# THE ROLE OF ILLUSION IN THE MAKING OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY (1919)

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

by

Bonnie Riddle Baker, B. A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1977

Baker, Bonnie R. The Role of Illusion in the Making of the Versailles Treaty (1919). Master of Arts (History), May, 1977, 176 pp., selected bibliography, 78 titles.

This investigation is concerned with the role played by the illusions of security, Bolshevism, and American innocence in the making of the Versailles Treaty of 1919. The main sources used in this thesis were the U.S. State Department publications The World War and The Paris Peace Conference and Paul Mantoux's Proceedings of the Council of Four.

The drafting of the Versailles Treaty is approached chronologically with special emphasis accorded the problems emanating from the questions of Russia and the Rhine. The study concludes that the peacemakers were manipulated by the illusions of security, Bolshevism, and American innocence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

The signing of the Treaty of Versailles on June 28, 1919, signaled the end of an era in the history of the world. The outbreak of the First World War in 1914 had taken Europe and the rest of the world virtually by surprise. With its horrors and hardships which involved the total populations and resources of the participants, the war became a global conflict that directly or indirectly affected the majority of the nations of the world. It devastated populations, economies, and political systems, and as a result of the war, the nineteenth-century international system disappeared. Those relationships which had been considered natural were undermined, and the balance-of-power system was destroyed. The monarchies of Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary fell, and the United States of America emerged from its cocoon of isolation to affect the outcome of the war and the formulation of the peace.

With the signing of the peace treaties in 1919, a new era began. The decisions made by the peacemakers were to have just as explosive an effect on the history of the world as the great war had. No major or minor country was left untouched by the decisions made at Paris. The Treaty of Versailles, which was drafted during the

first six months of 1919, has been scrutinized and discussed by historians for the past five decades. Viewed in retrospect, the defects of the Versailles Treaty formed and affected the international political and economic climate of the modern era and sowed the seeds of the Second World War.

Because of the treaty's effects on mankind and because of its controversial nature, the historian must continue to evaluate the personalities, motivations, and interactions of the negotiators; to review the external and internal problems faced by the peacemakers; and to study the process by which these monumental decisions were reached. A careful analysis will determine how and why the decision-makers at Paris arrived at their conclusions.

This work is based on the belief that the actions and decisions of the peacemakers in 1919 were often governed not by knowledge of fact but by illusion. An illusion is a false idea, an unreal or misleading appearance or image, or an incorrect perception. An illusion, like a myth, according to Theodore White in Breach of Faith, "is a way of pulling together the raw and contradictory evidence of life as it is known in any age. It lets people make patterns in their own lives, within the larger patterns." The peacemakers at Paris based their ultimate decisions on illusory thoughts, ideas, and perceptions; the result of their illusions was the controversial Versailles Treaty.

From the perusal of the peace conference writings, no fewer than twenty separate and interrelated illusions have been found. Because of the magnitude of those illusions, this work makes no attempt to analyze all of them or even to cite them. This thesis will focus only on those illusions which surround and emanate from the desire for security, the fear of Bolshevism, and the presumption of American innocence.

The task of studying and evaluating the illusions of the peace conference is simultaneously made simple and complex by the abundance of material available about the peacemakers and the negotiations at Paris. Each of the several dozen countries represented at the conference had enormous delegations. Each person present was fully aware that he was participating in an important historical event which would have diverse and profound effects on future generations. Virtually every figure saved papers, kept diaries, or wrote memoirs relating his role at the conference. Recently, the Woodrow Wilson Papers, which contain his major correspondence and papers of the period between December, 1918, and July, 1919, have been made available on microfilm by the Library of Congress. The minutes of the principal decision-making bodies, the Council of Four and the Council of Ten, have been published.

This work will consider the personalities and interactions of the major figures who participated in the formulation of the Treaty of Versailles, the events and the effects of the events leading up to the peace conference, and the process of the negotiations themselves. Although the Italian Premier Vittorio Emanuele Orlando will be briefly mentioned because he was considered one of the "Big Four," this paper will not treat his contributions in great detail. This lack of analysis of the Italian Premier is justified on the grounds that he was the weakest of those who made the decisions in both personal and political force, that he represented the weakest nation of the four powers, and most importantly that he was primarily concerned with the fate of Austria-Hungary rather than with the fate of Germany. This thesis will not attempt to study the formation of, or to evaluate the Leage of Nations in any great detail, except in those instances where negotiations surrounding the League affected other aspects of the conference.

This thesis will study the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 in the light of the illusions that the peacemakers held. False images and incorrect perceptions about security, Bolshevism, and innocence often guided the decision-makers. The result of the illusions that the peacemakers held was the controversial and influential Versailles Treaty.

# CHAPTER I

## THE PEACEMAKERS

The decisions made at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 shaped world events, international politics, and domestic policies during the twentieth century; all governments were touched by the events and decisions made at Paris. The world leaders at Paris in 1919 set out to frame a perfect world, to establish what the Allied leaders thought would be a just and fair peace, and to end the perennial conflicts which had been the source of world unrest in the past. That they did not attain these goals has been evident since 1919.

The decisions of the peacemakers, step by step, constructed the treaty. Decisions reflect the people who compose the decision-making body, and decision-makers, in turn, are products of their own eras, cultures, past experiences, and national inheritances. Individual personalities, goals, and ideals coupled with national preferences, not only mirror men's proposals and decisions but also influence the scope and content of their decisions.

Four men shaped the treaty: French Premier Georges Clemenceau, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, United States President Woodrow Wilson, and Italian Prime Minister Vittorio

Orlando. These men who had risen to power in "the rough and tumble of the struggle all balanced themselves upon the unsure shifting platform of public opinion, and claimed to be guiding mankind to higher destinies."[1] They represented "a turbulent collision of demagogues who were also great men of action, each of whom had to produce a triumph for himself and his Party and give satisfaction to national fears and passions well founded or not."[2] The representatives were party politicians who never seriously considered isolating themselves from their parties or their mass electorates.[3] Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando were bound to fight for certain terms of the settlement which they had led those at home to expect, whereas Wilson's ideals compelled him to fight for his published principles.[4] At Paris the American program of general settlement and general

---

[1]Winston S. Churchill, The World Crisis, vol. 5: The Aftermath (London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1929), p. 120.

[2]Ibid., pp. 120-21.

[3]Arno J. Mayer, Politics and Diplomacy of Peace Making, Containment and Counterrevolution at Versailles, 1918-1919 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967), p. 12.

[4]Edward Mandell House and Charles Seymour, eds., What Really Happened at Paris, The Story of the Paris Peace Conference, 1918-1919 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), p. 32.

published principles was destined to clash with "the immediate necessities, interests, and fears of the other Allied nations."[5]

The peacemakers who convened after World War I to remake the world on a foundation of lasting peace were not impervious to human frailties or emotions. Like all men, they were enslaved by themselves and were subject to their illusions which influenced their perceptions and decisions regarding the complex problems at the peace conference. French Premier Clemenceau alludes to the human frailties of decision-makers when he comments that the advocates' art is often to disregard the facts. "As for us, poor political stonemasons, we carve in stone historical monuments which sometimes deceive us no less than the old parchments swallowed up in the arcana of the past."[6]

Of the four decision-makers, seventy-seven-year-old Georges Clemenceau possessed the most dominant personality. Wilson's intimate friend and adviser Colonel Edward M. House describes Clemenceau:

---

[5]Ray Stannard Baker, Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement, 3 vols. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1922; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1960), 1:353-54.

[6]Georges Clemenceau, The Grandeur and Misery of Victory, trans. F.M. Atkinson (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1930), p. 144.

> Squat of figure, with massive head, penetrating eyes, wide apart and clouded by heavy, irregular eyebrows, overhanging mustache, high cheekbones, he presents with his eternal skullcap and suede gloves a gnome-like appearance. As he used to sit, hour after hour, presiding over conferences, with eyes half closed, his face was a masque. But behind it burned unquenchable fires --fires kindled by the Germans in 1870 and to which they added fuel in 1914-18.
>
> I never caught him seeking self-advantage; it was France --always his beloved France.
>
> He came at problems by direct attack, there was no indirection. . . . He was afraid of nothing, present or to come, and least of all mere man. . . .
>
> I never found him unfair. When he made a promise, no written word was necessary.[7]

Seen as "a rude but reasonable man,"[8] the French Premier was "dogged, domineering, honest, courageous, realistic, and narrow."[9] Clemenceau was named the "Tiger" because of his ferocious defense of French interests.[10] He had "the ever vigilant and fierce

---

[7]Charles Seymour, ed., The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, 4 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926-28), 4:191-92 (hereafter cited as Seymour, House).

[8]Harold Nicholson, Peacemaking, 1919 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939), p. 152.

[9]Thomas A. Bailey, Woodrow Wilson and the Lost Peace (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944; Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1963), p. 156.

[10]Paul Birdsall, Versailles Twenty Years After (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), p. 117.

eye of the animal who has hunted and been hunted all his life."[11] Clemenceau was cynical about everything, including most Frenchmen.[12] "In his cynical wisdom he had never believed that the end of the war would bring the millennium; these nationalistic quarrels seemed to him entirely natural, even though inconvenient."[13] Europe as it had been, was embodied in the personality of Georges Clemenceau;[14] diplomacy to Clemenceau was simply a means of getting what he wanted, a military guaranty of French security. With the aid of a powerful coalition, France had beaten Germany; the victory must make Germany powerless to rise again.[15]

On December 29, 1918, Clemenceau met with the Chamber of Deputies and explained the proposed new diplomacy which would be based on a supranational organization. The supranational organization was to replace the old diplomacy of alliances and balance of power. Clemenceau told the Chamber he had no intention of abandoning the old diplomatic devices which had served France so well in the

---

[11] David Lloyd George, Memoirs of the Peace Conference, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 1:140.

[12] Birdsall, Twenty Years After, p. 117.

[13] House and Seymour, What Really Happened at Paris, p. 93.

[14] Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 154.

[15] Birdsall, Twenty Years After, p. 116.

past.[16] He had no faith in an organization of nations. France had been saved not by ideals but by bayonets; "if she were invaded again, America would perhaps come rushing to her assistance--after three long years--with two million words."[17] In regard to American assistance, Clemenceau stated, "America is distant. It has taken her a long time to get here"; a supranational organization would be welcome but only as a "supplementary guarantee."[18] Clemenceau's cynicism struck out at the new diplomacy, personified by Woodrow Wilson and American ideals. He referred to Wilson as "Jupiter" and with his cutting sarcasm remarked about the President's "Fourteen Commandments."[19] He told House, "You are practical. I understand you, but talking to Wilson is something like talking to Jesus Christ."[20]

American youthfulness and innocence dismayed the old Tiger. America was naive; she would have to be taught. Clemenceau stated,

---

[16]Richard Watt, The Kings Depart: The Tragedy of Germany, Versailles and the German Revolution (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), p. 47.

[17]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 155.

[18]George Bernard Noble, Policies and Opinions at Paris, 1919: Wilsonian Diplomacy, the Versailles Peace, and French Public Opinion (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), pp. 88-89.

[19]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 155.

[20]Ibid.

"If the Americans do not permit the French to teach them, the Germans will do so at great cost of life."[21] Clemenceau held his belief in the naivete of the Americans throughout the conference. On February 14, 1919, Wilson said the Covenant of the League of Nations was "a definite guarantee of peace, . . . a definite guarantee against aggression."[22] Clemenceau remarked, "Unfortunately he forgets, as a matter of fact, that the violation of Belgian territory makes the word of the 'outlaws' utterly worthless."[23] Aware of history's effects on men's and nations' perceptions of events and ideals, the Premier saw America's short history as partially responsible for her idealism. Clemenceau sarcastically commented to Wilson, "For you, a hundred years is a very long time; for us, it does not amount to much. I knew men who had seen Napoleon with their own eyes. We have our conception of history, and it cannot be quite the same as yours."[24]

---

[21] Seymour, House, 3:268-269.

[22] Clemenceau, Grandeur and Misery, p. 179.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Council of Four, 28 March 1919, 4:00 p.m., Paul Mantoux, Paris Peace Conference 1919, Proceedings of the Council of Four (March 24 - April 28), trans. John Boardman Whitton, Publications de L'Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales, no. 43 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964), p. 47 (hereafter cited as Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four).

Clemenceau was the product of his own and of French history. Although trained as a doctor, he had become a journalist. His fluent English was perfected on a visit to the United States where he wrote articles for a French newspaper shortly after the Civil War. He had given his country long and faithful political service. Clemenceau's one love was France; his one hate was Germany. At age twenty-nine, he had seen the Germans burn France; at seventy-two, he again had seen the Germans pour into France.[25] He could not and would not forget the degradations her historic enemy had accorded France. On many occasions Clemenceau related how France had been devastated by war and had suffered more than Great Britain or the United States.[26] His deep enmity toward the Germans was displayed when he said that they were "worse" than "barbarians" because they had scientifically destroyed France to prevent her recovery in peacetime.[27] Lloyd George found the Premier to be unreasonable because Clemenceau's hatred toward Germany blinded his objectivity. Clemenceau refused to consider proposals on their merits. Lloyd George said, "He is anxious to preserve the demeanor of a conqueror towards Germany."[28]

---

[25]Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 153-54.

[26]Baker, World Settlement, 1:359-60.

[27]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:390-91.

[28]Ibid., p. 191.

Although Clemenceau spoke of wanting to make a just peace with Germany, the thoughts which prompted his words were illusory because he could not free himself from his hatred of his inherent enemy. Clemenceau said that "in view of the German mentality, it is not sure that justice is conceived by the Germans as it is conceived by the Allies."[29] Motivated by his hate and spurred on by his memories, he could not combat his deeply held conviction that the inherently militaristic Germans again would invade his beloved France. During a meeting of the Council of Four on March 4, 1919, Clemenceau said to Wilson:

> The fact of the war cannot be forgotten. America did not witness this war at close quarters during the first three years; we, on our part, lost a million and a half men during that period. We no longer have a labour force. Our English friends who lost less than we did but enough to have greatly suffered, will understand me. . . .
>
> It is a mistake to believe that the world is governed by abstract principles. These are accepted by some parties, rejected by others; I am not speaking of supernatural doctrines: of these I have nothing to say; but I do not believe that human dogmas exist, only rules of justice and good sense. You wish to do justice to the Germans. Do not believe that they will ever forgive us; they will only seek the chance for revenge; nothing will suppress the fury of those who hoped to dominate the world and who believed success so near.[30]

---

[29]Ibid., p. 276.

[30]Council of Four, 28 March 1919, 4:00 p.m., Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four, p. 46.

Georges Clemenceau's very demeanor, his past experiences, and his preconceived ideas made him vulnerable to illusion. As the personification of France in post-war Europe, Clemenceau maneuvered, blinded by the illusion of security. That security against Germany could be obtained under any set of circumstances was itself illusory. That crushing Germany militarily, that securing the Rhine River as Germany's western frontier, and that destroying her economic system would give security were among Clemenceau's preconceived ideas which shaped his policy and eventually the treaty. Subordinate to, but closely connected with, the illusion of security were other minor illusions to which the French Premier fell victim. His misconception that American innocence would sacrifice France's hard-fought victory, his over-estimation of German military strength and inherent militaristic spirit, and his belief that an economically prostrate Germany could and would pay reparations resulted in the formulation of a treaty that produced the horrible outcome that he labored to avoid.

Just as dynamic a personality as Georges Clemenceau, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George was a seasoned and shrewd politician. Short, stocky, with white hair and white mustache, the "Welsh Wizard" was amiable and charming. Overflowing with personal magnetism, he possessed behind his genial smile

and twinkling eyes a sleepless energy. A torrential talker, he was vivacious and impulsive, prone to rapid bursts of enthusiasm and panic.[31] House describes the British Prime Minister at the conference as "consumed with an electric energy, always on the edge of his chair, questioning and interrupting."[32] André Tardieu, an influential member of France's Chamber of Deputies, paints a vivid portrait of the British representative:

> Mr. Lloyd George argued like a sharpshooter, with sudden bursts of cordial approval and equally frequent gusts of anger, with a wealth of brilliant imagination and copious historical reminiscences; clasping his knee in his hands, he sat near the fireplace, wrapped in the utmost indifference to technical arguments, irresistably attracted to unlooked-for solutions, but dazzling with eloquence and wit, moved only by higher appeals to permanent bonds of friendship, and ever fearful of parliamentary consequences.[33]

Whereas Clemenceau tended to be predictable and firm in his positions at the conference, Lloyd George's position was erratic. "Lloyd George was as reliable as quick silver, as direct as a zigzag, as unwavering as a weathercock."[34] He was notorious for his

---

[31]Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 156-57.

[32]House and Seymour, What Really Happened at Paris, p. 93.

[33]André Tardieu, The Truth about the Treaty, with a Foreword by Edward M. House and an Introduction by Georges Clemenceau (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1921), p. 102.

[34]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 158.

"catapultic changes of opinion. Opposition, which always hardened Wilson behind his principles, had exactly the contrary effect upon the mercurial Welshman, who had politics but no principles--it sent him bounding to the other extreme."[35] The British Prime Minister was a master opportunist whose guiding principle was expediency. "He had a sixth sense for the changes in the pulse of public opinion, and like a chameleon he changed with them. . . . To him consistency was the mark of a small mind, and strict truth an insuperable handicap to political preferment."[36]

Usually condemned for his quick vacillations, Lloyd George is favorably viewed by Harold Nicholson, who says that ultimately the Prime Minister showed that the politician was more reasonable than the theocratic President. Evaluating the British politician, Nicholson states, "Lloyd George taught me that apparent opportunism was not always irreconcilable with vision, that volatility of method is not always indicative of volatility of intention."[37] That Lloyd George was above all else a politician, and a statesman only when his own political commitments allowed, was obvious throughout the

---

[35]Baker, World Settlement, 1:302.

[36]Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 157-58.

[37]Nicholson, Peacemaking, p. 209.

negotiations.[38] When discussing the renewal of the armistice, the Welshman stated that the negotiators were not bound by obligations "of honor, or as sportsmen," to renew the armistice; they were bound by obligations to the world and to their people to protect them from renewed hostilities.[39]

While Clemenceau represented what Ray Stannard Baker would later call the Old Order and Wilson the New, Lloyd George represented neither. Instead, the British Prime Minister promoted whichever order would advance the "best interests of Great Britain and endear him to the electorate."[40] Representing "the diversity of Britain," Lloyd George "used and played both of these groups [the French and Americans] at Paris as the momentary exigencies of politics demanded."[41] Secretary of State Robert Lansing said that Lloyd George's sudden changes of position and attempts to divide his opponents by supporting first one and then another were "methods unsuited to the settlement of international differences. . . . His methods

---

[38] Birdsall, Twenty Years After, p. 185.

[39] Council of Ten, 7 February 1919, 3:30 p.m., U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The Paris Peace Conference, 1919, 13 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-47), 3:901 (hereafter cited as Paris Peace Conference).

[40] Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 158.

[41] Baker, World Settlement, 1:384.

carried the impression, possibly an erroneous one, that he was unreliable, in fact, wabbly [sic]."[42] Often Lloyd George would change his mind overnight. When the electorate changed, he changed with it. "If they wanted vengeance, he promised vengeance; if they wanted leniency, he worked for leniency. Whatever his catapultic public wanted was right. Though gifted with vision and ideals, he could never completely rise above the arts of the demagogue. His opportunism bordered on shiftiness."[43]

Because the decision-makers were politicians who represented a composite set of democratic political ideas, "they were bound to adjust their own thoughts, which might be enlightened, to the emotions of their supporters, which assuredly were not."[44] It seems that Lloyd George, more than any of the other peacemakers, was governed by public opinion and bound to become a pawn of his country's belief in the process of democratic diplomacy. Nicholson points out that democratic diplomacy has one extreme disadvantage in that it obligates its representatives "to reduce the standards of their own thoughts to the level of other people's

---

[42]Robert Lansing, The Big Four and Others of the Peace Conference (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921), p. 101.

[43]Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 157-58.

[44]Nicholson, Peacemaking, p. 64.

feelings."[45] This type of diplomacy, by hindering the formulation of rapid, broad decisions, ties its representatives and makes it difficult, if not impossible, for them to follow a pattern.

In his memoirs, Lloyd George stresses that the peacemakers had to consider their people. He says that the World War was different from previous wars because it involved the entire manhood of the participating nations. All classes were involved; all classes had sacrificed. Therefore, it was necessary to consider the mood of the people who had suffered from taxation and death.[46]

The psychological state of Lloyd George's electorate must be examined if Lloyd George himself is to be understood. Hatred and fear survived in Britain in the weeks following the armistice. Besides the taxation and death that the British had experienced during the war, they had fresh in their memory the sinking of the Irish Mail Steamer Leinster[47] eleven days after the Germans had requested mediation from Wilson. Added to these events were the issues identified in the Khaki election of December, 1918.

---

[45] Ibid.

[46] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:3-4.

[47] The Leinster was torpedoed 16 October 1918 off Kingston. Four hundred fifty men, women, and children were drowned.

Lloyd George called for the mid-December elections because, from his point of view, "the moment seemed ripe to seek an extension of his period of office."[48] He was the "man who had won the war" and there was no previous example of a successful wartime leader being rejected by the public following such a victory.[49] Although his Coalition Government was at the time under attack from the Right, which called for a "peace of victors," and from the Left, which clamored for immediate demobilization, the British Prime Minster felt that he could use his war-time successes as a stepping stone to "render his own representative quality assured beyond all possible challenge." Therefore, at the conference table, he would be in a better position to deal with French nationalism and "arrogant" American republicanism.[50]

The historic issues that had elicited excitement in previous elections were not applicable in the Khaki election; and the politicians, fearing an apathetic electorate and seeking a mandate from the voters, drifted into harsher and harsher statements regarding the peace settlement. Statements made during the election prompted the

---

[48]Trevor Wilson, "The Coupon and the British General Election of 1918," Journal of Modern History 36 (1964): 28.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Nicholson, Peacemaking, pp. 19-20.

illusion that Lloyd George would be bound at Paris to press for a Carthaginian peace. This illusion, in turn, affected the attitudes and maneuvers of Lloyd George's fellow negotiators at Paris and has distorted historical perspective of the Prime Minister. Clemenceau expected Lloyd George to be sympathetic to French goals and join in a partnership against Wilson. Because of the French Premier's illusion that Lloyd George would press for a Carthaginian peace, Clemenceau's tactics fell in thin air.

Lloyd George's erratic qualities, his skill as a politician, and his subservience to public opinion were illustrated by his vacillation during the elections. On January 5, 1918, Lloyd George had addressed the Trade Union Conference at London. In his address, he said: "We have never aimed at a breakup of the German people or the disintegration of their state or country. . . . The settlement of the new Europe must be based on such grounds of reason and justice as will give some promise of stability. . . . We are fighting for a just and lasting peace."[51] At Wolverhampton on November 24, 1918, he urged as his sole intention "rendering England a land fit for heroes to live in." In Newcastle on November 30, 1918, he spoke of

---

[51] Address by Lloyd George to the Trade Union Conference, London, 5 January 1918, U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The World War, 1918, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933), 1:4-12 (hereafter cited as The World War, 1918).

a "relentlessly just peace" and of "terms not of vengeance but of prevention." He stated that Germany must pay for the whole cost of the war, but he carefully added, "to the limit of her capacity."[52] At this point, the patriotic press took over the campaign and demanded the expulsion of enemy aliens, the payment of indemnity, and harsh treatment of the Kaiser.[53] Lloyd George, with his finger on the pulse of public opinion and aware that the much needed issue was eminent, was caught up in the spirit of patriotism emanating from the press and public opinion. When he issued his statement of policy in December, 1918, he stressed that Germany must pay the entire cost of the war and that the Kaiser "must be prosecuted. . . . The men responsible for this outrage on the human race must not be let off because their heads were crowned when they perpetrated the deed."[54] At Leeds on December 9, he spoke of the "fruits of victory"; at Bristol he used the expression "the loser pays." Following this emotionalism the Coalition won a majority of 262.[55] Consequently, the illusion that

---

[52]Nicholson, Peacemaking, pp. 22-23.

[53]Chargé in Great Britain, Laughlin, to Acting Secretary of State, Telegram No. 4272, 4 December 1918, Paris Peace Conference, 1:409.

[54]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:109.

[55]Nicholson, Peacemaking, p. 22.

Lloyd George would seek a Carthaginian peace originated. It must be restated that Lloyd George qualified his statements on payments by adding "to the limits of her [Germany's] capacity." In essence, the Prime Minister refrained from "tying himself to any definite policy or making any firm statements on these matters."[56] His one definite pronouncement during the campaign was that Germany should not be allowed to pay "indemnity by [being] the defaulters of cheap goods or dumping manufactured articles in this country to the prejudice of British trade."[57]

Lloyd George was more liberal and more cautious than a mere glance at his election speeches indicates. At the conference, Lloyd George was not hindered so much by his promises as he was by the House of Commons, "the most unintelligent body of public-school boys which even the Mother of Parliaments has known,"[58] which, by his own "asseverations, he had produced."[59]

Always a politician, always concerned with public opinion, David Lloyd George assumed an intermediate position at the

---

[56]Laughlin to Acting Secretary of State, Telegram No. 4272, 4 December 1918, Paris Peace Conference, 1:409.

[57]Ibid., p. 410.

[58]Nicholson, Peacemaking, p. 19.

[59]Ibid., p. 66.

conference. He claimed later that he sympathized more with Wilson's objectives and, particularly, with the President's ideas of issues to avoid, than he did with the policies of the French Premier.[60] During the last days of the war, Britain appeared to share France's enthusiasm for severity toward Germany. Yet, by the time that the conference convened, the British Prime Minister was able to pursue a more practical line toward the defeated. Britain's primary worries had been removed. Germany was no longer a naval threat, and the fate of the German colonies was settled. Therefore, Lloyd George was free to approach the question of Germany more as an impartial mediator than as a combatant bent on securing the spoils of victory.[61] Lloyd George supported Wilson in wanting Germany to be able to resist Bolshevism and play a productive role in the recovery of Europe. Also, he usually sided with Wilson on questions of relief and the blockade.[62] Lloyd George's position was that "since Germany existed, she must be conciliated"; therefore "he tried to keep the door of future conciliation open."[63] Desiring to restore the economic life of Europe so

---

[60] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:157.

[61] A. J. P. Taylor, English History, 1914-1915 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 133.

[62] N. Gordon Levin, Jr., Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 146.

[63] Taylor, English History, p. 134.

that Britain's own export industries could recover, Lloyd George tried to reduce Clemenceau's extreme demands on Germany; and often assuming a more active and successful role than Wilson, he moderated the French projects against Germany.[64]

On territorial questions Lloyd George's motive in following this procedure was to keep France from creating any new Alsace-Lorraines which would inevitably drag Britain into a new world war.[65] While discussing the Rhineland, Lloyd George stated, "You must fully understand the state of mind of the British public. It is afraid to do anything whatsoever which might repeat the mistake Germany committed in annexing Alsace-Lorraine."[66] If France were allowed to enfeeble Germany, Britain would receive no reparations, but more importantly, she would lose a valuable customer essential for postwar economic recovery. Consequently, Lloyd George was willing to allow Germany enough strength with which to trade and pay reparations, but not enough strength to fight. After all, a totally debilitated Germany would be contrary to traditional British policy because it would allow France to dominate the continent.[67]

---

[64]Ibid.; Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 158.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:278.

[67]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 158.

At the end of World War I, Britain had already realized her two main war aims, the neutralization of the German high seas fleet and the elimination of German colonial competition.[68] Like the French, the British suffered from the illusion of security. Unlike the French, whose illusion was that by totally annihilating Germany they could obtain security, the British illusion of security rested on her belief that Germany was in no position to threaten her again, for Germany, Britain's chief naval rival, no longer had access to her fleet. Therefore, Britain deduced that if she could maintain her historical status as supreme mistress of the seas, Germany could not threaten her. "The fact of Britain's supremacy upon the seas was a potent element in determining her course at the Peace Conference."[69] A central British policy was to preserve the status quo. The British were not so much trying to acquire as they were trying to retain. Britain felt that she had security and power. Nevertheless, she recognized that the peace settlement could help intensify her favorable position by allowing her new access to raw materials,

---

[68] Most of the German colonies were occupied by various British dominion forces and the German fleet was interned at Scapa Flow. On 21 June 1919, the Germans sank their own fleet. See Baker, World Settlement, 1:386-89.

[69] Ibid., p. 380.

trade routes, and colonies, and by insuring her share of the reparations.[70]

So, except where reparations and colonial spoils were concerned, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George threw his country's strength toward moderation.[71] His decisions at the peace conference, like those of his fellow negotiators, were influenced by illusions. Possessing an illusory feeling of security based on his country's command of the seas, and easily influenced by British public opinion, the Prime Minister "hoped to combine the vae victis which the British public expected, with the more reasonable pacification which his own instincts desired."[72]

The American representative at Paris, President Woodrow Wilson, possessed an intricate and unique personality, difficult to untangle, difficult to grasp. The analysis of this important and complicated figure has been the subject of the works of numerous foreign and domestic historians. Wilsonian biographer Arthur S. Link summarizes the judgments of these works:

---

[70] Ibid.

[71] Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 158.

[72] Nicholson, Peacemaking, p. 66.

> All contemporaries and historical writers, friendly and hostile, have agreed that Wilson was different from the run of ordinary men. His personality was . . . strong, aggressive, dominant, and, to many persons, compelling. He had the power to command loyalty, to charm, and also to repel.
>
> Wilson was an extraordinarily intense person, . . . a well-disciplined and hard worker . . . always driving, never satisfied with monetary achievements and triumphs. . . .
>
> He had a first-class mind, though one more adept at synthesizing ideas than originating them. . . .
>
> He had a strong conscience, a highly developed ethical system, and deep Christian faith. . . .
>
> Most contemporaries and biographers also agree that Wilson was by nature headstrong, opinionated, and combative. Some critics have asserted that he had no capacity for self-criticism or understanding, would brook no opposition, and cut off friends who disagreed with him.
>
> To persons who did not like him, Wilson seemed cold, even capable of some personal cruelty. To . . . his friends . . . Wilson was outgoing, warm-hearted, and generously capable of friendship.[73]

The most complex of the personalities assembled at the Paris Peace Conference, Woodrow Wilson appeared "immaculately if soberly dressed, . . . alert, dignified, modest, soft-spoken, patient, conciliatory, and pleasantly stubborn."[74] His fellow peacemaker

---

[73]Arthur S. Link, ed., Woodrow Wilson, A Profile (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), pp. x-xi.

[74]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 150.

Lloyd George found him to be even-tempered, charming, intelligent, and pleasant, but also stiff, unbending, and uncommunicative.[75] The British Prime Minister also noted a certain duality in Wilson's personality, which increased as the conference progressed. Lloyd George reported that although the President was idealistic and possessed an undoubted integrity, he was imbued with personal hatreds, was often suspicious, and was extremely intolerant of criticism. Although Wilson apparently believed his own statements about human brotherhood and charity to all men, he was a "bigoted sectarian" who damned those professing a different political creed. He was jealous of those who disputed his authority and he refused to share or delegate power.[76] According to the "Welsh Wizard," Wilson's most disabling weakness was "his pervasive suspiciousness, [for] he believed in mankind but distrusted all men."[77] A solitary worker who experienced difficulty in delegating authority, he had little appreciation of the need for explanation, conference, and team play.[78] Perhaps exaggerating Wilson's single-mindedness regarding the League,

---

[75] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:144.

[76] Ibid., pp. 145-47.

[77] Ibid., p. 149.

[78] Baker, World Settlement, 1:114.

the British Prime Minister felt that the President was interested primarily in that portion of the treaty dealing with the League of Nations. Therefore, Lloyd George believed most of Wilson's energy was directed toward the covenant of the League while other important matters were ignored. Lloyd George stated, "His abnormal confidence in himself and limited confidence in others were largely responsible for his reluctance to delegate his duties. Thus it was that what he could not attend to himself he often neglected.[79] Secretary of State Lansing, who hated Wilson, supports the claim that the President tried to do too much himself. Lansing notes that Wilson's obsession with making most decisions himself probably helped bring about the President's untimely collapse at the conference and definitely retarded his ability to recuperate. Lansing also points out the flaw in solitary decision-making. He states that because many of the decisions were complex and required technical knowledge, "the attempt of a single individual, however gifted, to be sole arbiter as to the proper American position in regard to them all was at least perilous."[80] Clemenceau, on the other hand, credits the American

---

[79]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:185.

[80]Lansing, The Big Four and Others, pp. 63-64.

President with contributing more than anyone in fixing the laws of the New Europe.[81]

Wilson was a product of his past and of American tradition. A Scotch Presbyterian trained as an academician, Woodrow Wilson was President of Princeton University in 1911; in 1913, he was President of the United States.[82] His experience as a diplomat was negligible; his training was theoretical and academic. He had studied and taught international law, comparative government, and modern history. These experiences led him to follow a detached scientific approach in his study of events and to view his own diplomatic maneuvers as "playing for the verdict of history." In 1916, he told Ida Tarbell he believed that feeling, in the handling of national affairs, must never take priority over judgment. He commented, "No case could ever be made up at the time it was developing. The final judgment on everything that happens in the world will be made up long years after the happening."[83] Always cognizant of the verdict of history, Wilson, in his process of decision-making, took long historical views of motives and events and was reluctant to make

---

[81] Clemenceau, Grandeur and Misery, p. 167.

[82] Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 150.

[83] Quoted in J. Joseph Huthmacher and Warren I. Susman, eds., Wilson's Diplomacy: An International Symposium, The American Forum Series (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 4-5.

important decisions without knowing all of the facts and without studying all points of view.[84]

The foundations of Wilson's political thinking were his Christian values and beliefs. Link states, "Indeed, it is not too much to say that his every action and policy was ultimately informed and molded by his Christian faith."[85] As a Calvinist, Wilson believed in a just, stern God, a moral universe, and the Bible as the word of God and the rule of life. He saw God as the force which controlled history and used men and nations to unfold His plan in accordance with His purposes. In 1902, Wilson came to a full understanding of justification by faith--a relationship between God and man based on faith rather than law. From this point forward Wilson "tried to live by faith rather than by rules in meeting complex problems."[86]

Second only to his inherited acceptance of Christian values and beliefs, Wilson's political thinking was molded by his conviction that democracy was "the most advanced, humane, and Christian form of government."[87] He believed that all men were capable of governing themselves. As a result of his suppositions, he defined America's

---

[84]Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 151-52.

[85]Huthmacher and Susman, Wilson's Diplomacy, p. 7.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Ibid.

role in world affairs within the context of American democratic traditions and his own political and religious faith."[88]

Wilson visualized America as a powerful state that was committed to the service of the world. America would provide a moral leadership which rejected the seeking of selfish ends. If the other great nations of the world would follow the American example and apply the principles of Christian morality to other nations, international relationships would enter a new era based on faith and mutual trust.[89] He reasoned that since democratic traditions and religious faith had made America exceptional, these principles, if adopted by the other great nations, should insure a peaceful and safe world. To assure the realization of these objectives, Wilson wanted them incorporated into the peace. Therefore, he advocated the principle of self-determination which would be supported by an independent association of nations. On the eve of the peace conference, December 28, 1918, Wilson offered his utopian views, assuming that his ideas were also those of his fellow peacemakers. The President stated:

> . . . the small and the weak could never live free in the world unless the strong and the great put their power and strength in the service of right. . . . something must be done now not only to make the just settlements, but to see that the settlements remained and were observed and that honor and justice prevailed in the

---

[88]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[89]Baker, World Settlement, 1:17-18.

> world. . . . [The soldiers] fought to do away with an old order and establish a new one. . . .
>
> . . . from every quarter . . . there comes the suggestion that there must now be, not a balance of power, . . . but a single overwhelming, powerful group of nations who shall be the trustee of the peace of the world. It has been delightful in my conferences with the leaders of your Government to find how our minds moved along exactly the same line, and how our thought was always that the key to the peace was the guarantee of the peace, not the items of it.[90]

American idealism and American innocence, personified at Paris in the complex character of President Woodrow Wilson, were destined to attempt to put Europe through a cleansing process that would regenerate the world. Wilson, as he told a group of technical advisers aboard the U.S.S. George Washington, was committed to fighting for American ideals "agreeably if we can, disagreeably if we must."[91]

Wilson attributed the causes of the war to the defective and fatal European system. Nationalistic himself, without realizing it, he felt that America possessed a special political virtue which was non-existent in Europe. Devoid of original sin, the United States, Wilson believed, had "some wholesome, untrammeled, and liberating

---

[90]At the Guild Hall, London, 28 December 1918, Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds., The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: War and Peace, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Bros., 1927), 1:342-43.

[91]Baker, World Settlement, 1:11.

force which if applied to Europe, would break the evil spell from which Europeans could not escape unaided."[92] This illusory idea motivated Wilson's actions at Paris and led him to propose incorrect solutions to Europe's problems.

Wilson's sense of mission caused the Europeans to feel exasperated and to believe that the President was preaching at them.[93] Lloyd George said of Wilson, "The idealistic President regarded himself as a missionary whose function it was to rescue the poor European heathen from their age-long worship of false fiery gods."[94] Clemenceau stated, "He exasperates me with his fourteen Commandments when the good God had only ten!"[95] Wilson's speech on the eve of the conference shows he held the illusion, or at least hoped, that the other European statesmen had "the same philanthropic and altruistic motives which he possessed to so high a degree."[96] Secretary of State Lansing expressed the belief that the other peacemakers

---

[92]Edward H. Buehrig, ed., Wilson's Foreign Policy in Perspective (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), p. 157.

[93]Ibid., pp. 157-58.

[94]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:141.

[95]Howard Elcock, Portrait of a Decision, The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), p. 33.

[96]Lansing, The Big Four and Others, p. 48.

sensed the intensity with which Wilson viewed his mission and the intensity with which he held his unwavering conviction that an international organization should be the fundamental ingredient of the peace. Because of his basic character traits and his innocence, Wilson failed to comprehend many of the moving forces behind European History. In 1925, Clemenceau wrote, "Wilson was a noble figure, but he did not appreciate the facts or the significance of European history."[97] The European negotiators resented Wilson's attempt to solve their problems with a ready-made solution in a few short weeks. Europe had sacrificed; Europe had been the battleground, while America, secured by the Atlantic Ocean, had waited until the last moment to join the struggle. Subsequently Wilson, the "closet-philosopher," arrived "to tell France what she might or might not do."[98] Clemenceau synthesized the factors surrounding Wilson's predicament at Paris when he said, "President Wilson, the inspired prophet of a noble venture, to which he was unfortunately destined to become a slave, had insufficient knowledge of the Europe lying torn at his feet."[99]

---

[97] Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 155-56.

[98] Ibid., p. 152.

[99] Clemenceau, Grandeur and Misery, p. 167.

That Wilson was ignorant of the obstinacy with which European difficulties would be presented is understandable. America had never been threatened; Wilson and the Americans could not comprehend "how enormously exaggerated were the fears and how precarious the safety of Europe."[100] Sheltered by years of self-imposed isolation and self-sufficiency, America and the American President overlooked their lack of knowledge of European affairs, the forcefulness of European tradition, and the magnitude of European need.[101] Relying on American ideals and principles, Wilson was insensitive to historic European problems and scorned an examination of the politics, diplomacy, and economics of the old world. He was not cognizant of the fact that "there was a past, there were ancient traditions; other nations in the world also had their desires, needs, ambitions."[102] These particulars Wilson conveniently ignored. Disregarding unpleasant facts seemed to be inherent in Wilson's innocent makeup. Lloyd George said that Wilson "shunned the sight or study of unpleasant truths that diverted him from his foregone conclusions."[103] Wilson, "the idealist who is also something of an

---

[100] Baker, World Settlement, 1:350.

[101] Ibid., p. 9.

[102] Ibid., p. 23.

[103] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:140.

egoist,"[104] would not comprehend that European troubles could "not be settled by handing round its neck the phylacteries of abstract justice."[105]

The least influential of the Big Four decision-makers was Italian Premier Vittorio Emanuele Orlando. He was a learned and cultured gentleman who had been trained as a lawyer. Because he was the only member of the Council of Four who could not speak English, he was severely handicapped in the negotiations.[106]

Orlando was encumbered by democracy. He had used a stiff propaganda program to instill in his constituency an ardent Italian patriotism to which he became a prisoner. His colleague, Baron Sonnino, constantly reminded him of the patriotism of the Italian peopel. Therefore, "Signor Orlando was never able to rise to the level of his own intelligence."[107]

"The exponent of sacred egotism," Orlando was motivated by his desire to provide unstable Italy with the spoils of war. He believed that only by territorial acquisitions would he be able to

---

[104]Ibid.

[105]Ibid., p. 152.

[106]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 159.

[107]Nicholson, Peacemaking, p. 65.

exorcise "the demon of socialism."[108] He came to Paris hoping to expand "Italy's territorial sovereignty and economic power."[109] His achievements at the conference were insubstantial, in part, because his preoccupation with territorial gain made him more anxious about the fate of Austria-Hungary than Germany. When the confrontation over Italian claims finally came, he went home.[110]

Hindered by his inability to speak English and concerned with the Austro-Hungarian settlement, Orlando was the least influential of the peacemakers and played the smallest role in formulating the treaty with Germany. Lansing attributes Orlando's insignificant role "to the relative military, naval, and economic strength of the Great Powers represented in the Council of Four. Comparison by this standard . . . tended to place Italy in the background and subordinate the views of her statesmen."[111]

The representatives of the four Great Powers, French Premier Georges Clemenceau, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, United States President Woodrow Wilson, and Italian Premier Vittorio Orlando, must accept the responsibility for the decisions

---

[108]Ibid., p. 66.

[109]Lansing, The Big Four and Others, p. 129.

[110]Bailey, Lost Peace, p. 159.

[111]Lansing, The Big Four and Others, pp. 125-26.

made at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. Because they were human beings, their motivations, and subsequently their decisions, came from the wisdom and fallacies within their own makeup. Each man, depicting a specific and diverse national heritage and accommodating a unique personality, was predisposed to illusion. The reality of events during those confusing months of peacemaking is immaterial; it is the illusory perception of events by the decision-makers that shaped the Paris Peace Conference and created the Versailles Treaty.

# CHAPTER II

## POINTS OF DEPARTURE: AUGUST, 1914 - NOVEMBER, 1918

Between the outbreak of the First World War in August, 1914, and the German approach to Woodrow Wilson concerning cessation of hostilities in October, 1918, incidents took place and attitudes were shaped which weighed heavily on the peacemaking process. Affecting the peace were the secret agreements among the Allies, the entrance of the United States into the war, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, and the formulation of American and Allied war aims.

Before America's entrance into the conflict, the Allies forged several secret commitments among themselves and with other nations. Most important to this study of the peace conference was the 1917 agreement between France and Russia concerning the Rhine. France had the illusory impression that an eastern frontier on the Rhine would assure French security against future German invasion. One of the chief demands of the French at Paris was to control the area west of the Rhine. On January 12, 1917, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Aristide Briand, sent a note to the French Ambassador in London, Paul Cambon, relating French desires for the

restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to the frontiers of 1870 and for control of the geographic and mineral basin of the Saar. Briand also stated in his note that the "Rhine must serve as a rampart for France."[1] Six months later Cambon told British Foreign Secretary A. J. Balfour that the French wanted to see the territory west of the Rhine "separated from the German empire and erected into something in the nature of a buffer state."[2] The British never encouraged or acquiesced in the creation of a Rhenish buffer state.[3]

Nevertheless, the French were able to reach an agreement with Russia which provided that the territories on the left bank of the Rhine be separated from Germany after the war.[4] This agreement of March 11, 1917, was invalidated by the Bolshevik Revolution, but the accord illustrates the formal incorporation of "the illusion of the Rhine as security" into the French program in early 1917. Early in the war, the French established as their primary goal the destruction of Germany as a political power, and they believed that America would

---

[1] David Lloyd George, Memoirs of the Peace Conference, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 1:252.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Howard Elcock, Portrait of a Decision: The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), p. 8.

[4] Ibid., p. 9.

try to hinder French aspirations in the Rhineland. Therefore, the French viewed possible American participation in the war as hindering their achievement of a harsh peace for Germany.[5]

At the outbreak of the war in Europe, President Wilson proclaimed American neutrality. It appears that Wilson was already looking toward America's part in the peace. In Wilson's mind, America, by remaining "the one great nation at peace," would be able to carry out and perform a special mission for the world. America, by remaining at peace, could hold "itself ready to play the part of impartial mediation and speak the counsels of peace and accommodation, not as a partisan, but as a friend."[6]

On May 27, 1916, Wilson addressed the League to Enforce Peace. In this address, not only did the President advocate the reorganization of the international system by the creation of a universal association of nations, but he also ended America's traditional policy of isolation. Wilson stated, "We are participants, . . . whether we would or not, in the life of the world. . . . What affects mankind is

---

[5]Arthur S. Link and William M. Leary, Jr., eds., The Diplomacy of World Power: The United States, 1889-1920 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), p. 132; Charles Seymour, ed., The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, 4 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926), 2:289-90 (hereafter cited as Seymour, House).

[6]American Neutrality: An Appeal by the President, 19 August 1914, Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds., The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: The New Democracy, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Bros., 1926), 1:157-58 (hereafter cited as The New Democracy).

inevitably our affair as well as the affair of the nations of Europe and of Asia."[7] Wilson's preoccupation with American ideals showed that his thoughts were already governed by the illusion that American principles could be applied to the world.[8]

A speech by Woodrow Wilson to the Senate on January 22, 1917, reflected the innocence of the President prior to American involvement in the war. His belief that America's predestined mission was to liberate mankind and establish democratic principles throughout the world was the essence of the illusion which propelled the United States into the war and into the peace.[9]

The decision by the German Government on January 31, 1917, to resort to unrestricted submarine warfare was the event which brought the United States into the war.[10] This type of warfare greatly affected the President. The German Ambassador wrote, "From that time henceforward, he [Wilson] regarded the Imperial

---

[7]Seymour, House, 2:295.

[8]Ibid., p. 298.

[9]Essential Terms of Peace in Europe, 22 January 1917, Baker and Dodd, The New Democracy, 2:407-14.

[10]Link and Leary, The Diplomacy of World Power, p. 139; Seymour, House, 3:2.

Government as morally condemned."[11] America's entrance into the war guaranteed that the illusions surrounding the American President would weigh heavily on the peace.

Another event of 1917 which greatly influenced the decisions of the peacemakers was the Bolshevik Revolution. In November, 1917, the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia and sued for peace. This event had three important effects on the peace conference. The first effect was the publication of the secret documents of Imperial Russia in December, 1917.[12] These publications intensified the demand for a statement of Allied and American war aims. When an inter-Allied conference, meeting in Paris in November-December, 1917, became deadlocked over the question of war aims, Lloyd George and Wilson issued their own separate statements on the subject.[13]

On January 5, 1918, Prime Minister David Lloyd George outlined British war aims and peace conditions in an address made before the Trade Union Conference. He stated that the destruction of Germany or the German people was not a war aim but that an end must be

---

[11] Seymour, House, 3:2; Declaration of War Against Germany, 2 April 1917, Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds., The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: War and Peace, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Bros., 1927), 1:6-16 (hereafter cited as War and Peace).

[12] Elcock, Portrait of a Decision, p. 9.

[13] Link and Leary, The Diplomacy of World Power, p. 148.

placed to her "schemes of military domination." He said that Britain did not enter the war to destroy the Imperial Constitution of Germany but that the Germans' adoption of a truly democratic Constitution "would be the most convincing evidence that her old spirit of military domination has, indeed, died." Lloyd George called for equality of right for large and small nations, a settlement that would give stability, "reparation for the injuries done in violation of international law," and an international organization to settle international disputes. He concluded by stating:

> We are fighting for a just and lasting peace, and we believe that before permanent peace can be hoped for three conditions must be fulfilled: First, the sanctity of treaties must be re-established; secondly, a territorial settlement must be secured, based on the right of self-determination or the consent of the governed; and lastly, we must seek, by the creation of some international organization, to limit the burden of armaments and diminish the probability of war.[14]

In an address delivered to a joint session of Congress January 8, 1918, Wilson outlined American war aims, the Fourteen Points, stating that America, like all other peace-loving nations, demanded as an outcome of the war "that the world be made fit and safe to live in." He said world peace could only be achieved through

---

[14]Address by Lloyd George to the Trade Union Conference, London, 5 January 1918, U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The World War, 1918, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933), 1: 4-12 (hereafter cited as The World War, 1918).

justice and "that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us."[15] Although both the British and American war aims were on the whole vague, they established a basic outline for the peace settlement and reflected some agreement between the goals of the British Prime Minister and the American President.

The second effect of the Bolshevik Revolution emanates from the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk and the terms of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty between Germany and Russia. Officially taking Russia out of the war March 3, 1918, the treaty and its negotiations influenced Woodrow Wilson's attitude toward Germany.[16]

It must be assumed that innocence is manifested in varying degrees. The initiation of the innocent is often a slow, painful process obscured by events and concealed from the innocent himself. Fine lines separate the gradations from innocence to reality. Circumstances from his American past made Woodrow Wilson the innocent; experiences from his present lessened the degree of his innocence. The actions of the Germans between December, 1917, and

---

[15] The Fourteen Points Speech, 8 January 1918, Baker and Dodd, War and Peace, 1:158-61.

[16] Seymour, House, 3:381-82; see J. W. Wheeler-Bennett, The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and Germany's Eastern Policy (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).

March, 1918, were important to the initiation of the innocent, Woodrow Wilson.

Evident in Wilson's Fourteen Points speech is his growing disillusionment with the Germans, whose program as presented at the negotiations in Brest-Litovsk "proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant . . . that [Germany would keep] . . . every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied."[17] On January 24, 1918, German Chancellor Von Hertling replied to Wilson's war aims speech. Wilson found Von Hertling's speech "very vague and very confusing." Wilson said the reply confirmed the "unfortunate impressions" made by the Brest-Litovsk negotiations. He condemned the Chancellor for being "jealous of international action" and for advocating special interests in territorial settlements.[18] The inflexibility of the German Chancellor peeved Wilson, but the final terms of Brest-Litovsk infuriated him. Russia was forced to submit to a dictated, unconditional surrender which completely disregarded the preferences of the people in the surrendered areas. This event dashed "the Wilsonian policy of making friends

---

[17]The Fourteen Points Speech, 8 January 1918, Baker and Dodd, War and Peace, 1:155.

[18]War Aims of Germany and Austria, 11 February 1918, ibid., pp. 177-84.

with the German opponents of German imperialism."[19] Because virtually all Germans supported the imperialistic acquisition of Russian territory, Wilson was forced to confront the fact that as long as the actions of the Imperial Government were successful, few of the German people held any animosity toward their militaristic Government. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and Germany's blatantly immoral use of submarine warfare[20] were but two of the events which affected the President's attitude toward Germany.

The third effect of the Bolshevik Revolution was the emergence of the most influential and commonly shared illusion, the idea that Bolshevism would at any moment engulf the civilized world. While the war was still raging, the Allied leaders feared that the Germans would draw financial and military aid from Russia, making it possible for Germany to prosecute the war more successfully. The Russian Revolution prompted the statesmen to fear that Bolshevism might seize control in Germany, Central Europe, or even the Western Democracies. Therefore, many of the ultimate decisions at Paris were based on, or related to, this illusion. On important questions such as the official status of the Russian Government, Allied intervention in Russia, the disposition of the Rhineland, and the security of

---

[19] Seymour, House, 3:381-82.

[20] See above, page 44.

the treaty itself, the peacemakers were forced to view their decisions in the light of Bolshevism.[21]

Due to war weariness, lowered morale, and social discontent, Germany's ability to resist the Allies was greatly reduced in the fall of 1918.[22] The military reverses in the late summer and early fall convinced the German leaders that the war was lost.[23] On October 24, 1918, Prince Max of Baden, the German Chancellor, forwarded by way of the Swiss Government a dispatch to President Wilson requesting that peace negotiations begin. The request specified that the President's Fourteen Points be the basis for peace negotiations.[24]

Illusions surrounded the pre-armistice negotiations between October 4 and November 11. The illusions which manipulated the

---

[21]Arno J. Mayer, in Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking: Containment and Counterrevolution at Versailles, 1918-1919 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967), states that the problem of Russia and Bolshevism was the central problem at Paris to which all other problems were more or less related. Conversely, John M. Thompson, in Russia, Bolshevism, and the Versailles Peace (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), contends that Bolshevism was not a major preoccupation of the peacemakers and did not affect the general structure of the settlement.

[22]Thompson, Russia, Bolshevism, and the Versailles Peace, p. 21.

[23]Harry R. Rudin, Armistice 1918 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944), p. 49.

[24]Charge in Switzerland, Oederlin, to Wilson, U.S. Department of State, The World War, 1918, 1:337-38.

events and influenced the decisions during the armistice negotiations carried over to the peace conference. Surfacing as the Germans sued for peace were three major illusions: the illusion of American innocence, the illusion of security, and the illusion of Bolshevism. Each had an important effect on the nature of the armistice, which, in turn, had far-reaching consequences on the final settlement.

Prince Max's request for an armistice reached Washington on October 6.[25] That the note was directed to Wilson and not to the Allied Powers had far-reaching effects. Wilson failed to get in contact with the Allies during the early negotiations. As was characteristic of his scientific approach, Wilson delayed to collect and ponder the facts. Not only did his delay lead to jealousies and strained relations, but it also added to the Allied leaders' fear and their illusion that the innocent American President would sacrifice their victory.

Colonel Edward M. House, advisor and confidant of the President, maintained that the Germans were probably hoping for immediate action and an early preliminary conference. House suggested that the President's position should be "one of delay without seeming so."[26] House believed the military situation to be such that the war would

---

[25]Rudin, Armistice 1918, p. 89.

[26]House to Wilson, letter, New York, 6 October 1918, Seymour, House, 4:75-76.

terminate by the end of the year. Since time apparently favored the Allies, House felt justified in encouraging the President to delay his response.[27] Temporizing, Wilson replied to the first German note on October 8.[28]

The appeal to Wilson alarmed the French who were ever-concerned with security. "They did not know what to expect from 'a man of principle' like President Wilson, being as puzzled as other continentals at the sight of an Anglo-Saxon moralist in politics."[29] The diplomatic liaison officer to the Supreme War Council reported that the French people, suspicious of the German proposal, looked on it as a device by which the Germans hoped to extricate themselves from a difficult position. Also obvious among the French was an "undercurrent of hurt pride" because the note was directed to Wilson.[30] French attitudes a week later were much the same. The American Ambassador in France, Sharp, reported that the French called for strict demands and an armistice that would not end until a peace was signed. They saw the armistice as a possible ruse for

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] Lansing to Oeberlin, telegram #282, 8 October 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:343.

[29] Rudin, Armistice 1918, p. 89.

[30] Frazier to Lansing, telegram #142, 8 October 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:345-46.

continuing the war. Sharp stated that Wilson was condemned by the Sunday Temps for increasing the prestige of the Hohenzollern regime by communicating with it.[31] Yet, some of the comments in the press were attributed to "personal jealousies by a few men in high places over the authority exercised by one so far removed from the European arena of politics."[32]

Wilson's bilateral negotiations also angered and distressed the British. Lloyd George felt that Wilson had presupposed too much by asking the Germans if they accepted the Fourteen Points. Wilson had assumed that the Allies accepted them, when in fact the British totally rejected point two, the doctrine of freedom of the seas. Lloyd George believed that Wilson's pronouncement concerning the withdrawal from occupied territory as an indispensable condition of armistice could have undesirable consequences. He thought that the Germans might believe that to be the only condition; as a result, when the previously unconsulted Allies intervened with other conditions, the Germans would blame them for upsetting a promising peace.[33] The contempt for the President which was felt by Lloyd George and his

---

[31]Ambassador in France, Sharp, to Lansing, telegram #5442, 16 October 1918, ibid., pp. 364-65.

[32]Ambassador in France, Sharp, to Lansing, telegram #5442, 16 October 1918, ibid.

[33]Elcock, Portrait of a Decision, p. 24.

political and military advisers is related in the diary of the chief of the Imperial General Staff:

> As regards Wilson, we agreed that we would wire to say that he must make it clear to the Boches that his 14 points (with which we do not agree) were not a basis for an armistice, which is what the Boches pretend they are. As regards the Press, we agreed that they should be told that Wilson is acting on his own, that the war is not over, that the 14 Points are not an armistice, and that an armistice is not a peace. It was a very interesting afternoon. Everyone angry and contemptuous of Wilson.[34]

Even in America there were misgivings about the President's contact with the Germans. The American press expressed the opinion that the German offer was a trap to catch Wilson in a negotiated peace. A two-hour debate in the Senate demanded that Wilson reject the peace offer; they called for "a crushing military victory [which] must be preliminary to peace negotiations."[35] House testified to the attitude of the American people which had been unnoticed by the President. House stated that the President did not realize how war-mad the American people had become or how almost unanimous was their sentiment against anything but unconditional surrender.[36]

---

[34]Major-General Sir C. E. Callwell, Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson: His Life and Diaries, 2 vols. (London: Cassell and Company, 1927), 2:136.

[35]Seymour, House, 4:76.

[36]Ibid., pp. 78-79.

After Wilson's first reply to the Germans, the Supreme War Council met on October 9 to hear Foch's armistice suggestions. Foch called for evacuation up to the left bank of the Rhine and for the bridgeheads to be held by the Allies.[37] Foch wanted evacuation up to the left bank of the Rhine River and no protests were voiced against the plan. The Rhine River represented security to the French, and although it was illusory security, the French would fight vigorously for it at the coming peace conference. The preliminaries for this battle were laid during the armistice.[38]

The evening of October 9, the Allied Premiers met again. Although Clemenceau wanted to ignore the President's note, Lloyd George convinced him that a joint reply to the President was in order. The joint dispatch officially announced the apprehensions of the Allied Premiers. They pointed out that more than territorial evacuation was necessary to prevent the enemy from reaping a better military position from the armistice; they asserted the necessity that the conditions of the armistice be made with the consultation of military experts and in accordance with the military situation at the time.[39]

---

[37]Frazier to Lansing, telegram # 145, 9 October 1918, 4:00 p.m., The World War, 1918, 1:351-52.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Frazier to Lansing, telegram # 147, 9 October 1918, 8:00 p.m., ibid., p. 353.

Wilson had never intended to leave the Premiers or the military out of the negotiations. He was characteristically biding his time and collecting his own thoughts. The President planned to consult his Allies, but at his own convenience. Nevertheless, this untimely delay, combined with hurt pride, mistrust, and fear, perpetuated the Europeans' illusion of Wilson's total innocence.

Sometime before Wilson received the second German note of October 14, he appeared to undergo a change in his degree of innocence, which was reflected in his actions toward Germany. Admittedly, President Wilson was innocent in that he did not fully comprehend the ancient hatreds and quarrels of the Europeans and was oblivious to many of the motives and maneuvers of the European diplomatists. Nevertheless, through the events of 1917 and 1918, the President had experienced a slow, painful initiation into an understanding of the character and methods of the Germans.[40] By October 14, 1918, the President himself had developed such a mistrust and fear of the Germans that it is illusory to think that he would compromise, consciously or unconsciously, any part of the Allied victory.

---

[40]First Lord of the Admiralty Sir Eric Geddes reported that on October 13, the President's attitude toward Germany seemed "to be hardening toward caution." See Elcock, Portrait of a Decision, p. 26.

The President's attitude toward Germany was "hardening toward caution" because of the enlightening events of his past two years. He had experienced the German's "immoral" use of unrestricted submarine warfare, which had cost the lives of many Americans, when the official American position was one of neutrality. He distinguished between the German Government and the German people, hoping to befriend those elements who were opposed to militarism and imperialism. Again, his hopes and aspirations were obliterated when he was forced to accept the fact that the German people stood behind their Government in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Far from planning a temperate armistice for the Germans, the President wanted to render a crushing blow to the immoral and sinful agents of destruction.

The event which probably triggered his movement toward reality was the sinking of the Leinster. This useless destruction of life, coupled with his remembrances of unrestricted submarine warfare and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, ended any softness that the President might have held toward Germany. Wilson's change of attitude was obvious in his October 14 message to Germany.

Much more severe than his earlier notes, Wilson's communication of October 14 clearly stated that the process of evacuation and conditions of the armistice "must be left to the judgment and advice of the military advisers of the Government of the United States and the

Allied Governments" and that the armistice must guarantee the current military supremacy of the Allied armies in the field. Moreoever, he declared that the United States would not "consider an armistice so long as the armed forces of Germany continue the illegal and inhumane practices which they still persist in."[41] With the Leinster and other atrocities fresh on his mind, Woodrow Wilson severely reprimanded the Germans, saying:

> At the very time that the German Government approaches the Government of the United States with proposals of peace its submarines are engaged in sinking passenger ships at sea, . . . and in their present enforced withdrawal from Flanders and France the German armies are pushing a course of wanton destruction. . . . The nations associated against Germany cannot be expected to agree to a cessation of arms while acts of inhumanity, spoliation, and desolation are being continued which they justly look upon with horror and with burning hearts.[42]

Nevertheless, the Allies continued to express anxieties about Wilson's negotiations and about the Fourteen Points. The Chargé in Britain, Laughlin, reported a "grave uneasiness." The British questioned whether the Fourteen Points were clearly understood and whether they expressed the correct demands to impose on Germany to obtain a satisfactory peace. They saw the point relating to freedom of the seas as detrimental to their foreign trade and also raised

---

[41]Lansing to Oederlin, telegram #285, 14 October 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:358-59.

[42]Ibid., p. 359.

objections to points three, five, and twelve. Again, the British expressed the fear that Wilson would go too far and compromise their victory in his bilateral negotiations with Germany.[43]

On October 22, Wilson received the third German note, in which the Germans accepted the imposition of armistice terms by the Allied military, announced an end to submarine warfare, and insisted that Prince Max's Government was representative of the people and responsible to the Reichstag.[44] Wilson's reply questioned the representative nature of the German Government. He informed them that he was submitting the correspondence to the Allies and that he was recommending that the military representatives begin the preparation of armistice terms.[45]

Wilson sent House to Europe to act for him. The Colonel arrived in Paris on October 26. He immediately set out to determine the feelings of the Allies regarding a reply to the Germans.[46] He was faced with the problem of Allied objections to the Fourteen Points,

---

[43]Chargé in Great Britain, Laughlin, to Lansing, telegram #2823, 15 October 1918, ibid., pp. 365-66.

[44]Oederlin to Lansing, telegram, 22 October 1918, ibid., pp. 379-81.

[45]Lansing to Oederlin, telegram, 23 October 1918, ibid., pp. 381-83; Lansing to Allied Ambassadors in Washington, telegram, 23 October 1918, ibid., p. 383.

[46]Seymour, House, 4:86-92.

and House considered it of utmost importance for the Allies to accept the Fourteen Points explicitly. They had been the basis of German negotiations; if the Allies would officially endorse them, "the basis of a peace will already have been made." House noted in his diary on October 28 that although the Allies had tentatively accepted the Fourteen Points, it was becoming more apparent that they were trying "to get from under the obligations" that the Fourteen Points would impose on them in making the peace.[47]

The most formidable objection to the Fourteen Points came from the British.[48] The British objection to the "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas" was directly tied to the British illusion of security. The British saw their own security as resting on their status as an island nation, isolated from Europe, and on their position as supreme mistress of the seas. As Ray Stannard Baker states, "The British . . . came out of the war feeling more secure. Their only great naval rival in Europe was crushed. . . . The British wanted to preserve the status quo."[49] They felt that they had power and security and wanted to maintain them. Security was their control

---

[47]House Diary, 28 October 1918, ibid., pp. 150-51.

[48]Cabinet Minutes: Public Record Office, CAB 23, vol. 14, No. 489, Minute 2.

[49]Baker, World Settlement, 1:379-80.

of the seas; security was their fleet; the threat to security was Wilson's freedom of the seas. To the British, point two of the Fourteen Points "implied the abolition of the right of blockade, their chief offensive weapon in time of war."[50] Looking at the blockade from a British point of view, it appeared to be the force which ultimately brought Germany to her knees. In point two, the British saw chains which would enslave them to an unproven international organization and destroy their weapon of sea power. The ultimate result would be to render their secure position completely invalid.

The fallacy in British reasoning was that naval power alone could provide, or continue to provide, security in the modern world. The British were blinded by their past, seeing only the importance of sea power upon history. The blockade was Britain's chief offensive weapon in a world that could not know the ramifications of air power. To the British, the world was forever frozen in 1918. It was a world in which the ocean provided isolation, and isolation meant security; it was a world in which an all-powerful fleet and a blockade were synonymous with military victory. The British illusion was that there was security in the status quo, and that a status quo could be maintained. The illusion was security; the reality was that there was not, nor could there ever be, security.

---

[50]Seymour, House, 4:159.

The British reservations[51] regarding point two of the Fourteen Points were accepted by House and by Wilson.[52] American acceptance of the British proposal ended the deadlock between the two countries. The controversial point two was never discussed formally at the peace conference. The Fourteen Points were agreed to by the British and French, with the two reservations proclaimed in the British draft, as the basis of the pre-armistice agreement. On November 5, the Germans were informed of the agreement among the Allies that peace be made on the basis of the Fourteen Points and were told that Marshal Foch would receive their representatives to communicate the military terms of the armistice.[53] Thus, the Germans and the Allies seemingly were obligated to an agreement to make peace on the basis of Wilson's Fourteen Points and his subsequent addresses.

One grievance about the armistice draft was expressed by Lloyd George, who felt that modification of the military clauses was

---

[51] House to Lansing, a telegram, 30 October 1918, received 31 October 1918, 5:50 a.m., Presidential Papers Microfilm, Woodrow Wilson Papers (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress Photoduplication Service, 1973), Series 5 C, Reel 415.

[52] House to Lansing, telegram, 30 October 1918, received 31 October 1918, 5:50 a.m., ibid; Wilson to House, telegram extract, 31 October 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:427-28.

[53] Lansing to Swiss Minister, Sulzer, 5 November 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:468-69.

needed. Lloyd George said it was "unwise to insist on the occupation of the east bank of the Rhine."[54] House, relating Clemenceau's response to Lloyd George's statement, not only revealed French feelings but also his (House's) own on the important Rhineland issue:

> Clemenceau stated that he could not maintain himself in the Chamber of Deputies unless this [occupation of the Rhine] was made a part of the armistice to be submitted to the German forces and that the French army would also insist on this as their due after the long occupation of French soil by the Germans, but he gave us his word of honor that France would withdraw after the peace conditions had been fulfilled. I am inclined to sympathize with position taken by Clemenseau [sic].[55]

With the signing of the armistice, the French secured an occupied Rhineland. House had been warned by General Bliss to take care that none of the armistice conditions foreshadowed the future peace terms.[56] By ignoring Bliss and failing to see the ramifications of the Rhineland clauses of the armistice, House not only led the French to believe that America supported their interests in the Rhineland, but also helped lay the foundation for one of the most highly contested issues at the conference--the disposition of the Rhineland.

---

[54] House to Lansing, telegram, 30 October 1918, Woodrow Wilson Papers, Series 5 C, Reel 415.

[55] House to Lansing, telegram, 30 October 1918, ibid.

[56] Keith L. Nelson, Victors Divided: America and the Allies in Germany, 1918-1923 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p. 16.

After the acceptance of the Fourteen Points by the Allies and Germany and the subsequent transferral of armistice preparations to the military advisers, events progressed swiftly. On November 8, the Germans formally requested the armistice which was read and delivered to them.[57] On the morning of November 11, 1918, the armistice was signed by representatives of the German Republic.

In essence, the armistice was a preliminary, imposed treaty which, as much or more than the Fourteen Points, shaped the character of the Versailles Treaty. Article 5 of the November 11 Armistice provided that German armies evacuate the countries on the left bank of the Rhine, that the countries on the left bank be administered by troops of occupation, and that the bridgeheads on the Rhine be held by the Allies.[58]

The military occupation provided for by the armistice awarded France "the line of the Rhine" and as most Frenchmen knew, "possession is nine points."[59] With a foothold guaranteed by

---

[57] House to Lansing, telegram, 9 November 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:489.

[58] House to Lansing, telegram, 11 November 1918, ibid., p. 495.

[59] Baker, World Settlement, 1:165; George Bernard Noble, Policies and Opinions at Paris, 1919: Wilsonian Diplomacy, the Versailles Peace, and French Public Opinion (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), p. 243.

the armistice, the French were better able to press for the Rhine frontier as a permanent military barrier against Germany. After all, the hub around which French policy revolved at Paris was security. Although security was illusory, it manifested itself, in part, in the control of the Rhine.

Directly related to the illusion of security was the illusion that Germany would resume hostilities. Just as this illusion affected the Premier's views of Wilson's early armistice negotiations, it was to influence decisions throughout the conference.

Foch's illusion, like that of most Frenchmen, was security. To further his country's position, Foch played on the illusion of the peacemakers that Germany perhaps would renew the war. By keeping the Allies afraid of a possible German military revival, Foch cried for armament rather than disarmament and for continued mobilization rather than demobilization. He maneuvered to strengthen France at the expense of Germany.

During the autumn of 1918, the illusions of innocence and security were not the only persistent thoughts that influenced the negotiators. The illusion of Bolshevism also was ever present. The illusion of Bolshevism was complicated in that it took several related but distinct forms in the minds of the decision-makers. They envisioned Bolshevism not only in Russia but spreading to Germany

and also to their own homelands. The advent of Bolshevism in any of these places could be triggered from without or within. Bolshevism-from-without would come from a direct invasion by Russian Bolsheviks or from direct Russian Bolshevik aid to a European country. Bolshevism-from-within would come from the unsatisfied masses who would spontaneously rise up against their Government.

The Allied leaders were preoccupied with Bolshevism. In the United States, Wilson carefully watched for signs of Bolshevism, and he looked closely at internal developments in the Allied countries and in Germany. In a letter by Secretary of State Lansing dated October 12, the concern of the United States regarding Bolshevism was evident. Lansing wrote:

> Furthermore, in Eastern Germany Bolshevism is raising its abominable head, and a Germany crushed might become prey to that hideous movement. If it did, Europe might become a seething mass of anarchy. . . . The horrors of Bolshevik Russia must not be repeated in other lands. The doctrine is spreading as it is. It is in all nations of Europe and is (I say it with regret) gaining a foothold in this country.[60]

The Wilson administration was also worried about threats of Bolshevism from without. American diplomats relied on special agents to gather data which were evaluated and summarized by the

---

[60]Lansing to Edward N. Smith, letter, 12 October 1918, in Lansing Papers, vol. 39, as quoted in Mayer, Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking, p. 60.

Central European specialists in the State Department. Between November 1 and November 26, American diplomat William Bullitt prepared seven memoranda on "The Bolshevik Movement in Europe" and three memoranda on "The Bolshevik Movement in Germany."[61]

Bolshevism was a concern of Lloyd George and Clemenceau. On October 30, House pointed out to the Allied Premiers that harsh armistice terms could bring the danger of Bolshevism to Europe. House feared that Bolshevism, once in Europe, could spread to England, France, and Italy. Although Clemenceau refused to admit that any danger existed in France, Lloyd George "admitted it was possible to create such a state of affairs in England and both agreed that anything might happen in Italy."[62]

The Allied military leaders were also aware of Bolshevism during the armistice discussions. It was the fear of aggressive Russian Bolshevism which brought about the British generals' decision to oppose German demobilization. Lord Milner, the Secretary of State for War, felt that the Germans had to remain mobilized because

---

[61]Lansing to Root, letter, 28 October 1918; copy to President Wilson, Lansing Papers, vol. 39, as quoted in ibid., p. 62.

[62]House to Lansing, telegram, 30 October 1918, Woodrow Wilson Papers, Series 5 C, Reel 415.

Germany might "have to be the bulwark against Russian Bolshevism."[63]

As the Germans made their decision to sue for peace, Ludendorff supposed that the Allied concern with Bolshevism would influence the armistice. On September 28, he wrote that he did not think Germany would be forced to abandon territory in the east because of the Allies' concern with Bolshevism.[64] On November 8, when the Germans formally asked for the armistice, they inferred the uneasiness in the Allied camp and sought to use Allied anxieties relating to Bolshevism to their own advantage. A German attempt to foster the fear of Bolshevism in the minds of the Allies seemed obvious in Foch's November 9 discourse with the Germans. The Marshal's version of his conversation with the German representatives reads:

> They have made no remark either as to the bridgeheads or as to the fleet. Their theme is to say that they will succumb to Bolshevikism if we do not help them to resist it and that after them we ourselves will be invaded by the same scourge. They have asked that they be permitted to retire more slowly from the left bank of the

---

[63]Bliss to House, 28 October 1918, Seymour, House, 4:116.

[64]Rudin, Armistice 1918, p. 49.

> Rhine saying that they required the means of forming an army to combat Bolshevikism and reestablish order.[65]

Although Foch's responses did not at the time indicate that his opinions would be changed by what was said, the illusion of Bolshevism seemed to influence him, too, on this occasion. By the armistice terms, the German army withdrew with full honor; the Allies agreed to consider supplying Germany with food; and the German evacuation from eastern territories was delayed.[66]

Nevertheless, although the illusion of Bolshevism appeared to have influenced Foch's decisions in relation to the armistice, the illusion of Bolshevism did not affect Foch at the peace conference in the same manner that it did the other Allied leaders. While evidence indicates that the other leaders in Paris were constantly pressured and maneuvered by the illusion of Bolshevism, Marshal Foch, far from being influenced by this illusion, used the fear of Bolshevism which prevailed in the minds of others to advance his own desires and goals.

With the armistice signed and cessation of hostilities assured, President Wilson, confident of the American people's support, of the

---

[65] House to Lansing, telegram, 9 November 1918, The World War, 1918, 1:489.

[66] House to Lansing, telegram, 11 November 1918, 11:00 p.m., ibid., pp. 496-97.

Allies' acceptance of his program, and of Germany's reconciliation to defeat, announced on November 11, "Everything for which America fought has been accomplished. It will now be our fortunate duty to assist by example, by sober, friendly counsel, and by material aid in the establishment of just democracy throughout the world."[67] Wilson believed his peace program of American principles was guaranteed, signed, and sealed in the armistice. He ignored the ominous nationalistic claims and distrust that appeared during the armistice negotiations; he was blind to the illusions of innocence, security, and Bolshevism which, in their varying manifestations, shaped the armistice and would mold the peace.

---

[67]President's Address to Joint Session of Congress, 11 November 1918, U. S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, The Paris Peace Conference, 13 vols. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-47), 1:1.

# CHAPTER III

## THE INTERIM PERIOD, NOVEMBER 11, 1918 - JANUARY 11, 1919

The signing of the armistice signaled the cessation of hostilities. War-weary individuals wanted to return to their normal lives, to forget the fear and suffering of the past four years. Between the signing of the armistice, November 11, 1918, and the official opening of the Paris Peace Conference, January 18, 1919, many events brought pressure on the decision-makers. In this interim period between November and January, the influential illusions of innocence, Bolshevism, and security swelled at the very foundations of the decision-making process.

The first event to have an effect on the conference was the controversial decision of President Wilson to attend the conference in person. House advised Wilson of the "practically unanimous" opinion of Americans and Britons that his attendance would "involve a loss of dignity and commanding position."[1] House forwarded the

---

[1] House to Lansing, telegram # 107, 14 November 1918, U. S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, The Paris Peace Conference, 13 vols. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-47), 1:130 (hereafter cited as Paris Peace Conference).

President a copy of a telegram sent by Clemenceau to Lloyd George in which the French Premier stated that since Wilson was a chief of state, he was not on the same level with them; therefore, in Clemenceau's opinion, it was undesirable for Wilson to attend.[2] The President responded by expressing the opinion that the European leaders wanted to exclude him because they feared he would lead the weaker nations against them.[3]

Possibly because of innocence or because of arrogance, Wilson decided to attend. This decision has been viewed by many as Wilson's fatal mistake, while others believed his decision was wise. Nevertheless, his personal attendance caused him to lose touch with Congress and the American public. He was unable to avoid irritation from the French press or to devote enough time to the major questions.[4] Lloyd George said that because the President was not accustomed to conferring with equals, it was difficult for him to adjust to

---

[2]House to Lansing, telegram # 108, 15 November 1918, ibid., p. 132.

[3]Wilson to House, telegram # 15, 16 November 1918, ibid., 1:134.

[4]Edward H. Buehrig, ed., Wilson's Foreign Policy in Perspective (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), pp. 148-49.

that position.[5] Definitely, the presence of the American President with his permanently ingrained ideals about the American mission, European past, and democracy had a direct bearing on the actions and decisions of the peacemakers.

By the opening of the conference, each major power had systematically prepared information to help in the decision-making. In the spring of 1917, Great Britain created an organization "for collection of material and the training of a peace staff" under the direction of Alwyn Parker.[6] The French organized the Comité d' Etudes under Professor Lavisse and a committee especially for the study of economic questions.[7] In September, 1917, the United States gathered a special body of "experts"[8] known as the "Inquiry." Although these special teams were organized, much controversy surrounds whether their materials were used in the most effective way.[9]

---

[5] David Lloyd George, Memoirs of the Peace Conference, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 1:149.

[6] Harold Nicholson, Peacemaking, 1919 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939), p. 26.

[7] Ibid., p. 28.

[8] "The term 'expert' has been much attacked on the ground that in many cases these unhappy specialists had little or no first-hand knowledge of the countries whose fate they were called upon to determine." Ibid., p. 125.

[9] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:178-79.

Before the opening of the conference, political changes which would eventually affect the decision-makers occurred in America and Britain. The Congressional elections of November, 1918, undermined domestic support of Wilson's moderate peace program by returning a Republican Senate. The mid-December Coupon Election returned a House of Commons determined to hold Lloyd George to a Carthaginian peace. These developments in Britain and the United States encouraged Clemenceau to outwardly announce on December 29 to the war-hardened Chamber of Deputies his skepticism of Wilson's program.[10]

Besides the undercurrents evidenced in the elections, there were remarks made as early as November 15 by the French Foreign Office which indicated that divergent opinions existed between the Americans and the French. Wilson believed the basis of negotiation, the Fourteen Points, was sealed in the armistice. Noting that the Peace Congress must adopt a basis for discussion, the Foreign Office memorandum stated:

> One single basis [of discussion] seems to exist at the present time: it is the solidary [sic] decision of the Allies upon their war aims, formulated January tenth 1917, in answer to the question of President Wilson, but it is rather a program than a basis of negotiations.

---

[10] Arno J. Mayer, Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking: Containment and Counterrevolution at Versailles, 1918-1919 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 13.

The Foreign Office called for a meeting of the four great powers to settle between them the affairs with which they would have to deal prior to the formal opening of the conference.[11] The declaration of January 10, 1917, was never agreed to by the United States. The platform of negotiation, as far as America was concerned, was the January 8, 1918, speech with its specified changes. Those were the terms agreed to by the Allies on November 5, 1918.[12] This obvious divergence on such a critical topic foreshadowed future disagreements among the peacemakers.

As the year progressed, Allied demands on Germany strengthened. House recorded in his diary that the Allies were taking "a perfectly impossible stand. They are making it more difficult for Germany under peace conditions than it was under war" by restricting her fishing fleet, prohibiting the use of gold for food payments, and establishing zones which cannot send or receive articles of commerce.[13]

---

[11] House to Lansing, telegram # 109, 15 November 1918, "Remarks Made by the French Foreign Office on Previous Peace Conferences," Woodrow Wilson Papers, Series 5 C, Reel 415.

[12] Memorandum by David Hunter Miller, 21 November 1918, Paris Peace Conference, 1:359.

[13] House Diary, 26 December 1918, Charles Seymour, ed., The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, 4 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926-28), 4:254 (hereafter cited as Seymour, House).

President Wilson sailed aboard the George Washington on December 4; he reached Brest on December 13. On the trip over, Wilson called the American delegation together to explain his plans. Stating that Americans would be the only ones at the conference with a disinterested point of view, he charged that they must assure that the will of the people rather than that of their leaders was followed. Decisions must rest on the opinion of mankind, not on diplomatic schemes and previous determinations. He said that there must be a League of Nations and that questions such as German indemnity must be taken from political hands and studied by commissions.[14] The above statements seem to indicate the arrogance of the American President. They also point out that he had worked out a plan to follow. The statements also show the duality of the President, the innocent American who wished to follow the "opinions of mankind" and the initiated innocent who approached reality by warning against "diplomatic schemes" and "political hands."

Between December 14 and January 11, the President was in Europe with very little official business to conduct. The Coupon Elections in Britain and French procrastination delayed the opening of the

---

[14]Ray Stannard Baker, Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement, 3 vols. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1922; reprinted, Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1960), 1:9-10.

conference. The effects of the delay were a decrease in Wilson's European popularity and the advancement of the French program for European peace.

Wilson was invited but refused to visit French and Belgian battlefields. Therefore, he was subjected to much criticism from the European press. Wilson's explanation for not attending reveals that Wilson was not totally oblivious to French intrigues, nor had he forgotten the German "immorality" of the war. When first asked by Laughlin to visit the battlefields, Wilson remarked, "The French want me to see red. I could not despise the Germans more than I already do."[15] In his speeches made in England during this period, he alienated many Britons and much of the press by neglecting to make reference to the British role in the war or to the sacrifices made by the people.[16] His lack of tact cost him popularity and seems to indicate the self-centeredness and arrogance of the President.

The delay in opening worked to the advantage of the French. Postponing the conference delayed demobilization and further insured the Allied victory over the Central Powers. Postponed demobilization coupled with the continued blockade held Germany powerless

---

[15] Seymour, House, 1:243.

[16] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:112.

while the country decayed in political and economic dissolution.[17] The ability of the French to manipulate events to their own advantage by maneuvering the European situation to their liking was already obvious.

During the interim period, the Allies were forced to be preoccupied with the threat of Bolshevism taking over Germany. On October 5, before the signing of the armistice, disorders broke out at Kiel. Street demonstrations by sailors and workers, led by the Independent Socialists, were followed by a conflict with the military authorities. On the battleship Kaiser the crew overpowered the officers, tore down the war flag, and hoisted a red flag. Several were killed or wounded before a committee of soldiers took control.[18]

The American minister in Switzerland reported that after the successful revolution at Kiel, the sailors, arrested at Berlin, won over their captors and rode down the street waving red flags. He also reported that the administration of the Government was under the control of six Social Democrats, three Majority representatives, and three Minority or Independents who had Bolshevik tendencies.

---

[17] Baker, World Settlement, 1:98.

[18] Bliss to Lansing, telegram #4964, 5 November 1918, U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918: The World War, 1918, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933), 1:471-72.

Characterizing the Independents as terrorists, he warned, "If starvation, the ally of Bolshevism, . . . [intervenes], nothing can save Germany from the Bolshevism and all it stands for."[19]

On November 25, William Bullitt of the Division of Western European Affairs reported that Germany was moving toward Bolshevism and that it looked as if no one could stop her. Describing conditions in Germany, Bullitt noted that the Government of moderate Social Democrats was menaced by a Spartacist group of Bolsheviks; that the Spartacist Karl Liebknecht was receiving unlimited propaganda funds from Russian Bolsheviks; and that the propaganda seemed to be successful among the hungry, disorderly masses. Bullitt supported Chancellor Ebert's claim that the time period for carrying out certain parts of the armistice needed extension. Bullitt warned, "Unless the number of railroad engines and cars demanded by the Allies is diminished such dislocation of economic life will ensue in Germany that Bolshevism will be inevitable." He cited the need for economic and political support and the immediate distribution of food as critical to the Ebert Government. In conclusion, he stated, "Unless we support

---

[19] Stovall to Lansing, telegram, 21 November 1918, Paris Peace Conference, 2:95-96.

the Ebert Government a little more strongly than the Russian Bolsheviki are supporting the Spartacus Group, Germany will become Bolshevist."[20]

Three days before the first meeting of the conference, reports of possible Bolshevism in Germany continued to be placed before the Allies. Marshal Joffre, who had been Commander and Chief of the French Army, 1914-1916, noted that the Allies needed a stable German Government to sign the treaty, preferably the Ebert Government rather than a Liebknecht Government, which was Bolshevik. His suggestion was to allow Germany "to seethe without interference until it . . . [could] recover from its own unrest." Sending an inter-allied army to Berlin, "even for purposes of pacific occupation," would be a grave mistake.[21]

Reports like those of Stovall, Bullitt, and Joffre filled the minds of the Allies prior to the conference. They needed a strong German Government, hopefully democratic, to sign the treaty. They needed to reduce Bolshevik influence by insuring that the peace did not result in an overthrow of the Government. They needed to feed

---

[20]Lansing to Wilson, Enclosure from the Division of European Affairs, 25 November 1918, ibid., pp. 99-101.

[21]Dawson, the Confidential Advisor and Special Assistant to the American Embassy in France, to Bliss, Memorandum of a conversation with Marshal Joffre, 1 January 1919, ibid., p. 383.

Germany and restore her economic life to stem the tide of Bolshevism. On the other hand, there were the contradictory feelings of hate and distrust and the demands for extensive reparations, security, and a Carthaginian peace.

Besides their concerns with Bolshevism erupting in Germany and aid being given Germany by the Bolsheviks, the peacemakers during November and December tried to discern their policies toward Russia. When the armistice was made, three main groups of anti-Bolshevik monarchist forces existed: forces under Admiral Kolchak in Siberia, those under Gernal Denikin in South Russia, and those at Archangel and Murmansk assisted by a British Expeditionary Force. The Allied troops had been sent to Russia to deny Russian territory to Germany and to rebuilt the Allies' Russian front. With the end to the war, the reasons for Allied intervention ceased to exist.[22] But, the problem of Allied intervention and policy toward Russia remained. Two courses of action seemed open to the Allies: direct military intervention or isolating Russia by encircling her with a ring of buffer states. Also, a part of the Russian question was her official status, if any, at the conference. Bolshevism, the threat of Bolshevism, and the questions regarding Russia were illusions which

---

[22]Howard Elcock, Portrait of a Decision: The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), p. 40.

affected the decision-makers during the interim months of November and December.

The problem of security was on the minds of Frenchmen during the interlude of November and December, 1918. Clemenceau asked Foch to draw up a memorandum on the question of making Germany's boundary the Rhine. In a five-page note dated November 26, Foch advanced his ideas about the strategic security of the West. Germany must be cut off at the Rhine. The armistice placed the Allied armies in the advantageous position of controlling the Rhine and made it easy to renew an offensive. This advantage should be made permanent in the treaty. Foch felt that the only way for France and Western Europe to be secure, having lost their Russian ally, was to set the Rhine as Germany's western frontier. If the Rhine frontier were not insured, Western Europe, deprived of all natural frontiers, would be in danger of the same invasion it had suffered in the past. Foch further stated that the Rhine would have to be held by sufficient troops. The Rhinelanders should be included in a common defense with the Allies.[23]

Foch presented his Rhineland proposal to the Interallied Conference to Prepare for the Peace, which met in London on

---

[23]Jere Clemens King, Foch Versus Clemenceau: France and German Dismemberment, 1918-1919 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 16-17.

November 30. Claiming illness, Colonel House was not present.[24] Clemenceau was absent on the night of November 30 because of a social engagement. Lloyd George stated that he realized the true reason for Clemenceau's absence when he found out the nature of Foch's remarks about the Rhineland. Clemenceau knew of the partiality everyone had for Foch and thought "that the first introduction of French ideas as to the future of the Rhineland should be left to him."[25] Furthermore, Lloyd George expressed his belief that Clemenceau never raised the Rhineland question at an official peace conference meeting because Clemenceau "was anxious to avoid a rebuff which would be recorded in the minutes of the Conference."[26] The question was left for Foch and Tardieu to push on the council, but they had Clemenceau's backing in the endeavor.[27]

Lloyd George related that this meeting was the first intimation given to Brtain that France wanted control of all territory on the left bank of the Rhine. Foch approached the question directly, stating that from a military point of view, the concentration of fifty-five to seventy-five million Germans on the right bank of the Rhine made

---

[24]Seymour, House, 4:241.

[25]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:78.

[26]Ibid., p. 253.

[27]Ibid.

Western Europe defenseless to invasion. Foch stated, "The natural boundary against such invasion was the Rhine. . . . Germany ought to be limited to the right bank of the Rhine." Regarding neutral states as useless, Foch recommended that an armed state be formed in the West. The Marshal stated:

> France, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Rhine lands left of the river, and Great Britain--all organised for the defense of the Western front. We ought to prepare an Alliance, including the Rhenish Province, whether they were in an autonomous organisation or not (a question which he did not wish to discuss) which would provide forces fully organised to safe guard the position.[28]

When asked about the political condition of the provinces on the left bank, Foch replied that they would probably be independent. He did not want to annex them but to provide defense. When asked how he would reconcile his ideas to the Fourteen Points, the Marshal stated that it could be arranged on the basis that Germany's signature on any treaty could not be trusted. Military precautions had to be taken and the Rhine was the obvious precaution. When asked if he did not fear the danger of creating another Alsace-Lorraine, Foch said that the feelings of the people would have to be conciliated. Lloyd

---

[28]Ibid., p. 79.

George made no commitment but warned Foch that they must be careful not to create any new European problems.[29]

The obsession with the Rhine-as-security was the underlying motivation for many maneuvers and decisions at the conference. It was the first topic raised by the French after the armistice and it was the backbone of their demands from that point forward. The French received no encouragement from Lloyd George, who did not want to create any new Alsace-Lorraines. In House's report on the London Conference,[30] no mention was made about French intrigues in the Rhineland, although it is obvious that the entire idea contradicted Wilson's Fourteen Points.

Between the cessation of hostilities and the official conference opening, several circumstances which affected the peacemakers and their decisions transpired. President Wilson's decision to attend the conference personally and subsequent criticisms of him by the press, the preparations of factual materials, the elections in

---

[29]Ibid., 1:78-80; the question of the Rhine was discussed on January 8, 1919, by Marshal Joffre and Dawson. Joffre concurred with Foch's plan, declaring that "only the Rhine as frontier can offer to France absolute security against future aggressions but we cannot and must not violate the principles of the Freedom of Peoples." Memorandum of a conversation between Dawson and Joffre, 8 January 1919, Paris Peace Conference, 1:384.

[30]See Seymour, House, 4:247-49.

Britain and the United States, and the delay in the opening of the conference, each signaled vibrations of what was to follow. Coupled with these events were the impossible demands which the Allies pressed on Germany after the armistice, the Allied preoccupation with the Bolshevist threat in Germany, and the direct statement of French intrigues for security as manifested in the Rhineland. The strong coalition which held the Allies together during the war faltered as each nation's interests diverged and each became the pawn of one or more of the various illusions which prevailed at the peace conference.

# CHAPTER IV

## CONFRONTATION AND INDECISION: JANUARY 18, 1919 - MARCH 14, 1919

The Paris Peace Conference officially opened on January 18, 1919, exactly forty-eight years from the day that the German Empire had been proclaimed at Versailles. Opening in an atmosphere of activity and confusion, "that sense of a riot in a parrot house," which could only be described accurately "through the medium of a sound film,"[1] the conference appointed fifty-eight committees which sat for six months and held 1,646 meetings. The conclusions of these committees were verified by twenty-six local investigations and discussed by the Council of Ten at seventy-two meetings and by the Council of Four at 145 meetings.[2]

The Council of Ten, composed of the Heads of Government and high officials from the five principal powers,[3] was a holdover

---

[1] Harold Nicholson, Peacemaking, 1919 (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1939), p. 52.

[2] Ibid., pp. 124-25.

[3] The five principal powers were the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and on occasion Japan.

from the Allied war decision-making body, the Supreme War Council. The Council of Ten conducted preliminary discussions, made preliminary decisions, received advice and requests from delegations, and appointed committees to study special problems. As discussions advanced, important problems were frequently given to committees; committee experts established the texts of approximately three-fourths of the treaty provisions, and the Allied leaders accepted them without comment.[4] The Council of Ten eventually proved too cumbersome to serve as a decision-making body; and on March 24, 1919, an inner council, the Council of Four, was formed. Composed of President Wilson and the Prime Ministers of Britain, France, and Italy, the Council of Four was formed to accelerate the work of the conference and to provide for direct conversation among the principal leaders.

The first plenary session was held January 18; but during the week preceding the official opening, the peacemakers were forced to make decisions which were influenced, in part, by their illusions of security and Bolshevism. Ironically, the first decision demanded from the peacemakers related directly to the problems of

---

[4]Ray Stannard Baker, Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement, 3 vols. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1922; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1960), 1:188.

Eastern Europe and Russia and only indirectly to Germany.

Early in January, Poland requested help to combat Bolshevism. Marshal Foch issued a memorandum in which he devised a plan for aiding Poland. Citing his belief that a Polish army was the key to stability in Eastern Europe, Foch proposed that Germany be forced to give the Allies access rights by sea to Danzig and by rail from Danzig to Thorn,[5] thereby facilitating the deployment of an army to crush Bolshevism. The Marshal also advocated releasing vast numbers of Russian prisoners of war who were being held in Germany and sending home to Russia those who opposed Bolshevism.[6]

Possibly Foch sincerely feared Bolshevism, but probably he saw a chance to foster the peacemakers' fear of Bolshevism and thereby advance his own goals. Foch's illusion, like that of most Frenchmen, was security, which he felt could best be achieved by crushing Germany. Besides stripping Germany of the provinces west

---

[5] Ferdinand Foch, "Notes on the situation in Poland," 11 January 1919, printed as Appendix I to Supreme War Council, 12 January 1919, 2:30 p.m., U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, The Paris Peace Conference, 13 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-47), 3:477-78 (hereafter cited as Paris Peace Conference).

[6] Ferdinand Foch, "Memorandum on Russian Prisoners Detained in Germany," 11 January 1919, printed as Appendix II to Supreme War Council, 12 January 1919, 2:30 p.m., ibid., p. 479.

of the Rhine, France could weaken Germany further by creating powerful states on Germany's eastern and southern borders. These states, like Poland, would be indebted to France for their origins and permanent security, and in turn, they would be allies for France against future German aggression.

To Foch, aiding Poland seemed to be much more than a method of combating Bolshevism; it appeared to be a means to sap German strength, not only by assuring to the Poles a formidable army, but also by forcing the Allies to remain mobilized on the European Continent. If Foch, by flaunting the illusion of Bolshevism, could manipulate the Allies into supporting his plan in Poland, he would be one step closer to achieving his goal.

The British and Americans refused to support Foch's Polish plan. Wilson asserted, and Lloyd George concurred, that it would be unwise to commit Allied troops in Poland before the conference established a general policy regarding Bolshevism.[7] Thus, Marshal Foch's plan was momentarily dashed; nevertheless the illusion of Bolshevism continued to make its presence felt, as the peacemakers turned to the problem of Russian representation at the conference.

---

[7]Supreme War Council, 12 January 1919, 4:00 p. m., ibid., p. 471.

The council had to decide who, if anyone, should represent Russia at the conference. Lloyd George said that the question of Russian representation must be considered in the light of an overall Russian policy, a problem with which the conference would be forced to deal soon. The Allies had to decide whether to withdraw or reinforce the troops then in Russia. As for the Russian emigrés, they represented every opinion except the dominant opinion in Russia. Lloyd George stated that the conference must accept the fact that Bolshevism was the opinion supported by most Russians, and that

> . . . the peasants accepted Bolshevism for the same reason as the peasants had accepted it in the French Revolution, namely, that it gave them land. The Bolsheviks were the de facto Government. . . . To say that we ourselves should pick the representatives of a great people was contrary to every principle for which we had fought.[8]

The peacemakers postponed a decision about Russian representation until a general policy on the Russian question could be formulated.[9]

As the peacemakers turned their attention to the January 16 armistice renewal, they were constantly menaced by thoughts and fears of Bolshevism. In the discussions of January 13, the influence exerted by the Bolshevik illusion was apparent in Allied policies relating to food and reparations.

---

[8]Ibid., pp. 490-91.

[9]Ibid., p. 491.

In January, 1919, not only the Germans, but also European Allied countries were in need of food. Due to the post-armistice shipping shortage, the Allies wanted to use the German merchant fleet to send supplies to Europe. After much controversy, the Allies agreed to secure the German merchant fleet, which would be used to transport food.[10] The peacemakers then came into conflict over the method by which the Germans would pay for the food. As the discussion grew heated, the French suggested postponement of the question.[11]

Wilson was reluctant to delay this question, a stand which revealed his preoccupation with Bolshevism. Wilson felt that postponement could be fatal in that it would lead to the dissolution of order and government. He noted that as long as hunger continued, "the foundations of government would continue to crumble." Furthermore, he stated that because it was to the Allies' interest to maintain a stable government, "food should be supplied immediately." He asked that the French withdraw their objection, "as they were faced with the great problems of Bolshevism and the forces of dissolution which now threatened society."[12]

---

[10]Supreme War Council, 13 January 1919, 2:30 p.m., ibid., pp. 512-15.

[11]Ibid., pp. 515-16.

[12]Ibid., p. 516.

Wilson, who appeared to have great insight into the European reparations question, noted that if the immediate food situation in Germany were not alleviated soon, none of the debts would be paid. "The want of food would lead to a crash in Germany." Since the Allied Governments could not pay for supplies to Germany, Germany must pay; "but if they [the supplies] were not paid for and supplied immediately there would be no Germany to pay anything." The British supported the American position. Consequently, the French withdrew their objections, and the council decided to supply food to Germany and to give new debts priority payment for two months.[13] Yet, because of procrastination, these decisions were never carried out.

The meeting of January 13 not only illustrated the role played by the illusion of Bolshevism in decision making, but it also revealed important aspects of the illusion of security. The continuing French technique of trying to improve their own position by attempting to tighten the demands on Germany with each renewal of the armistice was apparent. To France, a weaker Germany meant a stronger France. On January 13, it became evident that this belief extended to French demands for reparations. The French illusion of security was manifested in the belief that saddling Germany with severe

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 516-17.

reparations payments would strengthen and secure France by weakening Germany.

The belief that high reparations payments would give France security was illusory. What the French refused to consider was that if Germany were annihilated by starvation and Bolshevism, there would be no Germany to make the payments to rebuild France. Furthermore, Wilson's recognition of the flaw in French reasoning and his statement that food had to be supplied to Germany if anyone were to receive indemnity refutes the belief that the American President was totally innocent in regard to the European situation.

On January 16, as the Council of Ten again approached the Russian question, the illusion of Bolshevism was again in the minds of the peacemakers. The British General Staff had prepared a study, dated January 12, 1919, entitled "Appreciation of the Situation in Russia." It noted that Bolshevik opportunities in neutral countries were "very seriously curtailed" but that the "Bolshevising" of the German Revolution was at present "the most vital stage of their [the Bolsheviks] world revolution," which they were "sparing no effort to hasten." As for the internal position in Russia, the document stated that "all evidence still shows that the internal, political position of

the Bolsheviks remains strong, and they are better supported by their subjects than during the summer."[14]

Lloyd George told the conference that hopes for a collapse of the Bolshevik Government had been disappointed. "Bolshevism appeared to be stronger than ever." Reviewing the alternatives open to the Allies in regard to Russia, the Prime Minister noted that the Allies could send forces to Russia, but that it must be remembered that it had taken one million Germans to garrison a few provinces when Bolshevism was weak and disorganized. "Now it was strong and had a formidable army," and none of the Western Allies wanted to send men to Russia.[15] On behalf of Great Britain, Lloyd George stated that they would not try to hold Russia by force and that he did not think any other Western power would either. Another alternative would be to isolate Russia with the policy of "cordon sanitaire"; however, a blockade of Russia would not hurt the ruffians of Bolshevism but "would lead to the killing . . . of the ordinary population." Furthermore, the Russian people did not support the "White" leaders who would receive Allied aid because many of the peasants were afraid that

---

[14]"Appreciation of the Situation in Russia," 12 January 1919, Presidential Papers Microfilm, Woodrow Wilson Papers (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress Photoduplication Service, 1973), Series 5 B.

[15]Supreme War Council, 16 January 1919, 10:30 a. m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:581-82.

the Whites would try to restore the old regime. Lloyd George suggested that one acceptable course for the conference would be to invite the various factions to call a truce, come to Paris, and let the conference mediate some arrangement between them.[16]

Wilson, fearing the power of Bolshevism, told the conference that Bolshevism had a latent force that attracted sympathy. Currently, a feeling of rebellion toward vested interests existed all over the world. The world was impatient with slow reform, and even people in the United States sympathized with Bolshevism. Wilson stated that "the seeds of Bolshevism could not flourish without a soil ready to receive them. If this soil did not exist, Bolshevism could be neglected." British and American troops would not fight to restore the old order because part of Bolshevism's strength came from the people's animosity toward foreign intervention. He, therefore, supported the British proposal to convene a meeting of emissaries from all of the factions in Russia.[17]

Fearing that the presence of Bolshevik emissaries in Paris could trigger a revolution in France, the French opposed Lloyd George's suggestion. Lloyd George recognized that it was certainly possible for Bolshevism to gain ground in Britain or France, but he

---

[16]Ibid., pp. 582-83.

[17]Ibid., pp. 583-84.

argued that no small group of Russians could ignite a revolution. Yet, the French refused to acquiesce in bringing Bolshevik representatives to France.[18]

At first glance, the French objection seems to indicate that French actions were influenced entirely by the illusion of Bolshevism. Nevertheless, Lloyd George indirectly suggests another possible explanation for the French attitude. The British Prime Minister noted that because of the apprehensions and animosities excited by Bolshevism, no one wanted to bring the Bolsheviks to the conference on equal terms with the Allies. He said that Bolshevik atrocities as well as their abandonment of the Allied cause at a critical stage had caused much resentment, especially from the French who considered the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk an unpardonable act.[19]

That Georges Clemenceau viewed Bolshevism from a different perspective than his colleagues was the conclusion David Robin Watson presented in his recent political biography of the French Premier. According to Watson, Clemenceau was concerned with the "possibility of German expansion into a power-vacuum created by chaos in Russia, not an ideological crusade against Bolshevism as

---

[18] Ibid., p. 583.

[19] David Lloyd George, Memoirs of the Peace Conference, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 1:213.

a political doctrine." The French Premier showed few signs of taking seriously the view that Bolshevism was a contagious disease that would infect Europe if not stopped. Several times Lloyd George and Wilson expressed this view in order to entice the French into a conciliatory attitude toward Germany, but Clemenceau thought Bolshevism in Germany was a bluff. Clemenceau's concern was not with the left but with the right, Prussian militarism.[20]

The meeting of January 16 testified again to the weight carried by the illusion of Bolshevism. The peacemakers studied carefully the apparent strength that Bolshevism had gained. Furthermore, the discussions at the meeting pointed out Lloyd George's and Wilson's reluctance to send their troops to Russia, a reluctance which foreshadowed the controversial demobilization question which later confronted the peacemakers.

The meetings of the council between January 12 and 18 revealed that the thoughts of the peacemakers were surrounded by illusions and that their first efforts at peacemaking resulted in delay rather than decision. Their early encounters were marked by confusion, and more importantly, pointed to a lack of unity of purpose that would continue to plague the decision-making process.

---

[20]David Robin Watson, Georges Clemenceau: A Political Biography (London: Eyre Methuen, 1974), p. 316.

Meanwhile in Germany, elections for the Constituent Assembly took place on January 19, and the Social Democrats won 40 per cent of the seats. "To all outward appearances, moderation had triumphed over the extremes of Bolshevism and nationalism."[21] Yet, the elections, instead of satisfying French opinion, caused increasing uneasiness. Germany seemed to be returning to "its former disciplined activity" with a stronger, more centralized government which the French feared "was strenuously preparing to resist the demands of the Allies, and to promote divided counsels among them."[22]

On January 20 and 21, the Council of Ten again debated the Russian question. Wilson believed that by using arms against the Bolsheviks, the Allies were allowing the Bolsheviks to recruit armies. Furthermore, the President believed that meeting with the Bolshevik leaders would nullify this ability to gather recruits. When Clemenceau again refused to invite the Bolshevik representatives to Paris, Lloyd George proposed that instead they meet on neutral ground.[23] After more debate, Clemenceau told the council that if

---

[21]George Bernard Noble, Policies and Opinions at Paris, 1919: Wilsonian Diplomacy, the Versailles Peace, and French Public Opinion (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), pp. 155-57.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Council of Ten, 21 January 1919, 3:00 p.m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:647-49.

he were acting alone, he would erect barriers to prevent the spread of Bolshevism. But since he was not alone, "he felt compelled to make concessions, as it was essential that there should not be even the appearance of disagreement among them."[24] With Clemenceau's approval, Wilson drafted a note to the various Russian Governments asking them to meet for mediation February 15, on Princes Island in the Sea of Marmora.[25]

The Russian question was again postponed because final action could not be taken until the Allies met with the Russians. The conversations concerning Russia illustrated the Allies' preoccupation with Bolshevism and strengthened Allied fears that Bolshevism was spreading. Clemenceau's actions were not characteristic of a man who believed Bolshevism to be a bluff.[26] Possibly he too hoped to intervene in Russia for the same reason that Foch advocated intervention, to keep the British and Americans mobilized. Curious also was Clemenceau's "compulsion to make a concession." Perhaps the wise French Tiger, knowing that concessions would have to be made, preferred to give in on points he considered less important to French security.

---

[24]Ibid., p. 649.

[25]Ibid., p. 653

[26]Watson, Georges Clemenceau, p. 316.

On January 22, the French resumed their attempt to send Polish forces then in France to Poland. Foch spoke to the council, asking once more that Germany be forced to allow the Allies to occupy the Danzig-Thorn railroad so that help could be sent to Poland. At first, Wilson seemed to favor the idea, but the British were suspicious of Polish intentions. Poland appeared to be taking advantage of the situation by attempting to acquire areas that were not clearly defined as Polish.[27]

Lloyd George thought that Poland possibly would try to use the arms to capture Posen, thereby prejudging a decision of the conference. Why should Germany allow arms to pass if there were a chance that those arms might be used against them? More trustful than Lloyd George, Wilson had thought that Poland wanted the arms only to fight off Bolshevism, but he certainly wanted no part in aiding Poland to take territory that was not hers. Foch felt that Poland needed help if she were to survive at all because by simultaneously fighting the Bolsheviks, the Ukranians, and the Germans, Poland was committing suicide.[28]

---

[27]Council of Ten, 22 January 1919, 11:00 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:370-72.

[28]Ibid., pp. 673-74.

The council reached no decision, but rather sent an inter-Allied Commission to Poland to investigate. The meeting of January 22 showed that Foch was not concerned with the legality of Polish claims, self-determination, or Bolshevism; he was preoccupied with the security which an armed Poland could provide France. On the other hand, Wilson's failure to realize immediately that Poland might possibly want to use the arms against Germany showed not only his innocence in relation to the European situation but also his overwhelming preoccupation with Bolshevism.

On January 23, Lloyd George brought before the council the controversial questions of disarmament and compulsory military service in Europe. He realized that if Germany were allowed to maintain armaments and munitions to support an army of two or three million men, there would be very little demobilization for either Germany or Britain. According to the British War Office, a British army of 1,700,000 men would have to be kept mobilized which meant that compulsory military service would have to be continued. He feared the political consequences of such a decision because maintaining an army of that size "was a very serious demand which would not be readily accepted by the country."[29] The Prime Minister, therefore,

---

[29]Council of Ten, 23 January 1919, 10:30 a.m., ibid., p. 694; Baker, World Settlement, 1:352-53.

suggested that at the February 16 renewal of the armistice, the Allies demand a reduction of the German armed forces to a point consistent with the maintenance of internal order and that they set a limitation on the amount of German armaments and munitions.[30] With German demobilization underway, the Allies could demobilize, end compulsory service, and return to normal conditions.

Lloyd George's suggestion threatened to undermine the French plan for security which entailed keeping Allied armies intact and on the Continent. Since the British wanted German demobilization and disarmament so that their own troops could go home, Foch found difficulties in disarming Germany. In reply to the British Prime Minister, Foch implied that the Germans were still in a position to renew hostilities and that they had not accepted their defeat. Noting that the situation in Germany seemed to be worsening, Foch stated, "Since the defeat of the Spartacus party, German officers were resuming their arrogant behavior and were considerably harder to deal with than before. Moreover, German troops were being massed against the Poles."[31]

Reviewing a January 15 report by the German military representative to the Armistice Commission, the council noted that

---

[30] Council of Ten, 23 January 1919, 10:30 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:694.

[31] Ibid., p. 695.

according to German figures, German forces consisted of approximately "400,000 men and 'several' hundred thousand men, kept in active service, either as volunteers or as out of work." Therefore, the Allies estimated the actual numbers in the German army to be 600,000 or 700,000 men.[32] Foch said that one hundred Allied divisions were needed to maintain the German front, and he warned that those men had to be ready to go into action without delay:

> . . . or else it will not be victorious armies which will come forward in front of the defeated German forces--armies able to renew the fight, if peace is not signed--but armies which are being demobilized or moved, already for the greater part demobilized, will appear on our side, both being powerless for military action. To sum up, the debate will start on the base of an equal military situation, and then how shall we be able to speak of compensation, important indemnities? How shall we be able to impose any terms on the enemy?[33]

By threatening the Allies, not only with Germany's ability to renew the war, but also with the possibility that the Allies might lose indemnities, Foch hoped to hold the Allies in Europe.

Lloyd George noticed that although the number of Allied troops seemed dependent on the number of German troops, Foch had not mentioned German demobilization. The Prime Minister felt that

---

[32] Council of Ten, 24 January 1919, 10:30 a.m., ibid., p. 705.

[33] Ibid., p. 706.

Germany should be told that unless demobilization were carried out, the armistice would not be renewed. He did not believe the Germans would offer much resistance. The Allies would decide the number of troops Germany needed for internal order. Germany would need a "sufficient number of troops to police, in order to put down Spartacists and other revolutionary parties."[34] That is, Lord George now believed that Germany was vulnerable to Bolshevism. This belief influenced him toward leniency which would allow Germany to retain some military forces to preserve internal order.

Foch said that Lloyd George's terms could be added to the armistice and that the Germans would accept them, although there would be no way to insure Germany's adherence to the agreement. The Marshal reiterated that it would be easy for Germany to take up arms again if a strong leader arose. Armies could be easily reconstructed from the skeleton of trained men, officers, and staffs. Germany could form a good army quickly; consequently, the inclusion of Lloyd George's proposals in the armistice would be ineffective. Seeming to contradict himself, the Marshal cautioned against the Allies' basing their own actions on an estimate of the German military situation, "because it would be impossible to say what the actual military strength of Germany at the time really was." The Allies

---

[34]Ibid., p. 707.

would have to occupy Germany to know what her true military strength was. Therefore, the Allies should make no reductions in the armies of occupation before March 31.[35] Again Foch tried to advance his own policy by keeping the Allies mobilized on the Continent.

Bolshevism weighed heavily on Wilson's mind, and it shaped his ideas toward German demobilization. He said that if the German officers could not control their men, who supposedly were waiting around the military depots to be fed, they probably would not be able to carry out remobilization. He believed Germany's economic life had to be reestablished, but at present, it was impossible to do so. Unemployment was increasing and demobilization would only increase unemployment. The President, motivated by the illusion of Bolshevism, stated, "The increase of unemployment would widen the soil for the seeds of Bolshevism, and so create a Germany with which it would be impossible to deal at all." The President said that the Allies had to trust Germany sooner or later; a great army of occupation could not be kept in Germany forever.[36]

Wilson saw an early peace as the answer to all problems. He said that "peace would bring with it a settlement of the many questions which were troubling Europe, which now consisted of a

---

[35] Ibid., pp. 707-08.

[36] Ibid., pp. 708-09.

seething body of an uncertain and fearful people who did not know what fate awaited them."[37] Wilson's thinking was directed by the illusion of Bolshevism and the American illusion of innocence. Wilson seemed to believe that they could bring about a peace which would cure Europe's ills and erase the animosities of centuries.

Lloyd George reiterated Britain's need to undertake demobilization at once and his belief that the British could not contribute the troops Foch thought necessary. He noted that the acceptance of Foch's argument would mean that Germany could never be trusted and that armies of occupation could never be reduced. Not believing the German army to be a threat, the British Prime Minister said Germany could better be controlled by the reduction of arms and the proper handling of food and raw materials.[38]

Wilson agreed with Lloyd George's belief that Germany would not want to take up arms again. He cited Bolshevism as the great danger that had to be guarded against and said "the only real protection against it was food and industry." Lloyd George added that immediate disarmament was important because it was rumored that the Germans were selling their war materials to the Bolsheviks. He claimed that because it was inevitable that the armies would lose

---

[37]Ibid., p. 709.

[38]Ibid., pp. 709-10.

efficiency with time, Germany must be disarmed or she would be more formidable, in proportion, than the Allies. Lloyd George and Wilson agreed that a definite proposal had to be placed before Germany.[39]

The opposing views of the Allies regarding disarmament and compulsory service greatly influenced the decisions of the peacemakers. Basically, the differences among the Allies had their origins in the Allies' fundamental principles. Anglo-Americans believed the "root of all evil was the European conscript system with nations-in-arms always ready to fly at each other's throats." Germany was blamed for introducing this "most pernicious form" of militarism and for forcing other nations to adopt it in self-defense. The Anglo-American belief was that if Germany were required to abandon the conscript system and adopt the Anglo-American system of a small professional volunteer force, adequate for defense but not for aggression, one of the primary causes of war would be destroyed.[40] Also, German disarmament would allow Britain to put pressure upon France to disarm, and therefore, Britain could disarm. On the other hand, France and Italy believed that the conscript system was the

---

[39]Ibid., pp. 712-13.

[40]Paul Birdsall, Versailles, Twenty Years After (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), p. 120.

foundation of Continental safety and power.[41] "The sword of France was its army, and the army rested upon the institution of compulsory service."[42] The possible extinction of compulsory service and the limitation of arms struck at the very roots of European safety; consequently, the Continental powers, who felt that their very existence was threatened, feared that disarmament and the abolition of compulsory service in Germany would lead to their own disarmament.

Marshal Foch put pressure upon the council on questions of disarmament, compulsory service, and the Rhineland. Seeing life throughout history as being between battles and truces, Foch, as Clemenceau correctly claimed, assumed that life was preparing for the advantage of the strongest.[43] Yet, Foch never advocated total disarmament or total occupation of Germany. He believed disarmament could provide only temporary security because Germany could rearm in secrecy. On the other hand, Foch advocated a massive truncation of the Rhineland which would not have crushed Germany, but

---

[41]Baker, World Settlement, 1:356.

[42]Ibid., p. 358.

[43]Georges Clemenceau, The Grandeur and Misery of Victory, trans. F. M. Atkinson (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1930), p. 187.

which would have been likely to produce a perpetual agitation.[44]

The apparent duality in Foch's policy possibly came from his being a military man who considered war as inevitable. Lloyd George said that Foch knew the Anglo-Americans hoped German disarmament would be a prelude to general disarmament.[45] If the German army were reduced to a small force, "then there would be no excuse for maintaining in France a huge army which with reserves numbered between four and five million men." Foch refused to consider dismantling the French army "to which he had devoted his life and which was such a source of perpetual pride to him." To him the French army embodied "the best security and the supreme glory of his country."[46] The ideal situation for Foch was for a German army to exist but for that army to be incapable of attacking France. Thus, France would be justified in raising an army large enough to give France unchallengeable preponderance in Europe. Foch opposed ending compulsory military service for the same reasons. By

---

[44]Jere Clemens King, Foch Versus Clemenceau: France and German Dismemberment, 1918-19 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 22-23; Clemenceau, Grandeur and Misery, p. 114.

[45]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:391.

[46]Ibid., pp. 391-92.

perpetuating universal short-term compulsory service in Germany, Foch could preserve it in France.

The illusion of Bolshevism was perpetuated in the minds of the peacemakers, as they heard requests from the lesser nations. The Polish representative reported that unless Poland were assisted, she would be crushed by Bolshevism.[47] He claimed that the Germans were leaving their arms and ammunition to the Bolsheviks and intimated that the Bolshevik aim was "to get into touch with German territory and . . . to join hands and make common cause with the Spartacist group inside Germany."[48] Lloyd George, encouraging the council to refrain from "wrangling and tearing each others' eyes out," showed his concern with Bolshevism as he expressed the fear that the Allies' disagreements among themselves would cause the smaller countries to lose faith in them and turn toward Bolshevism.[49]

The peacemakers, preoccupied with what they believed to be the force at Germany's disposal, were afraid of possible German

---

[47]Council of Ten, 29 January 1919, 11:00 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:777.

[48]Ibid., p. 776.

[49]Council of Ten, 30 January 1919, 3:30 p.m., ibid., p. 816.

recovery and resistance.[50] The French attempted to exploit this fear and demanded a further reduction in German arms and the Rhineland frontier.[51] In their bid for illusory security, they tried to keep the Allies mobilized. The suggestion that the number of troops and the amount of war materials in the German's possession be fixed and that their arms plants be controlled[52] was viewed as unacceptable by Foch. The Marshal intimated that the Germans could conceal their rearmament while the Allies demobilized and then rearm and catch the Allies by surprise. He stated, "It would be impossible to prevent a country like Germany from doing what she wished at home. She would always be able to manufacture arms."[53] The surrender of German arms would weaken Germany but not make her impotent. He suggested maintaining the blockade, thereby reducing raw materials and food, and using an army of occupation under a single military control to insure that Germany fulfilled the armistice conditions.[54]

---

[50]Noble, Policies and Opinions, p. 245; Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:389.

[51]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:389.

[52]Report by Committee Appointed 24 January 1919, printed as Appendix B to Council of Ten, 7 February 1919, 3:30 p.m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:310-11.

[53]Council of Ten, 7 February 1919, 3:30 p.m., ibid., pp. 897-98.

[54]Ibid., pp. 989-900.

By this means, the Marshal hoped to keep the Allies mobilized and on the Continent to aid in securing France.

Wilson opposed any additions to the armistice and added to the French illusion of American innocence by cautioning the "Allies to avoid doing the improper thing of exacting terms, without running the risk of renewing the war. . . ." Wilson reasoned that the Allies' best interest would be served if Germany were allowed to renew her economic life, reduce unemployment, and pay reparations. He suggested that Germany be asked to reduce her forces and give up arms while the Allies reduced their own forces. Therefore, Germany's bill for occupation would be less and the Allies could relax the blockade.[55]

Naturally worried about French security, Clemenceau stated that France's geographic position was dangerous without a firm attitude toward Germany. According to Foch's report, the Allied forces would be reduced by April. Clemenceau, horrified by Wilson's apparent innocence, stated "the present moment was decisive, not because it was a question of winning the war, but because there was danger of losing the fruits of victory." The Allies had to act quickly because the Germans were becoming insolent. As Allied troops were reduced, the Germans would become more arrogant. Again

---

[55]Ibid., p. 901.

showing his distrust for the Germans and his preoccupation with security, the French Premier stated:

> He knew the German people well. They became ferocious when anyone retires before them. Was it not forgotten that they were still at war; that the Armistice was a status of war? The Germans had not forgotten it. . . . The Allies would be exposed to great danger unless they menaced the Germans now.[56]

Clemenceau again demanded a strong Poland to act as a buffer on the East. He said an attack on Poland should mean an advance by the Allies from the West. German goodwill could not be bought with food. "Any appearance of yielding would be construed as an evidence of weakness." He did not want to starve Germany, but the blockade had to be maintained.[57]

Lloyd George wanted to prevent unemployment by letting some supplies into Germany, but uppermost in his mind was that Germany should be disarmed so that Britain would not have to maintain large armies.[58] Wilson perpetuated the illusion of innocence as he cited his concern "that the Allies should make a good impression on the world" and his belief that aggravations regarding the armistice placed the Allies at a "moral disadvantage." The Germans would not

---

[56]Ibid., p. 903.

[57]Ibid., p. 904.

[58]Ibid., pp. 904-07.

renew the fight because their spirit was broken.[59] Furthermore, it was necessary for the Allies to assist the Weimar assembly if the Allies were to have an authority in Germany with which they could deal.[60]

Germany's eluding and executing poorly the financial clauses of the armistice, their failure to surrender submarines, and their failure to stop their attacks in Poland increased the animosity of the Allies and was used by the French to support their belief that Germany could not be trusted.[61] Clemenceau caused the French public to believe that the Allies were demobilizing too quickly and to fear a renewal of the war when he said in an interview to the Associated Press that victory was "a lull in the storm." Describing the Allied victory as a hollow victory, Clemenceau perpetuated the illusion of Bolshevism by saying that he feared that Germany, with the aid of Russia, might renew the war.[62]

Clemenceau continued to demand that the Allies' victory be insured in the peace. To him war was inevitable, so he pleaded with

---

[59]Council of Ten, 8 February 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., p. 931.

[60]Ibid., p. 927.

[61]Council of Ten, 10 February 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., pp. 946-50.

[62]Noble, Policies and Opinions, pp. 160-61.

the Allies not to force France's meager fifty-one divisions into facing the Germans after the British and Americans had returned home. Because of the systematic destruction which Germany had wrought in French industry, economically, "France would be unable to compete against Germany for two years." Furthermore, the systematic destruction was "not for military reasons, but in order to prevent France from recovering in peace time."[63] Clemenceau wanted compensation, firmness, and decision in regard to Germany. Believing that Germany must be forced to give satisfaction for violation of the armistice terms, the French Premier stated that if the Allies gave in, the Germans would continue preparations for war and be ready for war when the Allies dispersed.[64]

Wilson was finally convinced that a month-to-month renewal of the armistice might allow Germany to reach a point where she could successfully resist and where "the ancient pride and boastfulness of Germany might gain a new lease of life." Possibly Clemenceau's argument influenced the President, but evidence exists that the illusion of Bolshevism played a role in Wilson's decision. Wilson noted that because of the plan for general disarmament, it was difficult to prejudge what an adequate force for internal policing should be. The

---

[63]Council of Ten, 12 February 1919, 11:00 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 3:976.

[64]Ibid., pp. 977-78.

amount of armed forces required by Germany, according to Wilson, should be based on the amount she needed "to maintain internal order and to keep down Bolshevism."[65]

The illusion of Bolshevism again confronted the Allies as they heard warnings that if the Allies demobilized and left Russia to her fate, Germany and Russia would join together and Germany would be stronger than ever.[66] Stressing the danger of a German-Russian alliance, Clemenceau, hoping to keep the Allies mobilized for French security, encouraged a policy of encirclement, backed by a strong Poland and Allies forces.[67] Even the Germans attempted to exploit the Allies' concern with Bolshevism. The head of the German Armistice Commission wrote:

> For all power gives an eternal responsibility. Remember that hunger gives birth to destructive bacilli. Remember that if these bacilli develop and propagate themselves, the greatest danger will arise for your own people as well. Despair is the mother of Bolshevism. It is a disease of physical and moral hunger. The best remedy is bread and justice.

---

[65]Council of Ten, 12 February 1919, 5:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 1001-02.

[66]Council of Ten, 15 February 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., 4:15-16.

[67]Ibid., p. 17.

He warned that if the Allies did not help Germany, they would "sow hatred" and "reap Bolshevism."[68] The German people believed that the one aim of the armistice was to impose new heavy conditions prior to a prejudiced peace. The German people were trying hard to repulse Bolshevism, but the Allies were preparing the way for it.[69]

After February 19, the French pressed for a speedy decision on economic and military terms. While Wilson was in the United States and Lloyd George was appearing before Parliament in Britain, Clemenceau was confined to bed by the bullet of a would-be assassin. Foch, feeling that the time was right to dictate peace, outlined for the council three principal areas upon which he believed a preliminary settlement had to be made: "1. The strength of her [Germany's forces; 2. Her [Germany's] frontiers; 3. The indemnity she [Germany] is to pay."[70]

Preeminent in the minds of Frenchmen was the illusory security which they believed could be attained through the redrawing

---

[68]Erzberger to Allied Commission, 14 February 1919, printed as Annexure A to Council of Ten, 17 February 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., p. 41.

[69]Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[70]House to Wilson, telegram, 19 February 1919, Charles Seymour, ed., The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, 4 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926-28), 4:332-34 (hereafter cited as Seymour, House).

of Germany's frontiers. The Rhine "represented the only fruit worth snatching from the tree of victory."[71] Foch stated that "under no circumstances will the German Empire extend beyond the Rhine. . . . [The Rhine] . . . is essential for the security of France. . . ."[72] The French argued that limiting Germany's forces would not guarantee security, nor would the League of Nations. They demanded the physical guarantee of the Rhine.[73] Hoping to gain British support for their aspirations on the Rhine, the French stated that it had been the strength of Germany's position that had made war possible. They said:

> Because of her control of the Rhine bridges and of the offensive positions she had prepared on the left bank of the river, Germany believed herself capable of crushing the Western democracies before help could come from the maritime democracies, Great Britain and the United States.[74]

Both Clemenceau and Foch wanted a physical guarantee "which could only be an Allied occupation of the Rhine bridgeheads, especially as Germany's population was larger than that of France and was also

---

[71] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:260.

[72] Seymour, House, 4:344.

[73] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:259-60.

[74] Quoted in Howard Elcock, Portrait of a Decision: The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), p. 105.

growing more rapidly."[75] On February 25, a French memorandum reiterating Foch's earlier ideas, called for the Western frontier of Germany to be fixed at the Rhine and for the Rhine bridges to be occupied by an inter-Allied force.[76] To France, an independent buffer state in the Rhenish Provinces under Allied occupation was equivalent to the illusory security which Britain believed she had gained with the destruction of the German navy.

Foch tried to prevent Allied demobilization and to force the council into a speedy peace. He stressed that military conditions imposed on Germany would be done in vain because Germany could still "reconstitute her army, material means to that end being still available."[77] He wanted an army to be sent to Poland[78] but noted that the situation in the East could not be settled until the Western question was dealt with. The situation was that the Allies were marking time in the West while losing position in the East. Hoping to speed the peacemaking process, Foch reignited the illusion of Bolshevism by telling the peacemakers that he feared either an alliance

---

[75]Ibid., p. 107.

[76]King, Foch Versus Clemenceau, p. 44.

[77]Council of Ten, 24 February 1919, 3:00 p.m., Paris Peace Conference, 4:102-03.

[78]Ibid., pp. 105-07.

between Germany and Russia or the spread of Bolshevism into Germany.[79]

The illusion of Bolshevism influenced the peacemakers in their consideration of the question of supplying food to Germany. Negotiations surrounding the surrender of the German merchant fleet and the supplying of food to Germany had broken off. The Germans wanted a guarantee that food would be supplied until they brought in the next harvest.[80] Britain and America hoped that food would prevent Germany from drifting into Bolshevism.[81] Lloyd George, influenced by the illusion of Bolshevism, believed that food was a more important weapon than guns. Reports from British officers in Germany said that Bolshevism was being created because of the lack of food. The British Prime Minister said that starving people would listen to the Spartacists and that the Allies, by their very actions, were encouraging anarchy which would spread to other countries. Germany had to be secured so that she could act as a buffer against Bolshevism.[82]

---

[79]Council of Ten, 25 February 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., p. 121.

[80]Council of Ten, 6 March 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., p. 214.

[81]Council of Ten, 8 March 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., p. 275.

[82]Ibid., pp. 280-81.

Clemenceau, who did not hold the illusion of Bolshevism to the extent of his Allies, said that "the Germans were using Bolshevism as a bogey with which to frighten the Allies. . . . They [the Germans] were simply attempting to blackmail the Allies. To yield today would simply mean constant yielding in the future."[83] Because payment for foodstuffs would go primarily to the United States, Clemenceau saw feeding the enemy as equivalent to betraying his country.[84]

The firmness of the French demand for the illusory security of the Rhineland was again apparent when Clemenceau rejected the March 10 draft of the military terms.[85] He saw the clause as an attempt to deliver a substitute for the proposed French buffer state and French security.

Because of Clemenceau's rejection of the draft, the matter was given to an ad hoc committee which was unable to reach a decision. Yet, the conversations within the committee pointed out not

---

[83]Ibid., pp. 281-82.

[84]Ibid., p. 290.

[85]The draft provided for demilitarization of the Rhenish Provinces, the prohibition of construction of fortifications within the provinces, the prohibition of conscription or military training within the provinces, and the release of the area from contributing through taxation toward the cost of the German armed forces; see Seymour, House, 4:354.

only the determination of the French, but also the reasons of the British for objecting to the French proposal. The British believed that the French tradition in the Rhineland no longer existed and that separating the Rhineland without consulting her inhabitants would violate self-determination. The British also opposed the French proposal because they did not want to commit troops outside of the country for a long period of time and because they believed that occupation would create nationalistic irritations in both Germany and the Rhineland.[86]

On March 14, Wilson returned from America to Paris where he discussed the Rhineland problem with Lloyd George and Clemenceau. Clemenceau could not be swayed from the French demands. Clemenceau's chief assistant described the French Premier's reiteration of the French proposal:

> He [Wilson] tells our needs, our dangers of yesterday and of tomorrow. Alone against Germany, invaded and bleeding, we do not ask for guarantees. Those offered us--disarmament, demilitarisation, League of Nations--are inadequate in their present form. Occupation is indispensable. It is essential that this occupation be inter-Allied. It is essential that the left bank be

---

[86]King, Foch Versus Clemenceau, pp. 44-45; Andre Tardieu, The Truth about the Treaty, with a Foreword by Edward M. House and an Introduction by Georges Clemenceau (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1921), pp. 172-75.

> closed to the political and military schemes of Germany.[87]

Lloyd George drafted for France a joint military guarantee of the United States and Britain which would consent to a short-term occupation of the left bank of the Rhine, as a provisional guarantee for the payment of the German debt, and proposed a military guarantee against unprovoked aggression by Germany against France.[88] Clemenceau asked that he be allowed to discuss the British proposal with his experts, thus leaving the question of the Rhine, again, undecided.

Between the opening of the Paris Peace Conference, January 18, 1919, and the deadlock over the Rhineland, March 14, 1919, the peacemakers analyzed and debated the major issues. They clarified the problems and aired their differences of opinions, but they reached no solutions. Throughout the early weeks of the conference, illusions manipulated the decision-makers. The American President's apparent desire to be lenient toward the Germans alarmed the French and seemed to verify their belief in American innocence, whereas the French obsession with the baseness of the Germans and their subsequent demands for security in the forms of

---

[87]Lloyd George Papers; Beaverbrook Library, quoted in Elcock, Portrait of a Decision, p. 149.

[88]King, Foch Versus Clemenceau, p. 46.

mobilization and occupation of the Rhineland intensified the American and British belief that France's primary aim was the destruction of Germany as a political power. While these illusions brought pressure to bear on the peacemakers, they were ever-wary and manipulated by the illusion of Bolshevism. They feared Bolshevism would come from without in the form of a Russian-German alliance or from within the form of a Spartacist uprising. All problems, whether economic, military, or territorial, were discussed in the shadow of the illusion of Bolshevism. Blinded by these illusions, the peacemakers during the early weeks of the conference confronted the major issues but did not reach any decisions.

# CHAPTER V

## COMPROMISE AND PRESENTATION: MARCH 15, 1919 - JUNE 28, 1919

Embroiled in conflict during the months of March and April, the peacemakers attempted to reach some compromise regarding the treaty with Germany. Unable to overcome their preconceived ideas in their search for a compromise, the great men at Paris were manipulated by the illusions of security, Bolshevism, and innocence.

During the discussions surrounding the question of the Rhineland, it was obvious that the French did not equate the proposed treaty of guarantee or the League of Nations with what they believed was security against Germany. Clemenceau insisted on the immediate and permanent occupation of the Rhine and the severing of the left bank from Germany and the German customs union for a period of thirty years. Although appreciative of the proposed treaty of guarantee, the French Premier again cited that the lack of a Russian alliance and of natural frontiers left France vulnerable to future German attack. Only military occupation of the Rhineland would

insure the arrival of Allied military assistance and spare France from a third German invasion.[1]

Meanwhile, the illusion of Bolshevism again placed pressure on the peacemakers. When it was suggested in the proposed disarmament clauses that the German army be reduced to 100,000, Wilson sought assurance "that the external dangers from the Bolsheviks . . . which the Germans might have to meet on their eastern frontiers had been considered by the military experts."[2] Lloyd George, concerned with Spartacist movements within Germany, asked if more than 100,000 troops had been needed to suppress previous Spartacist insurrections in Germany.[3] The illusion of Bolshevism prompted the American President and the British Prime Minister to be concerned that Germany's military level be such that she could combat Bolshevism from within and without.

Foch tried to capitalize on the peacemakers' illusion of Bolshevism to obtain assistance for the Poles. Noting the gravity of the

---

[1] Jere Clemens King, Foch Versus Clemenceau: France and German Dismemberment, 1918-19 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 46.

[2] Council of Ten, 17 March 1919, 3:00 p.m., U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, The Paris Peace Conference, 13 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-47), 4:356 (hereafter cited as Paris Peace Conference).

[3] Ibid., p. 357.

situation in Poland, he stated that the fall of the town of Lemberg would mean the end of the Polish Government. Poland, menaced on three sides by the Germans, Ukranians, and Bolsheviks, was threatened by anarchy. Hoping for a strong Poland that could serve as a check on the Germans, Foch stated that unless a strong barrier were constituted, Bolshevism would triumph.[4] Sending troops to Poland would follow the peacemakers' policy of an Independent Poland and insure the creation of "a nucleus of resistance against the Bolsheviks."[5] Unwilling to commit British troops and unsure of whether the conference would award Lemberg to the Poles, Lloyd George refused to support Foch's plan.[6] Not only Lloyd George, but also Wilson fought against any proposal which would require the presence of their troops on the Continent after the disarmament period. Wilson believed that the proposed Inter-Allied Commission of Control implied a continuation of the Allied and Associated armies and of an occupation which he was against. He stated, "If the Allied armies were to be maintained forever in order to control the carrying out of the Peace Terms; not peace, but Allied armed domination would

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 379-80.

[5]Ibid., pp. 381-82.

[6]Ibid., p. 381.

have been established."[7] The actions of Lloyd George and Wilson on these questions again illustrate their determination to trust, rather than occupy, Germany and foreshadows the conflicts which would surround the occupation of the Rhenish Provinces.

Lloyd George feared that the proposed German-Polish frontiers would create new sources of friction. He warned that high indemnities and the cessation of large German populations to Poland might lead to the collapse of the German Government. Although the French representative to the Commission on Polish Affairs argued that only through communication with the sea by way of Danzig "could Poland have contact with the liberal powers in the west," the British Prime Minister asked the council to reconsider the German-Polish frontier.[8] Lloyd George's proposals were ultimately rejected, but his views showed his fear that too harsh terms would lead to the possible disintegration of the Weimar Government and of a subsequent Bolshevik takeover. Again citing the weakness of the German Government, Lloyd George, preoccupied with the illusion of Bolshevism, warned against "presenting such a Treaty that no Government would dare to sign it, or such as would cause the immediate collapse of

---

[7]Ibid., pp. 358-60.

[8]Council of Ten, 19 March 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., pp. 414-17.

any Government that undertook the responsibility of accepting it."[9]

Aware of the growing impatience of the world and the inability of their experts to agree on many problems, the peacemakers decided on March 24 to confer twice a day, if necessary, "on the most difficult and urgent problems."[10] Although the Council of Ten continued to meet, the heads of government attempted to settle the most difficult questions as they met under the auspices of the Council of Four. Yet, even in the Council of Four, the peacemakers could not escape the illusions which so strongly affected the final treaty.

As the Council of Four turned to the question of reparations and Germany's capacity to pay, Wilson and Lloyd George, blinded by their illusions, pleaded for leniency toward Germany, whereas the French, preoccupied with a possible German revival, demanded crushing reparations. Furthermore, Wilson's views perpetuated the illusion of innocence in the minds of his fellow peacemakers.

---

[9]Council of Ten, 22 March 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., p. 449.

[10]Council of Four, 24 March 1919, 3:00 p.m., Paul Mantoux, Paris Peace Conference 1919, Proceedings of the Council of Four (March 24 - April 28), trans. John Boardman Whitton, Publications De L'Institut Universitaire De Hautes Etudes Internationales, No. 43 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964), p. 1 (hereafter cited as Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four).

Seeming to be driven by his innocence, Wilson urged that the "demands should not be pressed to such a point that no German government would sign the peace treaty." He also warned that prolonged payments were against the best interests of the Allies. Yet, French claims remained such that even Lloyd George agreed that French demands were excessive.[11]

The illusion of Bolshevism caused Lloyd George to reach the same conclusion as Wilson. The British Prime Minister reminded the peacemakers that too severe terms might prohibit the German Government from accepting the treaty.[12] He stated, "If the German leaders conclude that their best course is to imitate Hungary and allay themselves with the Bolsheviks, if they prefer the risk of a few years anarchy to a servitude of 35 years, what will we do?"[13] The French, again revealing their demand for occupation, countered that a German refusal should be met by Allied occupation of the Ruhr Basin and the left bank of the Rhine. Lloyd George expressed his fear of Bolshevism as he stated:

---

[11]Council of Four, 25 March 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 3-4.

[12]Council of Four, 26 March 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 11-13.

[13]Ibid., p. 13.

> If forced to occupy a thickly populated region, like Westphalia, while Germany all about us has recovered, or was a disturbed country afflicted with the contagious disease of Bolshevism, who could estimate the costs and risks to ourselves? . . . I am convinced that the Germans will not sign the proposals we have in view. . . . Germany will go over to Bolshevism. Europe will remain mobilized, our industries at a standstill, our States forced into bankruptcy, and, as it will be rightfully said, we will be guilty because we did not know how to make peace. We must make up our minds to act with wisdom, whatever the opposition, in your country or in ours, may think.[14]

Wilson added that pre-war Germany, bent on economic mastery of the world, no longer existed. Also fearing Bolshevism, the President urged moderation and support of the Weimar Government. "We owe it to the cause of world peace to save Germany from the temptation to abandon herself to Bolshevism,"[15] he said.

Because of the impasses met by the Council of Four and his desire to provide guidelines for peace, Lloyd George prepared a draft which gave his views of what the final treaty should be. His draft, entitled the Fountainbleu Memorandum, demonstrated his preoccupation with Bolshevism and the degree to which this illusion shaped his proposals regarding Germany. The draft also revealed the Prime Minister's determination to create no new Alsace-Lorraines which could ripen into future wars. He appealed to the French to abandon

---

[14]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[15]Ibid., p. 14.

their traditional policy of dismembering and disrupting the German Reich, stating that only through moderation could the peacemakers secure a lasting peace and European organization against Bolshevism.[16] He said that the greatest danger was that Germany might "throw in her lot with Bolshevism and place her resources, her brains, her vast organizing power at the disposal of the revolutionary fanatics whose dream it is to conquer the world for Bolshevism by force of arms."[17] Noting that peace was usually short sighted and dangerous to the victor, he recalled that "France itself has demonstrated that those who say you can make Germany so feeble that she will never be able to hit back are utterly wrong." If Germany felt that she had been unjustly treated, she would find a way to get even. The British Prime Minister urged fairness and opposed transferring more Germans from German rule because these many small states would clamour for reunion with their native land. The Germans should be made to prefer the peace to Bolshevism. The Allies should help Germany get to her feet because it would be

---

[16] Howard Elcock, Portrait of a Decision: The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), p. 165; Paul Birdsall, Versailles Twenty Years After (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), p. 184.

[17] "Some Considerations for the Peace Conference Before They Finally Draft Their Terms," 25 March 1919, David Lloyd George, Memoirs of the Peace Conference, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 1:266.

impossible to "both cripple her and expect her to pay." Hoping to capitalize on his bargaining power, he again suggested that the United States and Britain give France a guarantee against German aggression.[18]

With the fear of Bolshevism weighing heavily on his mind, the British Prime Minister charged the peace conference to deal with the Russian situation because Bolshevik imperialism menaced not merely the States on her borders but threatened Asia, Europe, and America. He informed the French that the Rhenish Provinces should not be separated from Germany nor should the French be allowed to seize the Saar.[19]

Wilson also urged moderation, but Clemenceau warned against "excessive fears." The French Premier demanded the fruits of victory. Stating that he knew the Germans better than the Allies, Clemenceau said that as a nation, Germany would "submit to force in order that they themselves may impose force on the world. . . . The Germans . . . must have force to sustain an arguement." He informed the American President that the German "idea of justice . . . is not ours." He demanded military guarantees for

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 267-71.

[19] Ibid., pp. 271-72.

France, because unlike Britain and America, France was not sheltered by the sea.[20]

Clemenceau's preoccupation was with French security, not with the fate of Germans placed under foreign rule. His primary concern was with securing adequate protection for France in what he considered to be an inevitable future war, not with avoiding issues which would lead to war.

On the subject of reparations, Wilson, by protesting the French proposal to have Germany place everything indefinitely at the Allies' disposal, alarmed the French and seemed to strengthen their illusion of American innocence.[21] These fears were further compounded by Wilson's attempt to foil French demands for annexation of the Saar.[22] Clemenceau's statement to the President explicitly illustrated his belief that Germany would again strike at France, and furthermore, that the President's failure to realize this fact was the embodiment of innocence. Clemenceau stated:

---

[20]Council of Four, 27 March 1919, 11:00 a.m., Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four, pp. 24-27.

[21]Council of Four, 28 March 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 37-40.

[22]Council of Four, 28 March 1919, 4:00 p.m., ibid., pp. 41-45.

> He [Wilson] eliminates feeling and memory . . . [and] disregards certain elements of human nature. The fact of war cannot be forgotten. . . . It is a mistake to believe that the world is governed by abstract principles. . . . Do not believe that they [the Germans] will ever forgive us; they will only seek the chance for revenge; nothing will suppress the fury of those who hoped to dominate the world and who believed success so near. . . . You do not want to make an exception to principle? You will be forced to do so by the facts. . . . I respect your convictions; they are most honorable. You have a noble role. But you are acting against your own purposes. You will not sow hatred; but you will encounter bitterness and regrets. That is why we must not seek a mathematical kind of justice, but one taking sentiment into account.[23]

All three illusions were present at the meeting of the Council of Four on March 29. The illusion of Bolshevism was partially responsible for the peacemakers' decision to send General Haller's troops to Warsaw "to protect Poland from the Russian Bolsheviks." Foch, hoping to keep the Allies on the Continent, suggested that Allied officers be sent with the troops, whereas Wilson, again alarming the French by urging moderation, demanded that a clear explanation for the Allies' actions be given to the Germans.[24]

Clemenceau's reply to the Fountainbleu Memorandum defended French territorial claims and illuminated his own view of Bolshevism. He stated that Germany's loss of her colonies, navy,

---

[23]Ibid., pp. 46-47.

[24]Council of Four, 29 March 1919, 4:00 p.m., ibid., pp. 51-54.

and merchant fleet was the blow she would feel most and that it was pure illusion to believe that she could be appeased by territorial amelioration on the Continent. He feared that Lloyd George's memorandum was filled with inequalities which would adversely affect the Allies' relations after the war because the British Prime Minister had considered only the maritime powers while the Continental Countires that suffered most were offered only partial and temporary solutions.[25]

Clemenceau's fear was not of Bolshevism in Germany, but rather that France might lose her potential allies in Eastern Europe and, thereby, forfeit her post-war check on Germany. He believed that Bolshevism could best be combated only by creating new states which had a sense of nationality. He warned that if the sense of nationality were destroyed, the only barrier between Russian Bolshevism and German Bolshevism would be shattered. "The result will be either a confederation of Eastern and Central Europe under the domination of a Bolshevik Germany, or the enslavement of the same countries by a reactionary Germany, thanks to general anarchy."[26]

---

[25]"General Observations on Mr. Lloyd George's Note of 26 March 1919," 31 March 1919, Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:274-76.

[26]Ibid., pp. 274-75.

The French preoccupation with the illusion of security was best illustrated by Marshal Foch's appeal for a military frontier on the Rhine. In a memorandum to the peacemakers, he condemned and warned:

> To give up the barrier of the RHINE is to admit the following unthinkable monstrosity: that, although she be beaten, GERMANY, all covered with blood and crime, GERMANY, who is responsible for the death of millions of human beings, GERMANY, who wanted to destroy our country and turn it into a heap of ruins, GERMANY who had undertaken to dominate the world by sheer force, would be, by our voluntary withdrawal from the Rhine, maintained in such a position that she could renew her undertakings just as if she had been victorious. . . . Consider that to-morrow just as to-day, that welfare can only be ensured in any lasting manner, by making the RHINE our military frontier, and by holding it with Allied forces. We must, therefore, maintain our present indispensable position.[27]

The Marshal told the Council of Four that the line of the Rhine was the German frontier for both defense and attack. By giving up the Rhine, the Allies would place their present trumps in the hands of the enemy. He stated, "To elucidate the importance for the western Powers of a strategic frontier, I shall merely recall that, without Russia, the assistance of the naval powers in 1914 would have been unavailing." According to the Marshal, the victory could be guaranteed only by the occupation of the line of the Rhine. Disarmament

---

[27]"Appeal by Foch Regarding the Rhine Frontier," 31 March 1919, ibid., p. 278.

would not insure victory because the Allies could not be sure that Germany did disarm. Fostering the fear of Bolshevism, he alluded to the possibility of the Germans finding resources for future war in Russia. He demanded that the peace be guaranteed "by our holding the left bank of the Rhine until further notice, in other words until Germany shows signs of a change of heart."[28] Of course the French wanted occupation of the Rhine to continue indefinitely. They wanted it because they believed the Germans to be inherently untrustworthy and because they believed future war to be inevitable; the French, obsessed by the illusion that the Rhine could and would provide security, attempted to manipulate the decisions of the peacemakers.

Clemenceau in a last minute attempt tried to gain support from Belgium for the French proposals in the Rhine. He noted that the Germans, who would be twice as close to the river as the French and Belgians, could increase their army and be in a good striking position for future war. The French Premier also asked for a permanent commission to watch over Germany. The King of the Belgians, citing the military opinion that a German army no longer existed, refused to support a prolonged occupation, which they felt might cause the

---

[28]Council of Four, 31 March 1919, 3:00 p. m., Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four, pp. 64-65.

Rhineland countries to envy Saxony or Bavaria and, therefore, reinforce purely German sentiment.[29]

When the attempt to gain Belgian support failed, the French scheme for an independent state on the Rhine was abandoned and replaced by the idea of the proposed joint Anglo-American guarantee, supported by an occupation of the Rhine bridgeheads for a defined period of time. Lloyd George, supported by Wilson, was against the occupation of important sections of Germany for long periods of time. The British Prime Minister stated, "Nothing was more likely to create a feeling of bitterness and exasperation than the presence of a foreign soldiery under conditions of martial law in a land inhabited by a proud people."[30]

On the question of reparations, the French were blinded by their illusion of security. Their desire to gain the spoils of war and annihilate Germany made it difficult for them to consider the contribution that a revived Germany could make to the economic world. Lloyd George wanted Germany's capacity to pay for the next thirty years taken into account. "It would take Germany ten years to find her feet." Germany's capacity to pay could not be judged until her

---

[29]Council of Four, 4 April 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 109-110; see Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:278-79.

[30]Ibid.

economy was revived. Yet, Clemenceau, adamantly objecting to any reduction, said, "what the enemy owes to us should be declared."[31] As the argument continued, Lloyd George attacked France's occupation figures as being too high.[32] Finally the British Prime Minister explained that a restricted formula had to be adopted, not because it would be unjust to claim reparations, but because it would be impossible to obtain full payment. Although Clemenceau argued violently, the council decided that reparations would be based on Germany's capacity to pay.[33] They agreed that "damages were not to be assessed for two years." Therefore, the time necessary for passions to cool and for inflated prices of the war to return to normal would pass.[34] Consequently, the reparations problems were shifted to the Reparations Commission, which was endowed with almost sovereign power and later fixed the amount and mode of the German payments. When the Germans signed, the treaty specified only one concrete figure, 20,000,000,000 gold marks ($5,000,000,000), which was to

---

[31]Council of Four, 5 April 1919, 11:00 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 5:22-34; Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four, pp. 116-21.

[32]Council of Four, 5 April 1919, 4:00 p.m., Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four, p. 126.

[33]Council of Four, 7 April 1919, 3:30 p.m., ibid., pp. 132-33.

[34]Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:340.

be paid by Germany before May 1, 1921, "pending the full determination of the claims of the Allied and Associated Powers."[35]

The French further pursued their goal of crushing Germany as a political power by demanding not only the coal of the Saar, but also the Saar itself. Wilson objected for reasons of principle.[36] Again, the French showed their distrust for Germany as Clemenceau said, "During the past ten years preceding the war, we suffered each year from German blackmail, rendered possible by the need of our industries for the Saar coal." Wilson refused to allow annexation, but a compromise was finally reached. France was guaranteed a fixed supply of coal while sovereignty of the Saar was transferred to the League for a period of fifteen years, at which time a plebiscite of only those residents of the Saar at the signing of the treaty would determine the final fate of the territory.[37]

Clemenceau never formally raised the question of the Rhine frontier before the council and Wilson and Lloyd George, believing that a treaty of guarantee and disarmament would give sufficient

---

[35] Ferdinand Czernin, Versailles 1919: The Forces, Events and Personalities that Shaped the Treaty (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1964), pp. 329-30.

[36] Council of Four, 9 April 1919, 3:30 p. m., Mantoux, Proceedings of the Council of Four, pp. 159-61.

[37] Council of Four, 11 April 1919, 11:00 a. m., ibid., pp. 176-79.

security to France, resisted continuing French demands related to the Rhine.[38] Accordingly, the Rhenish problem was settled outside of the council. While Lloyd George was in England, Colonel House and Clemenceau reached an agreement which House placed pressure on Wilson to accept.[39] A demilitarized zone, fifty kilometers in depth, was established on the permanently disarmed right bank of the Rhine. The Rhenish provinces would be occupied for a period of between five and fifteen years to insure proper execution of the peace terms. These provisions became articles 428 and 429 of the treaty; and it was added that if at the end of fifteen years the guarantee against unprovoked aggression by Germany were not considered sufficient by the Allied Governments, the evacuation of troops could be delayed. France also received the right to reoccupy, even after the evacuation, if Germany did not execute the reparations provisions of the treaty.[40]

Thus, on April 15, the crisis over the Rhine passed, and it became clear that the treaty would be ready for the Germans. Nevertheless, Lloyd George did not formally approve the Rhineland

---

[38] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:277-78.

[39] Ibid., pp. 279-80; Charles Seymour, ed., The Initmate Papers of Colonel House, 4 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926-28), 4:422.

[40] King, Foch Versus Clemenceau, p. 47.

agreement until April 22.[41] He accepted then, only with reservations because he did not want the British to be forced to supply troops for fifteen years. The British people wanted to abolish compulsory service. Clemenceau requested merely a battalion with a flag from the British.[42] Later when reflecting on the decision, the British Prime Minister called it a mistake which contributed to the difficulties of appeasement. He felt that provocative incidents were the consequence of occupation and that the occupation of German towns by foreign troops contributed greatly to the outbreak of patriotic sentiment that found its expression in Nazism.[43]

With the greatest obstacle, the question of the Rhine, overcome, the peacemakers were free to complete the treaty. So on April 17, the Germans were called to Paris. Yet, for three weeks, quartered behind barbed wire for their protection at the Hotel des Reservoirs at Versailles, the German delegates were forced to wait because the treaty was not finished. The peace conference was in a state of confusion. Italy had stormed out of the conference over the Fiume question; the Belgians, believing their share of reparations to

---

[41] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:280-81.

[42] Council of Four, 22 April 1919, 11:00 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 5:113.

[43] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:280-81.

to be too small, threatened to boycott the signing of the treaty; the Japanese and Chinese were unhappy about the Shantung question. Thus, the peacemakers slaved frenziedly to untangle the remaining problems, while the various commissions tied up loose ends and polished the treaty's articles.[44] Again, as they worked on the remainder of the treaty, the men at Paris could not escape from the ever-present illusion of Bolshevism or from their fear that Germany might refuse to sign the treaty.

Communications from inside Germany emphasized the instability of the Ebert-Scheidemann Government and noted the possibility of a Spartacist coup de main or the refusal of the Germans to sign the treaty, either of which they feared might ultimately result in military dictatorship and civil war or a Spartacist or Bolshevik dictatorship.[45] The illusion of Bolshevism prompted Wilson to ask that the blockade be raised. He believed that if Germany did not receive food so that she could resume her industrial life, Bolshevism, rather than ordinary life, would grow in the present soil.[46]

---

[44] Czernin, Versailles 1919, p. 331.

[45] Communication from Berlin, printed as Appendix II to Council of Four, 20 April 1919, 10:00 a.m., Paris Peace Conference, 5:102-03.

[46] Council of Four, 23 April 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 151-52.

The Allies' fear of Bolshevism was further fueled by the Germans who insinuated that they might turn toward Russia if the treaty were unacceptable.[47]

The illusion of Bolshevism combined with the instability of the German Government caused Wilson to urge moderation and careful examination of each item in the treaty to see that it was equitable. He felt that the treaty was severe because it deprived Germany of her merchant fleet and foreign properties, affected international machinery of commerce, and opened Germany to citizens from other countries but did not allow German citizens to recover their positions in other countries. Germany had to be placed in a position where she could be punished, which meant that she had to be allowed a favorable balance of trade.[48] Therefore, to make the military terms more acceptable to the Germans, the peacemakers agreed to present those terms as preparing the way for general limitation of armament.[49]

By the beginning of May, the loose ends were hastily tied up and decisions were made on those questions which had threatened to

---

[47] Council of Four, 24 April 1919, 11:00 a.m., ibid., pp. 204-05.

[48] Council of Four, 25 April 1919, 4:00 p.m., ibid., pp. 232-33.

[49] Council of Four, 26 April 1919, 3:00 p.m., ibid., p. 209.

destroy the conference in the middle of April. The Italians returned under new leadership; the Belgians accepted the reparations accorded them; and Shantung was awarded to the Japanese.[50] The various commissions handed over their portions of the treaty; the Council of Four approved the commissions' labors; and the treaty went to press.

The 80,000 word Versailles Treaty, a product of delayed haste and a synthesis of the work of the various commissions, was ready for presentation to the Germans and the world on May 7, 1919. For the first time the separate parts were viewed as a whole. The result of viewing the composite treaty illicited responses of shock and indignation, not only from the Germans from whom such responses were expected, but also from other participants who had helped formulate the treaty. One United States statesman's prophetic words illustrate his alarmed reaction to the treaty. He said:

> While I had known many of the ideas, agreed upon by committees, I had not before envisioned it as a whole. I was greatly disturbed. In it hate and revenge ran through the political and economic passages. Many provisions had been settled without consideration of how they affected other parts. Conditions were set up upon which Europe could never be rebuilt or peace come to mankind. It seemed to me the economic

---

[50] Czernin, Versailles 1919, pp. 331-32.

consequences alone would pull down all Europe and thus injure the United States.[51]

Receiving the treaty at the Trianon Palace Hotel, the German delegates immediately protested, a protest which Lloyd George described as "characterised rather by dignity than defiance."[52] On May 29, the Germans replied to the Allied Peace Delegation in a memorandum which demurred virtually item by item what they considered to be the harsh exactions of the treaty and emphatically repudiated the clauses which attributed war guilt entirely to Germany.[53] Lloyd George, although he did not feel that he could accept the German point of view regarding their war guilt "without giving away the whole of our [the British] case for entering into the War,"[54] reviewed the German complaints with the British Ministers and Dominion Premiers and was authorized by them to press the council for certain concessions for Germany.[55] Among the proposed concessions were modification of Germany's eastern frontiers where

---

[51] Herbert Hoover, Years of Adventure, pp. 461f, quoted in ibid., p. 332.

[52] Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:455; for complete text of German speech see Lloyd George, Memoirs, 1:455-58.

[53] Ibid., pp. 458-59.

[54] Ibid., p. 459.

[55] Ibid., pp. 462-80.

predominantly German districts were transferred to Poland, reduction of the numerical strength of the Army of Occupation and of the period of occupation, and the setting of a definite amount of German liability to the Allies.[56]

Over the protests of both Wilson and Clemenceau, a plebiscite, which had results favorable to Germany, was held in Upper Silesia. The Germans were also given three months to make an offer of a fixed sum in cash or kind which they could deliver for reparations.[57] Nevertheless, Clemenceau and Wilson agreed with Lloyd George's view of the German's war guilt and refused to relent on this question. Therefore, the peacemakers unanimously demanded that Germany accept total responsibility for having caused the war.[58]

On June 22, balking because of the inclusion of the war guilt clauses, the Germans attempted to accept the treaty conditionally. Because the Allies would not acquiesce in a conditional acceptance, the German Foreign Minister resigned and the German Government fell. The reorganized German Government, only hours before Allied Armies were to march into Berlin and Weimar, agreed to accept the treaty

---

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid., p. 483.

[58] Czernin, Versailles 1919, pp. 390-91.

"under duress."[59] Accordingly, on June 28, 1919, the fifth anniversary of the assassination which ushered in the war, the Germans signed that product of illusion and delayed haste, the Versailles Treaty.

---

[59] Ibid., pp. 391-92.

# CHAPTER VI

## CONCLUSION

Ushering in a new era, the Versailles Treaty greatly influenced the international and political climate of the modern world; yet, it failed to realize the peacemakers' goals of framing a perfect world and of ending the perennial conflicts which had been the source of world unrest prior to the First World War. Instead, the peacemakers' efforts have been blamed for the turbulence of the inter-war years and the Second World War.

Products of their own eras and national inheritances, the political stonemasons at Paris pulled together the raw and contradictory evidence, as they perceived it, and carved in stone that historical monument, the Versailles Treaty. The actions and decisions of the peacemakers, which ultimately shaped the treaty, were governed not by knowledge of fact, but rather by illusion. The reality of events during the confusing months of peacemaking was immaterial; it was the perception of events through the glass of illusion that shaped the treaty with Germany. Throughout the peace negotiations, the men at Paris were guided by false ideas, misled by images, and pushed by

incorrect perceptions about security, Bolshevism, and American innocence. These illusions that blinded the peacemakers created the controversial Versailles Treaty.

The human frailties within the makeup of the representatives of the four Great Powers made each predisposed to illusion. The cynical Clemenceau, believing nationalistic quarrels to be natural and diplomacy to be a means of snatching the spoils of war, was, like most other Frenchmen, possessed by the illusion of French security. He believed that the French would be secure if Germany were crushed militarily, if the Rhine frontier were torn from Germany, and if the German economic system were destroyed. That security against Germany could have been acquired under any set of circumstances was itself an illusion. The French adamantly refused to consider the consequences of their desires. They did not foresee the change which modern weapons would bring to warfare, nor did they envision a militarily prostrate Germany creating weapons which would ultimately render the line of the Rhine ineffective. The French were blind to the possibility that severing great populations from the Reich or occupying large areas of German territory could result in the creation of a patriotic sentiment ripe for Nazism. Moreoever, ignoring the warnings of the British and Americans that an economically crushed Germany would be unable to contribute to a revived Europe,

the French attempted to saddle Germany with outrageous reparations.

The French Premier's illusion that American innocence would sacrifice France's hard-fought victory prejudiced him against the ideas of the American President. That Clemenceau was genuinely frightened by what appeared to him to be Wilson's arrogant idealism was obvious throughout the negotiations. Possibly many of Clemenceau's rigid stands were prompted by this illusion. By beginning from an extremely harsh position, the French Premier could equalize what he believed to be Woodrow Wilson's leniency. Clemenceau could then yield on points which he did not feel were essential to obtaining French goals, and thereby reach a compromise that satisfied his desires.

Clemenceau and the other Frenchmen were not influenced by the illusion of Bolshevism in the same manner as the British and the Americans. The French Premier did not view Bolshevism as a contagious disease which could infect all of Europe. Rather, Bolshevism to him was a bluff that the Germans were trying to use to their own advantage. Therefore, unlike Wilson and Lloyd George, he did not feel that the condition of Bolshevism should influence the conference's decisions concerning Germany. On the other hand, the possibility seems to exist that although the French were not

preoccupied with the illusion of Bolshevism, they did use it as a ploy in an effort to attain their own goals. Both Clemenceau and Marshal Foch attempted to foster the fear of Bolshevism in the minds of the other peacemakers in order to advance their own illusory security.

Although statements made by British Prime Minister David Lloyd George during the Coupon Election led to the illusion that he would insist on a Carthaginian peace, in reality, he was able, as the conference progressed, to pursue a more practical line. During the conference, the British felt secure and only wanted to maintain the status quo. The only threat to British security, as they saw it, was point two of Wilson's Fourteen Points, which implied the abolition of their right to blockade. Because a compromise favorable to the British was reached on this point before the peace conference met and because the question of freedom of the seas was never again raised, the British did not feel immediately threatened. The isolation provided by the sea coupled with the internment, and later the destruction, of the German navy provided the British with an illusory sense of security. Seeing only the importance of sea power upon history, the British failed to realize that naval power alone could not continue to provide security in the modern world. The British, like the French, failed to conceive the full ramifications of air power and modern weaponry. That there was security in the status quo and that the

status quo could be maintained in a world where, in reality, there could be no security, was the British illusion of security, which moved the British toward a more lenient position regarding Germany.

More than the British illusion of security, the British preoccupation with the illusion of Bolshevism shaped Lloyd George's actions at the conference. Much of his indulgent attitude toward Germany was prompted by his fear that Bolshevism would engulf Germany from within, in the form of a spontaneous uprising of the masses against the Government, or from without, in the form of a direct invasion by Russian Bolsheviks or direct Russian Bolshevik aid to a faction within the country. The illusion of Bolshevism, the Prime Minister's desire to restore British export industries, and Britain's traditional policy of using Germany as a balance to France's power on the Continent were the catalysts which caused Lloyd George to demand a revived Germany in the new Europe. Only by allowing Germany to recover economically would she be able to resist Bolshevism and pay reparations. Afraid that Bolshevism would come to Germany, the British Prime Minister supported relief, the raising of the blockade, and a German army adequate enough to maintain domestic order.

Not saddled with the innocence which the French attributed to the American President, Lloyd George was more successful in

moderating French projects against Germany. The British Prime Minister also fought against the French designs to augment their illusory security. Afraid of creating new Alsace-Lorraines which might lead to future wars and knowing that the British public expected speedy demobilization, he contested French attempts to annex the Rhineland and to keep the Allies on the Continent. Realizing that France in her fight for illusory security might succeed in annihilating Germany through severe reparations, the British Prime Minister attempted to ammeliorate French claims. He believed that Germany had to be treated leniently so that there would still be a Germany to pay reparations and balance French power on the Continent. Therefore, basing his policies on the illusion of security and the illusion of Bolshevism, Lloyd George attempted to maintain the status quo.

Woodrow Wilson, whose personality was characterized by dichotomy, appeared to portray the arrogant idealism of an American innocent. America, sheltered by the Atlantic Ocean and years of self-imposed isolation, provided Wilson with an ideological background alien to his European counterparts. Wilson's illusory belief was that the United Stated possessed a wholesome liberating force which, if applied to Europe, would mend the defective and fatal European system to which he attributed the war. That belief motivated many of his actions at Paris and alienated the French.

Furthermore, the President's idealistic statements and his inattention to ancient European quarrels and traditions caused the French to fear that Wilson would sacrifice the hard-fought victory. In turn, French actions were also governed by the illusion of American innocence.

Although Wilson believed in the United States' sense of mission and professed to hold altruistic motives which he hoped the other peacemakers would adopt, he was not as predisposed to be indulgent toward the Germans as the French believed him to be. Wilson had undergone a transformation in his degree of innocence between the beginning of the war and the opening of the peace conference. When Wilson arrived in Paris, he was not the pure innocent who had made many idealistic statements at the outset of the European war. Rather, he was the initiated innocent, who had experienced unrestricted submarine warfare, the German people's support of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and the immoral sinking of the Leinster during the armistice negotiations. Wilson was not about to be indulgent toward those who had committed illegal and inhumane acts.

The Americans, like the British, felt secure because of their geographic position, and like the British, the Americans were manipulated by the illusion of Bolshevism. Wilson's illusory belief that Bolshevism might rise inside Germany or that Russian Bolshevism might seep across the border into Germany caused him to

fight against French aspirations on the Rhine and in the Saar and to ask for the lifting of the blockade and the lowering of reparations. The fear of Bolshevism also influenced him to support Germany's maintaining an adequate army. Therefore, the American President's actions and decisions at the conference were based on a combination of his American innocence and his fear of Bolshevism.

The illusions of security, innocence, and Bolshevism were rooted in events which took place between the outbreak of the war and the pre-armistice negotiations. The illusion of French security was first documented when the French, in an agreement with Imperial Russia, proclaimed an eastern frontier on the Rhine as essential to their security against future German invasion. Also pertinent to the illusion of security was the futile French attempt to get the British to acquiesce to a Rhenish buffer state. The British rejection of the French plan foreshadowed the difficulties which later arose at the conference.

The illusion of American innocence began prior to the United States' involvement in the war. Wilson's early speeches reflected his innocence and indicated that his thoughts were already governed by the illusion that American principles could be applied in the world. The entrance of the United States into the war and the experience of unrestricted submarine warfare moved the President away from his

purely innocent position, and furthermore, insured that illusions surrounding the American President would weigh heavily on the peace.

The illusion of Bolshevism began with the Bolshevik Revolution. The Revolution prompted both Wilson and Lloyd George to issue separate war aims, thereby giving a vague basic outline for the peace and illustrating a degree of agreement between the British and American goals. Also, the subsequent Treaty of Brest-Litovsk hardened Wilson's attitude toward Germany by forcing him to realize that the German people supported their Government as long as it was successful. Yet, the primary effect of the Russian Revolution was the emergence of the illusion that Bolshevism would at any moment engulf the civilized world. The fact that the Bolshevik Revolution occurred caused the peacemakers to fear that Russian financial and military aid would allow Germany to prosecute the war or that Bolshevism would spread into Germany, Central Europe, and the Western Democracies. Because the fear of Bolshevism interlaced the peace negotiations, many of the decisions of the peacemakers were governed by this illusion.

All of the illusions affected, or were affected by, the armistice. The armistice, in turn, influenced the final settlement. The illusion of American innocence was fueled by the fact that the German request for armistice was directed unilaterally to Wilson and by the

fact that he delayed in communicating with France and Britain. Also, Wilson's experience with the German's sinking of the Leinster during the pre-armistice negotiations was an important factor in moving the President into the position of the initiated innocent.

The illusion of security also advanced during the pre-armistice negotiations. The settlement surrounding point two of Wilson's Fourteen Points gave the British an illusory sense of security that influenced their actions at the conference. The French bid for illusory security also advanced during this period. Foch established and advanced the illusion that Germany could resume hostilities; therefore by playing on the peacemakers' fear that Germany might renew the conflict, he was able to ask for armament and mobilization. Also, the fact that Foch's suggestions for the armistice called for evacuation up to the left bank of the Rhine and that the Allies did not protest his plan resulted in the French believing that their plan was acceptable to all. Ultimately, the terms of the armistice awarded the Allies an occupied Rhineland which strategically positioned the French so that they could press for the Rhine frontier as a permanent military barrier against Germany.

During the negotiations for armistice, the illusion of Bolshevism grew. Lloyd George admitted that he believed that harsh armistice terms could bring the danger of Bolshevism to Europe.

The fear of Bolshevism and the desire to have a buffer against Bolshevism resulted in the Allies' allowing the Germans to remain mobilized. The Germans, aware of the Allies' illusion of Bolshevism, flaunted Bolshevism and used the Allies' fear of Bolshevism to their own advantage. Because of the Allies' illusion of Bolshevism, the Germans gained concessions in the armistice. They were allowed to withdraw from the West with full honor, and their evacuation from the Eastern territories was delayed. Furthermore, they received the Allied promise that the Allies would consider sending them food.

During the interim period, between the signing of the armistice and the opening of the conference, the strong war-time coalition showed signs of faltering as each nation's interests diverged and each became the pawn of one or more of the various illusions. The American President, with his permanently ingrained ideas and sense of mission, decided to attend the conference personally, while undercurrents indicated that divergent opinions existed between the Americans and the French regarding the bases of negotiations.

Because of the British Coupon Election and French procrastination, the opening of the conference was delayed and the French program for European peace gained ground. By postponing the conference, the French delayed Allied demobilization and prevented the

lifting of the blockade, which, in turn, led to political and economic dissolution in Germany. Wilson's refusal to visit French and Belgian battlefields and his tactless address to the British enhanced the Europeans' belief in his innocence.

Bolshevism, the threat of Bolshevism, and questions relating to Russia were components of the illusion of Bolshevism which affected the peacemakers during the interim period. Reports of Bolshevik-inspired demonstrations and messages relating the advances of revolutionaries in Germany kept the illusion of Bolshevism before the peacemakers and made the Americans and British feel that Germany needed a strong Government and a peace which would not undermine the Government. Therefore, they felt that Germany needed to be fed and that her economic life needed to be restored.

The peacemakers also tried to construct a policy toward Russia. They were faced with the question of whether to withdraw or reinforce Allied troops already in Russia. Too, the peacemakers were forced to consider what role, if any, Russia would play at the conference.

The primary motivation of the French was the illusion that the Rhine could provide security. During the interim period, Foch explained the strategic security which he believed the natural frontier of the Rhine would provide to the West and urged that this security be

made permanent in the treaty. He called for an independent Rhenish State and a sufficient number of Allied troops to occupy and hold the Rhine. Again, although important to the French, the intrigues on the Rhine received no encouragement from the other peacemakers.

During the week preceding the official opening of the conference, the encounters of the peacemakers were marked by confusion and a lack of unity of purpose. Because the thoughts of the peacemakers were surrounded by illusions, most of their first efforts at peacemaking ended in delay rather than decision.

Poland's request for help in combating Bolshevism prompted Foch to play on the peacemakers' illusions to advance France's own bid for illusory security. Hoping to create powerful states on Germany's eastern border to provide France with an ally against future German aggression, Foch devised a plan for aiding Poland. Using the guise of fighting Bolshevism, he hoped to strengthen Poland at the expense of Germany and force the Allies to remain mobilized.

The illusions of Bolshevism and security also affected policies relating to food and reparations. Because the French thought that Germany's paying for food would reduce their reparations, they tried to postpone the question of supplying food to Germany. France believed that by saddling Germany with severe reparations, she could weaken Germany and become more secure herself. This portion of

the French plan was illusory because a Germany annihilated by starvation or Bolshevism would be unable to supply the reparations to rebuild France. Nevertheless, the food question was not delayed because of the British and American illusion of Bolshevism. Because they felt that the lack of food would bring disorder and Bolshevism, the British and Americans pressed the French into the decision to supply food to Germany.

The question of Russian representation at the conference, although ultimately postponed, forced the peacemakers to review reports which told of the progress of Bolshevism in Germany and the strength of Bolshevism in Russia. To the British and Americans, Bolshevism appeared to be a force which would win ultimate control in Russia and which would extend into Europe if the peacemakers did not discourage its spreading. The French, on the other hand, thought Bolshevism was a bluff; but hoping to add to their own security by retaining Allied troops on the Continent, the French called for intervention in Russia. Nevertheless, the other Allies, believing that Russia was already lost to Bolshevism and seeking immediate demobilization, refused to support the French plan.

When the question of supplying aid to Poland again confronted the conference, Wilson's innocence and his fear of Bolshevism influenced him initially to support Foch's plan for sending arms to Poland.

More trustful than Lloyd George and lacking an understanding of ancient European quarrels, Wilson did not foresee that the proposed arms might be used against the Germans rather than against the Bolsheviks. His intense fear of Bolshevism and his innocence were the illusions which again guided his decision.

The questions of disarmament and demobilization were influenced by the illusions of security, innocence, and Bolshevism. The French, because of the illusion of security, attempted to make it necessary for the Allies to remain mobilized. For this reason, they opposed German disarmament and demobilization, which Lloyd George felt were needed so that British troops could go home. Foch said that because the Germans could rearm secretly and resume hostilities, demobilization and disarmament would be futile. Yet, Lloyd George, although British demobilization was important to him, did not want total German demobilization. Believing that Germany was vulnerable to Bolshevism, he assumed a position of leniency toward Germany and asked that her army be such that she would be capable of putting down Bolshevik uprisings.

Wilson reached the same conclusion Foch did regarding German demobilization, but not because of the illusion of security; in his case it was the illusion of Bolshevism which prompted his decision. Wilson, believing that Germany's economic life had to be

reestablished if she were to be able to fight off Bolshevism, saw demobilization as a factor which would contribute to unemployment and, thereby, help bring Bolshevism to Germany. Wilson also agreed with Lloyd George that Germany's army had to be powerful enough to fight off Bolshevism from without and within.

Wilson attempted to ignore the question of demobilization temporarily, and he urged the council to work for a speedy peace. It was his innocence which prompted the American President to believe than an early peace was the cure-all for Europe's ills. This belief was certainly a product of his innocence which, in turn, caused him to fail to realize that no peace could erase the animosities which had plagued Europe for centuries. Wilson's apparent innocence was further enhanced in the minds of his fellow peacemakers as he counseled them against doing anything improper and encouraged them to make a good impression on the world. Furthermore, he alarmed the French when he proposed that the peacemakers ask for, rather than demand, concessions from the Germans.

Working for France's illusory security and attempting to offset Wilson's leniency, Foch exploited the fear that Germany might rearm secretly and demanded the Rhine frontier, occupation, and maintenance of the blockade. Clemenceau, also alarmed by Wilson's apparent innocence of the European situation, spoke of the historical

untrustworthiness, ferociousness, and arrogance of the Germans. Motivated by the illusions of American innocence and security, the French Premier demanded firmness toward Germany, the creation of a strong Poland, and the maintenance of the blockade. Clemenceau cited the possibility of a German-Russian alliance to keep the Allies mobilized and entice them into aiding Poland. On the other hand, the Germans attempted to exploit the illusion of Bolshevism to get food sent to Germany and to secure an easier peace.

Although the French illusion of security was partially manifested in keeping the Allies mobilized, creating a strong Poland, and saddling Germany with crushing reparations, the physical guarantee of the Rhine was the most important component of their illusion of security. The French believed that an independent buffer state in the Rhenish Provinces, supported by Allied occupation, would be equivalent to the illusory security which Britain equated with her fleet. The British, believing French tradition in the Rhineland to be nonexistent and believing occupation to be the mother of nationalistic quarrels, were joined by the Americans in fighting off the French schemes. Although offered disarmament, demilitarization, the League of Nations, and a joint military guarantee, the French were determined to find security in the Rhine.

Because of the illusion of security, Clemenceau was not as concerned with the fate of those placed under foreign rule as he was with preparing France for the future. Considering war to be inevitable, he wanted France to have adequate protection when war began. Because he believed the Germans to be inherently untrustworthy, he pushed for an independent Rhineland. When these hopes were dashed, he fought for and received an occupation of the Rhine bridgeheads which did not bring security to France, but which was probably instrumental in creating feelings which helped bring about the next war.

American innocence caused Woodrow Wilson to see the answer to Europe's problems to be in a speedy and just peace based on American principles. That such a peace could have been formulated even under the best set of circumstances was itself illusory. The President's innocence prompted him to make statements which alarmed his fellow peacemakers and also manipulated the French into a more rigid position at the conference. Yet, Wilson's innocence was one of varying degrees. Many times, especially on the question of reparations where he continually reminded the French that an economically annihilated Germany could not help rebuild Europe, he was in closer touch with reality than were the Europeans.

Touching virtually every aspect of the peacemaking process, the illusion of Bolshevism was held by the Americans and British and exploited by the French. Both Clemenceau and Foch attempted to keep the Allies mobilized and to strengthen Poland under the pretense of fighting off Bolshevism. Even the Germans attempted to flaunt the illusion of Bolshevism to gain concessions from the peacemakers. Indeed, it seems that the threat of Bolshevism from without and within was the primary factor in moving Wilson and Lloyd George to a position of moderation toward Germany. On questions of boundaries, reparations, Germany's military status, and her economic position in post-war Europe, the illusion of Bolshevism helped dictate the peace.

Prisoners of their own illusions, the peacemakers pulled together the raw and contradictory evidence as they perceived it and created the Versailles Treaty. Unable to escape from their illusions, the great men at Paris forged a treaty that did not end the recurring European conflicts. Rather, the product of their labors helped prepare the way for the conflicts of the future.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources

### Unpublished Materials

Great Britain. War Cabinet Minutes. CAB 23, Public Record Office, London, England. (Microfilm)

Woodrow Wilson Papers. Presidential Papers Microfilm. Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. (Microfilm)

### Government Documents

U. S. Department of State. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918: Supplement 1, The World War. 2 vols. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1933.

_____. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919: Supplement 3, The Paris Peace Conference. 13 vols. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-47.

Woodward, E. L., and Butler, Rohan, eds. Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-39. First Series, 8 vols. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1947-58.

### Memoirs, Diaries, Letters, Accounts by Participants, and Documents Privately Collected

Baker, Ray Stannard. What Wilson Did at Paris. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1919.

_____. Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters. 8 vols. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran, and Co., 1927-39.

_____. Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement. 3 vols. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1922; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1960.

_____, and Dodd, William E., eds. The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: The New Democracy. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Bros., 1926.

_____. The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: War and Peace. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Bros., 1927.

Baruch, Bernard M. The Making of the Reparation and Economic Sections of the Treaty. New York: Harper and Bros., 1920.

Bonsal, Stephen. Unfinished Business. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1944.

Burnett, Philip Mason. Reparations at the Paris Peace Conference from the Standpoint of the American Delegation. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Callwell, C. E., Major-General, Sir. Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson: His Life and Diaries. 2 vols. London: Cassell and Company, 1927.

Churchill, Winston S. The World Crisis. vol. 5: The Aftermath. London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1929.

Clemenceau, Georges. The Grandeur and Misery of Victory. Translated by F. M. Atkinson. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1930.

Hankey, Maurice, Lord. The Supreme Control at the Paris Peace Conference. London: Ernest Benn, Ltd., 1946.

Haskins, Charles Homer, and Lord, Robert Howard. Some Problems of the Peace Conference. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

House, Edward Mandell, and Seymour, Charles, eds. What Really Happened at Paris: The Story of the Paris Peace Conference, 1918-1919. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Keynes, John Maynard. The Economic Consequences of the Peace. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920.

Lansing, Robert. The Big Four and Others of the Peace Conference. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921.

_____. The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921.

Lloyd George, David. Memoirs of the Peace Conference. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.

_____. The Truth about the Peace Treaties. 2 vols. London: Victor Gollancz, 1938.

Mantoux, Paul. Paris Peace Conference 1919, Proceedings of the Council of Four (March 24 - April 28). Translated by John Boardman Whitton. Publications De L'Institut Universitaire De Hautes Eutudes Internationales, No. 43. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964.

Miller, David Hunter. My Diary at the Conference of Paris. 21 vols. New York: Appeal Printing Co., 1924.

Nicholson, Harold. Peacemaking 1919. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939.

Riddell, George Allardice Riddell, Lord. Lord Riddell's Intimate Diary of the Peace Conference and After, 1919-1923. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, Inc., 1934.

_____, et al. The Treaty of Versailles and After. New York: Oxford University Press, 1935.

Seymour, Charles. Letters from the Paris Peace Conference. Edited by Harold B. Whiteman, Jr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

_____, ed. The Intimate Papers of Colonel House. 4 vols. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926-28.

Shotwell, James T. At the Paris Peace Conference. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937.

Tardieu, André. The Truth about the Treaty. Foreword by Edward M. House. Introduction by Georges Clemenceau. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1921.

Temperley, H. W. V., ed. A History of the Peace Conference of Paris. 6 vols. London: Henry Frowde and Hodder and Stoughton, 1920-24.

## Bibliographies

Almond, Nina, and Lutz, Ralph H. An Introduction to a Bibliography of the Paris Peace Conference. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1935.

Birdsall, Paul. "The Second Decade of Peace Conference History." Journal of Modern History 2 (September 1939): 362-79.

Turnbull, Laura Shearer. Woodrow Wilson: A Selected Bibliography of His Published Writings, Addresses, and Public Papers. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

## Secondary Sources

Bailey, Thomas A. Woodrow Wilson and the Great Betrayal. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945.

_____. Woodrow Wilson and the Lost Peace. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944; Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1963.

Blum, John M. Woodrow Wilson and the Politics of Morality. Boston: Little and Brown, 1956.

Birdsall, Paul. Versailles Twenty Years After. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941.

Buehrig, Edward H., ed. Wilson's Foreign Policy in Perspective. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957.

Carsten, Francis Ludwig. Reichswehr and Politics, 1918 to 1933. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Czernin, Ferdinand. Versailles, 1919: The Forces, Events and Personalities that Shaped the Treaty. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1964.

Dodd, William E. Woodrow Wilson and His Work. New York: Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1920.

Elcock, Howard. Portrait of a Decision: The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles. London: Eyre Methuen, 1972.

Floto, Inga. Colonel House in Paris: A Study of American Policy at the Paris Peace Conference 1919. Aarhus: Universitesforlaget I Aarhus, 1973.

Gelfand, Lawrence E. The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Holborn, Hajo. A History of Modern Germany, 1940-1945. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Hoover, Herbert Clark. The Ordeal of Woodrow Wilson. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1958.

Huthmacher, J. Joseph, and Susman, Warren I., eds. Wilson's Diplomacy: An International Symposium. The American Forum Series. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1973.

Jones, Thomas. Lloyd George. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Jordan, W. M. Great Britain, France, and the German Problem: A Study of Anglo-French Relations in the Making and Maintenance of the Versailles Settlement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1943.

King, Jere Clemens. Foch Versus Clemenceau: France and German Dismemberment, 1918-1919. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Liddell Hart, B. H. Foch: The Man of Orléans. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1932.

Levin, Gordon, Jr. Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Link, Arthur S. Wilson, the Diplomatist: A Look at His Major Foreign Policies. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1957.

_____, ed. Woodrow Wilson, A Profile. New York: Hill and Wang, 1968.

_____, and Leary, William M., Jr., eds. The Diplomacy of World Power: The United States, 1889-1920. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.

Mantoux, Étienne. The Carthaginian Peace, Or the Economic Consequences of Mr. Keynes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

Mayer, Arno J. Politics and Diplomacy of Peace Making: Containment and Counterrevolution at Versailles, 1918-1919. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967.

Mowat, C. L. Britain Between the Wars, 1918-1940. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Nelson, Keith L. Victors Divided: America and the Allies in Germany, 1918-1923. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Noble, George Bernard. Policies and Opinions at Paris, 1919; Wilsonian Diplomacy, the Versailles Peace, and French Public Opinion. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.

Owen, Frank. Tempestuous Journey--Lloyd George: His Life and Times. London: Hutchinson and Company, Ltd., 1954.

Pinson, Koppel S. Modern Germany, Its History and Civilization. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Rudin, Harry R. Armistice 1918. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.

Schulz, Gerhard. Revolutions and Peace Treaties, 1917-1920. Translated by Marian Jackson. London: Methuen and Co., 1972.

Taylor, A. J. P. English History, 1914-1945. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Thompson, John M. Russia, Bolshevism, and the Versailles Peace. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Tillman, Seth P. Anglo-American Relations at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Tumulty, Joseph P. Woodrow Wilson As I Know Him. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1921.

Ullman, Richard Henry. Anglo-Soviet Relations, 1917-1921. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Walworth, Arthur. Woodrow Wilson. 2 vols. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1958.

Watson, David Robin. Georges Clemenceau, A Political Biography. London: Eyre Methuen, 1974.

Watt, Richard. The Kings Depart: The Tragedy of Germany, Versailles and the German Revolution. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.

Wilson, Trevor. "The Coupon and the British General Election of 1918." Journal of Modern History 36 (March 1964): 28-42.

Yates, L. A. R. United States and French Security, 1917-1921. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1957.