

The Justification of the War in the Conditions of the Pacification of International Relations after the First World War¹

Svetlana N. Shchegolikhina, Ph.D.

A Russian State Pedagogical University named after A.I.Herzen
Saint-Petersburg, Russia
sveta.shc@mail.ru

Abstract

The end of First World War contributed to the enhancement of two new trends – 1) the intensification of national liberation/anti-colonial movements and 2) the active involvement of the public in international policy. Therefore, in the activity of leading Nations was an urgent need to redefine its policy towards other States and territories. Its essence consisted in maneuvering between the traditional violent methods of foreign policy activities (as more usual, giving a quick result), the proclaimed principles of the new international order and challenges to the reality. The task of creating in post-war European society a benevolent attitude to aggression is becoming a major activity in States.

To achieve this goal are determined by the new target audience (e.g. women, veterans, youth), new symbols (for example, "the Unknown Soldier"), and new psychological and personal arguments.

The result is a transformation of the concepts of "right" and "justice" of war, again making it a valid element of human history.

Key Words: war, peace, justice, foreign policy.

The signing of peace treaties after the First World War went under the slogan "the War to end all wars". The Treaty of Versailles, the peace treaties with Germany's allies, the League of Nations were

¹ The research is carried out by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 14-18-00390) in the Russian State Pedagogical University named after A. I. Herzen

to assist in the process of elimination of war as a means of solving problems. These steps, as well as subsequent agreements (the most important of which is the Pact of Briand – Kellogg) have established a legislative framework for a new global policy. Indirect proof of the possible success of these intentions could be the collapse of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman empires and the creation of mandated States on the territories of the former German and Turkish colonies followed by providing them with opportunities for self-development.

The period of pacification of international relations has covered only the first postwar decade. In the 1920s the unfolding legal process of fixing the unacceptability of military conflicts in the main international instruments rejected the legality of the war. But in the 1930s, there remained a doubt as to the inevitability of a new military confrontation. The question was only about the scope and nature of future conflict – whether it is a new world war or a limited number of local conflicts. Also the essential point in international politics was the use of new types of weapons prohibited by the international law. All these points demanded the explanation from the politicians. Other methods, besides violent, did not give such quick results or were not accepted in principle. Consequently, new arguments of "justice" violence in the "era of pacifism" appeared. The only argument to justify military conflicts, armies, and arms build-up was the argument of equity, which was used in relations with society.

Not to mention the countries defeated in World War I (though they soon accepted into the League of Nations and signed the major peace documents), do not take into account the new national countries, where there was active state building, the remaining States have determined the shape of the new Europe. However, speaking in the role of peacekeepers in international relations, the winning countries faced with serious challenges resulting in the use of traditional military methods.

The case of the European and world peace tried to take on Britain and France. But even in these countries in the 1920s militant tendency was extremely clear, and it demanded to confirm the legitimacy.

Portugal received territory and the right to reparations under the Versailles Treaty, all signatories to the post-war agreement (in Genoa, Lausanne, and Washington), had a significant problem of internal political – military coups (Meneses, 2004). Spain faced with the same situation that led to the civil war. Belgium, received a "significant" share of compensation as a victim, already in 1923 together with France participated in the Ruhr. In Italy the fascist regime formed, it occupied Corfu, created by the state of Fiume, stirred up tensions with Austria over South Tyrol. And the most striking fact of this Italian "post-war policy" – by signing the "Treaty on the disarmament of navies and limiting the number of submarines and aircraft carriers", on April 22, 1930, already on the 30th of April the Italian government announced the program of rearmament of the Navy, which includes the construction of 29 new ships.

Thus, consciously or intuitively politicians and diplomats tried some new attitudes in public relations.

The essence of war

After the peace conference the conflicts were justified from the point of view of legal justice. One of the most widespread instruments was the change of rhetoric, the substitution of concepts in official speeches.

During the period 1919-1930 there were 69 conflicts, 42 of them were actively involved Britain, France, Portugal, and Belgium (calculated by the author). That is, those countries that were to be the guarantors of a peaceful development of the world order. Military operations were being conducted on both new territories and old. So, Britain and France have received the mandated territories of Palestine, Syria, Morocco, immediately turned to long-term military conflicts. The European governments, without deciding to end the issue of reparations in the negotiations, tried to solve it by force, that resulted in a Ruhr crisis, the construction of the Maginot Line. But the responsibility for this conflict was attributed to the country that did not accept the decisions of the European States. Leon Auguste Bourgeois (the first president of the Council of the League of Nations

in 1920), assessing World War as positively affecting the correction of mistakes of the past (the return of Alsace and Lorraine to France, creation of national States) was convinced that the war has generated new problems that could lead to war. And he considered the main danger was social movements (pan-Germanic, pan-Islamic, pan-Negro). Losing powers, he said, "have not been wholehearted in their acceptance of the moral disarmament", so you should not exclude the use of military forces. Any nation is free to protect its security. It is necessary to force to receive justice (Bourgeois, 1922).

Concerning intervention in the Civil War in Russia, the Secretary of State for War Winston Churchill said at the government's position, which should be revealed to the public: "Whether or not the allies in the war with Russia? Of course not, but the Soviet people they killed when they were caught their eye; in the Russian land, they remained as conquerors... But to declare war on him - this intervention is a disgrace" (History of Diplomacy, 1965: 31). In popular newspapers and magazines gave a new interpretation of the concept of "keep out of war" - e.g., "the only sure way to keep the Empire out of war is to keep the world out of war", therefore "it means surrendering British leadership in the greatest crusade being waged in the world today" (Spectator: 6).

A slightly different emphasis appeared to justify military solution to the problems in the colonies. Declared that these actions were beyond the scope of international law, and they were the internal problems. So they could be solved in "police" operations. It's not interstate war; it is the fight against criminals, rioters. This enemy traditionally endowed with dehumanizing features, was outlawed. Political technologies in this case remained the same as half a century ago. For example, in the satirical magazines "Punch", "Charivari" published cartoons mocking and dehumanizing of the enemy (for example, images of the leader of the Indian struggle of Mahatma Gandhi) (Punch, *The Frankenstein of the East*, 1930, 03.12). This approach has proven to be psychologically very clear to the ordinary European, the European who wanted peace and order.

The essence of society

Another PR direction was connected with distraction of public attention on domestic issues that directly affect the everyday life. The government made concessions in the labor question, in the requirements of the women's movement, national problem. In the UK the new electoral law expanded the electorate, granted people the hope to solve their problems.

In parallel, strongly promoted the achievements and potential of post-war everyday life. New fashion, new passion for sports, cinemas and dance halls, resorts, cars and planes, the pursuit of luxury – all of this was cultivated as the main spheres of life, not policy (moreover – international policy).

It was widely emphasized the availability of all of this, along with the aristocrats. In Paris, in a Russian restaurant "Kazbek", it was possible to meet the Prince of Wales, and the Serbian king Alexander – on Montmartre. Deposed Greek king George II and his wife engaged in cultivation of roses and longed to go to America. The Spanish king, in whose country state of emergency was declared, participated in car races, opened the Grand Prix in San Sebastian (and in the meantime, the Spanish troops fighting in Morocco, rebel military units in Malaga, continued guerrilla war in Barcelona...). Swedish Gustav was an avid tennis player, and every winter in Cannes played with Suzanne Lenglen (Vertinsky, 1991: 198-199; Hemingway, 1969: 78-79). Examples can be continued. The politicians thought that "distracted man in the street" would be interested in politics, especially international, as a kind of entertainment (Punch, *The Conference Habit*, 1922, 01.04), without going into details, the analysis, without noticing the contradiction.

At the same time political accent was made on a new kind of patriotism. Even before the War, in 1912, on the eve of his death, Nobel Prize Laureate, famous pacifist Frederic Passy wrote to Bertha von Suttner: "The world was destined to be "a melee of cupidity and violence"?" (Nordlinger, 2012: 58). After the First World War, pacifism was derided as a utopianism and gradually lost its influence (Braudy, 2003: 419). One explanation is that the lost illusion soldiers

were able to overthrow regimes (as it was in Russia, Germany, Turkey). The brotherhood in arms was the only thing that got war veterans in World War I. To counteract this restless mass (Bourke, 1999: 339, 342), not to allow spreading the ideas of anti-militarism, used symbolism as the substitution of reality. Began to form the new elements of historical memory of World War I. For the first time in the history of Europe was set the Memorial Day (Remembrance Day, Armistice Day in Belgium, France and the UK, a National Day of Mourning (Day of Mourning) in Germany). In the capitals of many countries the triumphal arches were under construction; initiated the creation of the monument to the Unknown Soldier (Mosse, 1990: 80-82, 94-98). Became a tradition of the procession of veterans. The most impressive was the procession on the Champs-Élysées, consisting of disabled veterans, headed by the organization "La gel the box office". To raise funds to help veterans settle in the balls that were supposed to symbolize the unification of the country (the fee is often less than the decoration of the participant of the ball, but it was necessary to keep up appearances) (Vertinsky, 1991: 188-189).

From the other side - until they are called to go against the government, it did not prevent the establishment of paramilitary formations such as Royal British Legion, "The Not Forgotten Association" (Great Britain), Union and Union Federale des Combatants (France), Polish Association of War Invalids, etc.

Thus was achieved a few goals. Firstly, for some time acted social tensions associated with the failure of obligations towards veterans. Secondly, supported the idea of the heroic, self-sacrifice in a policy of appeasement. Thirdly, the old and new cadres were prepared for future military policy. So, gradually, remained bellicose patriotism (Mosse, 1990: 186-189; Braudy, 2003: 416, 419).

Thus, in the period of 1920-30-ies increases the amplitude of the confrontation of violence - non-violence in relations between States and their societies. This requires new political, legal and moral concepts that generate and explain new realities. Society itself was ready for war, a very narrow range of active opponents of the war.

In 1935 Sir Norman Angell read the Nobel lecture called "Peace and the Public Mind". The main problem of the speech was to "reconcile the world with the problem of national defense". He explicitly stated that "the only way to keep the peace as people are now present - to be armed, to be ready to defend yourself." According to Angell, war or peace is determined by the willingness and readiness of the common man, the justice of war by the everyday interests. In force are deep human impulses, the instincts. "The security mechanism through the law is incomprehensible to the ordinary person". Angell as evidence cites the situation in post-war Europe. In his lecture on receiving the Nobel peace prize is the phrase: "there will be a war against injustice and not for justice" (Ralph Lane, 1933).

Conclusion

Thus, after the First World War the situation in Europe can be very schematically represented as follows: state and political structures are open about peacemaking and cooperation, but covertly continue the pre-war practice of a military solution to the issues of domestic and foreign policy; the society, intellectually striving for a peaceful life in practice are expressed aggressive plans to review the results of the war. Therefore, before politicians and diplomats had a difficult task of appeasement not only in the traditional foreign policy, but also appeasing the public.

References

1. A SPECTATOR'S NOTEBOOK (1934). *The Spectator*. April, 6. [Online] Available: <http://archive.spectator.co.uk/page/6th-april-1934/1> (September 13, 2015).
2. Bourgeois, L. (1922). *The Reasons for the League of Nations*. Nobel Lecture. [Online] Available: http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1920/bourgeois-lecture.html (September 12, 2015).
3. Bourke, J. (1999). *An Intimate History of Killing. Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare*. New York: Basic Books.

4. Braudy, L. (2003). *From Chivalry to Terrorism. War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
5. Gromyko, A. & Zemskov, I. (eds.) (1965). *History of Diplomacy*. Vol. 3. Moscow: OGIZ.
6. Hemingway, E. (1969). *Reports*. Moscow: Publishing of the Moscow University (in Russian).
7. Menes, F. R. de (2004). *Portugal 1914-1926: From the First World War to Military Dictatorship*. Bristol: Hiplam.
8. Mosse, G. (1990). *Fallen Soldiers. Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press.
9. Nordlinger, J. (2012). *Peace, They Say. A History of the Nobel Prize, the Most Famous and Controversial Prize in the World*. New York: Encounter Books.
10. PUNCH CARTOON GALLERIES. Interwar Cartoons 1919-1939. [Online] Available: http://punch.photoshelter.com/search?I_DSC=1920s&G_ID=G0000c53YnqnGf60&C_ID=&I_DSC_AND=t&_ACT=usrSearch (October 2, 2015)
11. SIR NORMAN ANGELL (1935). *Peace and the Public Mind. Nobel Lecture*. [Online] Available: http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1933/angell-lecture.html (September 20, 2015)
12. Vertinsky, A. (1991). *The Long Road*. Moscow: "Pravda". (in Russian).