

1943 Moscow, 30th October
1944 Dumbarton Oaks - August 21st - October 7th.

1945

Crimea Conference February 4-11
San Francisco Conference April 25- June 26th
Potsdam Conference July 17th - July 25th.
Five Power Conference (London) September 11th - October 2nd.
Moscow Conference of For. Min. December 16th - December 26th.

1946.

UNO in London. 10. Jan. 1946

United Nations Organisation.

USA

A. The main forces shaping this new organisation were the needs of the Grand Coalition which won the War. ~~MINIMUMS~~
The USA could not fully cooperate without some safeguards as to the war aims of the various powers. Yet she herself could not offer any contribution unless she first dropped her isolationism.
But American internationalism was (as we saw) necessarily universalist, i.e. directed towards all-inclusive international institutions, like the League of Nations or the Permanent Court of International Justice or more recently the Bretton Woods agreements.

a. Ideological factor: The rôle of the idea of the rule of law in the history of American internationalism. DISTR. OF BALANCE O.P. and against the The history of isolationism and the battle for the League.

All resolutions brought in in Congress to further internationalism (post-War commitments) were without exception of a 'universalist' nature.

Small

b. The realist factor: American political interest is amongst the countries of Latin America. American capitalist dependencies are amongst the assets of American foreign policy.

USSR

Russia, on the other hand, tended towards Great Power organisation.
a. Ideological factors: Traditional distrust of the League, which acted for a long time as an anti-Russian coalition of Western capitalist powers.

b. Realist factors: The bad experience made with the League. The camouflaging of Great Power policies in the garb of the League Covenant hid the absolute need for Great power cooperation.
This was powerfully reinforced by all the universalist traits of the Covenant like (aa) unanimity rule, (bb) the preponderance of the Assembly over the Council of the League, (cc) the preponderance of the small powers over the big in the Council. (Fifteen powers in the Council, acting under unanimity rules, not even procedure being always exempt). This paralysed the League and allowed sabotage of all its actions, even when some degree of great power solidarity was forthcoming.

Russia does not possess the object of the USA or even of the UK. She is the first socialist country in the world and must meet the distrust and hostility of all. May be this will be different (aaa) the Slav states may rally around her, (bbb) She may become influential with the colonial or exotic or non-coloured peoples. (ccc) Even may be some time in the future with socialist countries, but this certainly is not now the case.

Consequently, the UNO Charter had to be a compromise between the Russian and the American view, with Great Britain acting as a mediator. This actually was what happened.

To the extent to which Russia thought she could trust the UNO, she was prepared to relinquish territorial safeguards in Europe & Asia.
- but to that extent only.

UNO - problems and prospects.

I gather you had an excellent lecture ^{from} by Cpt. Swingler. He did not mince his words. I also am going to be outspoken and provocative ~~in my opinion~~, since I am sure you do not want me to waste your time. - on diplomatic formulae which satisfy everybody except ~~the~~ persons who happen to be sincerely interested. UNO is, of course, the next step ~~inward~~ on the road towards the establishment of world government on this planet. Not very much, than a year ago, the chances of such a venture would have had to be discounted. To-day the position is ~~very~~ different. UNO is a proposition of great practical importance.

For two reasons, ~~namely~~ (1) ~~the~~ the outcome of the war and the unprecedented scale ~~range~~ of the victory which it brought;

(2) the ~~atomic~~ release of nuclear energy and its use in the Atom Bomb. In other words the great permanent danger of war and the great permanent danger ~~from~~ from war.

The first has created a power vacuum which ~~inconstitutes~~ constitutes the greatest permanent danger of war. Two of the ~~greatest~~ power centres of the globe have been eliminated; Germany and Japan. On these hung Continental Europe (~~apart from Russia~~) in Europe, the ~~whole of the~~ Far East, ~~including~~ including not only Manchuria but ~~the~~ political ~~scene of the~~ ~~East~~ China & Indonesia. To this vast dislocation must be added - partly as a direct consequence of the war, the rise of India to independence. ~~Altogether~~ Hardly more than the populations of the USA, the UK and the Dominions, and the USSR remained within the traditional power fixtures. Some 1500,000,000 people are either without a roof of power over their heads, or have lost ~~their~~ contact with the ~~central~~ systems of power, Germany, ~~or are losing~~ ~~and~~ Japan, the U.K., and in some cases, smaller powers, as the Netherlands (in regard of the Indonesian Empire). The small neutrals were even in peace time non-powers, and kept on the map merely by ~~the balancing~~ right way in which they balanced between the ~~atomic~~ Powers. This is true of Switzerland, or Sweden. As to the other countries of ~~Europe~~ the European continent, none that has been occupied by Germany or co-operated with it, can be regarded as a Power on its own (for the time being not even France). In other words the colour scheme on the map is misleading, for ~~actually~~ European Continent is a power vacuum.

Now, if there is one law in political science which holds ~~with absolute~~ rigour, it is the inevitability of conflict between Independent ~~Great~~ Powers, which find themselves separated only by a power vacuum. The only alternative is (a) either to agree ~~to~~ on allowing the territories to build up their own independent national power ~~and assist them in doing so, or~~ fill in the vacuum, or (b) to agree on ~~preventing~~ any ~~government~~ government being established in that territory (1903). ~~strong~~ If neither of these happens, conflict cannot be avoided, even though both parties sincerely wish to avoid it, in their own interest. Unless they agree on how to deal with the vacuum, their ~~genuine~~ safety ~~interest~~ will draw them into conflict. For the simple reason that the peoples in the vacuum - which we assume to be in a state of chaos - will in their own interest create situations which must affect the safety and security of one or the other great neighbour, thus leaving them no alternative but to interfere and thus get involved in the affairs of the buffer territory. Mind, we have been assuming ~~all the time~~ that neither of the great Powers has ambitions, business interests or national or religious preconceptions which would make them take a less unselfish and disinterested attitude - a rather idealistic assumption. ~~Such a power vacuum is reported to exist in the Far East.~~

The ~~second~~ has made war ~~more~~ more dangerous than it was even in the last war. For the first time the perspective includes the possibility of the destruction of mankind, if not of this planet. The scientist may say, he cannot tell ~~anything about it~~, but the political philosopher must say: ~~you~~ use your common sense: If this is only the beginning, a modest tentative beginning, what are the perspectives of a somewhat more distant future?

~~hence~~ These are the two reasons why world government has become a much more real issue than it was before.

Personally, I never liked the idea of a world-state, nor did I accept peace ~~as~~ the dominating prime interest of political man. ~~that~~ to change my mind. To-day I accept both.

UNO - Problems and prospects (cont.)

(history)

But ~~UNO~~ is not governed ~~by~~ by man's interests nor his ideals. In vain would we need ~~UNO~~ a world state or agree that ~~it~~ was ~~an~~ ~~unrealistic~~ ~~idea~~, if no real forces were available ~~to~~ to achieve that end.

Take an instance:

Cpt. Swingler, I understand ^{what} said, that our Treaty with the USSR was not the result of British policy or of Russian policy, of German war strategy. ~~This is completely true.~~ ^{but of}

Now, in the same way UNO ~~has~~ ^{has} become a practical proposition not on account of the ~~great~~ danger to peace involved in the ~~vacuum~~ power vacuum left by the War, nor on account of the Atom Bomb, but on account of the participation of the USA in the war.

UNO, or something of the kind ^{is} ~~is~~ the only form in which the USA can or will participate in world affairs. This is not necessarily so of Russia which actually prefers a Three Power, ~~non-aligned~~ ~~system~~, and is not necessarily so in the case of Britain which can equally well (or, ~~rather~~ with equal difficulty) fit ~~into~~ either of these systems. (if you wish)

The reasons which bind the USA permanently to universalist forms of organization are twofold: (1) the ~~history~~ ~~of~~ ~~isolationism~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~meaning~~ ~~and~~ ~~meaning~~ of internationalism in the States; (2) the organization of American world power.

^{some 1/4 century ago.} ~~The first~~ ^{the meaning of internationalism -} goes back to the time of the battle for the League. ~~The Americans~~ ^{the Americans} believe that they made a bad mistake by ~~going back to isolationism~~ going back to isolationism after World War I. Roosevelt's Chicago speech in which he first warned his people that isolationism may have to go, revived the Wilsonian issue. ~~For or against~~ ^{For or against} isolationism therefore meant, (for or against) the League. ~~For or against internationalism, means consequently, means for or against~~ ^{For or against} the League. ~~This was the manner~~ ^{This was the manner} the struggle of Democrats and Republicans crystallized the issue. This is a political fact of the first importance. ~~It resulted in a compromise which removed the whole question from party politics, on the understanding that internationalism involved something like the League, something that I will call a universalist form of organization.~~ ^{It resulted in a compromise which removed the whole question from party politics, on the understanding that internationalism involved something like the League, something that I will call a universalist form of organization.} Such an organization has the following characteristics (1) it is inclusive -- the more countries are included the better (2) the principle of the sovereignty of the individual states is maintained (this is essential, since the reservation of American sovereignty was the basis of the compromise. No party ~~ever~~ suggested that the USA should relinquish her own sovereign rights. The constitutional position of the Senate alone would have made this impossible). ~~(3) it is based on a number of~~ ^{(3) it is based on a number of} ~~principles~~ ^{principles} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~authority.~~ ^{authority.}

The second factor ^(the principles of authority.) is directly linked with the first, especially with the inclusive character of a League or UNO type of body. The strength of the USA derives from ~~her~~ ^{her} ~~three~~ ^{three} ~~geographical~~ ^{geographical} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~economic~~ ^{economic} (1) from her Continental position, (a) in respect to the North American Continent, where Canada is a vital part of her strategic system (b) in respect to Central America which is essential to the defence of the Panama Canal, and therefore to the maintenance of her Two Ocean strategy. (c) in respect to ~~the~~ South America, a large part of which is nearer to Africa and even to Europe by sea than to the USA. The Panamerican oriental of the USA amounts to almost 20 states. No policy ~~can~~ makes sense to Americans which would deprive them of this asset. The need for a universalist type of organization is apparent. (2) it derives also from the ~~non-Continental~~ ^{non-Continental} links ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~finance~~ ^{finance} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~trade~~ ^{trade} with many countries in the world. Again, ~~no~~ American will willingly consent to discuss world affairs with other Powers in an apartment too small to permit her camp followers to congregate around her.

These are the two groups of reasons why the USA, if she is to depart from isolationism must and will insist on a League or UNO type of body: ~~inclusive, based on the maintenance of unrestricted~~ ^{inclusive, based on the maintenance of unrestricted} sovereignty and absolutely safe against the very possibility of the USA being forced to do anything counter to her will, and equally ~~useful~~ ^{useful} to have the ~~law~~ ^{law} as a backing, were she to ~~use~~ ^{use} force against others.

esp C. The present ~~problems and non-participation~~ of UNO ^{arise} from the ~~situation from which UNO sprang~~ ^{participation of USA in the war.} ~~that~~ ^{with Russian participation.} That participation involved military co-operation ~~which~~ ^{with Russia} without any safeguards in regard to ~~Russian~~ ^{Russian} aims. Russia would not even discuss such safeguards with the USA as long as the USA could not offer any indication whether or not she would continue to participate in world affairs after victory was achieved.

May I dramatise the situation. Roosevelt may have said: 'What territories are you going to claim after the War? ~~The Russians~~ ^{to Berlin:} might have answered: That will depend upon our security needs. Can you do anything about them? Of course, Roosevelt had no answer, since the Senate ~~man~~ ^{man} veto made his signature worthless. On the other hand, how could Roosevelt get an informal authorisation from Congress to participate in world affairs after the war, unless-- this is the point-- he left no shadow ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ of a doubt in the mind of Congress and American opinion that he is going to keep to the great compromise-- namely, to proceed on ~~the~~ ^{the} 'universalist' lines, --on the lines of some organisation like the League --inclusive, based on ~~an~~ ^{an} absolute sovereignty, on a written charter and leaving the USA in charge of the law?

Roosevelt achieved the almost impossible: He convinced the American people that they had to give up isolationism and go in for internationalism, - always, this was understood, ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ within the framework of a universalist body, or as the Americans call it, under 'the rule of law.'

But the Russians had never agreed to this. The Russian conception was that peace could not be maintained unless the three Great Powers continued to co-operate after the War. This being the one supreme need, it should be the openly proclaimed form of the organisation of peace. ~~But~~ ^{But} obviously, Russia's lack of ~~official~~ ^{official} of numerous supporters, came in. A head-on clash with the American conception was averted by the ~~adroit~~ ^{adroit} formula of ~~Yalta~~ ^{Yalta}, which is of the greatest importance for the understanding of the ~~problem~~ ^{problem} of UNO.

96 to the letter and the water
 As long as the UNO ~~charter~~ ^{charter} was ~~interpreted~~ ^{interpreted} as embodying ~~the~~ ^{the} Three Power co-operation, Russia agreed. If it meant the supersession of Three Power co-operation by ~~the~~ ^{the} universalist type of organisation ~~which~~ ^{which} excluded the Three Power rule, it was unacceptable. ~~The~~ ^{The} Dumbarton Oaks text-- it is worth studying -- seems to me to embody the Russian proposition fairly closely. The Assembly is to have no powers at all. The Security Council is to have all the Power. The Assembly accepts the Security Council as its executive, and undertakes to carry out its decisions. On the Security Council there is the Rule of the Five Powers, which, through the 'veto' is made into a Three Power rule. We know that Russia was even safeguarded at San Francisco in respect to the numerous ambiguities of the Charter by the declaration that all ~~procedural~~ ^{procedural} decisions should be subject to veto including the decision ~~non-procedural~~ ^{non-procedural} about what is and what is not a procedural decision. True the Russians agreed that the 'veto' could not be used lightly....

How ~~much~~ ^{much} this was felt ~~to be~~ ^{to be} an uneasy compromise might be inferred from what happened at Yalta. The Russians did not relinquish their ~~right to~~ ^{right to} ~~Three Power meetings~~ ^{Three Power meetings}. It was later invoked for Potsdam. They did not accept UNO, if it should turn out to clash with the Three Power principle. They expressed this by demanding safeguards for anti-fascist policies, and definite safeguards in regard to Poland (which was a ~~vital~~ ^{vital} issue from their point of view).

Yalta
 Now ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~shunting~~ ^{shunting} took place: the term ~~democratic~~ ^{democratic} was gravely ~~weakened~~ ^{weakened}. The Russians ~~had~~ ^{had} first suggested that this should be a grouping of the 'democratic' powers. In other words, they claimed to have a form of democracy of their own. We accepted this, under the pressure of war circumstances--- to prevent Hitler from winning the war. We know now that he was ~~still~~ ^{still} very much hoping to go on.

However, The responsibility for the ambiguity ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~assumed~~ ^{assumed} by the Russians. Churchill made a speech in Italy, in which he ~~described~~ ^{described} democracy ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ with ~~a~~ ^a ~~downward~~ ^{downward} ~~elasticities~~ ^{elasticities}, and far from making its meaning more elastic, he made it clear that in the interpretation of the British gov ~~t~~ ^t ~~claimed~~ ^{claimed} to ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~refused~~ ^{refused}.

F. Now let us return ~~humbly~~ to the British position, and look at it briefly from the point of view of ~~practically~~ the American and the Russian thesis.

What the Russians call Three Power Co-operation is the same thing as what historians call balance of power. For as long as you have independent power units - more than two of them - you have the play of the balance of power ~~law~~, as surely as there are ~~any~~ laws in politics. It consists in this: if any one power tries suddenly to increase its power substantially the others will band together to try and prevent ~~and~~ this. Ever since the Treaty of Westphalia, ~~and~~, especially since the Treaty of Utrecht, in ~~1648~~ 1713, such a system (1648) was in force in Europe, and ~~mainly~~ maintained the independence of all the small states ~~and~~ Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, etc. In effect, no ~~state who was~~ signatory of the Treaties of Munster and Westphalia, in 1648, ~~was~~ disappeared from the map for another 200 years (Poland was not a ~~signatory~~).

~~This~~ This should not be confused with the balance of power policy, which is a British national institution, and was the natural policy of an island ~~dominating~~ off a continental ~~mainland~~ littoral. It goes back far beyond the 17th century, and was practiced ~~by~~ the founder of ~~the~~ Christi Church, Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, in the 1520 i.e.

Such a policy cannot be followed to day since there is no strong continental power ~~except~~ Russia. Consequently, there is no possibility of supporting some other Continental power against Russia. To bring in the USA into Europe, raises the question of world policy, which is an entirely different matter. For the USA ~~is~~ the strongest world power, and the balance of power policy would then put us on the side of Russia, against ~~the~~ net, which again would be a ~~big~~ mistake. In other words, the ~~balance of power~~ policy ~~must~~ be dropped ~~and~~ altogether. They do not apply anymore. ~~It~~ should

~~This~~ This leaves us with the question: Does the balance of power, on which the Russians rely, exclude ~~the~~ League or UNO or any other form of Universalist organization? Not at all. The balance of power continued to act inside the League ~~and~~ as well as inside UNO. It is a law of a different kind, it belongs to life itself and will cease to operate only if there are no independent sovereign powers in existence anymore. ~~In other words~~ the world state is established.

Does this exclude the rule of law? Not at all. Somebody must operate the law and if that body is going to function there must be a balance of power in it, as long as ~~the~~ body consists of independent sovereign states.

There is ~~no~~ contradiction ~~at all~~, in an independent British foreign policy which at the same time decides to put its effort behind UNO. A foreign policy which does not link its fate with either Russia or America, but reserves ~~its~~ right to independent decisions. This might be the best peace policy.

Surely, from this angle Britain should try to increase her influence on the Continent, and in the world. It is the natural leader of the new Europe and should feel free to make use of this lead, irrespective of Russian suspicions. Those ~~are~~ mainly due to the Atom bomb which Britain does not possess anyway.

The prospects of UNO depend upon the prospects of the co-operation of the Great Powers. Should ~~there~~ be a rift, UNO might have to play a role which would be indistinguishable from banding together to stop one Power. We might then call that the rule of law, but it ~~is~~ better ~~to~~ be called ~~by~~ some more familiar name, ~~like~~ War. ~~It~~ should

A ~~stronger~~ Britain might more easily make concessions to Russia where ~~her~~ vital Russian interests are involved, and not vital British ones. Also we should not overrate the strength of the Communist parties on the Continent. They are much weakened by their allegiance to Soviet Foreign policy. Britain in other words has many assets which she does not make full use of. Her influence to UNO might much depend upon ~~the~~ the right use of

G. Let us finish by saying that this country ~~can~~ gain enormously in strength by developing an enlightened public opinion on foreign affairs. ~~It~~ We are rapidly ~~moving~~ changing times, when there will be great need for such an opinion, if we are to avoid ~~an~~ atomic war, -