

Read all the sources carefully and answer all the questions that follow.

Sources in this paper have been edited: word additions or explanations are shown in square brackets []; substantive deletions of text are indicated by ellipses ... ; minor changes are not indicated.

These sources and questions relate to the principle of collective security and early attempts at peacekeeping (1920–1925).

SOURCE A *Extract from a speech made by President Woodrow Wilson, 25 September 1919, in Colorado, USA, promoting the League of Nations.*

They [member states] enter into a solemn promise to one another that they will never use their power against one another for aggression; that they will never threaten the territorial integrity of a neighbour; that they will never interfere with the political independence of a neighbour; that they will abide by the principle that great populations are entitled to determine their own destiny and that they will not interfere with that destiny; and that no matter what differences arise amongst them they will never resort to war without first having done one or other of two things – either submitted the matter of controversy to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the result without question, or submitted it to the consideration of the Council of the League of Nations.

SOURCE B *Extract from the minutes of the fourteenth meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, **League of Nations Official Journal**, 24 June 1921.*

The Council at its meeting of 24 June 1921, having regard to the fact that the two parties interested in the fate of the Åland Islands have consented that the Council of the League of Nations should be called upon to effect a settlement of the difficulties which have arisen, and that they have agreed to abide by its decision.

Decides:

1. The sovereignty of the Åland Islands is recognized to belong to Finland.

[...]

4. The Council has requested that the guarantees will be more likely to achieve their purpose, if they are discussed and agreed to by the Representatives of Finland with those of Sweden, if necessary with the assistance of the Council of the League of Nations, and, in accordance with the Council's desire, the two parties have decided to seek out an agreement. Should their efforts fail ... the Council of the League of Nations will see to the enforcement of these guarantees.

SOURCE D

Extract from Fascist Ideology: Territory and Expansionism in Italy and Germany, 1922–1945 by Aristotle A Kallis, 2000. Aristotle A Kallis is Professor of Modern and Contemporary History at Lancaster University, UK.

In August 1923, a car carrying a League of Nations' arbitration team on the Greek–Albanian border was ambushed in northern Greece ... As the incident had happened inside Greece's national territory, the Italian government held Athens responsible for the murder and issued a strong ultimatum, demanding a massive compensation ... After the occupation and bombardment of Corfu by the Italian air force the case was referred to international arbitration; not, however, to the League of Nations, but to the Conference of the Ambassadors. The reason for this decision was that the French and British governments preferred to resolve the crisis without resorting to collective security in accordance with the Covenant of the League ... The negotiations were long and difficult, disrupted by Mussolini's refusal to reconsider the amount of financial compensation demanded from the Greek government ... In the end, a compromise formula was agreed which enabled the Fascist regime to get away with aggression and receive the full compensation it had initially demanded in return for the immediate withdrawal of the Italian forces from Corfu.

[Extract from Aristotle A Kallis (2000). *Fascist Ideology: Territory and Expansionism in Italy and Germany, 1922–1945*, Routledge: London and New York.]

SOURCE E

Extract from the article "The League of Nations and the Settlement of Disputes" by Lorna Lloyd, 1995. Lloyd is a Professor of International Relations at the University of Keele, UK.

But Greece itself confused the issue by appealing initially to both the Conference of Ambassadors and the League and ... when the Italian representative questioned the right of the Council to deal with the dispute, Lord Cecil of Britain asked the interpreter to read aloud the articles of the Covenant about disputes between League members. In a tense and silent room this was a clever tactic. For without bringing any allegation against the Italian Government ... he showed the world the firm intention of the British Government to uphold the Covenant.

Although Mussolini publicly proclaimed the Corfu incident a victory and had the overwhelming majority of Italians behind him, he knew he had been defeated. He might not have minded earning the label of being an international bully, but he had intended to keep Corfu and all he received was his compensation ... The impact of the new League morality had made itself felt, and Mussolini had been unable to ignore the League. The other great powers did not turn their backs on their League obligations.