Britain and France were not willing to risk war and send troops. • If a country didn't like a decision, they could ignore it or leave the League when an aggressive dictator wanted to invade neighbouring territories, the L of N was powerless to prevent it = Germany and Italy noted this. <p>Failure 2</p> <p>Failure 2) The Abyssinian Crisis Italy's invasion of Abyssinia</p> <p>Abyssinia= poor country in NE Africa. Near Italian colonies- Italy had tried but failed to conquer it in 1896. Mussolini now keen to avenge that defeat, get its rich resources, and get glory for Italy.</p> <p>Manchurian Crisis gave Mussolini the impression that the League would not stop a country if they did act aggressively so this gave him confidence to invade Abyssinia.</p> <p>L of N had to be careful again: Italy was a permanent member of the Council L of N anxious to avoid a clash with Mussolini. Br and Fr thought he was their best ally against the growing threat of Hitler. They were joined together in the Stresa Front which opposed Hitler's aims to change the Treaty of Versailles. French very keen to keep Italian support.</p> <p>Dec 1934 clash at Wal-Wal between Italy and Abyssinia. Dispute passes to League for a decision.</p> <p>Britain shows signs it will oppose this aggression. The Peace Ballot 1935 was held in Britain: British public say they believe that support for the League would keep peace (i.e.</p>	<p>Do all countries show their own self-interest? Is this right and should countries look after themselves first?</p>
--	--	---

	<p>if Britain were to act against an aggressor using the League, the British would be okay with this). Samuel Hoare gives a speech saying Britain will support idea of collective security if aggressive action does occur!</p> <p>But! Italy ignores Britain and the League.</p> <p>Oct 1935- Italy attacks Abyssinia causing destruction (modern weapons vs. poor country)</p> <p>This was a clear sign of aggression = under League rules actions should be taken.</p> <p>Emperor Haile Selassie appealed to the League</p> <p>The League's response This was clearly an unprovoked invasion of the weak by the strong For sanctions to work, they would need to be introduced at once.</p> <p>Britain and France didn't want to lose Mussolini as an ally = It took them two months to decide.</p> <p>The League agreed on limited sanctions: - banned loans & sale of arms to Italy, & imports from Italy</p> <p>League banned members from selling arms to Abyssinia as well as Italy</p> <p>Abyssinia left with nothing to defend itself against Mussolini's modern army - did not ban iron, coal, steel or oil (all the things needed for an invasion!)</p> <p>(Mussolini later said that if coal and oil had been banned he would have stopped his invasion)</p> <p>Why? didn't ban oil exports as feared USA would still trade anyway as they weren't in League</p> <p>didn't ban coal exports as feared affect on British mining industry</p>	
--	--	--

<p>How did the Abyssinian crisis show the weakness of the League?</p> <p>Why did the Hoare-Loval pact undermine the LON?</p> <p>Why did the USA not intervene in the Manchurian and Abyssinian crisis?</p> <p>How did the crises help Hitler?</p>	<p>France continued to trade iron and steel X Suez canal (owned by Br & Fr) wasn't closed to Italy's ships (Italy's easiest route to Abyssinia)!</p> <p>Hoare-Laval Pact: Britain & France foreign ministers made a plan to end the fighting. It was a secret agreement between Britain, France & Italy. The pact would give Italy 2/3rd Abyssinia including the best areas.</p> <p>But- plan was leaked - outcry and failure of pact!</p> <p>Hoare & Laval forced to resign. This showed Britain & France self-interests were put before L of N interests.</p> <p>May 1936 Italians captures capital of Abyssinia. Selassie makes another appeal to the League for help but the war was over. Abyssinia became part of the Italian empire.</p> <p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mussolini triumphed. Withdraws Italy from LoN in 1936 • Signalled the end of the L of N. Nobody took it seriously after this- of the Great Powers only Br, Fr and USSR remained in the League. Other means would have to be found to keep peace. • Smaller countries knew the League wouldn't protect them from invasion by aggressive dictators and realised it was powerless in stopping war • Hitler saw this and exploited its weaknesses & was confident he could get away with acts of aggression! Marches his troops into the Rhineland whilst League is distracted • Britain and France lost Italy as an ally against Hitler – end of Stresa Front • Europe begins to split into two sides: Ø Rome-Berlin Axis 1936 (Mussolini and Hitler) Anti-Comintern Pact 1937 – Japan joined the Axis 	<p>Are European countries right to rely on Oil and Gas from other countries or are they right to try and become self-sustainable?</p>
---	---	---

<p>How did the WSC impact other countries?</p>	<p>Reasons for League's failure</p> <p>Poor organisation and slow decision making - decisions had to be unanimous; infrequent meetings; delays in decisions, power of veto.</p> <p>Took a year to report in Manchuria, two months to act in Abyssinia.</p> <p>Important nations absent- USA never joined; Germany 1926-33. USSR late to join. Japan left 1933; Italy 1936 X Sanctions ineffective (especially without USA as a member) e.g. Abyssinia could have been resolved if US were involved, weakness of moral persuasion, economic sanctions limited, lack of army</p> <p>No army- relied on member countries- reluctant to commit troops! E.g. Manchuria X Had to uphold peace treaties of 1919-20 which were increasingly seen as unfair X Self-interests of member countries prevailed (e.g. Br & Fr were preparing to carve up Abyssinia rather than impose sanctions on Mussolini)! Lack of support during crises such as Manchuria.</p> <p>Wall Street Crash 1929. Depression afterwards made countries look after themselves and not put League's needs first</p>	<p>Can the United Nations be seen as a failure?</p>
<p>Why did the failure of the LON give Hitler confidence to gain back land?</p>	<p>Manchurian Crisis X Abyssinian Crisis Implications of League's failure</p> <p>Violence & aggression shown to pay: Mussolini & Hitler learned from Japan's example (aggressors kept land gained with no penalties)</p> <p>Victims suffer- Manchuria & Abyssinia occupied by foreign powers, abandoned by League</p>	<p>Britain has had a shock from the coronavirus epidemic. Was it right to focus on its self or should it try to help other countries and people?</p>
<p>Why would Britain allow Germany to rearm from what you know about the TOV?</p>	<p>Britain & France saw the League's weaknesses so chose to pacify Hitler instead (appeasement)</p>	

<p>What was the 14 points?</p> <p>What policy banned the uniting of Germany and Austria?</p> <p>What was Germany limited to in the TOV?</p>	<p>Part 3: Hitler's foreign policy</p> <p>1933+ Rearmament Withdrew Germany from the World Disarmament Conference on the grounds that no other power was disarming. Claimed Germany wanted peace & would disarm completely if other powers did so.</p> <p>Hitler withdrew Germany from L of N 1933</p> <p>Introduced conscription 1935 (claimed army was needed for defence).</p> <p>GB supported Germany's right to rearm by signing a naval agreement with Hitler in 1935, allowing G to build a fleet as long as it was no more than 35% of theirs.</p> <p>Why did he get away with it?: Wilson's 14 points said for all countries to reduce arms, only Germany had. France had in fact increased conscription to 18 months. It was only fair Germany should have an army and navy too. Claimed they needed an army for self-defence.</p> <p>Britain didn't act as it felt key parts of the treaty were unfair. France didn't act as it could not act on its own – Invasion of Ruhr 1923 proved this. = divide between Britain and France grows.</p> <p>Hitler exploited this. Hitler also makes sure whenever he does something that could cause a reaction, he follows up with an action suggesting peace.</p> <p>1934 The Dollfuss Affair</p> <p>Hitler wanted to unite Germany with Austria (Anschluss) - banned by T of V. Aware of Hitler's intentions, the Austrian chancellor, Dollfuss, banned the Nazi Party in Austria. In 1934, Hitler responded by telling the Austrian Nazis to create havoc in the country. They murdered Dollfuss. However, his plot failed because the Austrian army supported the government and because Mussolini moved his troops to the Austrian border, promising</p>	<p>Should countries still have conscription in the 21st century? Should we have a freedom of choice?</p> <p>Should budgets be spent on defence in the 21st century? Or should they be spent on other things such as welfare?</p>
---	--	--

	<p>Mussolini signed a pact with Hitler, the Rome-Berlin Axis (Hitler & Mussolini supported the Spanish fascist General Franco in the Spanish Civil War- brought Italy & Germany together), also allowed Hitler to test his weapons and allow his men to gain experience of war</p> <p>Hitler now knew Mussolini wouldn't stop Anschluss in future.</p> <p>Anschluss (Annexation of Austria), 1938</p> <p>Events:</p> <p>Why? Shared history, culture and language also where Hitler was born 1938: now he has Rome-Berlin Axis and has remilitarised Rhineland and grown army, Hitler feels strong and confident enough to try again.</p> <p>Austrian Nazis campaigned in Austria for union with Germany >riots, fires, bombs!</p> <p>When the Austrian government banned the party and asked Hitler for help to stop the plotting, Hitler held a meeting with the Austrian leader Schuschnigg.</p> <p>Hitler put pressure on Schuschnigg to give all important jobs in his government to Nazis. He arranged riots and demonstrations to add to the pressure.</p> <p>Schuschnigg compromised by appointing the Nazi Seyss-Inquart as Minister of the Interior (in charge of police)</p> <p>France, and Britain both refused to help Austria</p> <p>March 1938 Schuschnigg announced his intention to hold a plebiscite to allow the Austrian people to decide for themselves. Hitler not prepared to take the risk of losing = moved troops to the Austrian border and demanded that Schuschnigg call off the plebiscite.</p> <p>Schuschnigg resigned> replaced by leading Nazi Seyss-Inquart, who invited the Germans into Austria to restore order (imprisoned 80,000 of Hitler's opponents)!</p>	
--	---	--

<p>Why would Britain and France not want another war? Why would they follow the policy of appeasement?</p>	<p>Hitler entered Austria in triumph- union established 14 March 1938</p> <p>A plebiscite was held > 99.75% agreed with Anschluss!</p> <p>Most Austrians wanted the union as keen to be part of glory of Hitler's Reich</p> <p>Why wasn't Hitler stopped? He had been invited into Austria, he did not invade. Britain and France were not willing to get involved (shared language of Germany + Austria, plebiscite showed 99.75% wanted this in Austria, too distracted with USSR)</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Hitler had demonstrated how he aimed to dismantle the ToV >> heightened his popularity Austria was rich in natural resources such as steel and iron ore, which was used to fuel Nazi rearmament Austrian army of 100,000 men added strength to G forces Germany now bordered western Czechoslovakia on 3 sides.</p>	
<p>Why was Russia not allowed to join the LON originally?</p>	<p>Appeasement (policy of pacifying/giving in to Hitler in hope that he would not go too far)</p> <p>NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN-British PM 1937- supported appeasement</p> <p>Believed Germany had genuine, understandable grievances under the T of V</p> <p>Believed Germany's grievances could be solved by negotiation</p> <p>Failure of L of N meant Chamberlain wanted to try 'personal diplomacy' to solve issues</p> <p>France supported appeasement- felt safe behind their Maginot Line (fortified border)</p>	<p>Are peaceful tactics the best way to try and solve disputes or is war the only way to solve issues?</p>

<p>Why did the TOV cause problems for Germany?</p> <p>How was Anschluss different from the Sudeten crisis?</p>	<p>People keen to avoid another war- WW1's loss of life meant no one wanted a repeat</p> <p>Britain had not sufficiently rearmed so was in no position to resist Hitler</p> <p>Reasons for</p> <p>Fear of Communism. It was felt better to support a strong leader of Germany rather than risk Communist takeover.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Britain needed time. Britain had more time to build up her armed forces • Germany deserved a fair deal Germany was treated too harshly at Versailles, so were only being given their rightful land and their grievances could be solved which would avoid war • Economic costs of war Britain was still suffering from 1929 economic depression and could not afford a rearmament programme • The British people had to want war In 1938, public opinion was against war – WW1 loss of life haunted Britain. The policy of appeasement was sensible. • Collapse of League of Nations Chamberlain felt 'personal diplomacy' would be the future way to keep peace <p>Reasons against</p> <p>Hitler couldn't be trusted! 1933 onwards he had broken promises and the ToV e.g. Anschluss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany was growing stronger Allowed Germany to grow stronger meant it would be far more difficult to defeat. • Hitler was determined to conquer Eastern Europe. Plans clear in Mein Kampf - the policy of appeasement was clearly doomed from the start - Hitler just lied. • Betrayal Lands protected by the Treaty of Versailles could argue they were being betrayed • It encouraged Hitler Giving into Hitler only made him feel he could do what he wanted - without fear of being stopped and Britain looked weak 	
--	--	--

<p>How did the Munich conference lead to the policy of appeasement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeasement scared the USSR When Britain and France did not stand up to Hitler, the USSR became worried about German power - and began thinking about deals with Hitler. <p>Sudeten Crisis Sudetenland=border region around Czechoslovakia Lebensraum- Sudetenland was home to around 3 million G speaking-people As a minority group (20% of the population) the G speaking Sudetens claimed that they had been persecuted by the Czechs. Hitler used this as an excuse; he needed to 'save' the G speakers Sudetenland was a good base from which to launch an attack on Czechoslovakia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader of Czech Nazi Party, Konrad Henlein was urged by Hitler to demand that the Czech government make concessions to the Sudeten Germans. • April 1938- German troops began massing on Czech border • Czech president Benes mobilised his troops to resist Hitler • Britain & France keen to avoid war so persuaded Benes to make further concessions to Sudetens • Hitler says plebiscites would be held. • It became clear that Hitler wanted to make the Sudetenland part of Germany <p>Appeasement in action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 Sep 1938- Chamberlain met Hitler at Berchtesgaden to discuss his demands then persuaded Czechs to transfer parts of the Sudetenland to Germany • Benes realised he couldn't rely on Britain and France for help • 22 Sep- met again at Godesberg- this time Hitler wants all of Sudetenland, no plebiscites & threatens war if he doesn't get his way • Chamberlain returned to Britain & prepared for war • War was avoided when Mussolini persuaded Hitler to attend a conference <p>The Munich Conference & Agreement, Sep 1938</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 leaders: Hitler (Ger), Mussolini (It), Chamberlain (Br), Daladier (Fr) • No representatives from Czechoslovakia or USSR • Agreed: Hitler could have the Sudetenland, Britain and France guaranteed rest of Czechoslovakia would not be affected 	<p>The invasion of Czechoslovakia and Poland meant many people tried to leave the country. Should countries take in and help refugees or should they focus on their own people. Examples include Afghanistan, Iraq, Ukraine etc.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Why would the Nazi Soviet pact shock people from what you know about the Germany course and Fascism and Communist beliefs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Czechoslovakia forced to accept Also.... • Chamberlain & Hitler met privately. Also promised never to go to war against each other • Consultation not war! • Chamberlain returned to Britain a HERO “peace in our time” as he had kept peace in Europe <p>Outcome of Munich Conference: 1. Peace had been maintained by Chamberlain 2. Britain speeded up rearmament 3. Czechoslovakia had been betrayed 4. Hitler had gained the Sudetenland without fighting 5. Czechoslovakia had lost its defensive frontier and become vulnerable to invasion 6. Germany had gained the armaments and mineral resources of the Sudetenland 7. The USSR had been left out and felt betrayed – reason why they later sign Nazi-Soviet Pact</p> <p>The occupation of the rest of Czechoslovakia, March 1939 Czech lost 70% industrial lands, Munich border, and mountain defences.</p> <p>The loss of the Sudeten Germans stirred other nationalities in Czech to demand a return to their nation states. Loss of the Sudetenland also meant a loss of Czech’s strong defensive system = Poland and Hungary took land from Czech.</p> <p>Slovaks now felt it was their chance – Hitler was only too happy to stir up this trouble.</p> <p>The Czech president appealed to Hitler for help & in the end had no choice but to invite the Germans into Czech. 15 March- Hitler took the rest of Czech claiming he was “restoring order”.</p> <p>Nazi-Soviet Pact, Aug 1939: Shocked the world as Hitler hated Communism!</p>	
---	--	--

<p>How did Hitler's other actions lead to the attack on Poland. Did the policy of appeasement contribute to this?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany & Russia agree not to attack each other (non-aggression pact) & to divide Poland between them • Hitler felt confident Br & Fr wouldn't help Poland (they'd backed down over Czech)! • Stalin signed because grew impatient with Britain's delays and failure to sign a pact with him & was angry that he wasn't invited to Munich. Needed to protect himself! <p>Why did the pact happen?: Time to prepare for war Stalin said: 'We secured peace for our country for eighteen months, which enabled us to make military preparations'. (1941) Hope to gain Stalin was sure that Russia could only gain from a long war in which Britain, France and Germany exhausted themselves.</p> <p>Unhappy with Britain Stalin was insulted by Britain's slowness to negotiate, and did not trust Britain. When the Anglo-Soviet alliance failed, he turned to Germany. Germany Hitler wanted the alliance because only Russia could keep Britain's promise to defend Poland. He believed that, if he got a promise of peace with Russia, Britain would be forced to back down over Poland and Danzig.</p> <p>Overturn the ToV: Poland was created at the end of WW1- it was made up of former G and Russian territories. Both countries despised the new state</p> <p>Mutual Distrust- Stalin suspected Hitler would turn against him (which he did in 1941 when he invaded Russia). Signing the pact bought time for USSR to build up its army ready for war</p> <p>Impact of the pact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hitler could now attack Poland - he would avoid a war on two fronts 2. Hitler thought Britain wouldn't dare oppose the attack on Poland – Munich had proven that and there were Germans in Danzig. 3. If Britain did attack, war would be inevitable, would Britain risk that for Poland? 4. Britain and France had lost an ally – the USSR – they would now be a lesser threat to Hitler if war did break out. 	<p>Can alliances between countries be a good thing or do they always lead to tensions from other countries.</p> <p>Mention USA, Australia and UK giving Australia Nuclear technology for submarines and it upset China.</p> <p>NATO has upset Russia.</p>
---	--	---

	<p>Attack on Poland, 1 Sep 1939</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danzig had 90% German population • Danzig= independent state ran by Poland • Hitler wanted to overturn Treaty of Versailles • Lebensraum • Gained confidence thanks to appeasement and success during Sudetenland crisis/Munich conference and Czechoslovakia – thought Britain and France would back down, scared of war. • Nazi Soviet Pact – could act without a worry of war with the USSR Events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poland refused to give in to Hitler’s demands that they hand over Danzig • Britain and France had guaranteed Polish independence after Czechoslovakia and so warned Hitler they would go to war with Germany if they invaded Poland – no more Munichs! • Collapse of Czechoslovakia had been last straw for appeasers • Public opinion now favoured opposing Hitler • 1st September 1939 – Germany invaded Poland Chamberlain asked Hitler to withdraw but this failed> 3 Sep-Br declare war on Germany 	
--	---	--