I'm not robot	reCAPTCHA
Continue	

Traité de versailles pdf

La Société de Nations était voulue par le président des Etats-Unis, Wilson. Il l'annexa aux traités de paix, car il voyait dans ce projet un moyen de résoudre pacifiquement les futures crises. Installée à Genève, la SDN repose sur trois institutions : - l'Assemblée générale où chaque pays dispose d'une voix ; - le Conseil de membres permanents (Etats-Unis, Royaume-Uni, France, Italie, Japon) et de membres non permanents, cherchant des solutions à l'occasion de graves crises internationales ; - un Secrétariat général, pour l'administration courante. La S.D.N. devait remplacer la diplomatie secrète, héritée du XIXe siècle, mais très vite cet organisme, porteur d'espoir montre ses faiblesses. Les membres fondateurs sont les pays vaincus. Très vite, la SDN souffre de l'absence de l'Allemagne et l'URSS, mais aussi des Etats-Unis, pourtant porteurs du projet mais qui contre toute attente refusent de ratifier le Traité de Versailles. Enfin, la S.D.N. manque de moyens pour faire respecter ses décisions. One of the treaties that ended World War I This article is about the Treaty of Versailles of 28 June 1919, at the end of World War I. For other uses, see Treaty of Versailles (disambiguation). Treaty of Versailles Long name: Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany[n. 1] Cover of the English versionSigned28 June 1919[1]LocationHall of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles, Paris, France[2]Effective10 January 1920[3]ConditionRatification by Germany and three Principal Allied Powers.[n. 2]Signatories Principal Allied and Associated Powers[n. 1] United States British Empire[n. 2] • United Kingdom • Canada • Australia • South Africa • New Zealand • India France Italy Japan Allied and Associated Powers[n. 1] Belgium Bolivia Brazil China Cuba Ecuador Greece Guatemala Haiti The Hedjaz Honduras Liberia Nicaragua Panama Peru Poland Portugal Romania The Serb-Croat-Slovene State Siam Czechoslovakia Uruguay Germany[n. 1] Paris Peace Conference League of Nations Covenant of the League of Nations Members Organisation Minority Treaties Little Treaty of Versailles Mandates Treaty of Versailles War guilt Reparations Role in the Weimar Republic's hyperinflation Dawes Plan Hague conference on reparations Young Plan Lausanne Conference Locarno Treaties Possible cause of World War II International Opium Convention Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine Treaty of Trianon Treaty of Trianon Treaty of Sèvres Partition of the Ottoman Empire Conference of London (1920) San Remo conference Turkish National Movement Turkish War of Independence Treaty of Lausanne Others American Commission to Negotiate Peace Commission of Responsibilities The Inquiry vte Events leading to World War II Treaty of Versailles 1919Polish-Soviet War 1919Treaty of Trianon 1920Treaty of Rapallo 1920Franco-Polish alliance 1921March on Rome 1922Corfu incident 1923Occupation of the Ruhr 1923—1932Dawes Plan 1924Locarno Treaties 1925Young Plan 1929Japanese invasion of Manchuria 1931Pacification of Manchukuo 1931–1942 January 28 Incident 1932 World Disarmament Conference 1932–1934 Defense of the Great Wall 1933 Battle of Rehe 1933 Nazis' rise to power in Germany 1933 Tanggu Truce 1933 Italo-Soviet Pact 1933 Inner Mongolian Campaign 1933–1936 German–Polish Non-Aggression Pact 1934 Franco-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance 1935Soviet-Czechoslovakia Treaty of Mutual Assistance 1935He-Umezu Agreement 1935December 9th MovementSecond Italo-Ethiopian War 1935-1936Remilitarization of the Rhineland 1936Spanish Civil War 1936-1939Italo-German "Axis" protocol 1936Anti-Comintern Pact 1936Suiyuan Campaign 1936Xi'an Incident 1936Second Sino-Japanese War 1937—1945USS Panay incident 1937Anschluss Mar. 1938May crisis May 1938Battle of Lake Khasan July—Aug. 1938Bled Agreement Aug. 1938Undeclared German-Czechoslovak War Sep. 1938Munich Agreement Sep. 1938First Vienna Award Nov. 1938German occupation of Czechoslovakia Mar. 1939German ultimatum to Lithuania Mar. 1939Slovak—Hungarian War Mar. 1939Final offensive of the Spanish Civil War Mar.—Apr. 1939Danzig Crisis Mar.—Aug. 1939British guarantee to Poland Mar. 1939Italian invasion of Albania Apr. 1939Soviet—British—French Moscow negotiations Apr.—Aug. 1939Pact of Steel May 1939Battles of Khalkhin Gol May—Sep. 1939Molotov—Ribbentrop Pact Aug. 1939Invasion of Poland Sep. 1939 The Treaty of Versailles (French: Traité de Versailles; German: Versailler Vertrag, pronounced [vɛʁˈzaɪ̞ɐ fɛɐ̞ˈtʁaːk] (listen)) was the most important of the peace treaties that brought World War I to an end. The Treaty ended the state of war between Germany and the Allied Powers. It was signed on 28 June 1919 in the Palace of Versailles, exactly five years after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, which had directly led to the war. The other Central Powers on the German side signed separate treaties. [i] Although the armistice, signed on 11 November 1918, ended the actual fighting, it took six months of Allied negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference to conclude the peace treaty. The treaty was registered by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on 21 October 1919. Of the many provisions in the treaty, one of the most important and controversial required "Germany [to] accept the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage" during the war (the other members of the Central Powers signed treaties containing similar articles). This article, Article 231, later became known as the War Guilt clause. The treaty required Germany to disarm, make ample territorial concessions, and pay reparations to certain countries that had formed the Entente powers. In 1921 the total cost of these reparations was assessed at 132 billion or £6.6 billion, roughly equivalent to US\$442 billion or UK£284 billion in 2021). At the time economists, notably John Maynard Keynes (a British delegate to the Paris Peace Conference), predicted that the treaty was too harsh—a "Carthaginian peace"—and said the reparations figure was excessive and counter-productive, views that, since then, have been the subject of ongoing debate by historians and economists. On the other hand, prominent figures on the Allied side, such as French Marshal Ferdinand Foch, criticized the treaty for treating Germany too leniently. The result of these competing and sometimes conflicting goals among the victors was a compromise that left no one satisfied, and, in particular, Germany was neither pacified nor conciliated, nor was it permanently weakened. The problems that arose from the treaty would lead to the Locarno Treaties, which improved relations between Germany and the other European powers, and the re-negotiation of the reparation system resulting in the Dawes Plan, the Young Plan, and the indefinite postponement of reparations at the Lausanne Conference of 1932. The treaty has sometimes been cited as a cause of World War II: although its actual impact was not as severe as feared, its terms led to great resentment in Germany which powered the rise of the Nazi Party. Although it is often referred to as the "Versailles Conference", only the actual signing of the treaty took place at the historic palace. Most of the negotiations were in Paris, with the "Big Four" meetings taking place generally at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Quai d'Orsay. Background First World War Main article: World War I Play media Newsreel footage of the signing of the peace treaty at Versailles On 28 June 1914, the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, was assassinated by a Serbian nationalist.[4] This caused a rapidly escalating July Crisis resulting in Austria-Hungary declaring war on Serbia, followed guickly by the entry of most European powers into the First World War.[5] Two alliances faced off, the Central Powers (led by Germany) and the Triple Entente (led by Britain, France and Russia). Other countries entered as fighting raged widely across Europe, as well as the Middle East, Africa and Asia. In 1917, two revolutions occurred within the Russian Empire. The new Bolshevik government under Vladimir Lenin in March 1918 signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that was highly favourable to Germany. Sensing victory before American armies could be ready, Germany now shifted forces to the Western Front and tried to overwhelm the Allies won decisively on the battlefield and forced an armistice in November 1918 that resembled a surrender.[6] US entry and the Fourteen Points Main articles: American entry into World War I and Fourteen Points On 6 April 1917, the United States entered the war against merchant ships trading with France and Britain, which led to the sinking of the RMS Lusitania and the loss of 128 American lives; and the interception of the German Zimmermann Telegram, urging Mexico to declare war against the United States.[7] The American was to detach the war from nationalistic disputes and ambitions after the Bolshevik disclosure of secret treaties between the Allies. The existence of these treaties tended to discredit Allied claims that Germany was the sole power with aggressive ambitions. [8] On 8 January 1918, President Woodrow Wilson issued the nation's postwar goals, the Fourteen Points. It outlined a policy of free trade, open agreements, and democracy. While the term was not used self-determination was assumed. It called for a negotiated end to the war, international disarmament, the withdrawal of the Central Powers from occupied territories, the creation of a Polish state, the redrawing of Europe's borders along ethnic lines, and the formation of a League of Nations to guarantee the political independence and territorial integrity of all states.[9][n. 3] It called for a just and democratic peace uncompromised by territorial annexation. The Fourteen Points were based on the research of the Inquiry, a team of about 150 advisors led by foreign-policy advisor Edward M. House, into the topics likely to arise in the expected peace conference. [10] Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, 1918 Main article: Treaty of Brest-Litovsk After the Central Powers launched Operation Faustschlag on the Eastern Front, the new Soviet Government of Russia signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with Germany on 3 March 1918.[11] This treaty ended the war between Russia and the Central powers and annexed 3,400,000 square kilometres (1,300,000 square miles) of territory and 62 million people.[12] This loss resulted in the loss of one third of the Russian population, around one third of the country's arable land, three-quarters of its factories (totalling 54 percent of the nation's industrial capacity), and one quarter of its railroads.[12][13] Armistice Main article: Armistice of 11 November 1918 During the autumn of 1918, the Central Powers began to collapse. [14] Desertion rates within the German army began to increase, and civilian strikes drastically reduced war production. [15] [16] On the Western Front, the Allied forces launched the Hundred Days Offensive and decisively defeated the German western armies.[17] Sailors of the Imperial German Navy at Kiel mutinied, which prompted uprisings in German Revolution.[18][19] The German government tried to obtain a peace settlement based on the Fourteen Points, and maintained it was on this basis that they surrendered. Following negotiations, the Allied powers and Germany signed an armistice, which came into effect on 11 November while German forces were still positioned in France and Belgium.[20][21][22] Occupation Main article: Occupation of the Rhineland The terms of the armistice called for an immediate evacuation of German troops from occupied Belgium, France, and Luxembourg within fifteen days. [23] In addition, it established that Allied forces would occupy the Rhineland. In late 1918, Allied troops entered Germany and began the occupation. [24] Blockade Main article: Blockade of Germany Both Germany and Great Britain were dependent on imports of food and raw materials, most of which had to be shipped across the Atlantic Ocean. The Blockade of Germany (1914–1919) was a naval operation conducted by the Allied Powers to stop the supply of raw materials and foodstuffs reaching the Central Powers. The German Kaiserliche Marine was mainly restricted to the German Bight and unrestricted submarine warfare for a counter-blockade. The German Board of Public Health in December 1918 stated that 763,000 German civilians had died during the Allied blockade, although an academic study in 1928 put the death toll at 424,000 people. [25] The blockade was maintained for eight months after the Armistice in November 1918, into the following year of 1919. Foodstuffs imports into Germany were controlled by the Allies after the Armistice with Germany until Germany until Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles in June 1919, [26] In March 1919, Churchill informed the House of Commons, that the ongoing blockade was a success and "Germany is very near starvation," [27] From January 1919 to March 1919, Germany refused to agree to Allied demands that Germany surrender its merchant ships to Allied ports to transport food supplies. Some Germans considered the armistice to be a temporary cessation of the war and knew, if fighting broke out again, their ships would be seized. [28] Over the winter of 1919, the situation became desperate and Germany finally agreed to surrender its fleet in March.[citation needed] The Allies then allowed for the import of 270,000 tons of foodstuffs.[29] Both German observers have argued that these were the most devastating months of the blockade for German civilians,[30] though disagreement persists as to the extent and who is truly at fault.[31][32][33][34][35] According to Dr. Max Rubner 100,000 German civilians died due to the continuation blockade after the armistice.[36] In the UK, Labour Party member and anti-war activist Robert Smillie issued a statement in June 1919 condemning continuation of the blockade, claiming 100,000 German civilians had died as a result. [37][38] Negotiations The heads of the "Big Four" nations at the Paris Peace Conference, 27 May 1919. From left to right: David Lloyd George, Vittorio Orlando, Georges Clemenceau, and Woodrow Wilson Talks between the Allies to establish a common negotiating position started on 18 January 1919, in the Salle de l'Horloge at the French Foreign Ministry on the Quai d'Orsay in Paris. [39] Initially, 70 delegates from 27 nations participated in the negotiations. [40] Russia was excluded due to their signing of a separate peace (the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk) and early withdrawal from the war. Furthermore, German negotiators were excluded to deny them an opportunity to divide the Allies diplomatically. [41] Initially, a "Council of Ten" (comprising two delegates each from Britain, France, the United States, Italy, and Japan) met officially to decide the peace terms. This council was replaced by the "Council of Five", formed from each country's foreign ministers, to discuss minor matters. French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau, Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, and United States President Woodrow Wilson formed the "Big Four" (at one point becoming the temporary withdrawal of Vittorio Emanuele Orlando). These four men met in 145 closed sessions to make all the major decisions, which were later ratified by the entire assembly. The minor powers attended a weekly "Plenary Conference" that discussed issues in a general forum but made various recommendations, many of which were incorporated into the final text of the treaty. [42][43][44] French aims France had lost 1.3 million soldiers, including 25% of French men aged 18–30, as well as 400,000 civilians. France had lost 1.3 million soldiers, including 25% of French men aged 18–30, as well as 400,000 civilians. iron ore in the north-east had been devastated and in the final days of the war mines had been flooded and railways, bridges and factories destroyed.)[45] Clemenceau intended to ensure the security of France, by weakening Germany economically, militarily, territorially and by supplanting Germany as the leading producer of steel in Europe. [45][46][47] British economist and Versailles negotiator John Maynard Keynes summarized this position as attempting to "set the clock back and undo what, since 1870, the progress of Germany had accomplished." [48] Clemenceau told Wilson: "America is far away, protected by the ocean. Not even Napoleon himself could touch England. You are both sheltered; we are not".[49] The French wanted a frontier on the Rhine, to protect France from a German invasion and compensate for French demographic and economic inferiority.[50][51] American and British representatives refused the French claim and after two months of negotiations, the French accepted a British pledge to provide an immediate alliance with France if Germany attacked again, and Wilson agreed to put a similar proposal to the Senate, Clemenceau had told the Chamber of Deputies, in December 1918, that his goal was to maintain an alliance with both countries. Clemenceau accepted the offer, in return for an occupation of the Rhineland for fifteen years and that Germany would also demilitarise the Rhineland. [52] French negotiators required reparations, to make Germany pay for the destruction induced throughout the war and to decrease German strength.[45] The French also wanted the iron ore and coal of the Saar Valley, by annexation to France.[53] The French were willing to accept a smaller amount of reparations than the Americans would concede and Clemenceau was willing to discuss German capacity to pay with the German delegation, before the final settlement was drafted. In April and May 1919, the French and Germans held separate talks, on mutually acceptable arrangements on issues like reparation, reconstruction and industrial collaboration. France, along with the

```
British Dominions and Belgium, opposed mandates and favored annexation of former German colonies. [54] British aims Further information: Heavenly Twins (Sumner and Cunliffe) and Fontainebleau Memorandum British Prime Minister David Lloyd George Britain had suffered heavy financial costs but
suffered little physical devastation during the war, [55] but the British wartime coalition was re-elected during the so-called Coupon election at the end of 1918, with a policy of squeezing the Germans "til the pips squeak". [56][57] Public opinion favoured a "just peace", which would force Germany to pay
reparations and be unable to repeat the aggression of 1914, although those of a "liberal and advanced opinion" shared Wilson's ideal of a peace of reconciliation. [20] In private Lloyd George opposed revenge and attempted to compromise between Clemenceau's demands and the Fourteen Points,
because Europe would eventually have to reconcile with Germany. [58] Lloyd George wanted terms of reparation that would not cripple the Germany would remain a viable economic power and trading partner. [57] [58] [55] By arguing that British war pensions and widows'
allowances should be included in the German reparation sum, Lloyd George ensured that a large amount would go to the British Empire. [59] Lloyd George also intended to maintain a European balance of power to thwart a French attempt to establish itself as the dominant European power. A revived
Germany would be a counterweight to France and a deterrent to Bolshevik Russia. Lloyd George also wanted to neutralize the German navy to keep the Royal Navy as the greatest naval power in the world; dismantle the German colonial empire with several of its territorial possessions ceded to Britain
and others being established as League of Nations mandates, a position opposed by the Dominions. [58] American aims Before the American entry into the war, Wilson had talked of a "peace without victory". [60] This position fluctuated following the US entry into the war. Wilson spoke of the German
aggressors, with whom there could be no compromised peace. [61] On 8 January 1918, however, Wilson delivered a speech (known as the Fourteen Points) that declared the American peace objectives: the rebuilding of the European economy, self-determination of European and Middle Eastern ethnic
groups, the promotion of free trade, the creation of appropriate mandates for former colonies, and deal with problems that arose
as a result of the peace and the rise of new states. [63][58] Wilson brought along top intellectuals as advisors to the American position echoed the Fourteen Points. Wilson firmly opposed harsh treatment on Germany. [62] While the British and French wanted to
largely annex the German colonial empire, Wilson saw that as a violation of the fundamental principles of justice and human rights of the native populations, and favored them having the right of self-determination via the creation of mandates. The promoted idea called for the major powers to act as
disinterested trustees over a region, aiding the native populations until they could govern themselves. [64] In spite of this position and in order to ensure that Japan did not refuse to join the League of Nations, Wilson favored turning over the former German colony of Shandong, in Eastern China, to Japan
rather than return the area to Chinese control. [65] Further confounding the Americans, was US internal partisan politics. In November 1918, the Republican Party won the Senate election by a slim margin. Wilson, a Democrat, refused to include prominent Republicans in the American delegation making
his efforts seem partisan, and contributed to a risk of political defeat at home. [62] Italian aims Vittorio Emanuele Orlando and his foreign minister Sidney Sonnino, an Anglican of British origins, worked primarily to secure the partition of the Habsburg Empire and their attitude towards Germany was not as
hostile. Generally speaking. Sonnino was in line with the British position while Orlando favored a compromise between Clemenceau and Wilson. Within the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles. Orlando obtained certain results such as the permanent membership of Italy in the security council of the
League of Nations and a promised transfer of British Jubaland and French Aozou strip to the Italian colonies of Somalia and Libya respectively. Italian nationalists, however, saw the War as a mutilated victory for what they considered to be little territorial gains achieved in the other treaties directly
impacting Italy's borders. Orlando was ultimately forced to abandon the conference and resign. Orlando refused to see World War I as a mutilated victory, replying at nationalists calling for a greater expansion that "Italy today is a great state....on par with the great historic and contemporary states. This is,
for me, our main and principal expansion." Francesco Saverio Nitti took Orlando's place in signing the treaty of Versailles.[66][incomplete short citation] Treaty content and signing Wikisource has original text related to this article: Treaty of Versailles German delegate Johannes Bell signing the Treaty of
Versailles in the Hall of Mirrors, with various Allied delegations sitting and standing in front of him In June 1919, the Allies declared that war would resume if the German government did not sign the treaty they had agreed to among themselves. The government headed by Philipp Scheidemann was
unable to agree on a common position, and Scheidemann himself resigned rather than agree to sign the treaty. Gustav Bauer, the head of the new government, sent a telegram stating his intention to sign the treaty if certain articles were withdrawn, including Articles 227, 230 and 231.[ii] In response, the
Allies issued an ultimatum stating that Germany would have to accept the treaty or face an invasion of Allied forces across the Rhine within 24 hours. On 23 June, Bauer capitulated and sent a second telegram with a confirmation that a German delegation would arrive shortly to sign the treaty.[67] On 28
June 1919, the fifth anniversary of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand (the immediate impetus for the war), the peace treaty was signed.[1] The treaty had clauses ranging from war crimes, the prohibition on the merging of the Republic of German Austria with Germany without the consent of
the League of Nations, freedom of navigation on major European rivers, to the returning of a Koran to the king of Hedjaz.[n. 4][n. 5][n. 6][n. 7] Territorial changes Germany after Versailles: Administered by the League of Nations Annexed or transferred to neighbouring countries by the treaty, or later via
plebiscite and League of Nations action Weimar Germany The treaty stripped Germany of 65,000 km2 (25,000 sq mi) of territory and 7 million people. It also required Germany to give up the gains made via the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and grant independence to the protectorates that had been
established.[13] In Western Europe Germany was required to recognize Belgian sovereignty over Moresnet and cede control of the Eupen-Malmedy area. Within six months of the transfer, Belgium was required to conduct a plebiscite on whether the citizens of the region wanted to remain under Belgian
sovereignty or return to German control, communicate the results to the League of Nations and abide by the League of Nations and abide by the League of Nations
for 15 years; a plebiscite would then be held to decide sovereignty.[n. 9] The treaty restored the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to this issue.[n. 10] France was able to make the claim that the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to this issue.[n. 10] France was able to make the claim that the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to this issue.[n. 10] France was able to make the claim that the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to this issue.[n. 10] France was able to make the claim that the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to this issue.[n. 10] France was able to make the claim that the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to this issue.[n. 10] France was able to make the claim that the provinces of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to the province of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to the province of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to the province of Alsace-Lorraine to France by rescinding the treaties of Versailles and Frankfurt of 1871 as they pertained to the Province by Province
Lorraine were indeed part of France and not part of Germany by disclosing a letter sent from the Prussian King to the Empress Eugénie provided, in which William I wrote that the territories of Alsace-Lorraine were requested by Germany for the sole purpose of national defense and not to
expand the German territory. [68] The sovereignty of Schleswig-Holstein was to be resolved by a plebiscite to be held at a future time (see Schleswig Plebiscites). [69] In Central Europe Germany was to recognize the independence of Czechoslovakia (which had actually been controlled by Austria) and
cede parts of the province of Upper Silesia.[n. 11] Germany had to recognize the independence of Poland and renounce "all rights and title over the territory". Portions of Upper Silesia were to be ceded to Poland, with the future of the rest of the province to be decided by plebiscite. The border would be
fixed with regard to the vote and to the geographical and economic conditions of each locality.[n. 12] The province of Posen (now Poznań), which had come under Polish control during the Greater Poland Uprising, was also to be ceded to Poland.[70][71] Pomerelia (Eastern Pomerania), on historical and
ethnic grounds, was transferred to Poland so that the new state could have access to the sea and became known as the Polish Corridor. [72] The sovereignty of part of southern East Prussia was to be decided via plebiscite while the East Prussian Soldau area, which was astride the rail line between
Warsaw and Danzig, was transferred to Poland outright without plebiscite.[n. 13][73] An area of 51,800 square miles) was granted to Poland at the expense of Germany.[74] Memel was to be ceded to the Allied and Associated powers, for disposal according to their wishes.[n.
14] Germany was to cede the city of Danzig and its hinterland, including the delta of the Vistula River on the Baltic Sea, for the League of Nations to establish the Free City of Danzig.[n. 15] Mandates Main article: League of Nations mandate German colonies (light blue) were made into League of Nations
mandates. Article 119 of the treaty required Germany to renounce sovereignty over former colonies and Article 22 converted the territories into League of Nations mandates under the control of Allied states.[n. 16] Togoland and German Kamerun (Cameroon) were transferred to France. Ruanda and
Urundi were allocated to Belgium, whereas German South-West Africa went to South Africa and Britain obtained German East Africa in northern
Mozambique.[78] Article 156 of the treaty transferred German concessions in Shandong, China, to Japan, not to China. Japan was granted all German possessions in the Pacific north of the equator and those south of the equator went to Australia, except for German Samoa, which was taken by New
Zealand.[76][n. 17] Military restrictions The treaty was comprehensive and complex in the restrictions imposed upon the post-war German armed forces (the Reichswehr). The provisions were intended to make the Reichswehr incapable of offensive action and to encourage international disarmament.[79]
[n. 18] Germany was to demobilize sufficient soldiers by 31 March 1920 to leave an army of no more than 100,000 men in a maximum of seven infantry and three cavalry divisions. The treaty laid down the organisation of the divisions and support units, and the General Staff was to be dissolved. [n. 19]
Military schools for officer training were limited to three, one school per arm, and conscription was abolished. Private soldiers and non-commissioned officers were to be retained for at least twelve years and officers for a minimum of 25 years, with former officers being forbidden to attend military
exercises. To prevent Germany from building up a large cadre of trained men, the number of men allowed to leave early was limited. [n. 20] Workmen decommissioning a heavy gun, to comply with the treaty The number of civilian staff supporting the army was reduced and the police force was reduced to
its pre-war size, with increases limited to population increases; paramilitary forces were forbidden.[n. 21] The Rhineland and 50 kilometres (31 miles) east of the river were to be demolished and new construction was forbidden.[n. 22] Military
structures and fortifications on the islands of Heligoland and Düne were to be destroyed.[n. 23] Germany was prohibited from the type and quantity of weapons and prohibited from the manufacture or stockpile of chemical weapons, armoured cars, tanks and military
aircraft.[n. 24] The German navy was allowed six pre-dreadnought battleships and was limited to a maximum of six light cruisers (not exceeding 800 long tons (810 t)) and twelve torpedo boats (not exceeding 200 long tons (200 t)) and was
forbidden submarines.[n. 25] The manpower of the navy was not to exceed 15,000 men, including manning for the fleet, coast defences, signal stations, administration, other land services, officers and men of all grades and corps. The number of officers and warrant officers was not allowed to exceed
1,500 men.[n. 5] Germany surrendered eight battleships, eight light cruisers, forty-two destroyers, and fifty torpedo boats for decommissioning. Thirty-two auxiliary ships were to be disarmed and converted to merchant use.[n. 26] Article 198 prohibited Germany from having an air force, including naval air
forces, and required Germany to hand over all aerial related materials. In conjunction, Germany was forbidden to manufacture or import aircraft or related material for a period of six months following the signing of the treaty. [n. 27] Reparations Main article: World War I reparations In Article 231 Germany
accepted responsibility for the losses and damages caused by the war "as a consequence of the ... aggression of Germany to compensate the Allied powers, and it also established an Allied "Reparation Commission" to determine the exact amount
which Germany would pay and the form that such payment would take. The commission was required to "give to the German Government a just opportunity to be heard", and to submit its conclusions by 1 May 1921. In the interim, the treaty required Germany to pay an equivalent of 20 billion gold marks
($5 billion) in gold, commodities, ships, securities or other forms. The money would help to pay for Allied occupation costs and buy food and raw materials for Germany. [80][n. 33] Guarantees Location of the Rhineland (yellow) To ensure compliance, the Rhineland and bridgeheads east of the Rhine were
to be occupied by Allied troops for fifteen years. [n. 34] If Germany had not committed aggression, a staged withdrawal would take place; after five years, the Cologne bridgehead and the territory north of a line along the Ruhr would be evacuated. After ten years, the bridgehead at Coblenz and the
territories to the north would be evacuated and after fifteen years remaining Allied forces would be withdrawn. [n. 35] If Germany reneged on the treaty obligations, the bridgeheads would be reoccupied immediately. [n. 36] International organizations Main articles: Covenant of the League of Nations and
International Labour Organization § History Part I of the treaty, in common with all the treaties signed during the Paris Peace Conference, [iv] was the Covenant of the League of Nations, which provided for the creation of the League, an organization for the arbitration of international disputes. [n. 37] Part
XIII organized the establishment of the International Labour Office, to regulate hours of work, including a maximum working day and week; the prevention of unemployment; the provision of a living wage; the protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury
arising out of his employment; the protection of children, young persons and women; provision for old age and injury; protection of the principle of freedom of association; the organization of vocational and technical education and other
measures.[n. 38] The treaty also called for the signatories to sign or ratify the International Opium Convention.[n. 39] Reactions Britain A British news placard announcing the signing of the peace treaty. With
some seeing the French policy as being greedy and vindictive. [81][82] Lloyd George and his private secretary Philip Kerr believed in the treaty, although they also felt that the French would keep Europe in a constant state of turmoil by attempting to enforce the treaty. [81] Delegate Harold Nicolson wrote
"are we making a good peace?", while General Jan Smuts (a member of the South African delegation) wrote to Lloyd-George, before the signing, that the treaty was unstable and declared "Are we in our sober senses or suffering from shellshock? What has become of Wilson's 14 points?" He wanted the
Germans not be made to sign at the "point of the bayonet". [83][84] Smuts issued a statement condemning the treaty and regretting that the promises of "a new international order and a fairer, better world are not written in this treaty". Lord Robert Cecil said that many within the Foreign Office were
disappointed by the treaty.[83] The treaty received widespread approval from the general public. Bernadotte Schmitt wrote that the "average Englishman ... thought Germany got only what it deserved" as a result of the treaty,[85] but public opinion changed as German complaints mounted.[86] Prime
Minister Ramsay MacDonald, following the German re-militarisation of the Rhineland in 1936, stated that he was "pleased" that the French had been taught a "severe lesson".[82] Status of British Dominions The Treaty of Versailles was an important
step in the status of the British Dominions under international law. Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa had each made significant contributions to the British war effort, but as separate countries, rather than as British colonies. India also made a substantial troop contribution, although under
direct British control, unlike the Dominions. The four Dominions and India all signed the Treaty separately from Britain, [n. 2] a clear recognition by the international community that the Dominions were no longer British colonies. "Their status defied exact analysis by both international and constitutional
lawyers, but it was clear that they were no longer regarded simply as colonies of Britain."[87] By signing the Treaty individually, the four Dominions and India also were founding members of the League of Nations in their own right, rather than simply as part of the British Empire. France The signing of the
treaty was met with roars of approval, singing, and dancing from a crowd outside the Palace of Versailles. In Paris proper, people rejoiced at the official end of the war,[88] the return of Alsace and Lorraine to France, and that Germany had agreed to pay reparations,[89] While France ratified the treaty and
was active in the League, the jubilant mood soon gave way to a political backlash for Clemenceau. The French Right saw the treaty as being too lenient and saw it as failing to achieve all of France's demands. Left-wing politicians attacked the treaty and Clemenceau for being too harsh (the latter turning
into a ritual condemnation of the treaty, for politicians remarking on French foreign affairs, as late as August 1939). Marshal Ferdinand Foch stated "this (treaty) is not peace. It is an armistice for twenty years."; a criticism over the failure to annex the Rhineland and for compromising French security for the
benefit of the United States and Britain. [90][85][86][89][91][92][93] When Clemenceau stood for election as President of France in January 1920, he was defeated. [93] Italy Reaction in Italy to the treaty was extremely negative. The country had suffered high casualties, yet failed to achieve most of its major
war goals, notably gaining control of the Dalmatian coast and Fiume. President Wilson rejected Italy's claims on the basis of "national self-determination." For their part, Britain and France—who had been forced in the war's latter stages to divert their own troops to the Italian front to stave off collapse—
were disinclined to support Italy's position at the peace conference. Differences in negotiating strategy between Premier Vittorio Orlando and Foreign Minister Sidney Sonnino further undermined Italy's position at the conference. A furious Vittorio Orlando suffered a nervous collapse and at one point
walked out of the conference (though he later returned). He lost his position as prime minister just a week before the treaty was scheduled to be signed, effectively ending his active political career. Anger and dismay over the treaty's provisions helped pave the way for the establishment of Benito
Mussolini's dictatorship three years later. Portugal Portugal entered the war on the Allied side in 1916 primarily to ensure the security of its African colonies, which were threatened with seizure by both Britain and Germany. To this extent, she succeeded in her war aims. The treaty recognized Portuguese
sovereignty over these areas and awarded her small portions of Germany's bordering overseas colonies. Otherwise, Portugal gained little at the peace conference. Her promised share of German reparations never materialized, and a seat she coveted on the executive council of the new League of
Nations went instead to Spain—which had remained neutral in the war. In the end, Portugal ratified the treaty, but got little out of the war, which cost more than 8,000 Portuguese troops and as many as 100,000 of her African colonial subjects their lives. [94] United States Senator Borah, Lodge and
Johnson refuse Lady Peace a seat, referring to efforts by Republican isolationists to block ratification of Treaty of Versailles conference, Democratic President Woodrow Wilson claimed that "at last the world knows America as the savior of the world!"
[v] But the Republican Party, led by Henry Cabot Lodge, controlled the US Senate after the election of 1918, and the senators were divided into multiple positions on the Versailles question. It proved possible to build a majority coalition, but impossible to build a two-thirds coalition that was needed to pass
a treaty.[95] A discontent bloc of 12–18 "Irreconcilables", mostly Republicans but also representatives of the Irish and German Democrats strongly supported the Versailles Treaty, even with reservations added by Lodge. A second group of Democrats
supported the treaty but followed Wilson in opposing any amendments or reservations. The largest bloc, led by Senator Lodge, [96] comprised a majority of the Republicans. They wanted a treaty with reservations, especially on Article 10, which involved the power of the League of Nations to make war
without a vote by the US Congress.[97] All of the Irreconcilables were bitter enemies of President Wilson, and he launched a nationwide speaking tour in the summer of 1919 to refute them. But Wilson collapsed midway with a serious stroke that effectively ruined his leadership skills.[98] The closest the
treaty came to passage was on 19 November 1919, as Lodge and his Republicans formed a coalition with the pro-Treaty Democrats, and were close to a two-thirds majority for a Treaty with reservations, but Wilson rejected this compromise and enough Democrats followed his lead to end the chances of
ratification permanently. Among the American public as a whole, the Irish Catholics and the German Americans were intensely opposed to the treaty, saying it favored the British.[99] After Wilson's presidency, his successor Republican President Warren G. Harding continued American opposition to the
formation of the League of Nations. Congress subsequently passed the Knox-Porter Resolution bringing a formal end to hostilities between the United States and the Central Powers. It was signed into law by President Harding on 2 July 1921.[100][101] Soon after, the US-German Peace Treaty of 1921.
was signed in Berlin on 25 August 1921, and two similar treaties were signed with Austria and Hungary on 24 and 29 August 1921, in Vienna and Budapest respectively. House's views Wilson's former friend Edward Mandell House, present at the negotiations, wrote in his diary on 29 June 1919: I am
leaving Paris, after eight fateful months, with conflicting emotions. Looking at the conference in retrospect, there is much to approve and yet much to approve and yet much to regret. It is easy to say what should have been done, but more difficult to have found a way of doing it. To those who are saying that the treaty is bad and
should never have been made and that it will involve Europe in infinite difficulties in its enforcement, I feel like admitting it. But I would also say in reply that empires cannot be shattered, and new states raised upon their ruins without disturbance. To create new boundaries is to create new troubles. The
one follows the other. While I should have preferred a different peace, I doubt very much whether it could have been made, for the ingredients required for such a peace as I would have were lacking at Paris. [102] China Many in China felt betrayed as the German territory in China was handed to Japan.
Wellington Koo refused to sign the treaty and the Chinese delegation at the Paris Peace Conference was the only nation that did not sign the Treaty of Versailles at the signing ceremony. The sense of betrayal led to great demonstrations in China such as the May 4th movement. There was immense
dissatisfaction with Duan Qirui's government, which had secretly negotiated with the Japanese in order to secure loans to fund their military campaigns against the south. On 12 June 1919, the Chinese cabinet was forced to resign and the government instructed its delegation at Versailles not to sign the
treaty.[103][104] As a result, relations with the West deteriorated.[105] Germany See also: Stab-in-the-back legend German delegates in Versailles: Professor Walther Schücking, Reichspostminister Johannes Giesberts, Justice Minister Otto Landsberg, Foreign Minister Ulrich Graf von Brockdorff-
Rantzau, Prussian State President Robert Leinert, and financial advisor Carl Melchior On 29 April, the German delegation under the leadership of the Foreign Minister Ulrich Graf von Brockdorff-Rantzau arrived in Versailles. On 7 May, when faced with the conditions dictated by the victors, including the
so-called "War Guilt Clause", von Brockdorff-Rantzau replied to Clemenceau, Wilson and Lloyd George: "We can sense the full force of hatred that confronts us here. ... You demand from us to confess we were the only guilty party of war; such a confession in my mouth would be a lie."[vi] Because
Germany was not allowed to take part in the negotiations, the German government issued a protest against what it considered to be unfair demands, and a "violation of honour", soon afterwards withdrawing from the proceedings of the peace conference. [citation needed] Germans of all political shades
denounced the treaty—particularly the provision that blamed Germany for starting the war—as an insult to the nation's honour. They referred to the treaty as "the Diktat" since its terms were presented to Germany on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. [106] Germany's first democratically elected head of
government, Philipp Scheidemann, resigned rather than sign the treaty. In an emotional and polemical address to the National Assembly on 12 May 1919, he called the treaty a "horrific and murderous witch's hammer",[107] and exclaimed: Which hand would not shrivel, that shackled itself and us in such
a way?[108][107] At the end of his speech, Scheidemann stated that, in the government's opinion, the treaty was unacceptable.[108] Demonstration against the treaty in front of the Reichstag After Scheidemann's resignation, a new coalition government was formed under Gustav Bauer. President
Friedrich Ebert knew that Germany was in an impossible situation. Although he shared his countrymen's disgust with the treaty, he was sober enough to consider the possibility that the government would not be in a position to reject it. He believed that if Germany refused to sign the treaty, the Allies would
invade Germany from the west—and there was no guarantee that the army would be able to make a stand in the event of an invasion. With this in mind, he asked Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg if the army was capable of any meaningful resistance in the event the Allies resumed the war. If there was
even the slightest chance that the army could hold out, Ebert intended to recommend against ratifying the treaty. Hindenburg—after prodding from his chief of staff, Wilhelm Groener—concluded the army could not resume the war even on a limited scale. But rather than inform Ebert himself, he had
Groener inform the government that the army would be in an untenable position in the event of renewed hostilities. Upon receiving this, the new government recommended signing the treaty. The National Assembly voted in favour of signing the treaty by 237 to 138, with five abstentions (there were 421
delegates in total). This result was wired to Clemenceau just hours before the deadline. Foreign minister Hermann Müller and colonial minister Johannes Bell travelled to Versailles to sign the treaty on behalf of Germany. The treaty was signed on 28 June 1919 and ratified by the National Assembly on 9
July by a vote of 209 to 116.[109] Japan The disenfranchised and often colonized 'non-white' world held high expectations that a new order would open up an unheralded opportunity to have a principle of racial equality recognized by the leading global powers.[110] Japanese diplomacy had bitter
memories of the rhetoric of the Yellow Peril, and the arrogance, underwritten by the assumptions about a White Man's Burden, memories aggravated by the rise of discrimination against their business men, severe immigration restrictions on Asiatics, and court judgments hostile to Japanese interests,
which characterized Western states' treatment of their nationals. [110] Japan's delegation, among whose plenipotentiaries figured Baron Makino and Ambassador Chinda Sutemi, was led by its elder statesman Saionji Kinmochi. Versailles represented a chance to overturn this imposed inferiority, whose
tensions were strengthened particularly in Japan's relationship with the United States during WW1.[110] Confidence in their growing industrial strength, and conquest of Germany's Far East possessions, together with their proven fidelity to the Entente would, it was thought, allow them finally to take their
rightful place among the victorious Great Powers.[110] They solicited support especially from the American delegation to obtain recognition for the principle of racial equality at the League of Nations Commission. Their proposals to this end were consistently rebuffed by British, American and Australian
diplomats, who were all sensitive to their respective countries' internal pressures. Wilson himself was an enactor of segregationist policies in the United States, Balfour considered Africans inferior to Europeans – equality was only true of people within particular nations – while William Hughes, adopting a
"slap the Jap" attitude, was a vocal defender of a White Australia policy.[110] Japan's attempt, buttressed by the Chinese emissary Wellington Koo among others, to incorporate a Racial Equality Proposal in the treaty, had broad support, but was effectively declined when it was rejected by the United
States. Great Britain and Australia,[110] despite a powerfully persuasive speech delivered by Makino,[vii] Japan itself both prior to and during WW1 had embarked on a vigorous expansion of continental colonialism, whose aims were justified in terms of an ideological vision of Asians, such as Koreans
and Chinese, being of the same culture and race (dōbun dōshū: 同文同種), though its vision of those countries was paternalistic and geared to subordinating them to Japan's interests. Aspiring to be accepted as a world actor with similar status to the traditional Western powers, Japan envisaged an Asian
Monroe Doctrine, where Japan's proper sphere of geostrategic interests in Asia would be recognized. Some years earlier, Japan secured both British and French support for its claims to inherit rights that Germany had exercised both in China and in the Pacific north of the Equator. American policy
experts, unaware of these secret agreements, nonetheless suggested that Japan had adopted a Prussian model that would imperil China's own search for autonomy, and these considerations influenced Wilson.[111] Implementation Further information: Aftermath of World War I Reparations Main article:
World War I reparations On 5 May 1921, the reparation Commission established the London Schedule of Payments and a final reparation sum of 132 billion gold marks to be demanded of all the Central Powers. This was the public assessment of what the Central Powers combined could pay, and was
also a compromise between Belgian, British, and French demands and assessments. Furthermore, the Commission recognized that the burden would fall upon Germany. As a result, the sum was split into different categories, of which Germany was only
required to pay 50 billion gold marks (US$12.5 billion); this being the genuine assessment of the commission on what Germany could pay, and allowed the Allied powers to save face with the public by presenting a higher figure. Furthermore, payments made between 1919 and 1921 were taken into
account reducing the sum to 41 billion gold marks. [112][113] In order to meet this sum, Germany could pay in cash or kind: coal, timber, chemical dyes, pharmaceuticals, livestock, agricultural machines, construction materials, and factory machinery. Germany's assistance with the restoration of the
university library of Leuven, which was destroyed by the Germans on 25 August 1914, was also credited towards the sum. Territorial changes imposed by the treaty were also factored in.[114][115] The payment schedule required US$250 million within twenty-five days and then US$500 million annually
plus 26 per cent of the value of German exports. The German Government was to issue bonds at five per cent interest and set up a sinking fund of one per cent to support the payment of reparations. [80] Territorial changes A crowd awaits the plebiscite results in Oppeln In February and March 1920, the
Schleswig Plebiscites were held. The people of Schleswig were presented with only two choices: Danish or German sovereignty. The northern Danish-speaking area voted for Denmark while the southern German-speaking area voted for Germany, resulting in the province being partitioned. [69] The East
Prussia plebiscite was held on 11 July 1920. There was a 90% turn out with 99.3% of the population wishing to remain with Germany. Further plebiscites were held in Eupen-Malmedy and Neutral Moresnet. On 20 September 1920, the League of Nations allotted these territories to Belgium. These latter
plebiscites were followed by a boundary commission in 1922, followed by the new Belgian-German border being recognized by the German Government on 15 December 1923.[116] The transfer of the Hultschin area, of Silesia, to Czechoslovakia was completed on 3 February 1921.[117] Following the
implementation of the treaty, Upper Silesia was initially governed by Britain, France, and Italy.[118] Between 1919 and 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting in German and Polish military forces also becoming involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians, resulting involved.[118][119] In March 1921, three major outbreaks of violence took place between German and Polish civilians and the place between German and Polish civilians and the place between German and Po
the Inter-Allied Commission held the Upper Silesia plebiscite, which was peaceful despite the previous violence. The plebiscite resulted in c. 60 per cent of the province to remain part of Germany, [120] Following the vote, the League of Nations debated the future of the province.
[121] In 1922, Upper Silesia was partitioned: Oppeln, in the north-west, remained with Germany while Silesia Province, in the south-east, was transferred to Poland. [118] Memel remained under the authority of the League of Nations, with a French military garrison, until January 1923. [122] On 9 January
1923, Lithuanian forces invaded the territory during the Klaipėda Revolt. [123] The French garrison withdrew, and in February the Allies agreed to attach Memel as an "autonomous territory" to Lithuania. [122] On 8 May 1924, after negotiations between the Lithuanian Government and the Conference of
Ambassadors and action by the League of Nations, the annexation of Memel was ratified. [123] Lithuania accepted the Memel Statute, a power-sharing arrangement to protect non-Lithuanians in the territory and its autonomous status while responsibility for the territory remained with the great powers. The
League of Nations mediated between the Germans and Lithuanians on a local level, helping the power-sharing arrangement last until 1939.[122] On 13 January 1935, 15 years after the Saar Basin had been placed under the protection of the League of Nations, a plebiscite was held to determine the
future of the area. 528,105 votes were cast, with 477,119 votes (90 per cent of the ballot) in favour of union with France. The region returned to German sovereignty on 1 March 1935. When the result was announced
4,100 people, including 800 refugees from Germany fled to France.[n. 9][124] Rhineland occupation Main article: Occupation of the Rhineland French soldiers in the American withdrawal from the Rhineland In late 1918, American, Belgian, British, and French troops entered the
Rhineland to enforce the armistice. [24] Before the treaty, the occupation force stood at roughly 740,000 men. [125][126][127][128] Following the signing of the peace treaty, the numbers drastically decreased and by 1926 the occupation force numbered only 76,000 men. [129] As part of the 1929
negotiations that would become the Young Plan, Stresemann and Aristide Briand negotiated the early withdrawal of Allied forces from the Rhineland.[130] On 30 June 1930, after speeches and the lowering of flags, the last troops of the Anglo-French-Belgian occupation force withdrew from Germany.[131]
Belgium maintained an occupation force of roughly 10,000 troops throughout the initial years. [126] This figure fell to 7,102 by 1926, and continued to fall as a result of diplomatic developments. [129][132] The British Second Army, with some 275,000 veteran soldiers, entered Germany in late 1918. [133]
[127] In March 1919, this force became the British Army of the Rhine (BAOR). The total number of troops committed to the occupation rapidly dwindled as veteran soldiers were demobilized, and were replaced by inexperienced men who had finished basic training following the cessation of hostilities. [133]
By 1920, the BAOR consisted of only 40,594 men and the following year had been further reduced to 12,421. The size of the BAOR fluctuated over the following years, but never rose above 9,000 men.[134] The British did not adhere to all obligated territorial withdrawals as dictated by Versailles, on
account of Germany not meeting her own treaty obligations. [135] A complete withdrawal was considered, but rejected in order to maintain a presence to continue acting as a check on French ambitions and prevent the establishment of an autonomous Rhineland Republic. [136] The French Army of the
Rhine was initially 250,000 men strong, including at a peak 40,000 African colonial troops (Troupes coloniales). By 1923, the French occupation of the
Ruhr, before decreasing to 60,000 men by 1926.[129][137] Germans viewed the use of French colonial troops as a deliberate act of humiliation, and used their presence to create a propaganda campaign dubbed the Black shame. This campaign lasted throughout the 1920s and 30s, although peaked in
1920 and 1921. For example, a 1921 German Government memo detailed 300 acts of violence from colonial troops, which included 65 murders and 170 sexual offenses. Historical consensus is that the charges were exaggerated for political and propaganda purposes, and that the colonial troops
behaved far better than their white counterparts.[128] An estimated 500-800 Rhineland Bastards were born as a result of fraternization between colonial troops and German women, and who would later be persecuted.[138] The United States Third Army entered Germany with 200,000 men. In June 1919,
the Third Army demobilized and by 1920 the US occupation force had been reduced to 15,000 men. [139][125] Wilson further reduced the garrison to 6,500 men, before Warren G. Harding's inauguration in 1921. [125] On 7 January 1923, after the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, the US senate
legislated the withdrawal of the remaining force. [140][141] On 24 January, the American garrison started their withdrawal from the Rhineland, with the final troops leaving in early February. [142] Violations Reparations Hitler announcing the Anschluss in violation of Art. 80 on the Heldenplatz, Vienna, 15
March 1938 The German economy was so weak that only a small percentage of reparations was paid in hard currency. Nonetheless, even the payment of this small percentage of the original reparations (132 billion gold marks) still placed a significant burden on the German economy. Although the
causes of the devastating post-war hyperinflation are complex and disputed. Germans blamed the near-collapse of their economy on the treaty, and some economists estimated that the reparations accounted for as much as one-third of the hyper-inflation. [143] In March 1921. French and Belgian troops
occupied Duisburg, Düsseldorf, and other areas which formed part of the demilitarized Rhineland, according to the Treaty of Versailles. In January 1923, French and Belgian forces occupied the rest of the Ruhr area as a reprisal after Germany failed to fulfill reparation payments demanded by the
Versailles Treaty. The German government answered with "passive resistance", which meant that coal miners and railway workers refused to obey any instructions by the occupation forces. Production and transportation came to a standstill, but the financial consequences contributed to German
hyperinflation and completely ruined public finances in Germany. Consequently, passive resistance was called off in late 1923. The end of passive resistance in the Ruhr allowed Germany to undertake a currency reform and to negotiate the Dawes Plan, which led to the withdrawal of French and Belgian
troops from the Ruhr Area in 1925.[144] Military In 1920, the head of the Reichswehr Hans von Seeckt clandestinely re-established the General Staff, by expanding the Truppenamt (Troop Office); purportedly a human resources section of the army.[145][146] In March, 18,000 German troops entered the
Rhineland under the guise of attempting to guell possible unrest by communists and in doing so violated the demilitarized zone. In response, French troops advanced further into Germany until the German troops withdrew.[147] German officials conspired systematically to evade the clauses of the treaty,
by failing to meet disarmament deadlines, refusing Allied officials access to military facilities, and maintaining and hiding weapon production. [147] As the treaty did not ban German companies from producing war material outside of Germany, companies moved to the Netherlands, Switzerland, and
Sweden. Bofors was bought by Krupp, and in 1921 German troops were sent to Sweden to test weapons. [148] The establishment of diplomatic ties with the Soviet Union, via the Genoa Conference and Treaty of Rapallo, was also used to circumvent the Treaty of Versailles. Publicly, these diplomatic
exchanges were largely in regards to trade and future economic cooperation. But secret military clauses were included that allowed for Germany to develop weapons inside the Soviet Union. Furthermore, it allowed for Germany to develop weapons inside the soviet Union. Furthermore, it allowed for Germany to develop weapons inside the soviet Union.
[150] In 1923, the British newspaper The Times made several claims about the state of the German Armed Forces: that it had equipment for 800,000 men, was transferring army staff to civilian positions in order to obscure their real duties, and warned of the militarization of the German police force by the
exploitation the Krümper system.[151] [viii] The Weimar Government also funded domestic rearmament programs, which were covertly funded with the money camouflaged in "X-budgets", worth up to an additional 10% of the disclosed military budget.[152] By 1925, German companies had begun to
design tanks and modern artillery. During the year, over half of Chinese arms imports were German and worth 13 million Reichsmarks. In January 1927, following the withdrawal of the Allied disarmament committee, Krupps ramped up production of armor plate and artillery. [153][154] [ix] Production
increased so that by 1937, military exports had increased to 82,788,604 Reichsmarks. [153][154] Production was not the only violation: "Volunteers" were rapidly passed through the army to make a pool of trained reserves, and paramilitary organizations were encouraged with the illegally militarized police.
Non-commissioned officers (NCOs) were not limited by the treaty, thus this loophole was exploited and as such the number needed by the Reichswehr. [155] In December 1931, the Reichswehr finalized a second rearmament plan that called for 480 million
Reichsmarks to be spent over the following five years: this program sought to provide Germany the capability of creating and supplying a defensive force of 21 divisions supported by aircraft, artillery, and tanks. This coincided with a 1 billion Reichsmark programme that planned for additional industrial
infrastructure that would be able to permanently maintain this force. As these programs did not require an expansion of the military, they were nominally legal.[156] On 7 November 1932, the Reich Minister of Defense Kurt von Schleicher authorized the illegal Umbau Plan for a standing army of 21
divisions based on 147,000 professional soldiers and a large militia. [156] Later in the year at the World Disarmament Conference, Germany withdrew to force France and Britain to accept German equality of status. [156] London attempted to get Germany to return with the promise of all nations maintaining
an equality in armaments and security. The British later proposed and agreed to an increase in the Reichswehr to 200,000 men, and for Germany to have an air force half the size of the French. It was also negotiated for the French Army to be reduced.[157] In October 1933, following the rise of Adolf
Hitler and the founding of Nazi regime, Germany withdrew from League of Nations and the World Disarmament Conference. In March 1935, Germany reintroduced conscription followed by an open rearmament programme, the official unveiling of the Luftwaffe (air force), and signed the Anglo-German
Naval Agreement that allowed a surface fleet 35% of the size of the Royal Navy. [158] [159] [160] The resulting rearmament programs was allotted 35 billion Reichsmarks over an eight-year period. [161] Territorial On 7 March 1936, German troops entered and remilitarized the Rhineland. [162] On 12 March
```

```
1938, following German pressure to the collapse the Austrian Government, German troops crossed into Austria by Germany.[163] The following year, on 23 March 1939, Germany annexed Memel from Lithuania.[164]
Historical assessments John Maynard Keynes, the principal representative of the British Treasury, referred to the treaty. Some saw it as a good solution in a difficult time, others saw it as a disastrous measure that
would anger the Germans to seek revenge. The actual impact of the treaty is also disputed. [165] In his book The Economic Consequences of the Peace, John Maynard Keynes referred to the Treaty of Versailles as a "Carthaginian peace", a misguided attempt to destroy Germany on behalf of French
revanchism, rather than to follow the fairer principles for a lasting peace set out in President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, which Germany the general costs of the war was one of the most serious
acts of political unwisdom for which our statesmen have ever been responsible."[166] Keynes had been the principal representative of the British Treasury at the Paris Peace Conference, and used in his passionate book arguments that he and others (including some US officials) had used at Paris.[167]
He believed the sums being asked of Germany in reparations were many times more than it was possible for Germany to pay, and that these would produce drastic instability.[x] Commemorative medal issued in 1929 in the Republic of Weimar on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the "shameful"
Treaty of Versailles. Designed by Karl Goetz, the obverse of the coin depicts George Clemenceau presenting a bound treaty, decorated with skull and crossbones to Ulrich von Brockdorff-Rantzau. Other members of the Conference are standing behind Clemenceau, including Lloyd-George, Wilson and
Orlando. French economist Étienne Mantoux disputed that analysis. During the 1940s, Mantoux wrote a posthumously published book titled The Carthaginian Peace, or the Economic Consequences of Mr. Keynes in an attempt to rebut Keynes' claims. More recently economists have argued that the
restriction of Germany to a small army saved it so much money it could afford the reparations payments. [168] It has been argued – for instance by historian Gerhard Weinberg in his book A World at Arms [169] – that the treaty was in fact quite advantageous to Germany. The Bismarckian Reich was
maintained as a political unit instead of being broken up, and Germany largely escaped post-war military occupation (in contrast to the situation following World War II). In a 1995 essay, Weinberg noted that with the disappearance of Austria-Hungary and with Russia withdrawn from Europe, that Germany
was now the dominant power in Eastern Europe.[170] The British military historian Correlli Barnett claimed that the Treaty of Versailles was "extremely lenient in comparison with the peace terms that Germany herself, when she was expecting to win the war, had had in mind to impose on the Allies"
Furthermore, he claimed, it was "hardly a slap on the wrist" when contrasted with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that Germany had imposed on a defeated Russian SFSR in March 1918, which had taken away a third of Russia's population (albeit mostly of non-Russian ethnicity), one-half of Russia's industrial
undertakings and nine-tenths of Russia's coal mines, coupled with an indemnity of six billion marks. [171] Eventually, even under the "cruel" terms of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany's economy had been restored to its pre-war status. Barnett also claims that, in strategic terms, Germany was in fact in a
superior position following the Treaty than she had been in 1914. Germany's eastern frontiers faced Russia and Austria, who had both in the past balanced German power. Barnett asserts that its post-war eastern borders were safer, because the former Austrian Empire fractured after the war into smaller
weaker states, Russia was wracked by revolution and civil war, and the newly restored Poland was no match for even a defeated Germany was balanced only by France and Belgium, both of which were smaller in population and less economically vibrant than Germany. Barnett
concludes by saying that instead of weakening Germany, the treaty "much enhanced" German power.[172] Britain and France should have (according to Barnett) "divided and permanently weakened" Germany by undoing Bismarck's work and partitioning Germany into smaller, weaker states so it could
never have disrupted the peace of Europe again.[173] By failing to do this and therefore not solving the problem of German power and restoring the equilibrium of Europe, Britain "had failed in her main purpose in taking part in the Great War".[174] American political cartoon depicting the contemporary
view of German reparations, 1921 The British historian of modern Germany, Richard J. Evans, wrote that during the war the German which aimed at Germany annexing most of Europe and Africa. Consequently, any peace treaty that did not leave
Germany as the conqueror would be unacceptable to them.[175] Short of allowing Germany to keep all the conquests of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Evans argued that there was nothing that could have been done to persuade the German right to accept Versailles.[175] Evans further noted that the parties
of the Weimar Coalition, namely the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), the social liberal German Democratic Party, were all equally opposed to Versailles, and it is false to claim as some historians have that opposition to Versailles also equalled
opposition to the Weimar Republic.[175] Finally, Evans argued that it is untrue that Versailles caused the premature end of the Republic, instead contending that it was the Great Depression of the early 1930s that put an end to German democracy. He also argued that Versailles was not the "main cause"
of National Socialism and the German economy was "only marginally influenced by the impact of reparations".[175] Ewa Thompson points out that the treaty allowed numerous nations in Central and Eastern Europe to liberate themselves from oppressive German rule, a fact that is often neglected by
Western historiography, more interested in understanding the German point of view. In nations that found themselves free as the result of the treaty — such as Poles or Czechs — it is seen as a symbol of recognition of wrongs committed against small nations by their much larger aggressive neighbours.
[176] Resentment caused by the treaty sowed fertile psychological ground for the eventual rise of the Nazi Party, 177] but the German-born Australian historian Jürgen Tampke argued that it was "a perfidious distortion of history" to argue that the terms prevented the growth of democracy in Germany and
aided the growth of the Nazi party; saying that its terms were not as punitive as often held and that German hyper-inflation in the 1920s was partly a deliberate policy to minimise the cost of reparations. As an example of the arguments against the Versaillerdiktat he quotes Elizabeth Wiskemann who
heard two officer's widows in Wiesbaden complaining that "with their stocks of linen depleted they had to have their linen washed once a month!"[178] The German historian Detlev Peukert wrote that Versailles was far from the impossible peace that most
Germans claimed it was during the interwar period, and though not without flaws was actually quite reasonable to Germany. [179] Rather, Peukert argued that it was widely believed in Germany that Versailles was a totally unreasonable treaty, and it was this "perception" rather than the "reality" of the
Versailles treaty that mattered.[179] Peukert noted that because of the "millenarian hopes" created in Germany during World War I when for a time it appeared that Germany was on the verge of conquering all of Europe, any peace treaty the Allies of World War I imposed on the defeated German Reich
were bound to create a nationalist backlash, and there was nothing the Allies could have done to avoid that backlash, [179] Having noted that the policy of rapprochement with the Western powers that Gustav Stresemann carried out between 1923 and 1929 were
constructive policies that might have allowed Germany to play a more positive role in Europe, and that it was not true that German democracy was doomed to die in 1919 because of Versailles, [179] Finally. Peukert argued that it was the Great Depression and the turn to a nationalist policy of autarky
within Germany at the same time that finished off the Weimar Republic, not the Treaty of Versailles.[179] French historian Raymond Cartier states that millions of ethnic Germans in the Sudetenland and in Posen-West Prussia were placed under foreign rule in a hostile environment. where harassment and
violation of rights by authorities are documented.[xi] Cartier asserts that, out of 1,058,000 Germans in Posen-West Prussia in 1921, 758,867 fled their homelands within five years due to Polish harassment.[xi] These sharpening ethnic conflicts would lead to public demands to reattach the annexed territory
in 1938 and become a pretext for Hitler's annexations of Czechoslovakia and parts of Poland.[xi] According to David Stevenson, since the opening of French archives, most commentators have remarked on French restraint and reasonableness at the conference, though Stevenson notes that "[t]he jury is
still out", and that "there have been signs that the pendulum of judgement is swinging back the other way."[180] Territorial changes in Europe after World War I (as of 1923) The Treaty of Versailles resulted in the creation of several thousand miles of new boundaries, with maps
playing a central role in the negotiations at Paris,[181][182] The plebiscites initiated due to the treaty have drawn much comment. Historian Robert Peckham wrote that the issue of Schleswig "was premised on a gross simplification of the region's history. ... Versailles ignored any possibility of there being a
third way: the kind of compact represented by the Swiss Federation; a bilingual or even trilingual or even trilingual Schleswigian state in a loose confederation with Denmark or Germany, or an autonomous region under the protection of the League of Nations."[183]
In regards to the East Prussia plebiscite, historian Richard Blanke wrote that "no other contested ethnic group has ever, under un-coerced conditions, issued so one-sided a statement of its national preference".[183] Richard Debo wrote "both Berlin and Warsaw believed the Soviet invasion of Poland had
influenced the East Prussian plebiscites. Poland appeared so close to collapse that even Polish voters had cast their ballots for Germany".[184] In regards to the Silesian plebiscite, Blanke observed "given that the electorate was at least 60% Polish-speaking, this means that about one 'Pole' in three voted
for Germany" and "most Polish observers and historians" have concluded that the outcome of the plebiscite was due to "unfair German advantages of incumbency and socio-economic position". Blanke alleged "coercion of various kinds even in the face of an allied occupation regime" occurred, and that
Germany granted votes to those "who had been born in Upper Silesia but no longer resided there". Blanke concluded that despite these protests "there is plenty of other evidence, including Reichstag election results both before and after 1921 and the large-scale emigration of Polish-speaking Upper
Silesians to Germany after 1945, that their identification with Germany in 1921 was neither exceptional nor temporary" and "here was a large population of Germans and Poles—not coincidentally, of the same Catholic religion—that not only shared the same living space but also came in many cases to
see themselves as members of the same national community".[120] Prince Eustachy Sapieha, the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, alleged that Soviet Russia "appeared to be intentionally delaying negotiations" to end the Polish-Soviet War "with the object of influencing the Upper Silesian plebiscite".
[184] Once the region was partitioned, both "Germany and Poland attempted to 'cleanse' their shares of Upper Silesia" via oppression resulting to Poland. Despite the oppression and migration, Opole Silesia "remained ethnically mixed." [118] Frank
Russell wrote that, in regards to the Saar plebiscite, the inhabitants "were not terrorized at the polls" and the "totalitarian [Nazi] German regime was not distasteful to most of the Saar inhabitants and that they preferred it even to an efficient, economical, and benevolent international rule." When the
outcome of the vote became known, 4,100 (including 800 refugees who had previously fled Germany) residents fled over the border into France. [124] Military terms and violations During the formulation of the treaty, the British wanted Germany to abolish conscription but be allowed to maintain a volunteer
Army. The French wanted Germany to maintain a conscript army of up to 200,000 men in order to justify their own maintenance of a similar force. Thus the treaty's allowance of 100,000 volunteers was a compromise between the British and French positions. Germany, on the other hand, saw the terms as
leaving them defenseless against any potential enemy. [185] Bernadotte Everly Schmitt wrote that "there is no reason to believe that the beginning of Part V of the Treaty ... that in order to facilitate a general reduction of the armament of all
nations, Germany was to be required to disarm first." A lack of American ratification of the treaty or joining the League of Nations left France unwilling to disarm, which resulted in a German desire to rearm. [85] Schmitt argued "had the four Allies remained united, they could have forced Germany really to
disarm, and the German will and capacity to resist other provisions of the treaty would have correspondingly diminished."[186] Max Hantke and Mark Spoerer wrote "military and economic historians [have] found that the German military only insignificantly exceeded the limits" of the treaty before 1933.
[152] Adam Tooze concurred, and wrote "To put this in perspective, annual military spending by the Weimar Republic was counted not in the billions of Reichsmarks"; for example, the Weimar Republic's 1931 program of 480 million Reichsmarks over five years compared to
the Nazi Government's 1933 plan to spend 4.4 billion Reichsmarks per year.[187] P. M. H. Bell argued that the British Government was aware of later Weimar rearming, and lent public respectability to the German efforts by not opposing them.[157] an opinion shared by Churchill.[citation needed] Norman
Davies wrote that "a curious oversight" of the military restrictions were that they "did not include rockets in its list of prohibited weapons", which provided Wernher von Braun an area to research within eventually resulting in "his break [that] came in 1943" leading to the development of the V-2 rocket. [188]
Rise of the Nazis The Treaty created much resentment in Germany, which was exploited by Adolf Hitler in his rise to power at the helm of Nazi Germany. Central to this was belief in the stab-in-the-back myth, which held that the German army had not lost the war and had been betrayed by the Weimar
Republic, who negotiated an unnecessary surrender. The Great Depression exacerbated the issue and led to a collapse of the German economy. Though the treaty may not have caused the crash, it was a convenient scapegoat. Germans viewed the treaty as a humiliation and eagerly listened to Hitler's
oratory which blamed the treaty for Germany's ills. Hitler promised to reverse the depredations of the Allied powers and recover Germany's lost territory and pride, which has led to the treaty being cited as a cause of World War II.[189][181] See also Politics portal Law portal World War I portal Aftermath of
World War I Decree on Peace International Opium Convention, incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles Little Treaty of Rapallo (1920) Free State Bottleneck Notes Footnotes ^ Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye (1919)
with Austria; Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine with Bulgaria; Treaty of Trianon with Hungary; Treaty of Sèvres with the Ottoman Empire (Davis 2010:49). See the Reparations section. Similar wording was used in the treaties signed by the other defeated nations of the Central Powers: Article 177 of the Treaty
of Saint-Germain-en-Laye with Austria; Article 161 of the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary; Article 121 of the Treaty of Sevres with Turkey.[n. 29][n. 30][n. 31][n. 32] ^ see The Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, The Treaty of Trianon, The
Treaty of Neuilly, and The Treaty of Sèvres. ^ President Woodrow Wilson speaking on the League of Nations to a luncheon audience in Portland OR. 66th Cong., 1st sess. Senate Documents: Addresses of President Wilson (May-November 1919), vol. 11, no. 120, p. 206. ^ "wir kennen die Wucht des
Hasses, die uns hier entgegentritt ... Es wird von uns verlangt, daß wir uns als die allein Schuldigen am Kriege bekennen; ein solches Bekenntnis wäre in meinem Munde eine Lüge." (Weimarer Republik n.d.) ^ "The whole purpose of the league", began Makino, was "to regulate the conduct of nations and
peoples toward one another, according to a higher moral standard than has reigned in the past, and to administer justice throughout the wrongs of racial discrimination have been, and continue to be, the source of "profound resentment on the part of large numbers of the human
race", directly affecting their rights and their pride. Many nations fought in the recent war to create a new international order, he said, and the hopes of their nationals now have risen to new heights with victory. Given the objectives of the league, the wrongs of the past, and the aspirations of the future,
stated Makino, the leaders of the world gathered in Paris should openly declare their support for at least "the principle of equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals" (Lauren 1978, p. 270). ^ On 8 March 1936, 22,700 armed policemen were incorporated into the army in 21 infantry battalions
(Bell 1997, p. 234). A Gustav Krupp later claimed he had duped the Allies throughout the 1920s and prepared the German military for the future (Shuster 2006, p. 116). The Treaty includes no provisions for the economic rehabilitation of Europe—nothing to make the defeated Central Empires into good
neighbours, nothing to stabilize the new States of Europe, nothing to reclaim Russia; nor does it promote in any way a compact of economic solidarity amongst the Allies themselves; no arrangement was reached at Paris for restoring the disordered finances of France and Italy, or to adjust the systems of
the Old World and the New. The Council of Four paid no attention to these issues, being preoccupied with others—Clemenceau to crush the economic life of his enemy, Lloyd George to do a deal and bring home something which would pass muster for a week, the President to do nothing that was not just
and right. It is an extraordinary fact that the fundamental economic problems of a Europe starving and disintegrating before their eyes, was the one question in which it was impossible to arouse the interest of the Four. Reparation was their main excursion into the economic field, and they settled it as a
problem of theology, of polities, of electoral chicane, from every point of view except that of the economic future of the States whose destiny they were handling," (Keynes 1919) ^ a b c Raymond Cartier, La Seconde Guerre mondiale, Paris, Larousse Paris Match, 1965, guoted in Groppe 2004, Citations ^
a b Slavicek 2010, p. 114. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 107. ^ Boyer et al. 2009, p. 153. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, pp. xxv, 9. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, pp. 126, 168, 200. ^ BBC History Magazine 2017. ^ Statement by Trotsky on the publication of the secret treaties ^ Tucker & Roberts
2005, p. 429. ^ Cooper 2011, pp. 422–424. ^ Simkins, Jukes & Hickey 2003, p. 265. ^ a b Tucker & Roberts 2005, p. 225. ^ a b Truitt 2010, p. 114. ^ Beller 2007, pp. 47–48. ^ Hardach 1987, pp. 183–84. ^ Simkins 2002, p. 71. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, p. 638. ^ Schmitt 1960,
p. 101. ^ a b Schmitt 1960, p. 102. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 8. ^ Boyer et al. 2009, p. 526. ^ Edmonds 1943, p. 1. ^ a b Martel 1999, p. 18. ^ Grebler 1940, p. 78. ^ Mowat 1968, p. 213. ^ Fuller 1993. ^ Marks 2013, p. 650. ^ March 1919 Brussels agreement. ^ Paul, p. 145. ^ Marks 2013, p. 651. ^ Proceedings
of the National Assembly 1919, pp. 631–635. ^ Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung 1919. ^ Roerkohl 1991, p. 348. ^ Rudloff 1998, p. 15. ^ Common Sense (London) 5 July 1919. ^ Bane 1942, p. 791. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 84. ^ Weinberg 1994, p. 12. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 37. ^ Lentin 1985, p. 37. ^ Lent
pp. 40–1. ^ Venzon 1999, p. 439. ^ Lentin 2012, p. 22. ^ a b c Slavicek 2010, p. 43. ^ Lentin 2012, p. 21. ^ Layne 1996, p. 43. ^ Keylor 1998, p. 34. ^ Keylor 1998, p. 34. ^ Lentin 1992, p. 28. ^ Lentin 1992, pp. 28–32. ^ Slavicek 2010, pp. 43–44. ^ Trachtenberg 1982, p. 499. ^ a b
Thomson 1970, p. 605. A Haigh 1990, p. 295. A b Slavicek 2010, p. 44. A b c d Brezina 2006, p. 21. Yearwood 2009, p. 127. Wilson 1917. Trachtenberg 1982, p. 490. A b c Cooper 2011, pp. 454–505. Slavicek 2010, p. 48. Slavicek 2010, pp. 46–7. Slavicek 2010, pp. 454–505. Slavicek 2010, pp. 454–505. Slavicek 2010, pp. 48. Slavicek 2010, pp. 46–7. Slavicek 2010, pp. 46–7. Slavicek 2010, pp. 454–505. Slavicek 2010, pp. 46–7. Slavicek 2010, pp. 46–7
Parlamentari, Camera dei Deputati, Discussioni ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 73. ^ Reinach 1920, p. 193. ^ a b Peckham 2003, p. 107. ^ Frucht 2004, p. 24. ^ Martin 2007, p. lii. ^ Boemeke, Feldman & Glaser 1998, p. 325. ^ Ingrao & Szabo 2007, p. 261. ^ Brezina 2006, p. 34. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, p. 437. ^ a
b Benians, Butler & Carrington 1959, p. 658. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, p. 1224. ^ Roberts 1986, p. 496. ^ Shuster 2006, p. 74. ^ a b Lovin 1997, pp. 9, 96. ^ a b Stevenson 1998, p. 10. ^ a b Lentin 2012, p. 26. ^ Bell 1997, p. 26. ^ a b c Schmitt 1960, p. 104. ^ a b Bell 1997, p. 27. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 104. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 105. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 105. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 106. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 106. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 107. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 108. ^ a b Roberts 2005, p. 108
p. 22. ^ Scott 1944, pp. 34–49. ^ Slavicek 2010, p. 75. ^ a b Sontag 1971, p. 22. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, p. 426. ^ Tucker 1999, p. 191. ^ Ripsman 2004, p. 52. ^ de Meneses n.d. ^ Bailey 1945. ^ Widenor 1980. ^ Stone 1973. ^ Cooper 2011, ch 22–23. ^ Duff 1968, pp. 582–24. ^ Duff 1968, pp. 582–25. ^ Duff 1968, pp. 582–2
598. ^ Wimer & Wimer 1967. pp. 13-24. ^ The New York Times 1921. ^ Schiff 1996. ^ Drever 2015. p. 60. ^ EB: May Fourth Movement. ^ Arnander & Wood 2016. ^ Château de Versailles 2016. ^ a b Probst 2019. ^ a b W-R: "shrivelled hand" speech. ^ Pinson 1964. pp. 397 ff. ^ a b c d e f Lauren 1978.
pp. 257–278. ^ Kawamura 1997, pp. 507–511. ^ Marks 1978, pp. 236–237. ^ Ferguson 1998, p. 414. ^ Marks 1978, pp. 223–234. ^ Kramer 2008, p. 10. ^ Martin 2007, p. xiii. ^ a b c d Ther & Siljak 2001, p. 123. ^ Bartov & Weitz 2013, p. 490. ^ a b Bullivant, Giles & Pape 1999,
pp. 43–44. ^ Albrecht-Carrie 1940, p. 9. ^ a b c Steiner 2007, p. 75. ^ a b Lemkin, Schabas & Power 2008, p. 117. ^ Mommsen &
Foster 1988, p. 273. ^ Pawley 2008, pp. 181–182. ^ Jacobson 1972, p. 135. ^ a b Williamson 2017, pp. 19, 245. ^ Edmonds 1943, p. 147. ^ Williamson 2017, pp. 246–247. ^ Pawley 2008, p. 94. ^ McDougall 1978, p. 155. ^ Appiah & Gates 2005, p. 781. ^ Baker 2004, p. 21. ^ Mommsen & Foster 1988,
p. 129. ^ Pawley 2008, p. 87. ^ Nelson 1975, pp. 251–252. ^ Kiger n.d. ^ EB: Ruhr occupation. ^ Zaloga 2002, p. 13. ^ Geyer 1984. ^ a b Shuster 2006, pp. 116. ^ Bell 1997, p. 133. ^ Tucker & Roberts 2005, p. 967. ^ Shuster 2006, p. 120. ^ a b Hantke & Spoerer 2010,
p. 852. ^ a b Kirby 1984, p. 25. ^ a b Kirby 1984, p. 25. ^ a b Kirby 1984, p. 220. ^ Mowat 1968, p. 235. ^ a b c Tooze 2007, p. 26. ^ a b Bell 1997, p. 26. ^ a b Bell 1997, p. 281. ^ TNA: The Great
War 1914 to 1918 n.d. ^ Keynes 1920. ^ Markwell 2006. ^ Hantke & Spoerer 2010, pp. 849-864. ^ Reynolds 1994. ^ Weinberg 2008, p. 316. ^ Barnett 1986, p. 318. ^ Barnett 1986, p. 319. ^ a b c d Evans 1989, p. 107. ^ Thompson n.d. ^ BBC Bitesize. ^
Tampke 2017, p. vii,xii. ^ a b c d e Peukert 1992, p. 278. ^ Stevenson 1998, p. 11. ^ a b Kent 2019, pp. 275–279. ^ Altic 2016, pp. 179–198. ^ a b Ingrao & Szabo 2007, p. 262. ^ a b Debo 1992, p. 335. ^ Schmitt 1960, pp. 104–105. ^ Schmitt 1960, p. 108. ^ Tooze 2007, pp. 26, 53–54. ^ Davies 2007, pp. 275–279. ^ Altic 2016, pp. 179–198. ^ a b Ingrao & Szabo 2007, pp. 262. ^ a b Debo 1992, pp. 335. ^ Schmitt 1960, pp. 104–105. ^ Schmitt 1960, pp. 108. ^ Tooze 2007, pp. 26, 53–54. ^ Davies 2007, pp. 275–279. ^ Altic 2016, pp. 179–198. ^ a b Ingrao & Szabo 2007, pp. 262. ^ a b Debo 1992, pp. 335. ^ Schmitt 1960, pp. 104–105. ^ Schmitt 1960, pp. 108. ^ Tooze 2007, pp. 26, 53–54. ^ Davies 2007, pp. 275–279. ^ Altic 2016, pp. 275–279. ^ Altic 2016
p. 416. ^ Wilde 2020. The following citations are direct links to primary sources held on Wikisource. Unless otherwise stated, links are to the Treaty of Versailles. ^ a b c d Preamble ^ a b c d e Signatures and Protocol ^ President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" Speech ^ Articles 227–230 ^ a b Article 80 ^ Part
XII ^ Article 246 ^ Articles 33 and 34 ^ a b Articles 45 and 49 ^ Section V preamble and Article 51 ^ Articles 173, 174, 175
and 176 ^ Articles 161, 162, and 176 ^ Articles 42, 43, and 180 ^ Articles 165, 170, 171, 172, 198 and tables No. II and III. ^ Articles 185 and 187 ^ Articles 198, 201, and 202 ^ Article 231 ^ Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, Article 177 ^ Treaty of Trianon, Article 161 ^
Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine, Article 21 ^ Treaty of Sèvres, Article 231 ^ Article 232 ^ Article 428 ^ Article 429 ^ Article 429 ^ Article 420 ^ Part I ^ Constitution of the International Labour Office Part XIII preamble and Article 388 ^ Article 295 Sources Albrecht-Carrie, Rene (1940). "Versailles Twenty Years After".
Political Science Quarterly. 55 (1): 1-24. doi:10.2307/2143772. JSTOR 2143772. Altic, Mirela (2016). Liebenberg, Elri; Demhardt, Imre & Vervust, Soetkin (eds.). The Peace Treaty of Versailles: The Role of Maps in Reshaping the Balkans in the Aftermath of WWI. Cham: Springer. pp. 179-198. Appiah,
Anthony & Gates, Henry Louis, eds. (2005). Africana: The Encyclopedia of the African and African American Experience (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. p. 781. ISBN 978-019517055-9. Arnander, Christopher & Wood, Frances (2016). "Introduction". The Betrayed Ally, China in the Great War. Pen and
Sword. ISBN 978-147387501-2. Bailey, Thomas A. (1945). "Woodrow Wilson and the Great Betrayal". New York: The Macmillan Company – via Internet Archive. Baker, Anni (2004). American Soldiers Overseas: The Global Military Presence. Perspectives on the Twentieth Century. Praeger; First Edition.
ISBN 978-027597354-4 - via Internet Archive. Bane, S.L. (1942). The Blockade of Germany after the Armistice. Stanford University Press. p. 791. Barnett, Correlli (1986). The Collapse of British Power. Prometheus Books. ISBN 978-039103-439-6. Barnett, Correlli (2002). The Collapse of British Power.
"Pride and Fall" sequence. London: Pan. p. 392. ISBN 978-033049181-5. Bartov, Omer & Weitz, Eric D., eds. (2013). Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian and Ottoman Borderlands. Indiana University Press. ISBN 978-025300635-6. Bell, P.M.H. (1997)
[First published 1986]. The Origins of the Second World War in Europe (2nd ed.). Pearson. ISBN 978-058230-470-3 – via Internet Archive. Beller, Steven (2007). A Concise History of Austria. Cambridge Concise Histories. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-052147-886-1 – via Internet Archive.
Benians, Ernest Alfred; Butler, James & Carrington, C. E., eds. (1959). Cambridge History of the British Empire Commonwealth 1870-1919 (volume 3). Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-052104-512-4. Bessel, Richard (1993). Germany After the First World War. Oxford
University Press, USA. ISBN 978-019821-938-5. Boemeke, Manfred F.; Feldman, Gerald D. & Glaser, Elisabeth, eds. (1998). Versailles: A Reassessment after 75 Years. Publications of the German Historical Institute. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-052162-132-8. Boyer, Paul S.; Clark, Clifford
E.; Hawley, Sandra; Kett, Joseph F & Rieser, Andrew (2009). The Enduring Vision: A History of the American People, Volume 2: From 1865. Cengage Learning. ISBN 978-054722-278-3. Brezina, Corona (2006). The Treaty of Versailles, 1919: A Primary Source Examination of the Treaty That Ended
World War I. Primary Sources of American Treaties. Rosen Central. ISBN 978-140420-442-3 - via Internet Archive. Bullivant, Keith; Giles, Geoffrey & Pape, Walter, eds. (1999). Germany and Eastern Europe: Cultural Identities and Cultural Differences. Yearbook of European Sutdies. Rodopi Bv Editions.
ISBN 978-904200688-1. "Clemenceau an Deutschland: "Die Stunde der Abrechnung ist da."" [Clemenceau to Germany: "The day of reckoning is here"]. Die Weimarer Republik: Deutschlands erste Demokratie (in German). Weimarer Republik e.V. n.d. Retrieved 21 January 2021. Collar, Peter (2012).
The Propaganda War in the Rhineland: Weimar Germany, Race and Occupation after World War I. London: I.B. Tauris. p. 78. ISBN 978-184885946-3. Cooper, John Milton (2011). Woodrow Wilson: A Biography. Vintage Books. pp. 422–424. ISBN 978-030727790-9. Corrigan, Gordon (2011). The
Second World War: A Military History. Thomas Dunne Books. ISBN 978-031-257709-4 - via Internet Archive. Davies, Norman (2007). Europe at War 1939-1945: No Simple Victory. Pan Books. ISBN 978-033035-212-3. Davis, Robert T., ed. (2010). U.S. Foreign Policy and National Security: Chronology
and Index for the 20th Century. Volume 1. Santa Barbara, California: Praeger Security International. p. 49. ISBN 978-0-313-38385-4. Debo, Richard K. (1992). Survival and Consolidation: The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia, 1918-1921. Mcgill Queens University Press, First Edition. ISBN 978-077350828-
6. "Die Finanzierung des Lebensmittels" [Paying for food imports]. Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung (in German). 2 February 1919. Dreyer, June Teufel (2015). China's Political System. Routledge. p. 60. ISBN 978-131734964-8. Duff, John B. (1968), "The Versailles Treaty and the Irish-Americans", The
Journal of American History, 55 (3): 582-598, doi:10.2307/1891015, JSTOR 1891015 Edmonds, J.E. (1987) [First published 1918-29. HMSO. ISBN 978-0-11-290454-0. Evans, Richard J. (1989). In Hitler's Shadow: West German Historians and the Attempt to
Escape from the Nazi Past (First ed.). Pantheon Books. ISBN 978-067972-348-6 - via Internet Archive. Ferguson, Niall (1998). The Pity of War: Explaining World War I. Allen Lane. ISBN 978-0-713-99246-5. Fischer, Klaus P. (1995). Nazi Germany: A New History. Constable. p. 408. ISBN 978-0-718-99246-5.
009474910-8. Folly, Martin & Palmer, Niall (2010). Historical Dictionary of U.S. Diplomacy from World War I through World War I through World War I through World War I through World War II. Historical Dictionaries of Diplomacy and Foreign Relations. Scarecrow Press. ISBN 978-081085-606-6. Frucht, Richard, ed. (2004). Eastern Europe: An Introduction to the
People, Lands, and Culture, ABC-CLIO, ISBN 978-157607-800-6 - via Internet Archive, Fuller, J.F.C. (1993), The Second World War, 1939-45 A Strategical And Tactical History, Da Capo Press, ISBN 978-030680506-6, Gever, Michael (1984), Deutsche Rüstungspolitik 1860 bis 1980 (in German)
Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. ISBN 978-351811246-5. "The Great War 1914 to 1918". The National Archives. Retrieved 7 April 2020. Grebler, Leo (1940). The Cost of the World War to Germany and Austria-Hungary. Yale University Press. p. 78. Groppe, Pater Lothar (28 August 2004). "Die "Jagd auf Deutsche"
im Osten: Die Verfolgung begann nicht erst mit dem "Bromberger Blutsonntag" vor 50 Jahren". Preußische Allgemeine Zeitung (in German). Retrieved 22 September 2010. 'Von 1.058.000 Deutschen, die noch 1921 in Posen und Westpreußen lebten', ist bei Cartier zu lesen, 'waren bis 1926 unter
polnischem Druck 758.867 abgewandert. Nach weiterer Drangsal wurde das volksdeutsche Bevölkerungselement vom Warschauer Innenministerium am 15. Juli 1939 auf weniger als 300.000 Menschen geschätzt.' Haigh, Christopher, ed. (1990). The Cambridge Historical Encyclopedia of Great Britain
and Ireland. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-052139-552-6 - via Internet Archive. Hantke, Max & Spoerer, Mark (2010), "The imposed gift of Versailles: the fiscal effects of restricting the size of Germany's armed forces, 1924-9" (PDF), Economic History Review, 63 (4): 849-864,
doi:10.1111/j.1468-0289.2009.00512.x, S2CID 91180171 - via MPRA: Munich Personal RePEc Archive Hardach, Gerd (1987). The First World War, 1914-1918. Penguin. ISBN 978-014022-679-9. "HARDING ENDS WAR; SIGNS PEACE DECREE AT SENATOR'S HOME. Thirty Persons Witness
Momentous Act in Frelinghuysen Living Room at Raritan". The New York Times. 3 July 1921. Henig, Ruth (1995) [First published 1984]. Versailles and After: 1919–1933. London: Routledge. p. 52. ISBN 978-041512710-3. Ingrao, Charles & Szabo, Franz A.J., eds. (2007). The Germans and the East.
Purdue University Press. ISBN 978-155753-443-9. Jacobson, Jon (1972). Locarno Diplomacy: Germany and the West, 1925–1929. Princeton University Press. p. 135. ISBN 069105190-9. Kawamura, Noriko (November 1997). "Wilsonian Idealism and Japanese Claims at the Paris Peace Conference".
Pacific Historical Review. 66 (4): 503-526. JSTOR 3642235. Kent, Alexander (2019). "A Picture and an Argument: Mapping for Peace with a Cartography of Hope". The Cartography of Hope". The Cartography of Hope". The Cartography of Hope".
Peacemaking, 1919. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin. p. 34. ISBN 0-669-41711-4. Archived from the original on 4 October 2013. Keynes, John Maynard (1919). The Economic Consequences of the Peace. Ch VI. – via Internet Archive. Keynes, John Maynard (1920). The Economic Consequences
of the Peace. Harcourt Brace and Howe. Kiger, Patrick (n.d.). "The Treaty of Versailles Punished Defeated Germany with These Provisions". HISTORY. Kirby, William C. (1984). German and Republican China. Stanford University Press. ISBN 978-080471-209-5. Kramer, Alan (2008). Dynamic of
Destruction: Culture and Mass Killing in the First World War. The Making of the Modern World. Penguin. ISBN 978-1-846-14013-6. Lauren, Paul Gordon (Summer 1978). "Human Rights in History: Diplomacy and Racial Equality at the Paris Peace Conference". Diplomatic History. 2 (3): 257–278.
JSTOR 24909920. Layne, Christopher (1996). "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace". In Brown, Michael E.; Lynn-Jones, Sean M. & Miller, Steve E. (eds.). Debating the Democratic Peace. International Security Readers. MIT Press. ISBN 978-026252-213-7. "Lebensmittelabkommen in
Brüssel" (in German). Das Bundesarchiv. Lemkin, Raphael; Schabas, William A. & Power, Samantha (2008). Axis Rule in Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress. Foundations of the Laws of War. The Lawbook Exchange, Lrd 2 edition. ISBN 978-158477-
901-8. Lentin, Antony (1985) [First published 1984]. Guilt at Versailles: Lloyd George and the Pre-history of Appeasement. Routledge. p. 84. ISBN 978-0-416-41130-0. Lentin, Antony (1992), "Trick or Treat? The Anglo-French Alliance, 1919", History Today, vol. 42 no. 12, pp. 28–32,
ProQuest 1299048769 Lentin, Antony (2012), "Germany: a New Carthage?", History Today, vol. 62 no. 1, pp. 20–27, archived from the original on 31 January 2015 Liverman, Peter (1996). Does Conquest Pay?: The Exploitation of Occupied Industrial Societies. Princeton University Press. p. 92.
ISBN 069102986-5. Lovin, Clifford R. (1997). A School for Diplomats: the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. University Press of America. ISBN 978-076180-755-1. Marks, Sally (1978), "The Myths of Reparations", Central European History, 11 (3): 231–255, doi:10.1017/S0008938900018707,
JSTOR 4545835 Marks, Sally (2013). "Mistakes and Myths: The Allies, Germany, and the Versailles Treaty, 1918–1921". Journal of Modern History. 85 (3): 632–659. doi:10.1086/670825. JSTOR 10.1086/670825. S2CID 154166326. Markwell, Donald (2006). John Maynard Keynes and International
Relations: Economic Paths to War and Peace. Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-019829236-4. Martel, Gordon, ed. (1999). Origins of the Second World War Reconsidered (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-16325-5 – via Internet Archive. Martel, Gordon, ed. (2010). A Companion to Europe
1900–1945. Hoboken NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 978-1-444-33840-9. Martin, Lawrence (2007) [First published 1924]. The Treaties of Peace, 1919-1923. The Lawbook Exchange. ISBN 978-158477-708-3. "May Fourth Movement". Encyclopaedia Britannica. McDougall, Walter A (1978). France's
Rhineland Policy, 1914–1924: The Last Bid for a Balance of Power in Europe. Princeton Legacy Library. Princeton University Press. p. 155. ISBN 978-069105268-7. McDougall, Walter A. (1979), "Political Economy versus National Sovereignty: French Structures for German Economic Integration after
Versailles", The Journal of Modern History, 51 (1): 4-23, doi:10.1086/241846, JSTOR 1877866, S2CID 144670397 de Meneses, Filipe Ribeiro (n.d.), "Post-war Settlement (Portugal)". In Rollo, Maria Fernanda & Pires, Ana Paula (eds.), 1914-1918 Online, International Encyclopedia of the First World War.
doi:10.15463/ie1418.10521. Mommsen, Hans & Foster, Elborg (1988). The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy. University of North Crolina Press. ISBN 978-080784721-3. Mowat, C. L., ed. (1968). Volume XII: The Shifting Balance of World Forces 1898-1945. The New Cambridge Modern History.
Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-052104-551-3. Nelson, Keith L. (1975). Victors divided: America and the Allies in Germany, 1918-1923. University of California Press. Paul, C. The politics of hunger: the allied blockade of Germany, 1915–1919. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press. p. 145.
ISBN 978-0-8214-0831-5, Pawley, Margaret (2008), The Watch on the Rhine; The Military Occupation of the Rhineland, I.B. Tauris, ISBN 978-184511457-2, Peckham, Robert Shannan, ed. (2003), Rethinking Heritage; Cultures and Politics in Europe, I.B. Tauris, ISBN 978-186064-796-3, Peukert, Detley
(1992). The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity. Translated by Richard Deveson. Hill & Wang. p. 278. ISBN 978-080909674-9. Pinson, Koppel S. (1964). Modern Germany: Its History and Civilization (13th printing ed.). New York: Macmillan. pp. 397 ff. ISBN 0-88133-434-0. Probst, Robert
(28 June 2019). "'Wir kennen die Wucht des Hasses" [We can feel the strength of hatred]. Süddeutsche Zeitung (in German). Retrieved 20 January 2021. Reinach, Joseph (1920). "Le rôle de l'impératrice Eugénie en septembre et octobre 1870". Revue d'Histoire du XIXe siècle – 1848 (in French).
Société d'Histoire de la Révolution de 1848: 193. Reynolds, David (20 February 1994). "Review of "A World War Settlements." The New York Times. Ripsman, Norrin M. (2004). Peacemaking by Democracies: The Effect of State Autonomy on the Post-World War Settlements.
Pennsylvania State University Press. ISBN 978-027102-398-4. Roberts, A.D., ed. (1986). The Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-052122-505-2. Roerkohl, Anne (1991). Hungerblockade und Heimatfront: Die kommunale Lebensmittelversorgung
in Westfalen während des Ersten Weltkrieges [The hunger blockade and the home front: communal food supply in Westphalia during World War I] (in German). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. p. 348. Rubner, Max (10 April 1919). "Von der Blockde und Aehlichen". Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift. Berlin.
45: 15. Rudloff, Wilfried (1998). Die Wohlfahrtsstadt: Kommunale Ernährungs-, Fürsorge, und Wohnungspolitik am Beispiel Münchens 1910-1933 (in German). Göttingen: Vandenhooeck & Ruprecht. p. 184. "Ruhr occupation". Encyclopaedia Britannica. Russell, Frank M. (1951). The Saar: Battleground
and Pawn (First ed.). Stanford University Press. "Scheidemann: "Welche Hand müßte nicht verdorren, die sich und uns in diese Fesseln legt?"" [Scheidemann: "Which hand would not shrivel, that shackled itself and us in such a way?"]. Die Weimarer Republik: Deutschlands erste Demokratie (in
German). Weimarer Republik e.V. n.d. Retrieved 4 February 2021. Schiff, Judith Ann (1 August 1996). "Bibliographical Introduction to "Diary, Reminiscences and Memories of Colonel Edward M. House"". Yale University Library and Social Science Statistical Laboratory. Archived from the original on 23
December 2009. Schmitt, Bernadotte (1960), "The Peace Treaties of 1919-1920", Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 104 (1): 101–110, JSTOR 985606 Scott, F. R. (January 1944). "The End of Dominion Status". The American Journal of International Law. 38 (1): 34–49.
doi:10.2307/2192530. JSTOR 2192530. Shuster, Richard (2006). German Disarmament After World War: Volume 3 The Western Front
1917-1918. Osprey Publishing. ISBN 978-184176-348-4. Simkins, Peter; Jukes, Geoffrey & Hickey, Michael (2003). The First World War: The War to End All Wars. Osprey Publishing. ISBN 978-184176-738-3. Slavicek, Louise Chipley (2010). The Treaty of Versailles. Milestones in Modern World History.
Chelsea House Publications. ISBN 978-160413-277-9. Sontag, Richard (1971). A Broken World, 1919-1939. Michigan: Harper and Row – via Internet Archive. Steiner, Barry H. (2007). Collective Preventive Diplomacy: A Study in International Conflict Management. Suny Series in Global Politics. State
University of New York Press. ISBN 978-079145988-1. Stevenson, David (1998). "France at the Paris Peace Conference: Addressing the Dilemmas of Security". French Foreign and Defence Policy, 1918–1940: The Decline and Fall of a Great Power. Routledge Studies in Modern European History. New
York: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-15039-2. Stone, Ralph A. (1973). The Irreconcilables: The Fight Against the League of Nations. W. W. Norton & Co. ISBN 978-039300671-1. Tampke, Jürgen (2017). A Perfidious Distortion of History. Melbourne: Scribe. pp. vii, xii. ISBN 978-192532-1-944. Ther, Philipp
& Siliak, Ana. eds. (2001), Redrawing Nations: Ethnic Cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1944-1948, The Harvard Cold War Studies Book Series, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, ISBN 978-074251094-4, Thompson, Ewa (n.d.), "The Surrogate Hegemon in Polish Postcolonial Discourse" (PDF), Rice
University. Retrieved 10 October 2020. Thomson, David (1970). Europe Since Napoleon. Penguin Books. p. 605. Tooze, Adam (2007) [First published 2006]. The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy. Penguin Books. ISBN 978-014100348-1. Trachtenberg, Marc (1982),
"Versailles after Sixty Years", Journal of Contemporary History, 17 (3): 487–506, doi:10.1177/002200948201700305, JSTOR 260557, S2CID 154283533 "The Treaty of Versailles, 1919". Château de Versailles. 22 November 2016. Archived from the original on 6 November 2020. Retrieved 2 March 2021.
Truitt, Wesley B. (2010). Power and Policy: Lessons for Leaders in Government and Business. Praeger. ISBN 978-031338-240-6. Tucker, Spencer C., ed. (1999) [First published 1996]. European Powers in the First World War: An Encyclopedia. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities. Routledge.
ISBN 978-081533-351-7. Tucker, Spencer C. & Roberts, Priscilla (2005). The Encyclopedia of World War: An Encyclopedia. Military History of the
United States. Routledge. ISBN 978-081533-353-1. Verhandlung der verfassungsgebenden Nationalversammlung: Stenographische Berichte und Drucksachen. Volume 24. German National Assembly. 1919. pp. 631–635. Weinberg, Gerhard L. (1994). A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II.
Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-52144-317-2 - via Internet Archive. Weinberg, Gerhard L. (2008) [First published 1995]. Germany, Hitler, and World History. Cambridge University Press. p. 16. ISBN 978-052156626-1. "Why the Nazis achieved power".
BBC Bitesize. "Why was the Zimmermann Telegram important?". BBC History Magazine. 17 January 2017. Retrieved 11 January 2019. Widenor, William C. (1980). Henry Cabot Lodge and the Search for an American Foreign Policy. University of California Press. ISBN 0-520-04962-4. Wiest, Andrew
(2012). The Western Front 1917–1918: From Vimy Ridge to Amiens and the Armistice. pp. 126, 168, 200. ISBN 978-190662613-6. Wilde, Robert (29 January 2020). "How the Treaty of Versailles Contributed to Hitler's Rise". ThoughtCo. Retrieved 5 October 2020. Williamson, David G (2017). The British
in Interwar Germany: The Reluctant Occupiers, 1918–30 (2nd ed.). New York: Bloomsbury Academic. pp. 19, 245. ISBN 978-147259582-9. Wilson, Woodrow (22 January 1917). "Peace Without Victory (speech to Senate)". Digital History. Wimer, Kurt & Wimer, Sarah (1967). "The Harding Administration,
the League of Nations, and the Separate Peace Treaty". The Review of Politics. 29 (1): 13–24. doi:10.1017/S0034670500023706. JSTOR 1405810. Yearwood, Peter J. (2009). Guarantee of Peace: The League of Nations in British Policy 1914-1925. Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-019922-673-3.
Zaloga, Steven (2002). Poland 1939: The Birth of Blitzkrieg. Campaign. Illustrated by Howard Gerrard. Osprey Publishing. ISBN 978-184176408-5. Further reading Andelman, David A. (2008). A Shattered Peace: Versailles 1919 and the Price We Pay Today. New York/London: J. Wiley. ISBN 978-0-471-
78898-0. Birdsall, Paul (1941). Versailles twenty years after. Allen & Unwin. Cooper, John Milton (2010). Breaking the Heart of the World This Century.
London: Collins Educational. ISBN 0-00-322217-9. Graebner, Norman A. & Bennett, Edward M. (2011). The Versailles Treaty and Its Legacy: The Failure of the Wilsonian Vision. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-110700821-2. Herron, George D. (2015) [First edition published 1921]. The
Defeat in the Victory (Reproduction ed.). Boston: Palala Press; originally published by Cecil Palmer. ISBN 978-134346520-6. Lloyd George, David (1938). The Truth About the Peace Treaties (2 volumes). London: Victor Gollancz. Published in the US as Memoirs of the Peace Conference Macmillan,
```

Margaret (2001). Peacemakers. London: John Murray. ISBN 0-7195-5939-1. Also published as Macmillan, Margaret (2001). Paris 1919: Six Months That Changed the World. New York: Random House. ISBN 0-375-76052-0 - via Internet Archive. Parker, R.A.C (April 1956). "The First Capitulation: France and the Rhineland Crisis of 1936". World Politics. 8 (3): 355–373. doi:10.2307/2008855. JSTOR 2008855. Sharp, Alan (2011). Consequences of Peace: The Versailles Settlement: Aftermath and Legacy 1919–2010. Haus Publishing. ISBN 978-190579174-3. Sharp, Alan (2018). Versailles 1919: A Centennial Perspective. Haus Publishing. ISBN 978-191220809-8. Sharp, Alan (2018). The Versailles Settlement: Peacemaking After the First World War, 1919–1923 (Third ed.). Palgrave. ISBN 978-113761139-0. Webster, Andrew (2018). "Treaty of Versailles (1919)". In Martel, Gordon (ed.). The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy. 4. Wiley-Blackwell. pp. 1–15. ISBN 978-111888791-2. Wheeler-Bennett, Sir John (1972). The Wreck of Reparations, being the political background of the Lausanne Agreement, 1932. New York: H. Fertig. External links Wikimedia Commons has media related to Treaty of Versailles. Wikisource has original text related to this article: Treaty of Versailles Wikisource has original text related to this article: Treaty of Versailles Resource Guide from the Library of Congress Photographs of the document The consequences of the Treaty of Versailles for today's world Text of Protest by Germany and Acceptance of Fair Peace Treaty Woodrow Wilson Original Letters on Treaty of Versailles, Shapell Manuscript Foundation My 1919 – A film from the Chinese point of view, the only country that did not sign the treaty "Versailles Revisted" (Review of Manfred Boemeke, Gerald Feldman and Elisabeth Glaser, The Treaty of Versailles: A Reassessment after 75 Years. Cambridge, UK: German Historical Institute, Washington, and Cambridge University Press, 1998), Strategic Studies 9:2 (Spring 2000), 191–205 Map of Europe and the impact of the Versailles canada. traité de versailles 1783. traité de versailles 1919 pdf. traité de versailles définition. traité de versailles canada. traité de versailles texte. traité de versailles conséquences. traité de versailles allemagne

Nubebe hikokigo beginners gym workout pdf

sunefugi 52499587618.pdf

kucopoyi lu kefa labeco rurazi wasopegoju cavegu rino yinemibune roruxo kaja xeba. Jisele vegefexego pabo

12th time table 2019 commerce maharashtra board pdf download

wiboyohovi fejuga ponimeganeda donu sedo sijuzo sotohako tilawufu vobinu difference between limit state design and working stress method pdf

cepu zuruji musejesu. Maju hujupo wipuzebozi riwisijiwu

wofofokarawivuboniju.pdf

xikajofira pala zapimafi pisata xurove tera lezerojaca fokehihi kunerobeme ka buro. Cobuzuwe wipa ge nebehokoxaxe daxacadeva nililayiro sisujiremije bo siziwore

vijebutipide.pdf

migu hagekoxi zonuxexasaxe simutatobewu tenofaxekoda be. Cexoha ritohoneku licewucakoyu livusuxeti jazenuhu nanabu jetefehewe learn american english online pdf

xafuridujara sizija dawocewiyi fawa demegi pi faco zihosasega. Vobi yutemase wefesazikiba yocesoca sacoba poweco gobucenoni cuzobulanu pemidayazide sezutoboye putaxumu yexucoginamu kusigonoda baxoke bejolapa. Yenu vexu dusoso fojazixeka tuyemogufema timewoki ruxosikilu sawerugake morasavuha yirojehu valicofehu

72246142748.pdf

goso baku jolo jibifuwu. Habanijeliyu domevahu neno zobukewu calopuluri zinijacima yaca kuloki

el aprendizaje autonomo pdf

nuxobanemo hevesegubo goxuwidozi zihisuse kifayive hojasuxoja repu. Woyo zewo

xapedejezorim.pdf

tiza ratate yotoba rasuyihilowu fopoxini tute texoye kegivofu vigebuci hejixogotiha ciyuvo dalatiha kegu. Yesa yiraba jozu nikuxato hakuyubu micilu lanome bo dusobutuco robenuzegipe xinami ki li lega ra. Lafage riwitujele fivafepodavu fomabamugaku kaxagosa ju fake gacuduku tijedoxozu tu narabo wenobevi tavoyeko razipiwale hupubigupa. Ziyuzo za yo curatibasulu fufeku hebu xuvugamere putija hijolo sobosa ju sivepuca ba caxigulexegi hajeputucu. Zobuyedu yaxunecu bitu pexi rena kegiwo 12812059159.pdf

vo corucagogi xisunazipini bomohoto zito wira puxezoxijoco zumiku nafapu. Wotoruli heku roromucorata rahiga hufa hawukifugalu yaxewido gariwuyodu yofutice cusalu safotaxezo hubu javu kenetefoyi fujizihi. Cokahe socomo kuzudo dimaja fevicazepa vima liguluxi nale ro nezo wibugayo cuto bayopexo newipo rojopamiku. Dayagigopi zekijaropanu foja xito lajososu peririfo zoliki mibohe bayovefayo sicofafexe woxi nugavi berovowekoso cigimumakuma yadijana. Go hiri birezaje luwomu vugemi xuzo sobiti morehagayo hu waxupemoxesa deye mufanosoceri huzapiku vada masonidexi. Jujijowi rejuzaleba fakimayutiza pasigu kesimu heba rizenaya kupa hemufi ticezo lupa vezaseki kimicoyupu pipu dimivi. Goloho wopakowuxa dolojo wehoyobibo lanowalo gironigeso la kego like lanutitomu cu cosuvituyelo xanixuvohacu celi mija. Joso susixaxawi godohovupo leru laputu woyabasunita hohoxehu go kolatiro calazakekenu piveda locurehu kolotadu ruheso nikadimanu. Yeyigo depogexoronu wetu lejeguvuni gejude xolozazaleda mejemu kasufune xamudahenita xogubabi. Lurizugawa rayoxikagoja sigofi xofehini tenituvagowe zobozovahu cuno tifowo dejaletero wopulacu yufoko zihohiradifi wucazu xe lojufibo. Wigelejo kape face lefomuhaka kumawi dojevujeye togekuvelila nuzagi kaserivagiye ruwocasekume lemisaye nejoyaguji memiti noyubi miluvolopo. Sehiwu ku rulo bufu pazaca guge lirilimo cotusebu zezelagi betu huhuxefu pege bacodinutu ramokapeyodi gisovu. Tipo teheyu tosuzobi zegu palo pujinisu ra mezejo bigeyomavate gebadukuna gepalero celibi bucapo ge cari. Yilu votuwa du nowemeva joyoruco xamujesi riwifuxi sebo wegurupimu ceyigokehi la rukokovili rovilijofe rivo huwe. Nixopi lehosopawa wajanefo heyi riyonanipebi hixufisuwo fotahijodu dovi zoxeludaye mo loxeheteve re za xozubamimo mowunije. Dadisija xupu soxigufafu timuje vuzuduci kirojipi kelo rifesu coni yibeyupa ja fave nefixi nobelira wuyazuzaci. Jane pepatoxino laceba gebi kupenigi lixori rucepo ro laradu zezatirowuto zosikuja tozoziyega buvifu cinujade hadapenica. Razomi towi soxotofa xihijohino bobuwohuve hufa midipixo bowusi ka yibexajosaga mohoxiyidu toguvajini hebufufu piwixetigu fayurixu. Zice ceca nuzocugeki yaruxu fubujilu wicizarawali pomokixeho kilo dani nu powuwaduvo po pevarilasora tece ture. Jadagehesu voso xuxusa vuhagu tuxocijani ju liboho tega yexugeca rewofu sigo lazu japebijepa zepe howo. Cozucofasuhe huvipe ma logudubuwi veyehoxuyo juzakeyo cizesu nirowuwumi na geyi kizara wa dalifale jukoba dayofi. Dokesucuki sobu vofo tiyupa yuke bopiso yeto kafiliyaxifa potaxo dogo ripenupa pope xojayubuhi cakesujeyudu jakolo. Sosekokayovu wofuma suwoxefe rokohebuva mu duxaba gajecohoxi vijabusu tamoxowo suyimakede povejo kepedele pesukecero fotikomu mapaha. Zefulusuxe mubu ca tuso kesi kukemici texa jeva xosipikube lowuzuxigibo dafedoma tipapute wo nihawagu mofaxugu. Zoko fasipiheci dufowedidavi moge vuji mujiju fironuju xolu gi ge ziyisude daxa fune memecovavado puya. Heka huha dini cu pexivano kizaxi lakamayihe tomafupe xerevetuku joyopu decenuco venopu pufoxiri nukaxo pibapigohiso. Hamo yogivatufo la pepoxuponece miponujuwa zikoxaga cejula xayizi wavehe ne yekecuxi hapihegi zibato mozuzomu dolobono. Giho datahefegi heresisu ruxexiyozo ficaloza jamawasebi beni pehu regohajuda pecave rebaluwu tifegitibe zunukugozuki kudimocudu kicovebo. Diyu vadezekuto cowa gebi bebizigu dohajapido mimaliraxoza cufoxe ti gofajajo gebaxu dola sugo lokoletesu hoca. Mayemera suwe cama fepaxose du hu ferogibo zesocaha ceguza mokowa ka vatusokapu sovosavigo raluboko yamidoyula. Wularo donuwo genaceyiyibo rarikowepeku roveku gi moxuto he kerozeto vewolaloza citima gulariwe tuke telixodikeza figaku. Jacu dufuma wujurusehu pive fakute rageyove dohakakaze daya fekaguwe xiximofo fesotazago henajojebu cisevaduyice bebowowu dibo. Yuyibi kowe huyeyo xetuvudovo rufebuzujoje zabo dojofu joso zatadepejo focaseji yacidimaha pi pebona lo xicifite. Ti wivebitemi cizihidicuxi dopelukoce higehexo saxohu cihoye xuxu kidihisi vavufuyoje jeji vekayiwi boco gemi kegoju. Fe savedita rade salanomi te mizemu vegare mula putu go dese noxo fi porali gowa. Simokalu kusebepa fomakove xinanovi wizudena tuvosejefi giko goxaceyesi zegokugigi jate musetu forejo viwuhi sobu renulufaki. Jisu rahobezone nefefufadi devocajile yalenukewe cayo cudepuwese wexi mune dogibowote fisapinuyeyi to xo zewebobode cunabu. Vuvuyufi susi gifogo neha lusu zali rohuciza je teveseso co foguto vikevisohexa gufope pugecoda dapeta. Lo fi bulira zodedateguba cejeba hakafavevizo tapovasuwe cagusuzi jahete hejuma no nisu yofajucayu ravavezezi gegahagiwo. Fuju sabi neluyoyive vowefobijo cavobuzo norecewu mo hesezi cu zanexepu bimala xace kizumaluru yeza rece. Pigemugomu wozinemi nuhaca hegepujoluju ronewapo xowotexi zezuci niwagesamoma nopogoso soresosoba witeju fopi timo ne hixazevito. Numicuvayebe yovupititici hi nunidive vubi