

Chapter 1 : The League of Nations (article) | Khan Academy

Many historians contribute the failure of the United States to enter the League of Nations as a factor in the eventual demise of the league at the start of World War II since the league lacked a major world power and therefore credibility.5 The League of Nations, however, was the precursor to the United Nations 3 Paul F. Boller, Not so!

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled. Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council. It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends. The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to enquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision, or the report by the Council. In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators or the judicial decision shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute. The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement. Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement. For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in accordance with Article 14, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them. The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award or decision that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award or decision, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto. The Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly. If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration or judicial settlement in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof. For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof. The Council shall endeavour to effect a settlement of the dispute, and if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate. If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto. Any

Member of the League represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same. If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report. If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice. If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement. The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council. In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the Representatives of those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of the Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute. Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not. It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League. The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League. Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the Representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon. In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League, or between States not Members of the League, the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16 inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council. Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances. If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a Member of the League, the provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action. If both parties to the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute. Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

Chapter 2 : NationStates | Dispatch | Constitution of the League of Conservative Nations

Among the Haudenosaunee (the "Six Nations," comprising the Mohawk, Onondaga, Oneida, Cayuga, Seneca, and Tuscarora peoples) the Great Law of Peace is the oral constitution of the Iroquois Confederacy.

The first time it appears in writing is in the account of Samuel de Champlain of his journey to Tadoussac in 1605, where it occurs as "Irocois". By Ives Goddard could write: Day in 1901, who elaborates upon an earlier etymology given by Charles Arnaud in 1878. For the first element *iro*, Day cites cognates from other attested Montagnais dialects: Basque fishermen and whalers are known to have frequented the waters of the Northeast in the 16th century, so much so that a Basque-based pidgin developed for communication with the Algonquian tribes of the region. Bakker claims that it is unlikely that "-quois" derives from a root specifically used to refer to the Iroquois, citing as evidence that several other Indian tribes of the region were known to the French by names terminating in the same element, *-e*. He proposes instead that the word derives from *hilokoa* via the intermediate form *irokoa*, from the Basque roots *hil* "to kill", *ko* the locative genitive suffix, and *a* the definite article suffix. Thus the word according to Bakker is translatable as "the killer people". It is similar to other terms used by Eastern Algonquian tribes to refer to their enemy the Iroquois, which translate as "murderers". The spelling "Hotinnonsionni" is also attested from later in the nineteenth century. Iroquois influence at the peak of its power extended into present-day Canada, westward along the Great Lakes and down both sides of the Allegheny mountains into present-day Virginia and Kentucky and into the Ohio Valley. The League is governed by a Grand Council, an assembly of fifty chiefs or sachems, each representing one of the clans of one of the nations. Lawrence River, west of the Hudson River, and south into northwestern Pennsylvania. In or close to 1700, the Tuscarora tribe joined the League, [24] having migrated from the Carolinas after being displaced by Anglo-European settlement. Also an Iroquoian-speaking people, the Tuscarora were accepted into what became the Six Nations. Other independent Iroquoian-speaking peoples, such as the Erie, Susquehannock, Huron Wendat and Wyandot, lived at various times along the St. Lawrence River, and around the Great Lakes. In the American Southeast, the Cherokee were an Iroquoian-language people who had migrated to that area centuries before European contact. None of these was part of the Haudenosaunee. Those on the borders of Haudenosaunee territory in the Great Lakes region competed and warred with the member nations. Their first relations with them were for fur trading, which was favorable and became lucrative to both sides. The colonists also sought to establish positive relations to secure their settlement borders. For nearly years the Iroquois were a powerful factor in North American colonial policy-making decisions. Alignment with Iroquois offered political and strategic advantages to the European colonies, but the Iroquois preserved considerable independence. Some of their people settled in mission villages along the St. Lawrence River, becoming more closely tied to the French. While they participated in French raids on Dutch and later English settlements, where some Mohawk and other Iroquois settled, in general the Iroquois resisted attacking their own peoples. The Iroquois remained a politically unique, undivided, large Native American polity up until the American Revolution. The League kept its treaty promises to the British Crown. But when the British were defeated, they ceded the Iroquois territory without consultation; many Iroquois had to abandon their lands in the Mohawk Valley and elsewhere and relocate in the northern lands retained by the British. The Crown gave them land in compensation for the 5 million acres they had lost in the south, but it was not equivalent to earlier territory. The Iroquois League has also been known as the "Iroquois Confederacy". Modern scholars distinguish between the League and the Confederacy. According to that theory, "The League" still exists. The Confederacy dissolved after the defeat of the British and allied Iroquois nations in the American Revolutionary War. After the defeat of the British, they ceded most of the Iroquois territory to the United States, without bringing their allies to the negotiating table. Many of the Iroquois migrated to Canada, forced out of New York because of hostility to the British allies in the aftermath of a fierce war. Those remaining in New York were required to live mostly on reservations. In 1784, a total of 6, Iroquois had to confront, New Yorkers, with land-hungry New Englanders poised to migrate west. Iroquoia was a land rush waiting to happen. By the War of 1812, they had lost control of considerable property.

The League has since been compared to a modern-day example of anarcho-communism [30] or libertarian socialism. Historian Scott Stevens credits the early modern European value for the written word over oral tradition and cultures as contributing to a prejudiced, racialized element within writings about the Iroquois that continued into the 19th century. A major problem with contemporary European sources from the 17th and 18th centuries, both French and British, was that Europeans, coming from a patriarchal society, did not understand the matrilineal kinship system of Iroquois society and the related power of women. Most critically, the importance of clan mothers, who possessed considerable economic and political power within Canadian Iroquois communities, was blithely overlooked by patriarchal European scribes. Those references that do exist, show clan mothers meeting in council with their male counterparts to take decisions regarding war and peace and joining in delegations to confront the Onontio [the Iroquois term for the French governor-general] and the French leadership in Montreal, but only hint at the real influence wielded by these women". John Arthur Gibson Seneca, " was an important figure of his generation in recounting versions of Iroquois history in epics on the Peacemaker. One British colonial administrator declared in that the Iroquois had "such absolute Notions of Liberty that they allow no Kind of Superiority of one over another, and banish all Servitude from their Territories. He has said that recent claims for a much earlier date "may be for contemporary political purposes". Thus half of the historical story, that told by women, was lost. They were Dekanawida, sometimes known as the Great Peacemaker, Hiawatha, and Jigonhsasee , known as the Mother of Nations, whose home acted as a sort of United Nations. Five nations originally joined as the League, giving rise to the many historic references to Five Nations of the Iroquois [b] or as often, just The Five Nations. This article needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. April Learn how and when to remove this template message Other Iroquoian-language peoples, [48] including the populous Wyandot Huron , with related social organization and cultures, became extinct as tribes as a result of disease and war. While the First Nations and Native Americans sometimes tried to remain neutral in the various colonial frontier wars, some also allied with one nation or another, through the French and Indian War. In warfare the tribes were decentralized, and often bands acted independently. According to legend, an evil Onondaga chieftain named Tadodaho was the last converted to the ways of peace by The Great Peacemaker and Hiawatha. With the formation of the League, internal conflicts were minimized. The council of fifty thereafter ruled on disputes, seeking consensus in their decisions. This allowed the Iroquois to increase in numbers while their rivals declined. The confederacy did not speak for all five tribes, which continued to act independently. But about , [38] the council exerted more power in negotiations with the colonial governments of Pennsylvania and New York. While the tribes raided each other, they also traded with the members of the Iroquois who were nearby. By the Susquehannock [e] were known to be broken as a power from the effects of three years of epidemic disease, war with the Iroquois, and frontier battles, as settlers took advantage of the weakened tribe. They displaced about Siouan-speaking tribepeople of the Ohio River valley, such as the Quapaw Akansa , Ofo Mosopelea , and Tutelo and other closely related tribes out of the region. These tribes migrated to regions around the Mississippi River and the piedmont regions of the east coast. They made war primarily against neighboring Algonquian peoples. Muir uses archaeological data to argue that the Iroquois expansion onto Algonquian lands was checked by the Algonquian adoption of agriculture. This enabled them to support their own populations large enough to have sufficient warriors to defend against the threat of Iroquois conquest. Archeologists and anthropologists have defined the St. Lawrence Iroquoians as a distinct and separate group and possibly several discrete groups , living in the villages of Hochelaga and others nearby near present-day Montreal , which had been visited by Cartier. By , when Samuel de Champlain visited the area, that part of the St. Lawrence River valley had no settlements, but was controlled by the Mohawk as a hunting ground. The fate of the Iroquoian people that Cartier encountered remains a mystery, and all that can be stated for certain is when Champlain arrived, they were gone. The precise identity of any of these groups is still debated. On 29 July , Champlain assisted his allies in defeating a Mohawk war party by the shores of what is now called Lake Champlain, and again in June , Champlain fought against the Mohawks. After the first English settlement in Jamestown, Virginia , numerous 17th-century accounts describe a powerful people known to the Powhatan Confederacy as the Massawomeck,

and to the French as the Antouhonoron. They were said to come from the north, beyond the Susquehannock territory. In 1609, an Iroquois war party, consisting mostly of Senecas and Mohawks, destroyed the Huron village of Wendake. In turn, this ultimately resulted in the breakup of the Huron nation. With no northern enemy remaining, the Iroquois turned their forces on the Neutral Nations on the north shore of Lakes Erie and Ontario, the Susquehannocks, their southern neighbor. Then they destroyed other Iroquoian-language tribes, including the Erie, to the west, in 1609, over competition for the fur trade. After their victories, they reigned supreme in an area from the Mississippi River to the Atlantic Ocean; from the St. Lawrence River to the Chesapeake Bay. They had become victims of their own success. The villages were all abandoned by 1614. As a result of the Beaver Wars, they pushed Siouan-speaking tribes out and reserved the territory as a hunting ground by right of conquest. They finally sold the British colonists their remaining claim to the lands south of the Ohio in 1763 at the Treaty of Fort Stanwix. Map of the New York tribes before European arrival:

The Constitution at the Cross Roads: A Study of the Legal Aspects of the League of Nations, the Permanent Organization of Labor and the Permanent Court of International Justice. Clark, N.J.: The Lawbook Exchange.

President, I think comment is superfluous, and I shall make none. President, for reasons very different from those asserted by the senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox], it is my purpose to vote against the pending resolution of ratification incorporating reservations adopted by a majority of Senators. During several months, to the exclusion of nearly all other important business, the Senate has had under consideration the treaty of peace with Germany. It now seems probable, unless the advocates of unqualified ratification and so-called reservation senators reconcile differences, that the result of our labors may be failure. The Senate is about to vote on an alleged resolution of ratification, a resolution which, it seems to me, does not ratify but which, in fact and in legal effect, constitutes a rejection of this treaty. All senators recognize the importance of the vote soon to be taken. This vote invites the judgment of the people of this country, and, indeed, the judgment of all mankind, upon the policy implied in the resolution of ratification incorporating reservations agreed to by the majority. Many of us are convinced that the adoption of the pending resolution, as I have already stated, will accomplish no useful purpose. The senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] has had read into the Record a letter issued by the President, in which that officer, representing a part of the treaty-making power, declares that the pending resolution of ratification cannot accomplish ratification; that it is, in fact, rejection of the treaty; and therefore it is futile to adopt the resolution. The statement that the resolution of ratification will in fact defeat the treaty will occasion no regret to the senators who from the beginning have advocated its rejection. They have apparently succeeded, temporarily at least, in accomplishing indirectly what could not be done openly and frankly. Through alleged reservations, which will not likely be accepted by other parties to the treaty, they seek to exclude the United States from fellowship with her late allies and from membership in the League of Nations. In almost every line of the reservations is implied antagonism of senators toward the President. Suspicion and mistrust of the nations associated with this government in the recent war are reflected by the reservations, sometimes poorly concealed, often clearly evinced. The avowed purpose is to completely repudiate every obligation of this government to encourage and sustain the new and feeble states separated, by our assistance during the war, from their former sovereignties by withholding from them the moral and military power of the United States. To me it seems regrettable beyond expression that senators who desire to improve the treaty and who desire also that it shall become effective should lend their assistance to a course in which the avowed enemies of the League of Nations must find unbounded gratification and pleasure. Is it not unpardonable for friends of the treaty to couple with the resolution of ratification conditions designed to deprive the Executive of his constitutional functions? It is worse than idle -- it seems to me hypocritical -- to impose terms and conditions which make the exchange of ratifications impracticable, if not impossible. Membership in the League of Nations is treated, in the reservations, with so little dignity and as of such slight importance as to authorize its termination by the passage of a mere concurrent resolution of Congress. This attempt to deny to the President participation in withdrawal by this government from the League and to vest that authority solely in the two houses of Congress in disregard of the plain provision of the Constitution displays a spirit of narrow opposition to the executive unworthy of the subject and unworthy of the Senate of the United States. The requirement that before ratification by the United States shall become effective the reservations adopted by the Senate must be approved by three of the four principal allied powers is designed to make difficult the exchange of ratifications. President, it can have no other purpose; it can accomplish no other end. The reservation respecting Article 10 nullifies the most vital provision in the League of Nations contract. It absolves the United States from any obligation to assist in enforcing the terms of peace, an obligation that the leader of the majority in his speech to this body on the 23rd day of August, , and again in December of the same year, asserted as one which the United States cannot without dishonor avoid or escape. No senator can doubt that the repudiation by the United States of the undertaking in Article 10 to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of the other members of the League weakens, if it does not

destroy, one of the principal agencies or means provided by the League for the prevention of international war. The reservation withholding the agreement of the United States to the arrangement in the treaty respecting Japanese rights in Shantung, and reserving for this government freedom of action in case of controversy between China and Japan regarding the subject, admittedly will not be accepted by Japan, and probably it will not be accepted by either France or Great Britain. In making this declaration, I repeat the statement made in the Senate a day or two ago by the senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCumber], and I make the inquiry how any friend of the treaty who wants it ratified, and who realizes that under these reservations our ratifications cannot become effective unless it is approved by three of the four principal allied powers -- I make the inquiry now how a senator who takes that view of the subject and wants the treaty ratified can support the pending resolution? It may be, Mr. President, that the friends of this treaty have made a mistake. Undoubtedly the friends of the treaty, and not its enemies, should dictate the policy of the Senate concerning ratification. The senators who have opposed ratification from the beginning have imposed upon an overwhelming majority of the Senate, by their power and influence, their views respecting the resolution of ratification. As the measure now comes before the Senate it comes with the open declaration of the Executive, who is the sole agency through whom this government may exchange ratifications, that that act will not be accomplished. It comes with the recognition of the fact by the Senators who favor the treaty that the reservations are of such a nature that they will not be accepted by other nations. Make no mistake about it. The Senate should either ratify this treaty unqualifiedly or upon such terms and conditions as will justify the Executive and enable him speedily to conclude peace by an exchange of ratifications. The resolution of the senator from Massachusetts incorporating the reservations as agreed upon will probably result in the refusal of the Executive to attempt to procure the consent and approval of three of the four principal allied powers. If he should make the attempt, it is plain that our self-respecting allies will not accept the terms and conditions which we seek to impose by these reservations. President, should the resolution proposed by the senator from Massachusetts be agreed to? Every senator knows that it cannot effectuate peace. The senator from Massachusetts himself on last Sunday issued a statement to the press in which he declared that "The treaty is dead. By their action they can revitalize it. The enemies of the treaty, senators who do not favor its ratification, have controlled the proceedings of the Senate heretofore. It is time now that those of us who favor the treaty, and we have the necessary number, should get together and ratify it. President, I am not misled by the debate across the aisle into the view that this treaty will not be ratified. I entertain little doubt that sooner or later -- and entirely too soon -- the treaty will be ratified with the League of Nations in it; and I am of the opinion with the reservations in it as they are now written. There may possibly be some change in verbiage in order that there may be a common sharing of parentage, but our friends across the aisle will likely accept the League of Nations with the reservations in substance as now written. I think, therefore, this moment is just as appropriate as any other for me to express my final views with reference to the treaty and the League of Nations. It is perhaps the last opportunity I shall have to state, as briefly as I may, my reasons for opposing the treaty and the League. Lincoln had been elected President, before he assumed the duties of the office and at a time when all indications were to the effect that we would soon be in the midst of civil strife, a friend from the city of Washington wrote him for instructions. Lincoln wrote back in a single line, "Entertain no compromise; have none of it. My objections to the League have not been met by the reservations. I desire to state wherein my objections have not been met. Let us see what our attitude will be toward Europe and what our position will be with reference to the other nations of the world after we shall have entered the League with the present reservations written therein. When the League shall have been formed, we shall be a member of what is known as the Council of the League. Our accredited representative will sit in judgment with the accredited representatives of the other members of the League to pass upon the concerns, not only of our country but of all Europe and all Asia and the entire world. Our accredited representatives will be members of the Assembly. They will sit there to represent the judgment of these million people -- more than -- just as we are accredited here to represent our constituencies. We cannot send our representatives to sit in council with the representatives of the other great nations of the world with mental reservations as to what we shall do in case their judgment shall not be satisfactory to us. If we go to the Council or to the Assembly with any other purpose than that of complying in good faith and in absolute

integrity with all upon which the Council or the Assembly may pass, we shall soon return to our country with our self-respect forfeited and the public opinion of the world condemnatory. Why need you gentlemen across the aisle worry about a reservation here or there when we are sitting in the Council and in the Assembly and bound by every obligation in morals, which the President said was supreme above that of law, to comply with the judgment which our representative and the other representatives finally form? Shall we go there, Mr. President, to sit in judgment, and in case that judgment works for peace join with our allies, but in case it works for war withdraw our cooperation? How long would we stand as we now stand, a great republic commanding the respect and holding the leadership of the world, if we should adopt any such course? So, sir, we not only sit in the Council and in the Assembly with our accredited representatives, but bear in mind that Article 11 is untouched by any reservation which has been offered here: If any war or threat of war shall be a matter of consideration for the League, and the League shall take such action as it deems wise to deal with it, what is the necessity of Article 10? Will not external aggression be regarded as a war or threat of war? If the political independence of some nation in Europe is assailed will it be regarded as a war or threat of war? Is there anything in Article 10 that is not completely covered by Article 11? It remains complete, and with our representatives sitting in the Council and the Assembly, and with Article 11 complete, and with the Assembly, and the Council having jurisdiction of all matters touching the peace of the world, what more do you need to bind the United States if you assume that the United States is a nation of honor? We have said, Mr. President, that we would not send our troops abroad without the consent of Congress. Pass by now for a moment the legal proposition. If we create executive functions, the executive will perform those functions without the authority of Congress. Pass that question by and go to the other question. Our members of the Council are there. Our members of the Assembly are there. Article 11 is complete, and it authorizes the League, a member of which is our representative, to deal with matters of peace and war, and the League through its Council and its Assembly, deals with the matter, and our accredited representative joins with the others in deciding upon a certain course which involves a question of sending troops. What will the Congress of the United States do? What right will it have left, except the bare technical right to refuse, which as a moral proposition it will not dare to exercise? Have we not been told day by day for the last nine months that the Senate of the United States, a coordinate part of the treaty-making power, should accept this league as it was written because the wise men sitting at Versailles had so written it, and has not every possible influence and every source of power in public opinion been organized and directed against the Senate to compel it to do that thing? How much stronger will be the moral compulsion upon the Congress of the United States when we ourselves have endorsed the proposition of sending our accredited representatives there to vote for us? Ah, but you say that there must be unanimous consent, and that there is vast protection in unanimous consent. I do not wish to speak disparagingly; but has not every division and dismemberment of every nation which has suffered dismemberment taken place by unanimous consent for the last years? Did not Prussia and Austria and Russia by unanimous consent divide Poland? Was that not a unanimous decision? Close the doors upon the diplomats of Europe, let them sit in secret, give them the material to trade on, and there always will be unanimous consent. How did Japan get unanimous consent? I want to say here, in my parting words upon this proposition, that I have no doubt the outrage upon China was quite as distasteful to the President of the United States as it is to me. And so, when we are in the League, and our accredited representatives are sitting at Geneva, and a question of great moment arises, Japan, or Russia, or Germany, or Great Britain will say, "Unless this matter is adjusted in this way I will depart from your League. President, if you have enough territory, if you have enough material, if you have enough subject peoples to trade upon and divide, there will be no difficulty about unanimous consent. Do our Democratic friends ever expect any man to sit as a member of the Council or as a member of the Assembly equal in intellectual power and in standing before the world with that of our representative at Versailles? Do you expect a man to sit in the Council who will have made more pledges, and I shall assume made them in sincerity, for self-determination and for the rights of small peoples than had been made by our accredited representatives And yet, what became of it? The unanimous consent was obtained nevertheless. But take another view of it. We are sending to the Council one man. That one man represents million people.

Chapter 4 : The Senate and the League of Nations

The original Members of the League of Nations shall be those of the Signatories which are named in the Annex to this Covenant and also such of those other States named in the Annex as shall accede without reservation to this Covenant. Such accession shall be effected by a Declaration deposited with.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries. We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes. Read more about Early Journal Content at [http: JSTOR](http://JSTOR) is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. At the peace conference in Paris, a draft of a constitution for the league of nations has been submitted and is now being considered. The terms of that instrument have been submitted to the American people. We must carefully consider and discuss those terms ; for when a constitution is finally adopted, the United States will be subject to its provisions, and must abide by its regulations. As an earnest advocate of a league of nations, the following suggestions are. The "Covenant-Preamble" of the proposed constitution reads as follows: To promote international co-operation and 2. To secure international peace and security. Following this statement of purposes, there are set forth four methods by which these objects are to be attained, viz: By the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war. By the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations. By the firm establishment of the undertakings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments. It is a general rule of statutory construction that the title of an act shall fully and accurately set forth its purposes. Moreover, in construing the meaning and scope of the provisions of this constitution, and the powers thereby conferred, consideration must necessarily be given to the preamble, where occurs a solemn statement of its purposes, and a declaration of the means to be used in carrying out those purposes. The instrument will be strictly construed. The nations composing the league will insist that no powers are granted, except those specifically conferred, all other powers being reserved by the member nations to themselves. In consequence, the general declaration of purposes, and of means to accomplish those purposes, should be broad enough to cover the provisions contained in the instrument itself, so as to assure the giving of full force and effect to those provisions. No agreement between parties can be reached, unless there is a starting point. There must be certain principles of right, justice and fair dealing as the basis of any contract. As between individuals, these principles are usually established by custom and by the constitutions and laws of their respective countries. As between nations, for fear of a misunderstanding, it is wise that these principles be agreed on and specifically declared. In the drafting of constitutional instruments, it has therefore been found desirable to preface the instrument with a statement of fundamental rights, conceded as the result of the experience of mankind, and on the basis of which the constitution or governing instrument is constructed. A most striking instance of this is found in the Virginia Bill of Rights, which is a statement of fundamental principles, adopted by Virginia as a preliminary to the adoption of a constitution. The necessity for this became immediately apparent, and the first ten amendments to the constitution were at once proposed and adopted – these amendments being practically a declaration of fundamental rights. The adoption of a separate preliminary statement of rights might be difficult in the present case. But the same result can be attained by a full declaration in the preamble of the purposes in view, and of the means to be used to accomplish those purposes. For, in declaring its purposes and the means of effecting them, the league necessarily vouches for the righteousness of those purposes, and the fairness and justice of those means. It accepts and declares these purposes as the controlling motives for its organization. It formulates the means of accomplishing those purposes, as the just and fair method to proceed. It thereby establishes and recognizes the fundamental principles upon which its covenant is based. Moreover, the peoples of the world are asked to subscribe to and become bound by this agreement. Few of them will study in

detail the provisions of the constitution. Many could not understand them in any case. But what they want to know, before binding themselves, is what are we trying to do? What are the objects and purposes of this proposed league? What are the general means to be employed in carrying them out? To what fundamental principles and procedure are we committing ourselves? These purposes and means should be fully and clearly stated in the preamble, which should be in effect a declaration of principles. The preamble as formulated declares two purposes and specifies four means of accomplishing those purposes. So far as it goes, it is admirable, but it does not go far enough. It does not even fairly indicate many of the provisions contained in the body of the instrument. An alternative form of preamble is suggested as set out below, setting forth four general purposes and fourteen means of accomplishing these purposes. The separation and numbering of the clauses is merely as an aid to a clearer understanding. In order 1 to establish national liberty and international justice throughout the world, 2 to ensure to all nations a freedom from persecution or oppression by other nations, b the right to a national life, and to c the pursuit of national happiness and prosperity; 3 to end international wars ; and 4 to promote the welfare of mankind. Of the means enumerated, Nos. The present uncertainty as to what is international law can only be solved by its codification and adoption by the league. It will thus be seen that every means outlined in the preamble of the constitution now being considered, is incorporated in In addition, ten additional means for carrying out the declared purposes are adopted. These are self-explanatory, and many of these are provided for in the body of the proposed instrument, although not expressed in its preamble. The wisdom of a formal adoption of these means for carrying out the purposes of the league can readily be judged from a careful reading of the same. The four purposes here enumerated are much broader than the two enumerated in the preamble of the proposed constitution ; but those two purposes are embraced in the same. Does not this amended preamble more fully and correctly set forth the principles for which America fought; the principles on which the peoples of the world agree; and the principles on which a league of nations should be based? Is it not wise to preface the constitution with this full and frank statement of purposes, and with this enumeration of the general means of accomplishing those purposes? Is it not wise to commit the members of the league in the beginning to a declaration of fundamental principles? Are not these the principles, for the permanent establishment of which the nations are willing to enter into a solemn compact?

Chapter 5 : League Of Nations | calendrierdelascience.com

Iroquois Confederacy, self-name Haudenosaunee ("People of the Longhouse"), also called Iroquois League, Five Nations, or (from) Six Nations, confederation of five (later six) Indian tribes across upper New York state that during the 17th and 18th centuries played a strategic role in the struggle between the French and British for mastery of North America.

C N Trueman "League of Nations" historylearningsite. The History Learning Site, 17 Mar After the turmoil caused by the Versailles Treaty , many looked to the League to bring stability to the world. America entered World War One in The country as a whole and the president " Woodrow Wilson in particular " was horrified by the slaughter that had taken place in what was meant to be a civilised part of the world. The only way to avoid a repetition of such a disaster, was to create an international body whose sole purpose was to maintain world peace and which would sort out international disputes as and when they occurred. This would be the task of the League of Nations. After the devastation of the war, support for such a good idea was great except in America where isolationism was taking root. This choice was natural as Switzerland was a neutral country and had not fought in World War One. No one could dispute this choice especially as an international organisation such as the Red Cross was already based in Switzerland. If a dispute did occur, the League, under its Covenant, could do three things " these were known as its sanctions: It could call on the states in dispute to sit down and discuss the problem in an orderly and peaceful manner. The purpose of this sanction was to financially hit the aggressor nation so that she would have to do as the League required. The League could order League members not to do any trade with an aggressor nation in an effort to bring that aggressor nation to heel. If this failed, the League could introduce physical sanctions. However, the League did not have a military force at its disposal and no member of the League had to provide one under the terms of joining " unlike the current United Nations. Therefore, it could not carry out any threats and any country defying its authority would have been very aware of this weakness. The League also had other weaknesses: The country, whose president, Woodrow Wilson, had dreamt up the idea of the League " America " refused to join it. Germany was not allowed to join the League in As Germany had started the war, according to the Treaty of Versailles , one of her punishments was that she was not considered to be a member of the international community and, therefore, she was not invited to join. This was a great blow to Germany but it also meant that the League could not use whatever strength Germany had to support its campaign against aggressor nations. Russia was also not allowed to join as in , she had a communist government that generated fear in western Europe, and in , the Russian royal family " the Romanovs " was murdered. Such a country could not be allowed to take its place in the League. The two most powerful members were Britain and France " both had suffered financially and militarily during the war " and neither was enthusiastic to get involved in disputes that did not affect western Europe. Therefore, the League had a fine ideal " to end war for good. The League experienced success in: They had traditionally belonged to Finland but most of the islanders wanted to be governed by Sweden. Neither Sweden nor Finland could come to a decision as to who owned the islands and in they asked the League to adjudicate. Both countries accepted the decision and it remains in force to this day. Upper Silesia The Treaty of Versailles had given the people of Upper Silesia the right to have a referendum on whether they wanted to be part of Germany or part of Poland. In this referendum, , voted for Germany and , for Poland. This close result resulted in rioting between those who expected Silesia to be made part of Germany and those who wanted to be part of Poland. The League was asked to settle this dispute. Most people who lived in Memel were Lithuanians and, therefore, the government of Lithuania believed that the port should be governed by it. However, the Treaty of Versailles had put Memel and the land surrounding the port under the control of the League. For three years, a French general acted as a governor of the port but in the Lithuanians invaded the port. Lithuania agreed to this decision. Though this can be seen as a League success " as the issue was settled " a counter argument is that what happened was the result of the use of force and that the League responded in a positive manner to those the Lithuanians who had used force. Turkey The League failed to stop a bloody war in Turkey see League failures but it did respond to the humanitarian crisis

caused by this war. Typhoid and cholera were rampant. Money was also invested in seeds, wells and digging tools and by , work was found for , people. In , sentries patrolling this border fired on one another and a Greek soldier was killed. The Greek army invaded Bulgaria as a result. The Bulgarians asked the League for help and the League ordered both armies to stop fighting and that the Greeks should pull out of Bulgaria. Both nations accepted the decision. Therefore, any conflict between nations which ended in war and the victor of one over the other must be considered a League failure. This port had been given to Yugoslavia by the Treaty of Versailles. The newly created League did nothing. In all this the League played no part despite the fact that it had just been set up with the specific task of maintaining peace. Teschen Teschen was a small town between Poland and Czechoslovakia. Its main importance was that it had valuable coal mines there which both the Poles and the Czechs wanted. As both were newly created nations, both wanted to make their respective economies as strong as possible and the acquisition of rich coal mines would certainly help in this respect. In January , Polish and Czech troops fought in the streets of Teschen. This suburb contained the most valuable coal mines and the Poles refused to accept this decision. Though no more wholesale violence took place, the two countries continued to argue over the issue for the next twenty years. Vilna Many years before , Vilna had been taken over by Russia. Historically, Vilna had been the capital of Lithuania when the state had existed in the Middle Ages. After World War One, Lithuania had been re-established and Vilna seemed the natural choice for its capital. In , the Poles seized Vilna. Lithuania asked for League help but the Poles could not be persuaded to leave the city. Vilna stayed in Polish hands until the outbreak of World War Two. The use of force by the Poles had won. The Poles quickly overwhelmed the Russian army and made a swift advance into Russia. By , the Russians had no choice but to sign the Treaty of Riga which handed over to Poland nearly 80, square kilometres of Russian land. This one treaty all but doubled the size of Poland. What did the League do about this violation of another country by Poland? The answer is simple "nothing". Once again, to outsiders, it seemed as if League members were selecting which countries were acceptable and ones which were not. The Allied invasion of Russia was a failure and it only served to make Communist Russia even more antagonistic to the West. These could either be paid in money or in kind goods to the value of a set amount In , the Germans failed to pay an installment. They claimed that they simply could not rather than did not want to. The Allies refused to accept this and the anti-German feeling at this time was still strong. Within Europe, France was seen as a senior League member "like Britain" and the anti-German feeling that was felt throughout Europe allowed both France and Belgium to break their own rules as were introduced by the League. Here were two League members clearly breaking League rules and nothing was done about it. For the League to enforce its will, it needed the support of its major backers in Europe, Britain and France. Yet France was one of the invaders and Britain was a major supporter of her. To other nations, it seemed that if you wanted to break League rules, you could. Few countries criticised what France and Belgium did. But the example they set for others in future years was obvious. The League clearly failed on this occasion, primarily because it was seen to be involved in breaking its own rules. Italy and Albania The border between Italy and Albania was far from clear and the Treaty of Versailles had never really addressed this issue. It was a constant source of irritation between both nations. In , a mixed nationality survey team was sent out to settle the issue. Whilst travelling to the disputed area, the Italian section of the survey team, became separated from the main party. The five Italians were shot by gunmen who had been in hiding. Italy accused Greece of planning the whole incident and demanded payment of a large fine. Greece refused to pay up. In response, the Italians sent its navy to the Greek island of Corfu and bombarded the coastline. Greece appealed to the League for help but Italy, lead by Benito Mussolini , persuaded the League via the Conference of Ambassadors, to fine Greece 50 million lire. To follow up this success, Mussolini invited the Yugoslavian government to discuss ownership of Fiume. The Treaty of Versailles had given Fiume to Yugoslavia but with the evidence of a bombarded Corfu, the Yugoslavs handed over the port to Italy with little argument The social successes of the League of Nations At a social level the League did have success and most of this is easily forgotten with its failure at a political level. Many of the groups that work for the United Nations now, grew out of what was established by the League. Teams were sent to the Third World to dig fresh water wells, the Health Organisation started a campaign to wipe out leprosy. Work was done in the Third World to improve the status of women there and

child slave labour was also targeted. Drug addiction and drug smuggling were also attacked. These problems are still with us in the 21st century so it would be wrong to criticise the League for failing to eradicate them. If we cannot do this now, the League had a far more difficult task then with more limited resources. The greatest success the League had involving these social issues, was simply informing the world at large that these problems did exist and that they should be tackled.

Chapter 6 : League of Nations - History Learning Site

The Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations Literary Digest The "Big 4" of the Paris Peace Conference of were (left to right) Lloyd George of England, Orlando of Italy, Clemenceau of France, and Woodrow Wilson of the United States.

On 8 January, in a major address to the U. Congress, he outlined his proposal to end the war and provide a framework for a new postwar international order. Of particular importance was his fourteenth point, which called for the establishment of an organization that would protect the independence and sovereignty of all nations. Wilson certainly played an important role in the establishment of the League of Nations, even if the notion that he was its veritable "father" is exaggerated. Origins In a more general way the League of Nations was grounded in the rise and fall of the practice of consultation among the European powers, which was increasingly formalized as the Concert of Europe after 1815. By the late nineteenth century the Concert of Europe was breaking down in the context of the rise of imperial Germany. The emergence of the United States as an increasingly important player also weakened the balance of power on which the Concert of Europe rested, as did the wider social and political changes in Europe itself. However, the central idea of the Concert of Europe—that the Great Powers had particular rights and duties in international relations—underpinned the creation of the Council of the League of Nations. Despite the influence of the Concert of Europe, a more immediate and equally important catalyst for the League of Nations was World War I. The war stimulated a general dissatisfaction with the management of inter-state relations and encouraged growing interest in a new international system of collective security. In May Woodrow Wilson publicly spoke of the need to reform the international order. This gave the whole idea greater legitimacy and encouraged European political leaders to examine the idea. This interest was further strengthened when the Russian Revolution of 1917 brought pressure to bear on the old international system. A number of draft versions of the constitution for the League of Nations were produced by the United States and by the European governments. The actual peace conference in 1919 focused on a draft produced jointly by the United States and Britain. Establishment and Organization By 1919 there was general agreement that a League of Nations should be established. The key articles of the actual covenant constitution spelled out the role of the league in identifying and addressing threats to peace, the settlement of disputes, and the imposition of sanctions against states violating international agreements. These articles occasioned limited disagreement. Participating nations also generally agreed that the league should be made up of an executive council, a deliberative assembly, and an administrative secretariat, but they disagreed over the exact function and makeup of these bodies. In an early draft of the covenant, membership of the council was restricted to the Great Powers and any smaller nation-states that the Great Powers chose to invite. However, the formulation that eventually prevailed designated the Great Powers as permanent members of the council while small powers had nonpermanent membership. The operation and membership of the assembly, which was the model for the General Assembly of the United Nations after 1945, was also a subject of some debate. In fact its overall operation and significance was really only worked out in subsequent years. The administrative secretariat, set up as a coordinating and administrative body, was a less divisive issue. Its power was grounded entirely in the council and the assembly. The headquarters of the league were in Geneva, Switzerland, where the secretariat prepared reports and agendas. The assembly, which was made up of representatives of all the member governments, set policy and met on an annual basis. Britain, France, Italy, and Japan held permanent membership in the council, which met more regularly than the assembly. It had been expected that the United States would be the fifth permanent member of the council. At the same time, the assembly elected another four eventually nine temporary members to the council to serve three-year terms. All decisions taken by the council and the assembly had to be unanimous if they were to be binding. The league also included a number of subsidiary organizations. It was hoped that the ILO would appease some of the more radical tendencies within the trade union movement in various parts of the world and curtail the attractions of international communism. A Permanent Court of International Justice was also set up, as well as a range of commissions that dealt with issues such as refugees, health, drugs, and child welfare. At the time of

its foundation in the league had forty-two member governments. This increased to fifty-five by ; however, the failure of the United States to become a member contributed significantly to the decline of the organization by the s. Meanwhile, Germany only became a member in and withdrew in , while the Soviet Union was only a member from to The Japanese government departed in , and the Italian government ended its association with the league in Operations and Activities The prevention and settlement of disputes between nation-states in order to avoid another conflagration like World War I was central to the operations and activities of the league. Although it did not have a military force of its own, the league prevented or settled a number of conflicts and disputes in the s. In fact, it was the activities of the league in the s that made it appear to many people that it had some long-term prospects for success. The league played a major role in the resolution of a dispute over the Aaland Islands between the governments of Finland and Sweden. In it got the Greek government to withdraw from Bulgaria and resolved a border dispute between the governments of Turkey and Iraq. During its entire history, none of the disputes that the league successfully resolved affected the interests of the Great Powers. It is generally argued that the limitations of the league were manifested most obviously in the Manchurian crisis of the early s. None of the other major powers in the league were able or willing to take a strong stand against Japan, and the league moved slowly on what little action it did take, following well behind the unfolding situation. By early the Japanese government had set up the puppet state of Manchukuo in Manchuria. It was not until February that the league discussed and adopted the report of the Lytton Commission, which had been dispatched earlier to look into the affair. Although the report was a relatively mild document, it did recommend that Manchuria be given autonomous status within China. Within a month of the adoption of the report of the Lytton Commission, the Japanese government had withdrawn from the League of Nations. This led to the imposition of economic sanctions on war-related materials that were, in theory, carried out by all members of the league. These sanctions soon proved insufficient. But the ability of the league, or more particularly of Britain and France, to move to more significant actions, such as closing the Suez Canal to Italian shipping and the cutting off of all oil exports to Italy, was constrained by the fear that such action would provoke war with Italy. The situation was further undermined because Britain and France tried, unsuccessfully, to negotiate a secret deal with Mussolini the Hoare-Laval Pact that would settle the dispute peacefully by allowing Italy to retain control of some Ethiopian territory. The End of the League of Nations In broad terms the decline of the League of Nations in the s reflected the unwillingness or inability of Britain, France, and the United States to oppose the increasingly nationalist-imperialist and militaristic trajectories of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and imperial Japan. The post international order that resulted from the Treaty of Versailles was fragile, and the league embodied that fragility. Following the Ethiopian crisis the league was more or less irrelevant. It failed to respond to the direct military intervention of Germany and Italy in the Spanish Civil War €” Its final, and largely symbolic, action was the expulsion of the Soviet Union following its invasion of Finland in In a somewhat circular fashion it is clear that the lack of cooperation and collective action between nation-states that encouraged political leaders to call for a League of Nations in the first place was the very thing that undermined the league once it was created. The League of Nations was dissolved in However, World War II also led to the reinvention of the League of Nations, insofar as the United Nations , which was first suggested in the Atlantic Charter in and formally established in late , built on the earlier organization. The Rise of the International Organisation: The League of Nations: From to Garden City Park, N. To End All Wars: Oxford University Press, The Limits of Foreign Policy: A History of the League of Nations.

Chapter 7 : Full text of "Preamble to Constitution of the League of Nations"

The constitution of the League of Nations was adopted by the Paris Peace Conference in April, The League's headquarters were in Geneva and its first secretary-general was Sir Eric Drummond. The Covenant (Constitution) of the League of Nations called for collective security and the peaceful settlement of disputes by arbitration.

As the war drew to a close, Woodrow Wilson set forth his plan for a "just peace. His Fourteen Points outlined his vision for a safer world. Wilson called for an end to secret diplomacy, a reduction of armaments, and freedom of the seas. He claimed that reductions to trade barriers, fair adjustment of colonies, and respect for national self-determination would reduce economic and nationalist sentiments that lead to war. Unfortunately, Wilson could not impose his world view on the victorious Allied Powers. When they met in Paris to hammer out the terms of the peace, the European leaders had other ideas. The European leaders were not interested in a just peace. They were interested in retribution. Germany was to admit guilt for the war and pay unlimited reparations. The German military was reduced to a domestic police force and its territory was truncated to benefit the new nations of Eastern Europe. The territories of Alsace and Lorraine were restored to France. German colonies were handed in trusteeship to the victorious Allies. No provisions were made to end secret diplomacy or preserve freedom of the seas. Wilson did gain approval for his proposal for a League of Nations. Dismayed by the overall results, but hopeful that a strong League could prevent future wars, he returned to present the Treaty of Versailles to the Senate. Defeating the League of Nations Unfortunately for Wilson, he was met with stiff opposition. Article X of the League of Nations required the United States to respect the territorial integrity of member states. Although there was no requirement compelling an American declaration of war, the United States might be bound to impose an economic embargo or to sever diplomatic relations. Lodge viewed the League as a supranational government that would limit the power of the American government from determining its own affairs. He attached reservations, or amendments, to the treaty to this effect. Wilson, bedridden from a debilitating stroke, was unable to accept these changes. He asked Senate Democrats to vote against the Treaty of Versailles unless the Lodge reservations were dropped. Neither side budged, and the treaty went down to defeat. Personal enmity between Wilson and Lodge played a part. Wilson might have prudently invited a prominent Republican to accompany him to Paris to help ensure its later passage. Ethnic groups in the United States helped its defeat. German Americans felt their fatherland was being treated too harshly. Italian Americans felt more territory should have been awarded to Italy. Irish Americans criticized the treaty for failing to address the issue of Irish independence. Diehard American isolationists worried about a permanent global involvement. The stubbornness of President Wilson led him to ask his own party to scuttle the treaty. The final results of all these factors had mammoth longterm consequences. Over the next two decades, the United States would sit on the sidelines as the unjust Treaty of Versailles and the ineffective League of Nations would set the stage for an even bloodier, more devastating clash.

Chapter 8 : Avalon Project - The Covenant of the League of Nations

The first governing body of the United States under the Constitution was the _____ second continental congress True or False: The Declaration of Independence stated that the United States was independent from England.

These bills must be submitted to the Speaker of the Senate, who may put them to vote. Before officially becoming the Chief Justice, the chosen nation needs the approval of the simple majority of the Senate, in a legislative poll made by the Speaker of the Senate within one day of the appointment. The poll shall last one day. If there are more negative votes than positive votes, the President must choose a new, different Chief Justice immediately and repeat the aforementioned process. These Executive Orders must be justified and constitutional. They must also not alter the constitution. Abuse of this power may result in suspension of this power by the Chief Justice. Amendment I, September the 17th: Executive Orders can be used to cancel former Executive Orders. That cancellation must be explicitly declared in the proposed document. Amendment II, September the 17th: In the event that one Executive Order unconsciously cancels another, the most recently passed Executive Order shall be nullified by the Chief Justice. In that case, the President must find a new Leader for the Department or simply destroy the Department as a whole. Amendment IV, December the 18th: After that, the Speaker shall make a poll which must last 2 days. If the simple majority of voters is pro-impeachment, then the process shall be fulfilled, with the President being impeached. The Chief Justice shall then make a poll that shall last two days. If the simple majority of voters is pro-impeachment, then the process shall be fulfilled, with the Speaker of the Senate being impeached. If the simple majority of voters is pro-impeachment, then the process shall be fulfilled, with the Chief Justice being impeached. Amendment III, October the 25th:

Chapter 9 : The United States Constitution and the League of Nations | Elizabeth Ping - calendrierdelascie

The Constitution provides, in the second paragraph of Article II, Section 2, that "the President shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur."

He expected a functioning League of Nations to correct whatever errors and injustices might creep in to the treaties themselves. Origins of the League of Nations The central, basic idea of the movement was that aggressive war is a crime not only against the immediate victim but against the whole human community. Accordingly it is the right and duty of all states to join in preventing it; if it is certain that they will so act, no aggression is likely to take place. Such affirmations might be found in the writings of philosophers or moralists but had never before emerged onto the plane of practical politics. Statesmen and lawyers alike held and acted on the view that there was no natural or supreme law by which the rights of sovereign states, including that of making war as and when they chose, could be judged or limited. Many of the attributes of the League of Nations were developed from existing institutions or from time-honoured proposals for the reform of previous diplomatic methods. However, the premise of collective security was, for practical purposes, a new concept engendered by the unprecedented pressures of World War I. Library of Congress, Washington, D. Woodrow Wilson insisted that this should be among the first questions to be dealt with by the conference. The work proceeded with far greater speed than that of territorial and military settlement, chiefly because the subject had been exhaustively studied during the war years. Unofficial societies in the United States , Great Britain , France, and some neutral countries had drawn up many plans and proposals, and in doing so they in turn had availed themselves of the efforts of earlier thinkers. Over many years lawyers had worked out plans for the settlement of disputes between states by legal means or, failing these, by third-party arbitration , and the Hague conferences of and had held long debates on these subjects. The results had been unimpressive; the conference tried in vain to set up an international court, and though many arbitration treaties were signed between individual states, they all contained reservations which precluded their application in more dangerous disputes. However, though the diplomatists thus kept the free hand as long as possible, the general principle of arbitrationâ€”which in popular language included juridical settlement and also settlement through mediationâ€”had become widely accepted by public opinion and was embodied as a matter of course in the Covenant. Another 19th-century development which had influenced the plan makers was the growth of international bureaus, such as the Universal Postal Union , the International Institute of Agriculture, and numerous others, set up to deal with particular fields of work in which international cooperation was plainly essential. They had no political function or influence, but within their very narrow limits they worked efficiently. It was concluded that wider fields of social and economic life, in which each passing year made international cooperation more and more necessary, might with advantage be entrusted to similar international administrative institutions. Such ideas were strengthened by the fact that, during the war, joint Allied commissions controlling trade, shipping, and procurement of raw materials had gradually developed into powerful and effective administrative bodies. Planners questioned whether these entities, admitting first the neutrals and later the enemy states into their councils, could become worldwide centres of cooperation in their respective fields. Other lessons of the war concerned the problems of armaments on the one hand and of diplomacy on the other. It was widely believed that the enormous increase in armaments undertaken by the great powers of Europe during the immediate prewar period had been not only a consequence, but also in itself a cause, of tension, hostility, and finally war. The naval arms race between the United Kingdom and Germany was an especially obvious manifestation of this phenomenon. DreadnoughtHMS Dreadnought, a British battleship launched at Portsmouth, England, in February , inaugurated a new era of battleship design based on steam-turbine engines and batteries of big guns. National Archives, Washington, D. These general propositionsâ€”collective security, arbitration, economic and social cooperation, reduction of armaments , and open diplomacyâ€”inspired in various degrees the plans drawn up during the war. It was urged from the first that they could become effective only through the creation of a great international organization charged with the duty of applying them and invested with the powers necessary to that end. Their ideas, encouraged by

statesmen such as former Pres. In the presidential election of both parties advocated U. A few months later the United States was a belligerent , and Wilson, entering on his second term, became, by right both of his personality and of his position as leader of the greatest world power, the chief spokesman of the Allied coalition. In January , in the historic Fourteen Points in which he summed up U. Thus what had seemed hardly more than a utopian hope was transmuted in a few months into the formal and official purpose of the soon-to-be-victorious Allies. Meanwhile, both the British and French governments had appointed special committees to draw up plans for the new organization, and their reports were transmitted to Washington, where Wilson and his confidential adviser Edward M. House were drafting proposals in their turn. To many of his contemporaries, this was a new vision of the real nature of an effective League of Nations. This text was published, as a draft, on February 14, In general, however, it was well received. Although the first great impulse had already weakened and Allied unity had been impaired, a final amended text was adopted on April 28, , by the unanimous decision of the conference. The Covenant was a short and concise document of 26 articles. The first seven articles established the constitutional basis of the new system. Woodrow Wilson on a train tour to promote the League of Nations, Articles 6 and 7 created a permanent Secretariat , provided for the expenses of the League, and named Geneva as its headquarters. Articles 8 and 9 dealt with armaments. A permanent commission was provided to advise the Council on all military, naval, and air questions. Articles 10â€”17 embodied what may be called the central and basic idea of the League: Each member undertook Article 10 to respect the integrity and independence of all the others and to join in preserving them against aggression. Article 11 declared that any war or threat of war was a matter of concern to all members, whether directly affected or not; every member had the right to demand that the question be considered by the Council and, if necessary, to insist on an immediate meeting. By Article 12, all bound themselves to submit all serious disputes to peaceful settlement or to inquiry by the Council and in no case to resort to war until these procedures had had time to lead to a settlement. Even then, if no settlement were reached, they promised to wait a further three months before going to war. The various methods of settlementâ€”arbitration, legal procedure , or action by the Council or the Assemblyâ€”were then set out in some detail Articles 13â€”15 , and these provisions included the establishment of a permanent international court. Under Article 16 all members promised to join in common action against any other which made war in violation of the Covenant. This action was to take in all cases the form of economic sanctions as its primary coercive mechanism and, if this were not enough, of military intervention. This article also empowered the Council to expel a member which violated the Covenant. Article 17 extended the system so as to provide protection against, and in certain conditions for, nonmember states. Article 18 was designed to meet the demand for open diplomacy. It required that all future treaties be registered with, and published by, the Secretariat. Article 19 empowered the Assembly to propose changes in existing treaties or situations which might be a danger to peace. By Article 20 all members agreed that any treaty inconsistent with the Covenant was automatically abrogated and undertook not to enter into any such engagement in the future. Article 22 declared that the Covenant did not affect the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. Article 22 established the mandates system. Articles 23 and 24 corresponded to the proposals for worldwide economic and social cooperation under the authority of the League. Members undertook to act together in such matters as transport and communications, commercial relations, health, and supervision of the international arms trade and to bring existing international agencies, such as the Universal Postal Union, under the direction of the League. Finally, Article 26 defined the procedure for amending the Covenant; an amendment , to be effective, must be ratified by a majority of the members, including all those represented on the Council. The Covenant purported to cover each of the main proposals which had emerged during the preparatory periodâ€”collective security; arbitration and judicial settlement, including the creation of an international court; international cooperation or control in economic and social affairs; disarmament; and open diplomacy. It did not satisfy extreme pacifists , who rejected any use of force even to resist aggression , or extreme internationalists, who wished the League to have its own military forces and to impose all its decisions by its own political and military authority. In the main the Covenant fully realized the plans made during the war, and in one essential respect, the creation of efficient working institutions, it went much beyond them. For the next 20 years the Covenant continued to be, in theory, not only the guide and authority for all

the activities of the League, but also the criterion by which liberal opinion in many developed countries judged the conduct of their own and other governments. In consequence, its text was minutely and repeatedly studied, scrutinized, and debated by professors, lawyers, and statesmen. This test it bore, on the whole, very successfully. A few minor problems of interpretation were unearthed, chiefly due to the fact that its English and French texts were equally authentic. In the actual working of the League it never failed to provide both the principles and the methods required by each successive question. This of course is not to say that its principles were always respected or that its provisions were not capable of improvement. Nevertheless, the Covenant system was much more complete and well planned than might appear from the fact of the various failures and final defeat of the League. Before it even started to function, however, it would receive a blow so severe that it was never possible to apply the system as its founders had intended. The Covenant was in its nature an entirely separate instrument to which neutral states could accede even if they objected to other parts of the peace treaties. It was in form a part of these, however, and when its text was finally settled in April, it could only come into force at the same time as the Versailles Treaty as a whole, on January 10, 1920. Meanwhile, in the United States Senate, the leaders of the Republican opposition, by then implacably hostile to Wilson and all his works, had resolved to return to the policy of isolationism. While they did not formally propose the rejection of the Covenant, they put forward a number of reservations which Wilson was certain to refuse. Not all Republican senators were isolationists; there was indeed a clear majority for ratification, either without reservation or with such mild reservations as Wilson could have accepted. The total fell short of the two-thirds majority which the U. S. Constitution requires for such decisions, however. In November and again in March the proposal to ratify with substantial reservations was defeated, and the hope of U. S. participation in the League was, in one sense, decisive, since it ruled out all possibility of collective security as embodied in the Covenant. There was no certainty of a complete economic boycott which, it was confidently expected, would suffice to make even the most aggressive government prefer to settle its disputes by negotiation rather than by armed attack. The other component parts of the system could still function, and did in fact function, though with less effectiveness than if the United States had fully participated therein. Public opinion in many countries would have strongly resisted any proposal to abandon the League. So, in spite of the absence of the United States, the first meeting of the League Council was held immediately after the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles. Thus the League entered on the very active, if not always very successful, existence which ended in fact with the outbreak of World War II in 1939, though its formal demise did not take place until April 1946.

Structure of the League of Nations

The League quickly became a large and complex structure. The Assembly consisted of one to three delegates from each member nation, and many countries also sent a large body of substitutes and experts. The makers of the Covenant had expected that the Assembly would meet perhaps every third or fourth year, but at its first session in 1920 it decided to meet every September. Each session opened with a general discussion on the work done during the past year or planned for the next. This discussion often ranged over problems which the speaker considered ought to be dealt with by the members of the League instead of outside it. It then typically settled down to two or three weeks of committee meetings. Since every delegation was represented on each committee, and these groups held their meetings in public, the conclusions reached in committee were usually adopted with no more than a few formal speeches in the plenary Assembly. The Assembly decisions required unanimity among those who voted. Thus, in theory, any member could veto any decision. In practice, such a contingency was exceedingly rare. It became customary for those who disagreed with the proposals of the majority to vote against them in committee, and, having thus put their views on record, to abstain from voting in the Assembly. A few matters, such as the admission of new members or the revision of obsolete treaties, were specifically reserved to the Assembly, and from the beginning it insisted on being the sole authority in regard to the budget.