International Conciliation

Published monthly, except July and August
Entered as second-class matter February 13, 1935, at the post office
at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE

SECOND REPORT—THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

AND

PAPERS PRESENTED TO THE COMMISSION

Online: www.unfor.info/transition_text.pdf

APRIL, 1942
NO. 379

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE
DIVISION OF INTERCOURSE AND EDUCATION
PUBLICATION AND EDITORIAL OFFICES:
405 WEST 117TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Subscription price 25 cents for one year, one dollar for five years
Single copies 5 cents

POLITICAL CONDITIONS OF THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION

BY QUINCY WRIGHT (pp. 264-279)

The concept of a transitional period from war to peace is not unfamiliar, but it has in the past been considered a period which should be made as short as possible. This period has usually been dominated by the concept of "back to normalcy" without delay, and normalcy has been interpreted as the conditions which prevailed before the war.

This idea has been assisted by international law which has not recognized the transitional period at all, but has held that war is separated from peace by an instant of time, usually the moment at which the treaty of peace goes into effect. International politics, however, have not been able to neglect this period. While it has lasted, the relations of belligerents have usually been regulated by the terms of an armistice and activities have centered around the proceedings of a peace conference and subsequent debates of national parliaments and governments in deciding upon ratification of the peace treaty.

A dynamic concept of international relations, by recognizing the need for continual change, tends to minimize the transition between war and peace. From this point of view, international relations is always in process of transition from the past to the future. Change may, however, be violent or peaceful. Violent change, or in a broad sense war, is characterized by the tendency of opinions to polarize into two groups, each concentrating on the single objective of destroying the other and submitting to positive and vigorous leadership in order to achieve that objective in a minimum of time.[1] The result is usually a rapid tempo of change, but seldom in precisely the direction desired by either of the opposing groups. Peaceful change on the other hand is characterized by a variety of opinions, parties, and pressure groups with less clearly defined objectives and less positive leadership proceeding by discussion, propaganda, argument, voting, and other methods of deliberation to gradual change.

Conditions of peaceful change may be suddenly succeeded by conditions of violent change, hut the reverse is seldom if ever observed in civilized societies. In such societies, conditions of violent change exist whenever institutions of adjustment cease to function, and such conditions can [p.

[1] According to the *American Rules of Land Warfare* published by the War Department (Art. 10) : “The object of war is to bring about the complete submission of the enemy as soon as possible by means of regulated violence."

265] disappear only gradually during a period in which institutions of peaceful change are gradually reestablished.

It is proposed that the transitional period from violent to peaceful change be given a more definite recognition in relation to the present hostilities. This is particularly appropriate at the present time because the distinction which international law has made in the past between legal states of war and of peace has become in a large measure obsolete. The parties to the Pact of Paris declared that resort to nonpacific means for the settlement of disputes was illegal. Such resort could not, therefore, initiate a jural status, entitling the aggressor and his victim to equal treatment.[2]

When European hostilities broke out in September, 1939, some States manifested confusion by declaring war and proclaiming neutrality but gradually many of them came to recognize that under the Pact these hostilities could not be characterized as war in the sense formally understood by international law. Rather a condition existed during which violence by certain governments in violation of international obligations was being opposed by other governments acting in defense, or acting to give assistance to those defending themselves, or acting as a police force to suppress assaults on basic principles of international order.[3] Since the attack on Russia in June, 1941, and on Pearl Harbor in December, 1941, practically all the world has become arrayed against the aggressors as a universal *posse comitatus.*

The problem after hostilities have ended will not, therefore, be one of changing from a legal situation of war, involving established rights and duties of belligerency and neutrality, to another legal situation of peace with different rights and duties.

The community of nations is faced by a revolutionary outbreak against its basic laws, an outbreak on so large a scale that it transcends ordinary breaches of law and manifests an inadequacy of those laws with respect both to their content and to their enforceability. After the fighting is over and aggression has been suppressed, a period of reconstruction will be [p. 266] necessary to establish an order more adequate than the "peace"

---

[2] Sec address by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, Habana, Cuba, March 27, 1941, *American Journal of International Law* (April, 1941) , Vol. 35 , p. 348f; Q. Wright, "The Meaning of the Pact of Paris," *Ibid*. (January, 1933), Vol. 27, p. 39.

[3] Q. Wright, "The Concept of Aggression in International Law," *Ibid.* (July, I 935), Vol. 29, p. 373ff.; "The Present Status of Neutrality," *Ibid*. (July, I 940) , Vol. 34, p. 391ff; "The Lend-Lease Bill and International Law," *Ibid.* (April, 1941), Vol. 35, p. 305ff; "Repeal of the Neutrality Act," *Ibid.* (January , 1942).

which preceded and produced the hostilities.

The problem, therefore, resembles that which faced the United States after the Civil War of 1861-65 rather than that which has faced States after international wars in the past. This is not to say that the American "reconstruction period" provides a perfect model for the transitional period after the suppression of the present world revolutionary violence, but it may provide suggestions in respect to the nature of the problems, and the difficulties and advantages of alternative courses of action. During the American "Reconstruction Period" neither President Lincoln's wish to bind up the nation's wounds nor Thaddeus Stevens's wish to treat the South as conquered soil dominated public opinion or public action, and much of the difficulty of this period arose from the lack of a consistent theory on which to act. Gradually, however, the theory became accepted, that the Union had never been dissolved, that illegal governments had been usurping the powers of the Southern States, that amendments were needed to adapt the Constitution to existing conditions, and that new governments of the Southern States should be recognized as soon as they had been established and had reaffirmed the Constitution with the new amendments.[4]

It is proposed here to develop a theory of the transitional period after the present hostilities by considering (I) the functions; (II) the duration and extent; (III) the leadership and (IV) the program of that period. The conclusions arrived at will be set forth briefly without much exposition even at the risk of an appearance of dogmatism.

I - FUNCTIONS OF THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

The activities of the transitional period should be guided by four preeminent purposes: (I) the general discrediting of aggression; (2) the demonstration of the capacity of democracy; (3) the efficient administration of emergency tasks; and (4) the establishment of the foundations of a peaceful world order.

I. Discrediting of Aggression

All sections of world opinion must be convinced that aggression has [p. 267] failed, and that it will fail in the future. The defeat of the aggressor governments must be so complete, and that completeness of failure must

[4] See W. A. Dunning, *Essay on the Civil War and Recopnstruction* (New York, 1931), p. 11ff; Chief Justice Chase, in Texas vs. White, *allace Supreme Court Reports* (1869), Vol 7, p. 700.

be so borne into the minds of the populations subject to those governments, and to the other peoples of the world, that no government can in the future develop a "stab in the back" myth. It must be made clear that those who invoked force in violation of their duties to the world order were destroyed by the inherent capacity of the world order eventually to invoke a greater force in its own defense. Aggression cannot be discredited by words but only by acts.

There will always be potential leaders ready to tell people that aggression can pay, but future world order depends upon the incapacity of such leaders to convince any larger number of people because the people themselves have had experiences to the contrary. It is not surprising that the German people have been particularly susceptible to the propaganda of such leaders because of the important role which aggression has had in building up the Prussian State and the German Empire in the last three centuries. The expansion of the Mark Brandenburg to the present Hitler Empire has proceeded on the theory that military aggression is the normal procedure of national politics. Prussian policy acting on this theory had setbacks during the Napoleonic period and the First World War. Though defeated on the latter occasion, Germans were persuaded that this was not because of an inherent weakness of the method of military aggression, but rather because of extraneous conditions of internal opinion and economy which could be remedied.[5] Though the theory which assigns major political value to military aggression has been preeminent in Germany, it is not confined to Germany. Many people in all States still harbor that theory.

It seems probable that the military occupation of portions of the territory of the aggressor governments for a considerable period would be the best means of convincing the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, and other people that military aggression does not pay.

2 . The Capacity of Democracy

Action during the transitional period must make it clear that liberal democracy has succeeded in its task and thereby create a conviction that it can succeed in the future. It will be argued by pacifists and others that [p. 268] the capacity of the democracies to occupy the territory of Germany and its allies, far from destroying the tradition that aggression can be successful, will substantiate it. Where German aggression failed, they will

[5] James T, Shotwell, *What Germany Forgot* (New York, 1940), p. 64ff; Ladislas Farago, Ed., *German Psychological Warlare* (Committee for National Morale, New York, 1941).

say, Anglo-American aggression succeeded. The only answer to this argument lies in the possibility of the democracies so acting during the transitional period that world opinion will be convinced that their forces constitute a police power acting in behalf of the world community, and not national or imperial armies acting for national or imperial interests. If the democracies do not succeed in creating this conviction, they will have failed.

Democracy does not imply that force has been eliminated in government, but that force will be used only in accord with law under authority of the community as a whole. World democracy means that force will be used only in so far as authorized or permitted by the world community and that it will be conducted within the limitations of world law.

In accordance with these principles, during the transitional period, the aims of occupying forces must, as soon as possible, be defined by declarations in the name of the world community. These forces must be utilized with strict regard for elementary rules of justice such as the protection of innocent human life, the prevention of crime, the restoration of order, the avoidance of reprisals and discriminations, even against ex-enemy populations. Military force must be used efficiently to maintain order but it must be always subject to law and must serve justice rather than any particular interest.

It must be made clear from the beginning that no nation or group of nations is to gain wealth or political advantage from the occupation. The occupation must be conducted as a responsibility both to the population of the area and to the world, not as a power which will benefit the occupants.

Upon the success of the democracies in convincing world opinion, including opinion in Germany, Italy, and Japan, that force used for aggression cannot succeed and that force used to maintain world order can, depends the possibility of organizing an enduring peace.

3. Administration of Emergency Tasks

During the transitional period certain tasks of an emergency nature must be performed. These concern the feeding of populations, the prevention of epidemics, the suppression of violence and lawlessness, the demobilization of armies, the establishment of refugees, the rebuilding of roads, railroads, telegraph lines, and factories, the setting of people to [p. 269] work, the reestablishment of money and credit, and the reeducation of peoples in the values of civilization.

The efficient accomplishment of these tasks will require a great deal of preliminary planning and a great deal of competent administration. They are tasks of major importance and should be made the subject of special study by the democratic governments.

During the transitional period these tasks will be especially pressing in the territories of the defeated aggressors. They must at first be conducted by the governments responsible for that defeat. How soon these functions can be transferred to local, national or regional authorities is a problem of major importance concerning the dynamics of the transitional period.[6]

4. The Foundation of a Peaceful World Order

The final task to be accomplished during the transitional period is the establishment of the political institutions and political conditions essential for the functioning of a democratic order in the world. This is a dynamic problem. It involves the timing of changes during the transitional period so that the régime of the occupying forces governing the territory of defeated enemies at the beginning of the period, will become a régime of national governments, regional unions, and world institutions functioning with the consent of the governed at the end of the period.

It has been suggested that the institutions and practices of collaboration developed among the democracies to win the war should be perpetuated indefinitely. The world order of the future, it is said, should gradually grow out of this collaboration. Such a process is said to be in accord with the Anglo-Saxon tradition of gradual development, preferring tried practices to logical theories.[7] From the administrative and technical stand- [p. 270] points, much is to be said for this process, but it is to be feared that institutions so developed would always be associated with defeat and humiliation by the populations of the former aggressors. They would look upon such institutions as agencies of external oppression rather than of

---

[6] Much attention has been given to postwar emergency tasks in Great Britain and the United States. See below notes 11 and 12 . The International Labor Conference at its meeting in New York in November, I 941, requested the Governing Body: "to set up from its own membership a small tripartite committee, instructed to study and prepare (I) measures of reconstruction and (II) emergency measures to deal with unemployment, which should be empowered to enlist the assistance of technically qualified experts and authorized to cooperate with governmental, intergovernmental, and private agencies engaged in similar studies and with those agencies whose present activities in the social and economic field affect the conditions under which postwar programs will be carried out."

[7] See the interesting paper by H. Duncan Hall, "The Anglo-American Nucleus of World Order," read at the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia (July, 1941).

voluntary collaboration.[8]

Those emphasizing the psychological aspects of international relations have, therefore, urged the value of new institutions which would evolve not from the practices of the winning side in the hostilities but from the consent of the peoples and nations to be subject to them. Only institutions, it is said, which can be symbolized by words which have a favorable connotation in all the populations can win the loyalty and support of all.[9]

The peace conference after the first World War sought to make this distinction by vesting certain powers of a transitional nature in the various commissions of the "Allied and Associated Powers" but gradually superseding their action by the authority of the League of Nations, designed to symbolize the world order. The latter, however, was hampered in assuming this role by the fact that its Covenant was included in the treaties of peace, that the defeated powers shared little in its making, and that they were at first barred from its membership.

It is believed that the distinction here envisaged was sound and must be carried out more adequately. The transition after World War I was affected gradually during a period of fifteen years. During that time such special régimes as that in the Saar Valley and Upper Silesia initially under the control of the Allied and Associated Powers were to be liquidated or transferred to the League. The difficulty lay in the incapacity of the League completely to meet its responsibilities especially in the fields of armament and sanctions, because of its lack of prestige in world public opinion.[10]

The *de facto* institutions of the democracies mainly responsible for the suppression of aggression should therefore function with diminishing scope as the transitional period proceeds. They should be superseded step by step by the functioning of new institutions which owe their *de jure* authority to the consent of the populations affected by them and the sup-
[p. 271] port of world public opinion. The program for instituting these changes cannot be foreseen in detail but an idea of its nature will be considered in Section IV of this study.

---

[8] James T. Shotwell, At *the Paris Peace Conference* (New York, 1937), discusses how the Paris Conference drifted into a "dictated peace" and the consequences thereof.

[9] H. D. Lasswell, *World Politics and Personal Insecurity* (New York, 1935), p. 237ff; Lewis D. Dexter, "The Politics of Prevention in War Time and After," *Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and Pathology of Interpersonal Relations* (May, 1941) , Vol. 4, p. 177ff.

[10] Q. Wright, "The End of a Period of Transition," *American Journal of International Law* (October, 1937), Vol. 131, p . 604ff.

II-DURATION AND EXTENT OF THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

Will the transitional period last for a few months or for decades? No definite answer can be given, hut it is believed a period of four or five years should be envisaged during which most of the changes should be made. This has been the normal period for an administration to last in England and in the United States. It is the period usually allowed for carrying out large-scale economic plans in Russia, Germany, and elsewhere. It has apparently been considered long enough to enable an efficient régime to carry out major political plans, but not so long that such a régime will lose its contact with public opinion and its elasticity of action.

The transitional period must be thought of as affecting the entire world. The aggressors have aimed at world revolution and have involved all important countries in their depredations. The task of the transitional period must be one of world reconstruction. The authorities conducting this task will, however, be very different in different regions. The nature of the task will also differ in different regions.

The transitional period has already begun in the United States and the British Commonwealth of nations. It is functioning under the control of various intergovernmental commissions engaged in coordinating action, and of unofficial organizations such as the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace engaged in enlightening opinion on the responsibilities for world order which must be assumed and the burdens which they will involve. Within the United States the National Resources Planning Board is engaged in planning for meeting post defense problems, especially those concerned with the demobilization of war industries and the prevention of postwar depression.[11] In England even more attention is being given to such problems by official agencies.[12] [p. 272]

In the Far Fast and Russia, it is possible that active hostilities may terminate before they do in Europe. In that case the transitional period may begin there much earlier. It cannot yet be said what authority will

---

[11] See U.S. National Resources Planning Board, *After Defense What?* (Washington, August, 1941); R. L. Buell, Ed., The Tenth Fortune Round Table, on "Demobilizing the War Economy" (September, 1941).

[12] See data papers presented to Conference on North Atlantic Relations, Prout's Neck, Maine, September, 1941, under auspices of American Committee on International Studies, Princeton: No. 3, Eugene Staley, "War-Time and Peace-Time Economic Collaboration"; No. 6, "United States Cooperation with Britain," National Planning Association, Washington, D.C.; No. 15, "Memorandum on Chatham House Committee on Reconstruction"; No. 18, "Note on Post-War Shipping Problems"; No. I9, "Note as to Some Post War Economic Problems."

have the primary responsibility in instituting changes in these areas. In Russia presumably the Soviet Government will undertake the task. In the Far East the role of the Chinese Government will certainly be important. Economic and financial assistance from the United States and the British Commonwealth will, however, be necessary.

In Europe the transitional period may begin latest and last longest and the tasks will probably prove the most difficult. In this area it is to be assumed that British and American governments will have to initiate action and will have to be ready to provide both economic resources and military forces on a considerable scale. Though the duration, problems, and controls of the transitional period will differ in different sections of the world, coordinated planning for the whole is necessary. The Inter-allied Committee in London, the International Labour Organisation in Montreal, and the Economic Section of the League of Nations in Princeton are engaged in studies of this general scope. A similar world point of view is being applied to studies of the transitional period by such unofficial bodies as the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace in New York and Political and Economic Planning in London.

III-LEADERSHIP IN THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

A period of dynamic change is a period requiring positive leadership capable of making rapid decisions. This is because timing is the outstanding problem of such a period. One task cannot be initiated until others have been achieved, but must be completed before further tasks which press for action can be undertaken. This need of effective leadership is preeminent during hostilities, and only slightly less so during the early stages of the transitional period. Peace means a condition in which deliberation and persuasion are possible to achieve necessary changes. Such an opportunity for deliberation is a desideratum of democratic government, but it does not exist when rapid adjustments are continually forced by external circumstances.

Within the democracies, which continue to control their territories, leadership will naturally remain with their governments hut as functions expand beyond national boundaries intergovernmental commissions, such as that now established between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Great Britain, will exert an increasing leader- [p. 273] ship. A council of the democracies may establish a leadership of all of them before the hostilities are over. A committee of

representatives of eleven allied governments was actually established in London on September 24, 1941.

It is to be hoped that such a body resting upon a base larger than the Anglo-American nations may acquire influence. International agencies which exist such as the International Labour Organisation and the League of Nations can contribute to planning.

Effective leadership, however, means concentrated leadership and unless Great Britain and the United States are prepared to assume major responsibility through adequate agencies, both the defeat of aggression and the program of the transitional period will be in grave danger of failing.

In the early stages of the transitional period the governments and the intergovernmental councils and commissions which assume responsibility in the areas which they occupy should recognize a central leadership. A unified directorate of the transitional period should have primary responsibility. It must have under its control adequate economic resources, military forces, and administrative agencies to maintain order and to meet emergency tasks in the occupied areas.

As the transitional period progresses, the initial authority of this directorate should be transferred; some of it to reconstituted national governments; some of it to European or other regional institutions; some of it to world institutions. Care must be taken not to restore and recognize national governments prematurely. To do so might reestablish concepts of national sovereignty which could present serious obstacles to the creation of adequate European and World institutions. National governments should only be recognized subject to the limitations of sovereignty necessary if the European and the World orders are to function successfully. Thus it seems that recognition of European governments would have to await the decision of a peace conference on the nature of the new European order, but such a conference could hardly assemble until its participating governments had been recognized.

Such an impasse has been solved after general wars of the past by calling a peace conference to deal with all problems simultaneously. Provisionally recognized governments have been permitted to present their views, but control has remained with the few great powers who won the war. The process has been one of dictation by those powers, after they have achieved agreement among themselves, only slightly modified by the participation of lesser States on subjects of special interest to them. The influence of [p. 274] public opinion, except as represented by the governments of the directing powers, the lesser powers, or the

provisionally or potentially recognized powers has been indirect.[13]

It would appear desirable, from the points of view both of democratic procedure and of future stability, to devise a different process in which all aspects of public opinion might exert an influence in proportion to their actual and potential importance within the various areas under consideration. National, European, and World Orders would have the maximum chance of stability if they rest less on the contracts of governments than on the opinions of peoples.

This may be accomplished if the directorate of the transitional period establishes provisional institutions to deal with regional and functional problems as the need arises, and provisionally recognizes reconstituted national governments as the circumstances of the areas permit. Doubtless in the Scandinavian countries, the Low Countries, and in France and Spain, new governments may be provisionally recognized earlier than in Central and Eastern Europe. Provisional recognition of governments in Germany and Italy would probably occur last of all. These provisional recognitions would not become definitive, until those affected have had an opportunity to discuss and modify the régimes and have given their consent.

The directorate would have to continue until such definitive recognition of both national and supranational governments was possible in the various regions.

While eventually sea power should be controlled by a World authority representative of all distinctive groups of opinion and while this power should be exercised during the period both of hostilities and of transition, in the name of the World Community, the British and American governments in collaboration would probably retain de *facto* control of this instrument of world policy for a considerable time after the transitional period had passed in other respects.

IV-PROGRAM OF THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

It would be premature to attempt to develop a detailed program of action for the transitional period while Hitler and his allies are undefeated, yet the outline for such a program may be envisaged. [p. 275]

The transitional period will probably progress through three stages, the

[13] See on Versailles conference above note 8; on Vienna Conference, 1815, Guglielmo Ferrero, *The Reconstruction of Europe* (New York, 1941), and C. K, Webster, *Great Britain, Foreign Office, Peace Hand books* (London, 1920), No. 153; and on Congress of Berlin, 1878, E. L. Woodward, *Ibid.,* No. 154.

first dominated by the need of meeting emergency problems, the second dominated by the problem of establishing new institutions, and the third dominated by the problem of vesting these institutions with the reality of political power.

1. Emergency Administration

During the first stage attentions will necessarily be directed primarily to those areas devastated by war. A unified directorate of the transitional period must be ready to assume primary responsibility for governing these areas and meeting immediate emergencies within them. The United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations would necessarily play a leading role in this directorate, but other governments opposed to the aggressors, notably those of China and the Soviet Union, would also have to collaborate, and the directorate .would act in the name of the world community. To meet these problems, large outlays of military and financial resources will be required. The British and American publics must be educated to the need of assuming this responsibility.[14]

2. Establishment of Institutions

After these emergency problems have been met, the reestablishing of political institutions must be undertaken. The primary problem will be that of devising the means whereby the consent of those to be governed by these institutions can be gained. While the governments of many of the occupied States now in exile in London have been provisionally recognized, it may be doubted whether the immediate reestablishment of these governments with the powers of sovereign States in the territories which formerly constituted their boundaries would be either possible or desirable. Before such a government is definitively recognized, it should be able to demonstrate, first that it enjoys the confidence and consent of its population, second that it is prepared to collaborate in whatever institutions of European and World government may be established with the general consent of the populations involved, and third that it regards its frontiers as provisional until they have been definitively recognized by the world order.

In some cases federal arrangements may have been concluded between certain of the governments in exile, as for instance that by the

[14] Above Notes 6, 11, I 2.

governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia. The recognition of such federal unions should be merely provisional, subject to similar conditions. [p. 276]

It seems probable that permanent maintenance of national security in Europe will require the establishment of a European union with powers extending at least to the maintenance of an air force to protect frontiers against aggression, to the limitation of national armaments, probably eliminating all national military air forces, and to the solution of controversies concerning frontiers. Other functions such as the control of railroads and waterways, air communication and telegraph systems, might also come under the jurisdiction of the European Union. To perform these functions such a body would clearly need a representative assembly and an executive council. Effective functioning would seem to require that the Union rest upon a broad basis of European opinion rather than upon contract among national governments. It is possible that a constitutional convention of Europe might be organized for which delegates would he elected from the various areas of Europe. The European constitution proceeding from this body should receive formal ratification from the national governments after they have been recognized but it should be conceived as prior to the national constitutions of these governments from the legal point of view. National legislation in violation of the European constitution should be null and void.[15]

World institutions should center around the reestablished World Court with competence to maintain a universal Bill of Human Rights against adverse regional or national legislation. Some sort of World Assembly, Council, and Secretariat would also be necessary, mainly to coordinate the activities of functional organizations dealing with problems of world trade, health, labor standards, backward areas, narcotics, intellectual cooperation, and other nonpolitical activities. It would seem preferable to gain general acceptance of a draft of fundamental principles of these world institutions by a brief conference of delegations from the governments of the world, leaving to later conferences the drafting of detailed constitutions. Apart from nonpolitical matters, world institutions might have regulatory powers over international commerce, radio, and intercontinental air communication and it might exercise direct control over all areas not

[15] For discussion of European Union see R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Pan-Europe* (New York, 1926) ; "European Federal Union, Report of Twenty-six Governments of Europe to M. Briand's Memorandum of May 17, I930," *International Conciliation* (December, 1936), No. 265; Arnold Raestad, "Europe and the Atlantic World," Data Paper No. 5, Conference on North Atlantic Relations.

capable of self-government and over naval armaments.[16] [S 277]

The primary consideration during this stage of the transitional period should be that of gearing national, regional, and world institutions with one another, so that powers can be properly apportioned among them and each can be accepted in principle before the fluid situation created by world war shall have become crystallized. Leadership will be rested by its skill in establishing provisional institutions to meet emergencies but with capacities for a longer future; in provisionally recognizing governments; and in utilizing existing international bodies like the International Labour Organisation and the League of Nations. Careful timing of the various conferences by which these institutions can be permanently established and careful determination of the representation in these conferences would be major factors in the success of the structure. This process will doubtless consume several years.[17]

3. Transfer of Political Power

The final stage of the transitional period will be reached when national, regional, and world institutions have been so recognized and established that the directorate of the transitional period can withdraw and yield the reality of governing power to these institutions. Political power flows mainly from two sources, public opinion and military force.

The creation of suitable symbols for these institutions and the management of public opinion to accept them will be a major task of the leadership of the transitional period.[18] While the prestige of the regional and world institutions may grow if they function adequately, their prestige at first will depend mainly upon the general conviction that they have been created by a representative system adequately expressing the will of those whose interests will be controlled by them and that their constitutions are just. These institutions should in no way discriminate between the populations of the two sides in the hostilities. The peoples should not be punished for the iniquities of their governments. This implies that power cannot be transferred to the new governments in Germany, Italy, and Japan until their former despotisms have been discredited and the spirit of aggression has been destroyed. Until that time has arrived the realities of

---

[16] Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, "Preliminary Report and Monographs," *International Conciliation* (April, 1941) , No. 369 .

[17] Q. Wright, “Dilemmas for a Post-War World,” *Free World* (October, 1941), Vol. I, p. 14.

[18] A beginning has been made in the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941.

governing authority should remain in the control of the directorate of the transitional period.[19] Primary attention should be devoted to [p. 278] reeducating these populations and gaining their consent to democratic institutions.

The problem of distributing military force among these institutions presents difficulties. A careful examination of the technical differences between land, air, and sea power might provide the basis for an adequate equilibrium. The world order as a whole will probably rest for a long time on sea power; European and other continental orders will rest on air power; and national governments will rest on land power.

General disarmament arrangements should be accepted before the national governments are definitively recognized and these arrangements should permit each government to maintain adequate land forces to police its territory and defend its frontiers, but should deny to all heavy tanks, heavy mobile artillery, and both civil and military aircraft in the continent of Europe. In other continental areas, the plan of land disarmament might be different.

The European Union might well have a monopoly of military and civil aviation. Military aviation should be controlled by the European council, solely for the purpose of preventing aggression by one State in that area against another, and for defending the union from outside aggression. It would, therefore, contribute to the equilibrium of power arising through the defensive land armaments controlled by the national governments themselves.

The European air forces should be manned through international recruiting, officered by persons owing sole allegiance to the European order, and based on neutralized or insular areas outside of the direct control of any great power.

Such a distribution of land and air power in Europe might establish an equilibrium whereby the whole would be able to prevent breaches of law by any of the parts and yet would not be able to tyrannize over them.

The transfer of sea power to a world authority would have to wait until world institutions had manifested a capacity to control backward areas, to maintain freedom of the seas, and to regulate maritime commerce. Until that time the reality of sea power will probably remain with the British Commonwealth and American government. The control of sea power

[19] See "Comment upon tile Eight-Point Declaration of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill," Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, December, 1941, p .

should, however, early be subjected to international regulations defining its functions and limiting its quantity and methods. The moderate success of naval disarmament conferences in the past suggests the possibility of agreement on these matters among the naval powers, once the present epidemic of aggression is ended. Eventually the World Council itself [p. 279] might be vested with direct control of the major instruments of sea power, and the principal naval bases from which it operates in the various parts of the world. That achievement, however, would probably not be possible until long after the transitional period in other respects had passed.