

Global Issues 2 – Adapting to Historical Change

Based on:

1. “The Problem of Super-State Authority” (*Le Probleme de L’Autorite Super-Etatique*). By Boris Mouravieff, published in 1950.
2. Article: Freedom, Equality, Fraternity. By Boris Mouravieff.

* The form this cultural program takes is weekly dialogues, based on the following points taken from the above.

1. Critics of the UN Charter attack a small number of ideas:

- A) Its weakness due to the dominating position of the powerful countries.
- B) The demand for “unanimity” in the heart of the Security Council; which paralyzes any constructive work agreed to by the majority. Noting that the Security Council is composed of 15 countries, of which 5 are permanent (USA, France, UK, Russia, China) and hold “veto” power. The other 10 are selected from the five continents every 15 months and each of the 15 holds the Presidency for one month.
- C) As long as the world is divided between Capitalism and Communism (the book was written in the 1950 – the division can now be West and East and Right and Left), the normal functioning of an international organism, singular in nature is impossible.

But the critics don’t offer a solution, and so leave international peace in great danger.

2. The UN Charter is technically speaking quite perfect, with only minor defects.

The problem however, from a judiciary point of view is clear: The international judicial order does not really recognize any “Super-state” authority, i.e. the authority of the United Nations, above individual states. So long as such an authority has not been established, and given adequate power, the weakness and impotence of the UN will remain incurable. This is obvious to everyone.

What is even more grave than this lack, is the general conviction of the impossibility of creating such an authority. This subconscious conviction paralyzes all energies and blocks every attempt, directed towards solving the problem.

It’s a vicious circle, where the old ways lead to the same old results. Practically speaking, this means, that even if we try to perfect the stipulations of the old charter, even up to changing and regulating the voting of the Security Council, yet still this would not lead to a notable improvement of the international situation in its ensemble. In other words, even if we manage by some modifications to break the deadlocks that result, whether by further empowering the smaller members of the Security Council, or by rethinking the unanimity/veto question somehow, leading to an easier flow in decision taking, yet still, despite all this and similar

efforts, the improvements will only reach the superficial level and not the very core of the problem, as we will see later in this discussion.

3. Accordingly, we must ask ourselves:

Does the structure of the UN really correspond with the nature of the things it deals with?

Is there perhaps, hidden behind its seemingly perfect judicial forms, some contradictions, some flagrant discord between some basic elements in the real international conjuncture (i.e. the world's various circumstances after two wars) on the one hand, and certain dispositions of the Charter on the other? For our twenty first century, the same question remains: Is the state of the world's various circumstances, from balance of power, to economic, global and humanitarian issues, etc... within the grasp of the UN or not? And if not, then it must mean that something within the Charter is amiss.

Regardless of "How it can be solved", let us admit that this IS the Question to which we are led, when we examine the ensemble of the Problem.

But at least now, once we've put the question clearly before us, we place ourselves in a new starting position, which can lead to a new search and orientation.

4. Some historical recapitulations are given here, merely to further elucidate the problems:

Soon after the establishment of the UN, "Unanimity" in the Security Council became impossible. In 1949 sessions were held to revise the "Veto". Western nations wanted to cancel it, while Russia insisted on keeping it, justly arguing that "... if the principle of unanimity were abolished or weakened, the Security Council would be transformed into a blind instrument, directed by the Anglo-American block, and all decisions dictated by the USA." M. Gromynko of Russia also rejected the blame that Russia abused its veto power, reminding that "... on all the major issues, Indonesia, Palestine, and the Anglo-Egyptian dispute, the Security Council was unable to resolve the dispute in a normal manner, despite the USSR not using its veto power." He also set forth, instead of the veto cancelling proposal, a Special Resolution project that "All member states work at reinforcing the authority of the UN organization in accordance with the Principles of the Charter." This project was rejected by the majority of western powers.

But even if the western powers were in favour of weakening the veto power, they nevertheless could not conceive of abolishing unanimity, as that would go directly against the essence of the UN and towards its destruction. Even if smaller nations argued that they can be reduced to slavery on account of the unanimity of the big five, yet on the other hand they recognized that it is this same unanimity which secures peace.

Summary of 1949 sessions: A. Despite its major imperfections, all UN members fear its dissolution. B. There are two criticisms of unanimity: 1. Rivalry between the big players, and 2. The aversion of the small players to the dictates of the big. C. Even when disagreement arises between the fifteen, this does not necessarily mean disagreement between the five. D. The

present composition of the Permanent members cannot be considered fixed forever, since it is the product of the world political conjuncture.

This historical recapitulation of a post war session is not intended to offer any solution or conclusion, but merely to state the position, power, etc., of different nations, at that time, with regard to the UN.

5. Let us now consider the heart of the problem, which imperatively demands a solution: Whereas the Charter is judicially quite perfect (i.e. It has clear and exact written laws to regulate disputes), yet this is not enough, since as is, The Five Nations Allied Can Bring the World Wherever they Please if they Agree Between Themselves. What to do!?

In any given time, the judiciary knowledge (let us even call it judiciary Science, since it functions scientifically. i.e. through observation, analysis and deduction), cannot exceed the limitations of the era or eras in which it applies. It is thus fixed statically and does its best within these fixed limitations (e.g. we can only apply roman law relating to slavery in an era where it belongs; certainly not in our modern times). The only way to help this judiciary science to function adequately in another era is through some dynamism. This is possible through a historical Science: In other words, the judicial order is based on facts and phenomena, and if it is no longer functioning properly, it is likely that the facts have changed with time, and so what is needed from it, is to adapt or even transmute accordingly. The case we are presently reviewing can be called "the evolution of international life", with which the old international judicial order no longer corresponds. Hence appears the need for a Real super-state authority, that of the UN.

Realistically speaking, the Charter was drafted in war times and in answer to the extreme forces of war. Therefore, in times of peace, it is clearly necessary to reassess the whole. Unfortunately, statesmen are usually anchored in obsolete conceptions, and find themselves suddenly called on to create new rules for the future, without having the luxury of time to assess the present let alone the future. They tend to linger on past ideas, and defend what cannot be defended due to the change of times. It is quite normal to want to go back to a state of normalcy, but the conditions of war, make post war altogether different in its conditions, and going back to the past is impossible. Moreover, besides war, history itself has a forward march, and it is impossible to force the present to adhere to bygone times.

These are very simple and obvious facts, yet unfortunately they most often pass unnoticed by statesmen, in their hunger for political dominion or swayed by public opinion.

6. With an apocalyptic outlook after two world wars, man was unable to see the positive sense in the catastrophes. This sense is greater and other than what he set out to do, simply because History demands an equilibrium that is other than man's preconceived goals and expectations. If the Historical sense of WWI was the triumph of the principle of the emancipation of European nations from other more domineering European nations, WWII's Historical sense was the emancipation of indigenous peoples from European domination.

The definitive fall of colonialism is demonstrated in the UN Charter article 73 (putting an end to colonial exploitation), which describes this in all the domains of political, economic and social life. With this, we reiterate the Historical sense, and the nonsense of trying to adapt the present to past conditions, such as post to pre emancipation from colonialism.

7. The three essential factors of the Historical change:

- A) WWI moved Europe out of its previous axis.
- B) WWII emancipated indigenous peoples from colonialism.
- C) The consequences of the blossoming of Industrialization and technological advance.

The last factor progressing at an exponential speed, while leaving moral progress to lag behind and arguably even to regress.

Before the creation of weapons of mass destruction (namely atomic weapons), the victor by beating an army was in a position to subject the vanquished and benefit politically and economically. With mass destruction, the situation is different: Vanquishing means devastating the country of the vanquished (politically and socially), exterminating its best part, namely the productive laborious one, and sowing fear in the rest – what remains is a non-profitable acquisition. Only localized warfare can keep some advantage.

Therefore, whereas the first two World Wars, made political sense, a third one would have none. And, while technology created weapons of mass destruction, yet it equally deployed efforts towards the means of conservation. Conservation that is of the planet with its environment, of organic life, and of man from poverty, disease, etc... Moreover, the epithet “war is the mother of invention” applies just as much in cold as in hot wars. Ironically, we see that while man pursues his egoistic goals, yet he creates byproducts geared towards fraternity. Such are the means of communication, transportation, recycling, but most of all, of organizations, the greatest of which being the United Nations, byproduct of WWII, as The League of Nations was the byproduct of WWI, whose only real goal is fraternity, with all its subsidiary manifestations.

8. Let us clarify what the present conjuncture is (i.e. the set of affiliated circumstances, which concern us today, rather than yesterday) in relation to how the International scene has changed over time, wars, colonialism, etc.

A. The tendency characterizing the 20th Century is of an increasing interpenetration of “intra-state” and “inter-state” affairs (unlike the times before modernization, when most matters were of an inter-state nature, even in the aftermath of an invasion and occupation).

B. This interpenetration of things between what is within and what is outside a country, is also accompanied by an increasing influence of economic and social factors, over other factors, which are strictly speaking political (By contrast with older times, whatever had to do with matters outside one’s own country was strictly speaking political).

Given these two facts, it becomes more and more difficult to deal with the political factors independently from the general mix that constitutes public life, both on the national as well as on the international level.

Two of the most obvious examples of problems, which were elevated in the post war era from the (inter) to the intra-state level are Disarmament and Work. The humanitarian aspect of the latter in post-colonial indigenous countries is of no less significance than the threat of global fear, which instigated disarmament.

On such and many other matters, statesmen drag their feet without any constructive effort towards a super-state solution, or else they adopt old obsolete means, which if not harmful are simply useless.

9. With such examples, we can see how the principles of federation of the people, and of fraternity, begin taking place despite the myopic will of nations and statesmen. They never posit such goals for civilization, as they busy themselves with all sorts of activities of constraint. Nevertheless, and despite its misdirection, humankind finds itself faced with such byproducts aimed at solidarity.

Make no mistake a New Era will arrive in all cases, but if it arrives against the grain of "humankind" as evidenced in the mentality of statesmen, it will inevitably end in catastrophe.

The UN Charter has successes as well as failures. Successes in the economic and social domains, and failure notably in the political one. This is because economic and social problems face us with immediate realities. With Politics it is another matter; we let ourselves fall victim to experiences of foregone times, or to calculations over forthcoming ones; while living in the Present, we behave in ways lacking objectivity; we leave the imagination to posit theories, ideas, combinations, etc..., ranging from purely idealistic dreams, to extreme thoughts of aggression and destruction.

10. Now, the pivotal question: Is the United Nations an Organization of Governments or of People?

This same question was asked in a note, one hundred years ago (even before the UN was created), when the Swiss representative was joining the League of Nations: "Is it a league of nations or a simple alliance of governments? The preponderant influence should pertain to parliamentary or popular delegations, and not to ministers and plenipotentiaries." He goes on to say, "We can also conceive beside the council representing governments, the existence in the League of Nations of an **assembly of parliamentary delegates.**"

This point however was never raised again, for fear of disagreement between the governmental league and the popular league. As well as, due to skepticism that the large number within the popular league, could slow decision making to a halt.

Yet, **the solution is obviously to be found there**. After all, isn't the Preamble of the UN Charter formal on this point? It is made in the name of the "Peoples" of the United Nations – not the Governments.

11. Since the 19th century, "economy" has gradually grown tremendously intra-state, but the political domain did not follow suit. Quite the contrary, it increased in nationalisms, whether sentimental, mystical, cultural, political, etc..., thus creating a force of repulsion, which led to the First World War.

Realistically though, if running towards nationalism we reach an impasse, yet on the other hand running too quickly in the other direction, we go against the grain of human nature and again find problems.

So we ask: Is there a middle ground between those two contradictory movements? Is it possible to find a stability in the movement? Can we reach an organic synthesis?

12. Since each state must direct its attention to the welfare of its own, for obvious reasons, there neither exists nor can exist any true and fundamental solidarity between States.

But does this equally apply to Peoples?

Until now nobody can answer this question, except by offering their personal opinion, since until now there exists no body, no proper organ that can express and manifest the opinion of Peoples on the international plane, similar to those which exist on the national plane.

Only once we have such a body, can we come to know if a moral solidarity exists between people over the globe, and in which particular domains as well as up to what measure.

Nevertheless, it is very clearly in the creation of such a body that we can hope to avoid a new global catastrophe.

13. The International Judiciary order v.s. Internal Law:

Whereas people are people and there exists no difference between their "rights" whether internal or otherwise, yet the two judiciary systems, internal/international, have a huge discrepancy between them. The former is precise, dense, entering into minutest details, whereas the latter is not.

So, shouldn't this similarity in human rights, accompanied by the extreme fragility of international law orient our search?

14. It is quite simply a question of the extreme weakness in the guarantees provided for securing the rights of Peoples. Of course, "Force" plays a large role in international life, but it is a disorganized role.

Lawyers will argue that law is enforced internationally by adequate measures of execution and policing – yet the problem is precisely there: In fact, it is the states alone which hold the

executive force, and therefore it is they alone who decide, in due turn, whether or not to use it, in what manner to use it, as well as to which extent.

Given that international society is dominated in its present structure by the principles of “private justice”, each party is accordingly charged with defending its own rights. With all the surging problems associated with discrepancies between governments and their justifications in the usage of their laws, resides all the injustice; the weak cannot exercise their rights against the strong, who can manoeuvre and manipulate quite freely across the international arena...

Inasmuch as international relations are not subjected to more firm and severe constraints, the matter of legal rights remains a practical fallacy. In this context, it may be asked: Since the end of colonialism, have the indigenous nations truly received right of world citizenship?

15. Theoretically, the Perfect Solution of the problem implies the creation of a Super-State Organization, armed with an irresistible force, and made competent to take sovereignly all the decisions related to the usage of this force. This would be the exact duplication on the international level of what has evolved over many years on the inter-state level.

16. A classical error, is often made however, which is to compare states in the international judicial order with individuals in the internal order. It is an error, since the two did not develop harmoniously and in parallel; as we have seen, the internal has become developed in its minutest details, while the international lags dangerously behind.

To compare and take example from History of how things could become, let us go back 300 years and prior, to medieval times, before the discrepancy took place, where private justice (analogous to state justice today) was then conducted in the Feudal regime, and answering to society’s degree of moral development. In those times, intra-state matters were regulated by the Papacy and the Empire, while inner-state matters, that is matters between the individual and the state, took place through layers of feudal powers.

From this we can see the error we commit when nowadays we try to compare individual to state; we should consider a third tier (and not just two) as evidenced from the past. Put analogically we would have the following:

20th Century

Super-state Power

State Power (on world scale)

Individual

17th Century

State Power

Feudal Power (Inside state)

Individual

17. How then we ask, did the old society liquidate the Feudal regime, and with it the vestiges of private justice?

Certainly there were civil wars, etc., but the real coup de grace did not come from the top (through any kind of policing constraint), but from the bottom, by Revolution for the democratization of Power. In other words the Moral Plane is what upturned the status quo and not any constraining measures.

18. In single nationality states, the process is straightforward, but this is not the case for multinational states, where the process is more complex (It is the latter, which interest us, since the World is multinational). All in all there are three processes with which we are familiar, of which two have failed. Namely, Imperialism as in Austria, and *Liberum Veto* as in Poland.

The third, which has succeeded in Switzerland and Russia deserves the study of the United Nations. In Switzerland, it commenced as the Confederation of Sovereign Cantons, consecrated by the primitive pact of 1291, and five centuries later, after suffering the vicissitudes of time, was transformed into a Federative State, respecting the liberty of the diverse parts in language, confession, and economic and social structure. No doubt it was a majority, conscious of the needs of the time, which in 1848, imposed this "Federative State Status" with moderation and without violent constraint, over a minority that was still attached to the past.

This is the example that needs to be followed today, but of course with modification to suit the global context. Yet modern political thought has not as yet taken inspiration from such simple historical facts.

19. Let us discard altogether from the start any ideas of a super-state police charged to keep the order. The thought is completely chimerical, for if such a UN police may manage to handle the insurgence of a small country, it would certainly be overwhelmed and defeated by a belligerent USA for example, or a combined USA and Russia which decide to coerce the world.

No, it is not from the top that an effective power can hold the world in place, but from the bottom; we must abandon the State and Intra-state plane and go to the very sources of all public power, the Popular Consultation.

20. Let us retake the Swiss analogy to envisage a functional UN scenario: The "States Council of the Helvetic Constitution" is the equivalent of the "UN's General Assembly of member nations". But, the Swiss have a second body, namely the "National Council" representing the People, which is non-existent in the UN. In Switzerland, the **Supreme Authority** is established only in the reunion of the "States Council of the Helvetic Constitution" together with the "National Council". If then, the UN General Assembly is at present the reunion of all the member Nations, expressing the principle of "Sovereign equality of member States", this represents only one half of the "Supreme Authority". We must add the other half that would represent the "UN's Peoples' Assembly". Once this second chamber is added, the one representing Universal Human Solidarity, then and only then can the idea of fraternal equality be considered realistic.

21. The two Chambers would be equal in rights, and convening at the same time, and thus forming the Supreme Assembly of the United Nations.

Needless to say, there would still be trouble, and time must take its course – but the essential would have been accomplished:

“Henceforth the International judiciary order and the structure of the UN will have been put in harmony with the new nature of political and social life, both national and international at once. On the matter of menaces against peace and international security – first preoccupation of the UN –, the Supreme Assembly will have all the means at hand to stifle on the spot even the strongest rebels. For it will act against them simultaneously on two planes: On the physical plane, by sanctions, and on the moral plane by internal action, in the very heart of the aggressor State. The latter action will have as much force as the former, if not more. In fact, faced with an inter-parliamentary solidarity, it would be difficult, even impossible, for a recalcitrant government to engage its country on the path of abuses.”

22. Conclusions:

“The practical application of the fundamental principles of the new United Nations organization, demands an adequate adaptation of the Charter. This adaptation can be made by means of the following modifications:

- A. The constitution of the *general Assembly of the Member-Nations* will remain, in its ensemble, without change (art. 9-22 of the Charter) [note: Only the number of delegates per Member-State, which at present is “five at most”; will need to be fixed in a definite manner, and the vote will no longer be by State, but by delegate.] (note: This would make the vote of member nations in line with their size and demography. At present a small island of one million inhabitants exercises one vote, equaling Russia with its seventeen million square kilometers, or China with its one and a half billion inhabitants)
- B. The *general Assembly of the Peoples of the world* may be constituted on the following bases:
 1. The global number of delegates to this Assembly must be equal to that of the general Assembly of the Member-States of the United Nations.
 2. This number must be distributed amongst all the States of the globe, whether Members or not of the United Nations, in proportion to their population.
 3. The ideal would be that this Assembly represent proportionately all the peoples of the globe, pertaining to all the races, and within each people, to all the classes of society.
The delegates to this Assembly will not be nominated by the governments, but elected by the populace. Practically, it will sensibly be , the representation of Parliaments.
 4. Whereas in the general Assembly of States will sit only the representatives of the Member-States (with the admissions and exclusions of the latter, as foreseen in the Charter), in the general Assembly of the peoples of the world, will be represented *all*

- the peoples. Their inalienable right of sending delegates derives from the fact of their existence as well as from the principle of fraternity of humans.
5. The vote in this Assembly will be individual. The delegates, in their ensemble, as bearers of the world public opinion, will be free to form groupings between themselves, such as will be deemed good by them, much as is customary in the practice of Parliaments, reflecting the national public opinion.
 - C. Each of the Chambers of the supreme Assembly, will only be allowed to make recommendations. But the positive vote of the supreme Assembly, that is to say of the two Chambers together (in conditions to be established) will take an imperative character.
 - D. The Security Council will, at least provisionally, be able to maintain its present constitution. However, its non-permanent members will be elected by the two chambers together. The electoral procedure should be inspired by that of the elections of members of the international Court of Justice.
As for modifications to the permanent members of the Council, these will take place in time, by reason of and consequent to modifications in the world's political conjuncture. However, as in the past, they will not be decided on, except by the vote of the general Conference of the United Nations.
 - E. The general Conference of the United Nations, will also have two Chambers, constituted along the same principles.

Meanwhile, the errors of conception found at the base of the present researches for a solution to the problem, consist in thinking of a super state *power*, whereas it is a question of establishing *authority*. Such, it would seem, the indication, which historical Science can offer to juridical Science. To be noted, that in so doing, it brings back the minds and the consciences to the antique formula, the origins of which got lost in the fog of time: *Vox populi, vox Dei*. Salvation therefore presents itself in a resolute and effective democratization of the supreme organ of the United Nations, which is called upon to regulate, if not manage, international relations.

*

* *

This said, we mustn't close our eyes to the fact that the proposed formula, logical as it may be, comports some drawbacks, even dangers. Which nonetheless is very normal; for, as per the well-known saying of Peter the Great, *the application of new principles is always painful*.

Thus, for example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to say in advance what would be the physiognomy of this general Assembly of peoples, in which atmosphere it will open its debates, and finally, which attitude it will take vis a vis the general Assembly of Member-States. We may even ask ourselves whether, under the circumstances, logic isn't colliding with wisdom. And we remain hesitant before this tragic dilemma: audacity or prudence?

Only one thing is certain: the general Assembly of the people will resolutely stand for peace, since, in general, peoples are not for war. And if the United Nations, as an organization of governments, proves powerless from the start, in forestalling a conflagration that could surge among the “Big ones”, the peoples’ Assembly will, by contrast, have in its grasp the necessary means to crush in the bud any attempt of a government, which abuses its executive power to launch its people into aggression. Equally, all chances of a rebirth of the Nazism, which resides in the present division of the world, will thenceforth be reduced to zero. This is evident; and even by itself, this seems sufficient reason to accept the risk of the proposed experience and bear any drawbacks it entails. For faced with the dangers of a new general conflagration that would paralyze any constructive work, the drawbacks of the proposed reform lose much of their amplitude and do not seem out of proportion with the goal sought after.

It would be vain in this brief study to want to analyze the drawbacks in detail; however, it is necessary to examine one, which appears to be the foremost. In all evidence, the creation of the general Assembly of the peoples will exceptionally complicate the already heavy task of national governments. By the force of things, each of them will, henceforth be obliged, to account, not only, for the public opinion of its own country, in conformity with the terms of its own constitution, but over and above with the world opinion, expressed by the general Assembly of the peoples. And this not only theoretically. We know that the vote of distrust of a parliament, normally entails, the government’s resignation. What consequences would the vote of distrust of the general Assembly of the peoples entail, with regard to a national government, approved by its own parliament? Logically, the dissolution of the Chamber.

This example suffices to demonstrate the extents to which the proposed reform could lead, and the profound modifications in the ways and customs it is susceptible to provoke. After all, it is the national sovereignty, being called to question here. Certainly, at present (note: this book was written in 1950 and calling for urgency, even back then) it is clearly known, that the time has come to revise this principle; we have seen that it no longer corresponds, in its primitive rigidity, to the new ambiance of international life. Yet, no one has proposed any practical formula, supple and efficacious at once, capable of putting the old principle in harmony with the exigencies of modern life. It seems that, on this point, the proposed reform also answers to the needs. There where the States Assembly, by its very nature, cannot lift all the iron curtains of the sovereignty of its members, the Peoples’ Assembly can easily do it.

Would it be a good or an evil? That would depend on the point of view at which we place ourselves. But in sequence of the historical development, characterized by the interdependence of the national and international elements, and before the phenomenon of progressive growth of the *consciousness of solidarity*, it would be a logical adaptation. And this would serve as a safety net. Though it bears an audacious appearance, yet this reform is in reality, dictated by prudence and wisdom.

* *

(A second historical perspective)

In the course of the IVth session of the general Assembly of the United Nations, some voices made themselves heard, and rising at moments above the discussion, they sounded the alarm.

“The Council divided, with the Court barely filled” said Mr. De Freitas-Valle (Brazil) “the world has good reason to bewail itself.”

An uncontrollable development of the organs and functions was resorted to, in order to try to resolve the difficulties in the system. The orator points out that practically, whenever an international problem is submitted to the Organization of the United Nations, or to one of its organs, no one takes the trouble beforehand to check whether those institutions are equipped to study and resolve it or not. There has resulted an almost automatic multiplication of institutions and commissions. The number of meetings which resulted from the creation of this new international mechanism, he said, is “quite simply incredible: 3504 in 1947, 4092 in 1948, 3683 in 1949, and 3859 so far in 1950”.

“The purpose of San Francisco and London, he went on to say, was to reunite the numerous international institutions under the aegis of the *new super-State* – it was not to diversify, but to *simplify international life*. The results however give the impression that *we work haphazardly*.

Let us have the courage to admit the existence of this situation, and seek to remedy it.”

“The major problems” declared for his part Mr. Acheson (United States) “which agitate international life, since the end of the war, have roots, in many cases, which are too deep to be surmounted through persuasion or compromises, or by isolated diplomatic actions.”

This ascertainment is very exact. But it is even more pessimistic in what concerns the Organization of the United Nations than the opinion of Mr. de Freitas-Valle. This does not mean however that Mr. Acheson does not see the means of resolving these problems through pacific proceedings. Only he advocates for this a new international order:

“With time, and on account of persisting, we will come to create a system of international relations *better and more solid than that of today*.”

Mr. Lester . Pearson (Canada), expressed himself in the same vein, saying:

“We must start by conscientiously making a new inventory *of the program, the activity and the method of work* of our international organization, and question ourselves what we may reasonably expect of the organization in the present circumstances.”

And in the name of his country, he made the following declaration:

“Canada... is ready to bear all its weight, on any measure, which it is hoped can effectively contribute to resolving a determined problem.”

These few quotes suffice to demonstrate, that the problem of *super-state authority*, without being so called, arises of itself in the conscience of delegates at the very heart of the United Nations. "We work haphazardly", "Let us have the courage to admit the existence of this situation, and seek to remedy it", "We must start by making a new inventory of the program, the activity and the method of work of our organization", finally, we think "of creating a system of international relations better and more solid than that of today". Such is, in summary, the appreciation of the situation, as given by the responsible delegates.

Summing up the work of the IVth session, Mr. Trygve Lie, the Secretary General of the United Nations, declared:

"The discussion on atomic energy, as well as on the control of armaments of the classical type, the debates over the Soviet project of a pact of the five major powers, and the counter project of the United States and the United Kingdom on the 'essential conditions of peace', have permitted, if not to regulate, at least to posit more clearly some of the major problems, which the United Nations should one day resolve."

The whole world is in agreement on this point: in fact, they (the United Nations) must one day resolve them. Remains to know how. In his previously mentioned discourse, Mr. Acheson gives a precious indication:

"For this, a commonly led action and one for the common interest is necessary. *The concept of public interest, in the field of international relations, of which we realize the importance all the more on a daily basis, is a fact about which we speak little, yet it is most significant of our epoch.*"

That is to say, it is agreed to call on the *vox populi*, eternal source of sovereign will, solely competent in leading a common action and for the general interest, the only one deemed to recognize and defend public interest on the international plane, as it does within the national domain.

Article: Freedom, Equality, Fraternity. By Boris Mouravieff

Translated by: Ashraf Shenouda

“According to the universally widespread tradition, which is being lost in the night of time, man is endowed with a possibility to overcome death. And so abnegation, reaching the ultimate sacrifice, is thus justified for the individual by the hope of finding a counterpart in the beyond. Such is not the case with Peoples (i.e. communities, nations, etc.). As Peoples live but once and their death signifies a definitive disappearance. Hell, purgatory and heavens of Peoples take place here-below. The history of international relations offers us a permanent spectacle where tribes, peoples, nations and States pursue an egoistic politics; quite justified by the above mentioned fact. The pompous proclamations of altruistic politics and the attempts at “disinterested” politics, such as for example those of Emperor Alexander 1st and his successors, were either folly, or hypocrisy. Thus, we must admit that on the international plane, the politics of States seen without embellishment has been, and will always be, guided in the first place by egoistic considerations. Also, because the self-consciousness of Peoples – as with any community – has not and cannot have goals other than the welfare of their members – in every shape, but always here-below.

Such is a fact of nature, implicitly known in the very depth of every thoughtful person. Its dissimulation is not necessary and can be dangerous: it leads sometimes directly to armed conflict.

Remains to know if it’s possible to find an organic method of creating the conditions for the coexistence of the Peoples and States of the globe in an atmosphere of veritable peace, outside hot and cold wars, outside the classical hypocrisy and chimeric constructions? – Such that everyone finds their due?

While pursuing the answer to this question, let us attempt to rapidly analyze the principles at base of the self-consciousness of those Peoples bearing the civilization whose home is Europe and birthplace France.

Freedom, Equality, Fraternity – such is the sacramental formula, engraved in occidental minds – and so strongly that with time it has been raised to the rank of taboo.

On the internal as on the international level, freedom is demanded. And it is undoubted that without a minimum of freedom we can’t even live, in the integral sense of the word, that is to say to *develop in peace and in dignity*. (...) Let’s try to find its real place on the scale of political values proclaimed by the French Revolution, as it holds the foremost position of the three (Freedom, Equality, Fraternity)...

Bizarre as it may appear at first, this formula seems to us presented inverting the natural order of things.

Let us look more closely. Generally the notion of *liberty* is conceived of as a *right*. Put in motion, it quickly takes the form of a demand, often supported by an armed hand. Whether won or granted, freedom is enjoyed within the limits imposed by the law or by treaties.

Freedom as we know it has been criticized more than once. More frequently, from the point of view of its practical application. We say, for example, that the freedom granted doesn't mean all that much if it isn't accompanied by the means of realizing it. Hence freedom for some and not for all, in other words a return to the aristocratic principle under a democratic guise. Similarly, the principle of equality is criticized. It is said to be purely imaginary since life, including humankind, is founded on inequality, a fact that is diametrically opposed; that in reality, the equality proclaimed is restricted to the judicial equality of citizens before the law – and moreover the facts don't always correspond with the theory.

Surely in the imperfect world where we live it would be absurd to expect something that is perfect. But at least our efforts should be directed towards the possible perfection of the conditions of our lives and planned in a strictly logical manner. But then, as we have just said, the formula: Freedom, Equality, Fraternity seems illogical to us. Freedom maintains its aggressive sense; Equality is in jeopardy; as to the unfortunate Fraternity, it never leaves the frame of (empty) declarations. Moreover, one cannot see how, after two centuries of experience, can we ameliorate the practical application of this famous formula of 1789.

II

The situation can be radically modified if we take the same formula, but backwards.

Fraternity, Equality, Freedom.

Let us allow that, by some marvelous means, we had established and generalized over the globe the great principle of Fraternity. What would then be the imaginable consequences?

First of all, the principle of Fraternity would relegate into immorality and flagrant illegality violence under all its forms; it would heal little by little individuals as well as Peoples suffering from either an inferiority or superiority complex. And it would condemn in a decisive and definitive manner racial prejudice – survivor of the tribal mentality.

The practical application of the principle of Fraternity would surely not change the face of the world all of a sudden. Transgressions, abuses, weaknesses and incomprehension – this curse of humankind – will still subsist for a long while; but if it doesn't modify straight away the facts, it would modify our attitude vis-à-vis the facts. Such that certain transgressions, certain abuses, certain weaknesses from which public life suffers, would no longer have the possibility of manifesting into action.

The proclamation and glorification of the principle of Fraternity would not be a chimeric act. It would be a very realistic enterprise; historical evolution, as we see, approves and demands it. Prudently applied in practice, it will prevent for example, a group of activists' interests from drawing their Peoples into a war. Also, racial prejudice, once it is stigmatized, would lower the (excessive) pride of some and raise that of others...

All this is very lovely, the realistic reader will say, but how can we introduce practically in the morals of Peoples – and with all the more reason in those of States – the principle of Fraternity, such that it becomes a driving social and international force and ceases to be dead letter?

Very legitimate question; as in general, the value of any theory consists in its practical application. But before answering, let us finish our analysis of the reversed formula of 1789.

Let us allow, as we said, that by some marvelous process the great principle of Fraternity becomes rooted in the consciousness of Peoples and of States. Wouldn't that be the best, even the unique possible guarantee for Equality, both on the social as on the international plane? And Freedom, wouldn't it then appear as the logical and organic consequence of this new state of things?

(The Author then provides the suggested solution to the question set above, by summarizing here his study concerning the United Nations, which we have presented: "The Problem of Super-State Authority" *Le Probleme de L'Autorite Super-Etatique*. It is only in the radical modification of the Charter of the United Nations and the consequent empowering of the latter through a global democratization, as elucidated by Boris Mouravieff, and some of the post Second World War delegates to the UN that there can be hope.)