Construction of the international system of Versailles, according to the doctrine of Woodrow Wilson

Albulena Halili

Msc. Albulena HALILI

Abstract

Mapping of the international system after the First World War took place in the Conference of Versailles, where a peace treaty was negotiated to end this war, and would reshape the world order. The key role in negotiating peace was handed to the United States of America, and its President Woodrow Wilson. This paper aims to elaborate the doctrine of US President Wilson, presented through the Fourteen Points, which were the basis for the international system that was created after First World War. Two of Wilson's Fourteen Points, which are the object of study in this paper, had the most important impact on international relations, thereby transforming into international law principles, respected to this day: the right of the people for self-determination, which led to the destruction of multi-national empires, and the creation of a association of nations, which resulted in the establishment of the League of Nations, a predecessor of United Nations. The methodological approach used in this paper is analytical-theoretical, and is based on contemporary literature. It aims to identify the strong and weak sides of this doctrine, and its influence in the establishment of the Versailles international system, which only lasted twenty years. Conclusions from this paper are that the Fourteen Points not only served for the mapping of the Versailles international system but also for the establishment of preceding international systems. Many of those principles are the foundation of contemporary international relations.

Introduction

Failure of an international system, which preserved peace for over a century, led to the most devastating war that humanity had ever encountered, while the end of it brought the need of shaping a new international order. The European concept began shaking in the 50s of the 19th century, receiving its hardest hit in 1871, a year in which Europe saw the emergence of a new and strong power – united Germany. It was this power that sought to take the rule and a dominating role in the continent, that triggered many crisis and was deemed to be the cause of World War I. The concept of Europe was quickly decimating along with the concept of balance of powers that brought so many wars, hatred and nationalism between the people in the old continent. A new saving, trans-oceanic power had emerged, bringing quick victory to the allies in the continent and sought to bring new values. He would bring to the European Continent a new concept of international relationship regulation, where no alliance based on interest or hidden agreements would exist, but where a spirit of mutual cooperation and a common goal would rule – preservation of peace. He designed this concept perfectly with the *Fourteen Points,* which were presented before the American Congress on January 8th, 1918. These points would give birth to a new doctrine in international relations, knows today as Wilson's Doctrine.

1. Wilson's Doctrine

Wilson and America were about a new world order, ruled by democracy, collective security and the right of people for self-determination. All three elements were considered related to the nature God has given to man. Peace is in human nature, democracy in social nature, self-determination in the nature of the people – thus these three elements transformed into a global system of values, would bring about a new world order.[1]

When Wilson's doctrine presented in the form of points was made public, it was understood that they held within them the concept for forging a different world, a new international system that would replace the old, based on new values of a new world that was America. Freedom, equality and democracy were widespread promoted values by the new power. The impact of these points became visible only when the Axis were defeated. When the main Axis power – Germany demanded the signature of a truce and the war ended, there was a need to establish a new world order that would pass on the Concept of Europe. But it was very hard to ask France and Britain for

---

[1] Lisen Bashkurti, Albanian Diplomacy (Diplomacia shqiptare), Volume 1, Tirana: GEER, 2005, f. 222

moderation, since the Wilson's doctrine brought the need of a compromise on their behalf regarding peace, which they were not able to make. Both states had a long statehood tradition and in periods of time, they had been founders of international systems. In the 17th century, France, under Cardinal Richelieu, brought into international relations the contemporary concept based on nation-states and motivated by national demands as an ultimate goal. In the 18th century, Great Britain created the concept of the power balance, which dominated the European diplomacy for the next 200 years.[2]

Coming out of isolation, America took the duty of a missionary of international relations. Thus the mission Wilson gave to himself was the establishment of an international system based on justice. This doctrine included powerful principles, new to the old world and unheard before such as: the fall of balance of powers, abandoning secret diplomacy, the right of people for self-determination, guaranteeing of the freedom of the seas, establishment of a body called League of Nations, which would give guarantees to its members regarding preservation of territorial integrity and sovereignty, without having to go to war for them.

These principles were the way by which Wilson sought to undo the old system, the balance of powers, a system where it was not allowed for a state to strengthen itself more than another country, on the contrary, other powers would react to stop expansion, in order to maintain this balance. Wilson was convinced that this system, based on a power balance, was one of the biggest causes for such a terrible war. He expressed himself on power balance: "That sacred thing we called 'Balance of Power' – where balance was set by the unstable balance of competing interests; a balance which was preserved by jealous wakefulness and antagonizing interests, which even though it was not active in general, was deeply rooted".[3] In order to participate in a system of power balance, a nation has to believe it faces a real threat it cannot control by itself, [4] therefore Wilson wished to replace it with a system based on justice, where no organized rivalries or fears from other powers would exist, because all together would engage themselves towards organizing mutual peace.

Another cause, according to Wilson, for the outbreak of war was the secret diplomacy exercised by the old continent powers. Therefore, Wilson promoted the principles for abandoning secret diplomacy and replacing it with public diplomacy, thus stopping the making of secret treaties. These treaties produced secret alliances between continental actors, reached based on selfish

---

[2] Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy (Diplomacia),* Tirana, 1999, f. 17
[3] Gordon A. Craig and Alexander L. George. *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, f. 46
[4] Henry Kissinger, Does America need a foreign policy*?*, Tirana: Plejad, 2004, f. 370

interests, different crisis between allies, loss of faith, increase of military budget instead of civil budget, conspiratorial rearmament and in the end it resulted in a world war. In the interpretation done by Colonel House on the Wilson's Fourteen Points, regarding the first point, he says: "Maybe the case should be presented like this: It is proposed that in the future every treaty will be part of public global law and every nation accepts set obligations in accordance with capabilities to fulfil them. Naturally nations cannot accept obligations related to issues that are unknown to them; as a consequence, every secret treaty is tend to weaken the solidity of the whole international convention structure that is being proposed to be established".[5] Besides preventing of secret treaties between powers, in conspiratorial ways against each other, Wilson established the first basis for the establishment of a legal panel in international relations. By calling for open diplomacy, international public law is put above selfish interests of powers, to prevent every arbitrary action or bargains between powers, which have led to devastating wars.

Another basis for establishing sustainable peace in Wilson's plan was the national self-determination principle, as a transformation of society based on legal procedures. Wilson predicted that people are born with natural rights to determine the form and fate of their government. This principle of the American president had the purpose that nations realize their rights, to not choose war as a mean, but the mechanisms based on their rights. Democracies do not fight each other they seek the expansion of human issues based on universal principles[6]. Nonetheless, point 10 of the famous Wilson points, where this principle was first promoted, was and remains one of the most obscure and problematic principles. Different empires were keeping people enslaved for some time. Wilson, through this philosophy, induced ambitions in different countries by making them embrace this philosophy. But, he was not well informed on the circumstances of the old continent. "When I said these words – he admitted afterwards – I said them without knowing that nationalities existed, which are springing every day".[7] American principles on universal values that Wilson so passionately promoted, were hard to apply on a place that had and still has many differences and hostilities between the people living in it. Self-determination doctrine was a complex doctrine and almost

---

[5] United States Department of State, *Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States, 1918. Supplement 1, The World War*, Volume I, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918, ff. 405-413. File No. 763.72119/8970

[6] Henry Kissinger, *Does America need foreign policy?*, Tiranë: Plejad, 2004, op.cit., ff. 372-373

[7] Margaret Macmillan, *Paris 1919: six months that changed the world (Gjashte muajt qe ndryshuan boten),* Tirana: Plejad, 2006, p. 10

unrealisable. "Identity is a very complicated thing to be regulated simply by lines on a map or words on a treaty".[8]

In the midst of principles, standing out of the fourteen points by the American president, was "the famous American policy that lead USA to victory of both wars – in years 1812 and 1917 – policy that insisted in the freedom of seas and the right of neutral states to trade with war participating states".[9] This policy was rejected by USA allies – Britain and France. Especially Britain, known in international relations as "King of the Seas" would never give up some of the rights such as: the right of sea control, law of smuggling and enforcing blockades.[10] One of those rights such as enforcing blockades was one the main factors for the Antante victory. Britain would never allow losing such right.

In the centre of Wilsonian principles stood his project for establishing an international organization where all states would be members and would guarantee collective security. This would be a "universal unification" of nations, which would ensure for the world a long sustainable peace and a safe warless world. This vision of the American president was offered to the Europeans to replace once and for all the system of power balance and European secret diplomacy, since history has shown that such systems would never lead to a long and sustainable peace in the continent and in international systems. The organization, which he called League of Nations, would be an organization that would be based on principles that would be accepted by all and in international rights. Through this organization, Wilson would make his dream come true – establishment for the first time of a international system based on justice.

All of Wilson's proposals for mapping a new international order, foreseen in his fourteen points, were completely dependant on the establishment of such an organization. Therefore the failure of the League of Nations brought the fall of the Versailles international system.

1.1 Self-determination principle and its impact: collapse of empires and birth of new states

The right for self-determination, first as a principle then as a right of people, known and accepted internationally, has often produced dramatic effects in international relations. Since in its birth the preconditions were clear for the great role this principle would play in international relations

---

[8] Alan Sharp and Conan Fischer, "The Versailles settlement: enforcement, compliance, contested identities", Diplomacy &Statecraft, nr. 16, 2005, ff. 419-422
[9] "Freedom of the Seas?", Time, Monday, Oct. 21, 1935
[10] "Foresees harmony on freedom of seas", The New York Times, December 12, 1918

development. Self-determination principle has been contested since its origin since it has revived many ambitions, secessionist movements and has added attention to minority rights in the entire world. Its origin remains the same. Proclaiming this right has started in the revolts in America against colonials, inspired by the ideas of John Lock on natural rights, continuing to Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence. "We surely cannot withhold the right of any people, when we have established our own; everyone can govern himself according to every form he likes or change those forms on his will."[11] Even though during these years this principle has taken its modern form and it was supported strongly by American leaders, it never became an official policy. The sole impact during these periods was towards European people who at that time were fighting against autocratic governments and colonies which were fighting for their independence.[12]

Before Wilson brought his fourteen points for the second time in Europe, this principle was promoted during the American revolution, and it was officially implemented in the French revolution through popular vote.

Self-determination right evolved decade after decade being treated and interpreted by many scholars. "The world – wrote the famous Swiss international right scholar Johann Caspar Bluntschli (1808-1881) in 1870, should be divided in as many states as humanity is divided in nations"[13], continuing with his famous statement - "every nation – a state and every state – a national being".[14] Bluntschli based this formulation in the right of state-forming of single-nation people, as a possibility to create balance and stability in the world. This concept was advanced by Robert Redslop, whose ideas had a powerful impact on the Weimar Republic (1919) through the idea that self-determination right should serve as a principle to ensure regional peace. With time passing, self-determination right was enriched with quality and quantity elements.

In the legal aspect, the people's right was formulated in 1867 by the Austro-Hungarian Empire where it stated that all people, regardless of nationality and origin, have an unalienable right to preserve and take care of their nationality and language.

---

[11] Letter to Gouverneur Morris, December 30, 1792, Boyd 1950-, XXIV.800; Opinion on the Treaties with France, April 28, 1793, Boyd 1950-, XXV.608-10; Letter to James Madison, August 28, 1789, Boyd 1950-, XV.366-67. Cituar sipas Will Morrisey, *Self-Government, the American Theme: Presidents of the Founding and Civil War*, Lexington Books, 2006, f. 120
[12] Betty Miller Utenberger, "Self-Determination", <u>Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy</u>, 2002. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_gx5215/is_2002/ai_n19132482 më 22/01/2009
[13] Stanford M. Lyman , *Postmodernism and a Sociology of the Absurd and Other Essays on the "nouvelle Vague" in American Social Science*, University of Arkansas Press, 1997. ff. 71-72
[14] Johann Caspar Bluntschli, *Allgemeine Staatslehre*, Stuttgart, 1875, f. 107

These principles were further developed in not similar concepts by the policy of two poles: Western policy represented by ex-president Woodrow Wilson and Eastern Communist policy represented by Roza Luxenburg and Vladimir Ilich Lenin. While for Wilson this principle was one of the most powerful principle he promoted in 1918 through the *Fourteen Points,* for establishing a international system based on justice which would bring peace and stability to the world, Lenin sought to fulfil his dream for total socialist revolution in the entire world. For Lenin this principle was based in socialist philosophy, while western democratic theory was the base where the American president found his support. Bolshevists promoted this American principle as a concept for stopping wars and achieving peace. Peace Decree of 1917[15] contained similar points to those that will later be the Fourteen Points of the American president, such as: achieving a truce, annulment of secret treaties and the right of self-determination for people. The concept of the right for self-determination was transformed in legal form under the Soviet Union Constitution of 1918[16], which recognized the right of self-determination to its republics to the extent of secession and establishment of independent states. "Self-determination of nations cannot mean something other than political self-determination, state independence and establishment of national states."[17]

Perhaps Wilson proclaimed the right of self-determination as a right of people to freely choose their leading authorities, so as a right to self-govern, just after the Great War ended, this principle took a greater size than it was anticipated. According to Wilson the right of people for self-determination had the propelling power for establishing new national states. This would mean that people may construct their existence, from the inside or outside, in a political, economical, cultural point of view, free from the influence from other powers.[18] By the time self-determination was being promoted, it did not present a internationally recognized right, but it represented a principle, this political principle had an enormous impact on the European continent. It inspired enslaved people under monarchies, movements that quickly led to the collapse of empires such as the Austro-Hungarian Empire or Ottoman Empire giving way to a set of new states in the European continent.

Ex American secretary of state during 1915-1916, Robert Lansing, was a great adversary of this principle. His prophecy turned to be very accurate

---

[15] Vlladimir Iliç Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977, ff. 419-423; Lisen Bashkurti, *Diplomacia shqiptare*, vëll. I, Tiranë: GEER, 2005, op.cit. ff. 218-219
[16] *Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, 1918.* http://www.marxists.org/history/ussr/government/constitution/1918/
[17] Vlladimir Iliç Lenin, *Lenin's* Collected Works, Vëll. 20, Moskow: Progress Publishers, 1972, ff. 395-400.
[18] Urs Altermatt, *Ethno-nationalism in Europe*, Tiranë, 2002, f. 82

during the following years. He, while interpreting the Fourteen Points of Wilson, had said that self-determination would be left in a stream of bloodshed[19]. "When the president speaks of self-determination what unit does he have in mind? Does he have in mind a race, territorial space or communion? This will raise hopes that may never realise. I am afraid that this will cost thousand human lives. At last this will be discredited, will be called the dream of an idealist that did not manage to understand the risk until it was too late to control those that sought to realise it".[20] This reflection of Lansing, naturally went in the direction that Wilson himself gave to self-determination right, in stability and international peace. Wilson had declared that it was not self-determination what caused wars, on the contrary it was the lack of it. However, when Wilson presented this idea, he was not aware of the heterogeneous structure that dominated world regions. Therefore, by the end of 1919, he had stated before the American Congress: "When I stated those words (that all nations had the right of self-determination), I did it without knowing that there were nationalities which were springing every day".[21] Therefore, the principles of Wilson on self-determination and collective security threw the European diplomats to an entirely unknown territory.[22]

The self-determination doctrine served first and foremost to the winners of the World War I, to remake the European map aside the establishment of a new international system. In pursuit of the Wilsonian principle of nations' right to self-determination they tried to match state borders with pure national borders, which resulted in violence and conflicts of catastrophic extent. Apart from Lansing, a strong opposer of such efforts, there was also the British Prime Minister Lloyd George, for whom such efforts would never fit for such a heterogeneous region such as the Eastern Europe.

The right to self-determination had an effect limited by the winning powers of the war only. Any allowance of implementation of the self-determination rights within the continent would foster ambitions and revolts in other countries aspiring for independence and the rights to self-govern. Nationalism continued to threaten the fate of multi-ethnic empires. When this traditional doctrine was encouraged by the largest winning power, which promoted the rights of nations to self-determine, the consequences for such artificial empires were fatal. The peoples within empires were armed with a principle with which they gained the room and support for realization of their

---

[19] Quoted from Stefan Hobe, Otto Kimminich, "Einführung in das Velkerecht'', botimi VIII, Basel 2004, f.114
[20] Margaret Macmillan, op. cit., f. 40
[21] Ibid, f. 41
[22] Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy (Diplomacia)*, Tirana 1999, op.cit., f. 222

own national ambitions. This brought to revolts and upheavals of enslaved nations captured by the two large empires: Austro-Hungaria and the Ottoman Empire, bringing them to an ultimate end. Wilson was not aware of the revolutionary implications of such a principe if applied within the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires, and surely he had no intention of dissolving them.[23] The dissolution of these two multi-national empires brought the establishment of a number of weak states, which for a long time would remain unsolved issues of larger powers, thereby producing continuous crisis.

Although Wilson continued to maintain the principle, the Versailles created new countries without even consulting the peoples living in them. Countries like Czechoslovakia, the Serbo-Croat-Slovenian Kingdom, were created without referenda, thereby violating the rights of self-determination of peoples living in those territories. The same thing happened with different provinces in the European continent: Alzace-Lorraine was returned to France, a large part of the Western Prussia was given to Poland, etc.

From the former giant Ottoman Empire, only one democratic Republic was inherited, the Republic of Turkey, while other countries springing out of the empire, such as Syria, Jordan, Liban and Palestine/Israel, were put under the mandate (control) of the League of Nations, obtaining their ultimate independence after the World War II.[24]

From a political ideal, the principle of self-determination begun taking form of an international law principle with the Atlantic Charter (1941), signed by Churchill and Roosevelt. They had agreed on the principle of self-determination, integrating it within the Charter.

From a political principle, the right of self-determination transformed into an internationally recognized right in 1945, when the United Nations Charter was ratified.[25] The self-determination scholar, Hurst Hannum[26] stated that "some things are too important to leave to the lawyers, and I believe self-determination is one of them". The nature of international relations and the pace of their development and transformation often impose the necessity of decisions, which are not necessarily an application of principles provided by international law covenants.

---

[23] Allen Lynch, "Woodrow Wilson and the principle of 'national self-determination': a reconsideration", <u>Review of International Studies</u> (British International Studies Association: 2002), 28. o. 427

24 John T. Rourke and Mark A. Boyer, *International politics on the world stage*, Santiago : Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, 1996, p. 42

[25] Charter of the United Nations 26 June 1945, San Francisco. Kapitulli I. Neni 1. Pika 2 http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/chapter1.shtml .

[26] Hurst Hannum is a professor of International Law at the Fletcher School of Law and diplomacy, Tufts University

1.2 Principle of collective security

The lengthy period without a world war has proven that the substitution of the traditional system of power balance with the system of collective security was a successful action, which served to guarantee and maintain peace in the world. Nevertheless, the path towards creating a proper collective security, which would incorporate all international entities would be long and difficult.

Until the period after the World War I, the international relations were ruled by a system of power balances and hidden alliances between larger powers, a system which was proven to be a failure, because in such relations, it only created hostilities which ultimately brought to destructive wars. The older diplomatic system seemed to have failed once and for all, and when the *War to end all wars*[27] begun, leaders started seeking alternatives to establishment of a new world order, and finding new mechanisms for preserving peace and stability in the new world order.

With the entry of the USA into war, Wilson harshly criticized this system[28], which was grounded upon individual strengths and interests of one or more powers, suggesting new concepts and principles of regulation of such relations: "...there should not be a power balance, but a community of powers; no organized rivalries, but a common organized peace."[29] In his speech on 27 September 1918, amidst other visionary principles such as democracy and self-determination, the US President had promoted the principle of collective security (thereby proclaiming the necessity of creation of an organization he would call the League of Nations), as an essential principle to permanent peace. "It is the foundation of the whole diplomatic structure of permanent peace"[30], was the statement of Colonel House for the last item of Wilson, according to which the foundation of an organization had to take place under specific covenants, with a view of providing mutual guarantees for political independence and territorial integrity, both for small and large countries.

This doctrine was built upon two general principles: the principle of respect for state sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention in the

---

[27] A nomination used for the World War I. This nomination was used by the British author Wales, further by Wilson, David Lloyd George and many other actors of the international scene of the early 20th Century.

[28] The European Concert system (1815-1914) which was grounded upon the principle of power balance.

[29] "Conditions of peace", January 22, 19 17, Address to the Senate. *Selected addresses and public papers of Woodrow Wilson,* op. cit., New York: Boni and Liveright, 1918, f. 175

[30]File No. 763.72119/8970, United States Department of State, *Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States, 1918. Supplement 1, The World War*, Volume I, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918. ff.405-413.

internal affairs of a state. With time passing, these principles were turned against each other. Apart from giving the room to smaller countries in the forum, the principle also upheld the national rights as per self-determination principle. Many of the countries, which were members of the League of Nations, were made of heterogeneous structures, which meant that there would be permanent risk to their territorial integrity. Therefore, principles upon which collective security was built only remained a desire of the time, not only during the period between the two World Wars, but until the end of the bipolar international system.

Although it is widely known that the US President did a lot to promote and protect the idea of collective security, the efforts to realize such a principle were being discussed already between important American and British figures such as Lord Bryce, G. Lowes Dickinson, Sir Walter Phillimore, Edouard Grey etc. Maybe the necessity of a "League to guarantee peace" was a debate which had begun with the beginning of the war, and Wilson had a great role in shaping that idea, and further its protection and support by all means.

Professor Zhivojin M. Peric states on the League of Nations:

"In this Association of Nations, there is no freedom and independence for various peoples who make it: each nation must sacrifice important parts of the first and the second to have peace, without which there cannot be any happiness or progress for humanity. (...) Therefore, one must choose between freedom (independence) and war on the one hand, and dependence and peace on the other. He who wants freedom (independence) shall not have peace, while he who does not want war, shall not have peace (independence)."[31]

The guarantee of peace could not come through hidden alliances between large powers, it would have to be sanctioned by legal norms of international law, transforming it from a political concept, the sustainability of which depended on the ambitions of one or the other power, to a legal concept known and recognized by all entities of an international system. The Bismarck *realpolitik* had maintained peace for a long time, but it was proven that its consequences were to be fatal. Therefore, the necessity of finding other alternatives, and creation of a supranational organization, universally recognized, to promote and protect these principles for the construction of peace, was immediate. Secret alliances and international anarchy would need to end once and for all, to give way to legal acts recognized by all international actors.

Apart from building peace and creating a new world order, the League would have other duties as well. "The League may arbitrate and rectify the

---

[31] Zhivojin M. Peric, *Nezavisnost i rat ili zavisnost i mir.* Arhiv za drushtvene nauke, godina XI – drugo kolo, knjiga II (XIX) br. 1, Beograd: Administracija arhiva, 1921, ff. 110-113

mistakes which are unavoidable in a treaty we are trying to make now"[32], stated Wilson. The drafters were aware that the Treaty they were drafting, and the peace they were designing were not to be perfect, and the League of Nations would be the mechanism to rectify such omissions.

Difficulties in realizing such a project were rather large, while the obstacles were the European states, where he wanted to realize this legal concept. The building of peace would begin from the place it had been ruined. The guarantee for a world peace would need to spring from the roots of the powers which started the war, and it would be very difficult to imagine that these countries, traditionally hostile against each other, would abandon their way of diplomacy, to substitute it with new criteria of an entirely different world, the American world. In this sense, Wilson would need to be diligent in his role of convincing these nations to abandon their historical traditions, which had brought nothing but wards, and for them to join in the efforts of building an new world order, entirely different from the old one. This in fact was the intention of the US entering the world way, in a war, which according to him would end all wars. "The war was about transformation, and not geo-politics", the President would say.[33]

Debates and controversies were to be coarser with the French leaders. More than any other European country, France felt it needed security, a condition it demanded secured by its allies. The French had a right to demand the security of their country by the League of Nations. France was twice the first victim of the same aggressor, in a difference from the Great Britain and USA, which were geographically more secure from Germany. Therefore, the demand of France made to the two powers was the establishment of a military force within the League of Nations, which would provide protection against its neighbouring enemy. Its allies, especially by the US, rejected this demand of France for a military guarantee. The American Senate would not ratify any military structure parallel to the Federal one. This rejection only added the fear, which was already present in France. It knew rather well that Germany was defeated, but not weakened, and therefore, its decision would be concise and would bear no risk to it. The only way, according to the French Prime Minister Klemonso, in which Germany would not pose a threat for it and the European and global stability, was its division. Truthfully, Richelieu had built a system which stood three centuries, but the fall of such a system was to be very painful. There were other factors which would oppose this utopian concept of the French leader. First, France had no more the power it had once. While in the

---

32 Seth P. Tillman, *Anglo-American relations at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919*, quoted by Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy (iplomacia)*, Tirana, 1999, op. cit., p. 234
33 Ibid, p. 226

17th century, France built systems and imposed its will throughout the continent, it was now unable to preserve even its own territorial integrity; second, although Germany was defeated, it was not weakened, and for a difference from the age of *raison d'etat*, it was not a territory divided into 300 parts. Germany now represented a unitary state in the middle of Europe, with a population almost the largest in the continent, and a very developed industry. The French concept was not suitable to then the circumstances, strategic interests of countries, and the new principles the American President was striving to implement, and therefore this concept was left aside in return to a guarantee provided by the Great Britain and the US. France found itself in the middle of British and American conditions, and the need to be part of a multi-lateral decision-making institution, and was compelled to accept the offer given by its allies. In one occasion, Clemenceau had stated: "We have millions of lost, killed and wounded. If in our heads we would not have the great cause of the League of Nations, we would turn egoistically to ourselves. Who can say that we would not justify that? This was not our wish."[34] Therefore, Clemenceau accepted the concept of collective security, making France part of it. "We have gathered around ourselves a number of interested nations. We gathered them not to impose our will, not to make them do what they do not want to do, but to demand their collaboration. This was the reason we invited them here. Nevertheless, we have still to determine the organization of such collaboration."[35]

---

[34] André Tardieu, *The Truth about the Treaty*, Indianapolis: 1921, f. 99
[35] Ibid, p. 99

Conclusions

The Wilson's Fourteen Points were taken as basis for the construction of the new post-war international order. By these points, the effort was for this system to bring about a new age in international relations, very different from the previous one: the power balance was to be replaced with a community of powers, the secret diplomacy was to be substituted with public diplomacy, bilateral diplomacy with multilateral diplomacy, etc. the largest project of his was the establishment of the League of Nations, which would be tasked with the materialization of the known principle of collective security. Despite all omissions and failures of the organization, it built a foundation, which would serve to the construction of an institutionalized world order, within which the genesis of the international relations legal framework would be born. The United Nations, which is a universal organization with a multilateral nature, is a direct descendant of the League of Nations, which was a product of Versailles, and simultaneously represents the modern reflection of the concept of collective security.

The right of self-determination, promoted throughout the period, left no room for implementing principles of legitimacy of monarch dynasties. This principle tore down the two strongest empires: Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, the people became the basic element of creation of nation-states. This philosophy paved the way for the birth of a number of new nation-states.

The entry of the USA in the World War I had a substantial impact on the changes to the international system, giving it a universal character. In this manner, the US entered the world politics and became the founders of two international systems, and the new world order of the 21st century, which is still consolidating.

The Wilson's Doctrine, despite the failure in building an international system to preserve permanent peace, gave life to new concepts in international relations: the concept of collective security, the principle of the right of self-determination, the principle of mandates, international protection of minorities, which would be the foundations of a modern international system.

Literature:

1. Alan Sharp and Conan Fischer, "The Versailles settlement: enforcement, compliance, contested identities", <u>Diplomacy & Statecraft</u>, nr. 16, 2005, ff. 419-422

2. Allen Lynch, "Woodrow Wilson and the principle of 'national self-determination': a reconsideration", <u>Review of International Studies</u> (British International Studies Association: 2002), 28.

3. André Tardieu, *The Truth about the Treaty*, Indianapolis: 1921

4. Betty Miller Utenberger, "Self-Determination", Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy, 2002 <u>http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_gx5215/is_2002/ai_n19132482</u>

5. *Charter of the United Nations 26 June 1945*, San Francisco. Chapter I. Article 1. Point 2 <u>http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/chapter1.shtml</u>

6. "Conditions of peace", January 22, 19 17, Address to the Senate. Selected addresses and public papers of Woodrow Wilson, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1918

7. *Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, 1918*. <u>http://www.marxists.org/history/ussr/government/constitution/1918/</u>

8. "Foresees harmony on freedom of seas", <u>The New York Times</u>, December 12, 1918

9. "Freedom of the Seas?", <u>Time</u>, Monday, Oct. 21, 1935

10. Gordon A. Craig and Alexander L. George. *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995

11. Henry Kissinger, Does America need a foreign policy? (*A ka nevojë Amerika për një politikë të jashtme?*), Tirana: Plejad, 2004

12. Henry Kissinger, Diplomacy (*Diplomacia*), Tirana, 1999

13. Johann Caspar Bluntschli, *Allgemeine Staatslehre*, Stuttgart, 1875, f. 107

14. John T. Rourke and Mark A. Boyer, *International politics on the world stage*, Santiago : Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, 1996

15. Lisen Bashkurti, Albanian Diplomacy (*Diplomacia shqiptare*), Volume 1, Tirana: GEER, 2005

16. Macmillan, Margaret. *Paris 1919: Six months that changed the world (gjashtë muaj që ndryshuan botën)*. Tirana: Plejad, 2006.

17. Stanford M. Lyman , *Postmodernism and a Sociology of the Absurd and Other Essays on the "nouvelle Vague" in American Social Science*, University of Arkansas Press, 1997.

18. Stefan Hobe, Otto Kimminich, *Einführung in das Velkerecht*, botimi VIII, Basel 2004

19. United States Department of State, Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States, 1918. Supplement 1, The World War, Volume I, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918

20. Urs Altermatt, Ethno-nationalism in Europe (*Etnonacionalizmi në Europë)*, Tirana, 2002

21. Vladimir Ilich Lenin, *Lenin's Collected Works*, Volume 20, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972

22. Vladimir Ilich Lenin, Selected Works, vol. 2, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977

23. Zhivojin M. Peric, Independence and war, or dependence and peace (*Nezavisnost i rat ili zavisnost i mir).* Arhiv za drustvene nauke, godina XI – drugo kolo, knjiga II (XIX) br. 1, Beograd: Administracija arhiva, 1921

24. Will Morrisey, *Self-Government, the American Theme: Presidents of the Founding and Civil War*, Lexington Books, 2006.