

THE YEAR BOOK OF WORLD AFFAIRS 1984

Edited by

**GEORGE W. KEETON AND
GEORG SCHWARZENBERGER**

Managing Editor

COLIN BURNHAM



THE YEAR BOOK OF WORLD AFFAIRS 1984

VOLUME 38

Editors:
GEORGE W. KEETON
AND
GEORG SCHWARZENBERGER

Managing Editor:
COLIN BURNHAM

AUSTRALIA
The Law Book Company Ltd.
Sydney : Melbourne : Brisbane

INDIA
N. M. Tripathi Private Ltd.
Bombay
and
Eastern Law House Private Ltd.
Calcutta and Delhi
M.P.P. House
Bangalore

ISRAEL
Steimatzyk's Agency Ltd.
Jerusalem : Tel Aviv : Haifa

MALAYSIA : SINGAPORE : BRUNEI
Malayan Law Journal (Pte.) Ltd.
Singapore

NEW ZEALAND
Sweet & Maxwell (N.Z.) Ltd.
Auckland

PAKISTAN
Pakistan Law House
Karachi

U.S.A. AND CANADA
Westview Press, Inc.
Colorado

THE YEAR BOOK
OF
WORLD AFFAIRS
1984

Published under the auspices of
THE LONDON INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1984 by Westview Press

Published 2019 by Routledge

52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 1984 Stevens & Sons

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Card Catalog Number 47-29156

ISBN 13: 978-0-367-27386-6 (hbk)

CONTENTS

| | <i>page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| 1984 AND BEYOND | 1 |
| LONDON INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS: <i>1934–1984</i> | 3 |
| By E. D. BROWN <i>Professor of International Law in the University of Wales; Director, London Institute of World Affairs</i> | |
| FOCUS ON WORLD AFFAIRS | 29 |
| <i>Selected L.I.W.A. Material, 1934–1984</i> By COLIN BURNHAM <i>Managing Editor, Year Book of World Affairs</i> | |
| POWER POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL ORDER | 43 |
| <i>Pre-Charter Origins and Post-Charter Views</i> By ROBERT A. FRIEDLANDER <i>Professor of Law, Ohio Northern University</i> | |
| THE FLEET, THE FALKLANDS AND THE FUTURE | 59 |
| By DAVID GREENWOOD <i>Director, Centre for Defence Studies, University of Aberdeen</i> | |
| LATIN AMERICA AND THE FALKLANDS CONFLICT | 73 |
| By GORDON CONNELL-SMITH <i>Professor of Contemporary History, University of Hull</i> | |
| THE FALKLANDS, THE LAW AND THE WAR | 89 |
| By LESLIE C. GREEN <i>University Professor, University of Alberta</i> | |
| AMERICA'S DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVE IN THE MIDDLE EAST | 121 |
| <i>Prospects and Perils</i> By ROBERT G. NEUMANN <i>Senior Adviser and Director of Middle East Studies, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University; Formerly United States Ambassador to Afghanistan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia</i> | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| PLURALISM AND FOREIGN POLICY: <i>THE STATES AND THE MANAGEMENT OF AUSTRALIA'S EXTERNAL RELATIONS</i> By BRIAN HOCKING <i>Senior Lecturer in International Relations, Department of Politics and History, Coventry (Lanchester) Polytechnic</i> | 137 |
| RUSSIA AND POLAND IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY By ROBIN KEMBALL <i>Professor of Russian Language and Literature, University of Lausanne (Switzerland)</i> | 155 |
| THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT CO-ORDINATION CONFERENCE By P. E. SLINN <i>Department of Law, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London</i> | 183 |
| EQUALITY AND DISCRIMINATION IN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LAW (XII): <i>THE PROPOSED GLOBAL SYSTEM OF TRADE PREFERENCES AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES</i> By B. G. RAMCHARAN <i>Research Associate, London Institute of World Affairs</i> | 199 |
| THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER (PART TWO) By D. H. N. JOHNSON <i>Challis Professor of International Law, University of Sydney</i> | 217 |
| LIMITED NUCLEAR WAR? By IAN CLARK <i>Senior Lecturer in Politics, University of Western Australia</i> | 243 |
| THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPER-POWER NUCLEAR RELATIONS By PAUL BUTEUX <i>Associate Professor, Department of Political Studies, University of Manitoba</i> | 259 |
| NUCLEAR WEAPON DEVELOPMENTS AND THE GENEVA TALKS By FRANK BARNABY <i>Guest Professor of Peace Studies, Free University of Amsterdam; Formerly Director, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute and STAN WINDASS</i> | 277 |

Contents

vii

BEIRUT 1982

295

An Interdisciplinary Test Case

By GEORG SCHWARZENBERGER

Vice-President, London Institute of World Affairs;

Emeritus Professor of International Law

in the University of London

Cumulative Index, Volumes 26–38 (1972–1984)

329



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1984 AND BEYOND

“Volentem dei ducunt, nolentem trahunt”

AT recent meetings, the Council of the London Institute of World Affairs has carefully reconsidered the lessons to be drawn from the Institute's record in its first half-century and reshaped its plans of activities for the 1980s. As in an earlier “cold peace” era, the Council is united in its resolve not to be taken by surprise by any of the contingencies that, on a darkening world scene, must be anticipated in medium-range planning.

It is thus only in keeping with comparable action taken in earlier phases of the Institute's existence that the Council has decided to suspend the publication of the *Year Book* after this Volume. Among the several considerations lying behind this decision is the conviction that, in the prevailing economic climate, continued publication would not be a rational use of always scarce resources by an Institute that has always placed great importance on its independence from governments, foundations and corporations.

As will become apparent from even a cursory consultation of the two cumulative indices published in Volume 25 and this Volume, the *Year Book* series provides now a library of world affairs that, in the course of nearly 40 years, has probably covered most significant facets of a world-activity area which is sadly repetitive in its actions and reactions. It is hoped that these volumes will continue to offer fresh insights to a new generation of readers. They will also be served from time to time by the publication of a series of ad hoc papers, entitled *Focus on World Affairs*.

Members of the Institute will be contacted direct by the Secretary of the Institute regarding future subscriptions.

It remains to thank the Institute publishers and our contributors for the invaluable part they have played for so long in this co-operative effort.

Council, L.I.W.A.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

THE LONDON INSTITUTE
OF WORLD AFFAIRS
1934—1984

By

E.D. BROWN

THE London Institute of World Affairs will be 50 years old in August 1984 and it is perhaps fitting to celebrate its golden anniversary by offering a brief historical review of its origins and development and of the contribution which it has made to the study of world affairs. For the older generation of our members, such a review will serve as a somewhat nostalgic reminder of the early years of struggle in the 1930s and 1940s, when the intellectual foundations of the Institute were laid, and of some of the eminent scholars and public figures who have been associated with its work. There is, however, a more serious object to be served by undertaking this review: to demonstrate that independent, “uncommitted” research is possible under even the most adverse circumstances. At a time when more and more academics seem to assume that research and publication are well nigh impossible without generous funding from foundations and research councils, there are lessons to be learned from the experience of the Institute, particularly in its early years.

The history of the Institute falls roughly into four periods. The first period, between August and December 1934, saw the emergence of the New Commonwealth Research Bureau as an organ of the New Commonwealth Society. It is this Bureau which constituted the real beginning of what was later to be the London Institute of World Affairs. At the end of this period the Research Bureau developed into the New Commonwealth Institute, a body rather more loosely associated with the New Commonwealth Society. The second period, between 1935 and the outbreak of war in 1939, covered the formative phase of the Institute, during which some of its most characteristic features were firmly established. The war years from 1940 to 1945 witnessed the formal transformation of the New Commonwealth Institute into the London Institute of World Affairs and a remarkably fruitful period of education and publishing in very difficult circumstances. Finally, there is the period since 1945—the period of post-war reconstruction and after.

I—THE NEW COMMONWEALTH RESEARCH BUREAU
AUGUST—DECEMBER 1934

The key figure during this period was Lord Davies of Llandinam, a co-founder of the New Commonwealth Society and Chairman of the Welsh League of Nations Union. Monuments to this remarkable South Wales coal baron still exist both in London and in his homeland. They include the David Davies Memorial Institute of International Studies, formerly the New Commonwealth Society, which only recently moved from the birthplace of the London Institute of World Affairs in Thorney House, Smith Square, Westminster, and the Temple of Peace and Health in Cardiff, where the Welsh Centre for International Affairs still enjoys a close relationship with the Davies family.¹

Lord Davies was a man with an international mission and firm views on the means whereby “the problem of the twentieth century” was to be solved.² His ambition, reflected in his writings and summed up in the advertised “object” of the New Commonwealth Society, was “The promotion of International Law and Order through the Creation of an Equity Tribunal and an International Police Force.”³ It was characteristic of the Society that, while associate membership did “not involve the acceptance of any particular plan,” it did imply “a willingness to investigate the problems with which the Society is concerned.”⁴ It soon became apparent to his more scientific colleagues that there existed between him and them a fundamental difference in attitudes to freedom of research. For Lord Davies it was axiomatic that the purpose of the Society’s research should be to develop persuasive arguments in favour of *a priori* conclusions which would further the pursuit of the Society’s reformist objective, reform of the League of Nations Covenant through the creation of an International Equity Tribunal and an International Police Force. For Professor Jaekch and Dr. Schwarzenberger, who joined the staff of the Society in 1933 and 1934 respectively, such “committed” research, designed to find the most efficient means of achieving *a priori* political ends, was quite inconsistent with a scientific attitude to social studies which involved the open exploration of alternative approaches to given problems.

¹ The writer is indebted to the Director of the Welsh Centre for International Affairs, Mr. W.R. Davies, for providing him with access to the Centre’s library and to Lord Davies’s works.

² See, e.g. D. Davies, *The Problems of the Twentieth Century. A Study in International Relationships* (1930), and Lord Davies, *Force* (1934).

³ *The New Commonwealth Quarterly* (hereafter “N.C.Q.”), Nr. 1(1935), back cover.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Professor Jaeckh, formerly the President of the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik* in Berlin, was invited to join Lord Davies in London in 1933 and became the co-founder and first Director of the International Section of the Society. It appears that, almost from the start, Jaeckh's ultimate intention was to establish a much less committed Research Institute. In the beginning, however, when Professor Jaeckh and Dr. Schwarzenberger met for the first time in London in 1934, it was considered desirable to start with a small Research Bureau.

The new approach to the study of world affairs which was the *raison d'être* of the Research Bureau was immediately apparent in the working methods of the new Bureau. A questionnaire was issued for the purpose of receiving constructive criticisms and suggestions relating to the Bureau's research into the problems of international justice and security and of enlisting the active co-operation of universities, institutes, organisations and individuals concerned with the study of international relations. By this and other means a comprehensive scheme for research was prepared and, as a result, it could later be reported that "some forty topics are being dealt with as subjects of scientific study."⁵

Another product of the early work of the Bureau was the issue of a document entitled *Research Material Nr. 1*, with contributions from such distinguished writers as Dr. Max Habicht, Professor Schücking, Dr. Schwarzenberger and Professor Verdross. This document elicited "interesting and stimulating replies and comments from several countries."⁶ Those which related to the proposals which had been made for the establishment of an International Equity Tribunal and an International Police Force are analysed in a subsequent Institute publication.⁷

Whether as a reaction to the tendency of the New Commonwealth Society to concentrate its research energies on policies selected by Lord Davies as its co-founder and treasurer or as a reflection of the personalities and training of its key officers, the Research Bureau which was ultimately to evolve into the London Institute of World Affairs acquired, during these first months in 1934, characteristics which have endured throughout its 50-year history. It was an unofficial body committed to no particular party and no particular ideology; it was—or at least its Director, Professor Jaeckh and its Secretary, Dr. Schwarzenberger, were—already aware of the pitfalls of accepting financial support for scientific research; and it was

⁵ I N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1935), p. 151.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 151–155.

committed to uncommitted research—the critical analysis of alternative approaches to problems of world affairs.

II—THE NEW COMMONWEALTH INSTITUTE 1935—1939

This second phase of the Institute's development was characterised by an internal struggle for greater autonomy which began—earlier than Professor Jaeckh had anticipated—with the transformation of the Research Bureau into the New Commonwealth Institute and ended with the complete reorganisation of the Institute in September 1939.

The stated "object" of the new Institute was "The study of fundamental principles of international relations and research into the particular problems of international justice and security"⁸ and, in seeking to realise this object, the Institute was served by a distinguished Advisory Research Committee which included Paul de Auer, P.J. Noel Baker, Max Habicht, Manley O. Hudson, Philip C. Jessup, Hans Kelsen, Georges Scelle and Alfred Verdross and drew its membership from several disciplines and many countries. The Director, until his resignation in 1939, was Professor Jaeckh and Dr. Schwarzenberger served as Secretary. Lord Davies's role as Treasurer reflected the continuing link between the New Commonwealth Institute and the New Commonwealth Society.

Harold Temperley, then Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, was the first President of the Institute and, in an elegant foreword to the first issue of *The New Commonwealth Quarterly*, summed up admirably the aims of the Institute and its Journal. Having noted that the world was "full of journals which contain the views of propagandists, of parties, witnesses prejudiced or perjured," but "much less full of journals which are calm, scientific and unprejudiced," he went on to state the aim of the new Journal as being "to see things as they are, in the high and dry light of reason, of science, of law and of history."⁹ The fundamentals of the creed were stated boldly and clearly in a passage later to be recalled in an obituary penned by Professor Keeton: "The application of scientific and objective methods to the problems of jurisprudence, of diplomacy and of history is one of the most urgent needs to-day. It is the aim of this Journal. We shall invite suggestions from all sides; we shall prefer criticism to indifference and questioning to acquiescence. We shall be tolerant of differences and patient of prejudices,

⁸ I N.C.Q. Nr. 1 (1935), front cover.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 3.

for it is by discussion and dispute that the truth emerges from darkness.”¹⁰

1. *Widening scope of research*

Looking back, the most remarkable feature of this pre-war period in the Institute’s development was the very considerable growth in its research and publishing activities.

The New Commonwealth Institute Monographs. Even as early as the first issue of *The New Commonwealth Quarterly*, April–June 1935, no less than six monographs had already been published and a further five were in preparation. Reflecting the “object” of the Institute, they were grouped under three headings: (a) Principles of International Relations; (b) Questions of International Justice, Law and Equity; and (c) Problems of International Security.

Some of these monographs were so closely tied to the conditions of the period in which they were published that they are now of little more than historical interest. What is more notable, as a reflection of the quality of the Institute’s work and the calibre of its associates, is the enduring significance of many of these pioneering studies. The first category included Kelsen’s *The Legal Process and International Order*. Works in the second category which are still consulted today included Max Habicht’s study of *The Power of the International Judge to Give a Decision ex aequo et bono*, Wolfgang Friedmann’s *The Contribution of English Equity to the Idea of an International Equity Tribunal* and Dr. Schwarzenberger’s *William Ladd: An Examination of an American Proposal for an International Equity Tribunal*. The Institute’s later interest in air transport was foreshadowed by one of the monograph’s in the third category, Admiral Lawson’s *A Plan for the Organisation of a European Air Service*, which ran to a second edition in 1936. The initial list was gradually expanded and by the end of this period included Professor Keeton’s *National Sovereignty and International Order*, Karl Strupp’s *Legal Machinery for Peaceful Change* and Dr. Schwarzenberger’s *The League of Nations and World Order*.

The New Commonwealth Quarterly. From the beginning, those who moulded the Institute were ever conscious of the need for it to develop as an *international* Institute and nowhere is this ideal better realised than in the principal periodical publication of the Institute during this period, *The New Commonwealth Quarterly*. Its very

¹⁰ *Ibid.* For Professor Keeton’s obituary of Harold Temperley, see V N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1939), pp. 95–96.

language was international. Thus, in the Editors' Foreword in the first issue, the policy of publishing contributions in English, French and German was launched with separate editorials in these languages by Harold Temperley, Georges Scelle and Ernst Jaekch.¹¹

The width of the *Quarterly's* coverage, both in a multidisciplinary sense and geographically, was ensured by the composition of its editorial team and the distinguished Advisory Research Committee already referred to above. As a glance at the contents of the *Quarterly* shows, the members of this Committee were more than general advisers; they were active collaborators and frequent contributors to the *Quarterly*.

The New Commonwealth Information Bulletin. Issued monthly, the Bulletin sought to provide its readers with "reliable data on questions of peaceful change and collective security." It was produced with the assistance of an Information Department, largely staffed by volunteers from the Society and by research students, particularly those encouraged in this direction by the Institute's President, Harold Temperley. The Institute also maintained a Translation Bureau.

Research Committees. A further source of stimulation and of publications was provided by the network of standing "International Research Committees" which were established in different fields. The General Research Committee included members from most European countries, as well as the United States and embraced a wide range of experience from academia, politics and the armed services. It was supplemented, in the United Kingdom, by four "Special Research Committees," dealing with legal, military, political and psychological aspects and by similar committees in other countries.

Research emphasis. The work of the Institute during this period was marked by increasing emphasis on a number of related themes.

Recognising the need to counter the propaganda campaign mounted by the Nazis and supported by those who sought to appease them, the Institute endeavoured to point out the dangers of seeking revision and peaceful change in isolation and laid stress upon the necessary interrelationship between peaceful change and security in international relations. And, as the consequences of ignoring this lesson became apparent with the growing military men-

¹¹ I N.C.Q. Nr. 1 (1935), pp. 3-7.

ace of the Triangle Powers, the editors of the *New Commonwealth Quarterly* devoted the journal to analyses of the transformation which was taking place from the inter-war period to a pre-war period.¹²

The original “object” of the New Commonwealth Society, identified by Lord Davies, continued to generate research during this early phase in the Institute’s development. The emphasis, however, was on careful, realistic analysis of the feasibility of the Society’s objectives. An attempt was made to identify possible stages of development in the movement towards these objectives and stress was laid upon the need to satisfy the requisite preconditions at each level. An important result of such inquiries was to reveal that, at a certain point, the pursuit of these aims, if it is to hold out any hope of their realisation, becomes in substance a quest for a federal as distinct from a confederate solution. Readers will find this thinking reflected in the first edition of Dr. Schwarzenberger’s *Power Politics*, published in 1941, and in the increasing amount of attention paid to federalism in *The New Commonwealth Quarterly*. The two issues of the *Quarterly* published prior to the outbreak of war in 1939 and in the first months of the war¹³ still make fascinating reading for the student of history and international relations. They also illustrate, perhaps better than any other Institute publications, the dynamic, creative, critical role which the Institute then played, a role which enabled it to attract the collaboration of some of the more original thinkers of the time.

The issue published in September 1939 is devoted exclusively to “Federalism and World Order” and reflects the considerable influence of such works as Clarence Streit’s *Union Now*, a somewhat idealistic proposal to reorganise international society on the basis of a federal constitution resembling that of the United States, and Edward Mousley’s *Man or Leviathan?*, advocating the taming of national sovereignty and the construction of a World Commonwealth around the nucleus of the British Commonwealth.¹⁴ Mr. Mousley joined the Editorial Board at this time (together with Dr. Schwarzenberger—“in view of the part he has played in the foundation and development of the *Quarterly*”¹⁵) and was one of a number of contributors to this issue of the *Quarterly*. His collaborators included Clyde Eagleton on “The League of Nations and Federal

¹² See, e.g. the issue of the *Quarterly* devoted to “The Munich Settlement and After” IV N.C.Q. Nr. 3 (1938).

¹³ V N.C.Q. Nrs. 2 and 3 (1939).

¹⁴ Mr. Mousley’s book, published in 1939, was reviewed by Professor Keeton in V N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1939), pp. 177–178.

¹⁵ V N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1939), p. 170.

Union,” F.A. von Hayek on “Economic Conditions of Inter-State Federalism” and Barbara Wooton on “Economic Problems of Federal Union.” This issue of the *Quarterly* also reports a debate on “Union Now,” chaired by Professor Keeton, held in the New Commonwealth Institute in May 1939 and attended by about 80 members of the London Schools and Colleges Dining Club.¹⁶

2. *Educational activity*

By the end of this pre-war period a link had been forged between the Institute and the University of London which was later to develop into a two-year, full-time Diploma course organised by the Institute in association with the Department of Extra-Mural Studies of the University. In 1939 the link took the form of two series of University Extension Lectures given by Professor Keeton and Dr. Schwarzenberger. Each series consisted of 10 weekly lectures given in the Institute, recognised as an Extension Centre of the University. The first series on “Making International Law Work” led to the book of that title¹⁷ and the second, on “Federalism and World Order” was yet another aspect of the Institute’s concentration on federalism. All this was in addition to the now well-established season of evening lectures arranged for members of the Institute.

3. *Growth, change and search for autonomy*

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, the second phase of the Institute’s development, between 1935 and 1939, was marked by an internal struggle for greater autonomy. As has been seen, there were within the New Commonwealth Society, practically from the beginning, two incompatible attitudes towards research which made it necessary to establish first a small Research Bureau and shortly afterwards the New Commonwealth Institute. In retrospect, it is apparent that the uneasy co-existence reflected in this development was destined to lead to rupture and, as will be seen, the breach was formally finalised when the Institute decided to change its name to the London Institute of World Affairs in 1943.¹⁸ The essential reshaping and reorganisation of the Institute had, however, taken place much earlier in 1939.

In March 1939, Professor Jaechk resigned as Director of the Institute and was succeeded by Professor Keeton. In the same year the Institute lost its first President, Harold Temperley, who died in July.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* at pp. 157–169.

¹⁷ 1st ed. 1939, 2nd ed. 1946.

¹⁸ Minutes of Council Meeting held on June 12, 1943.

These changes in the senior officers of the Institute took place at a time when it was becoming clear that the Institute might well be faced with the need to prepare both for the outbreak of war and possible separation from the New Commonwealth Society. It was, then, a time of transition in many senses and, not unnaturally, change brought with it a degree of stress, human and financial, for those who had to manage the Institute's affairs. The difficulties are hinted at in Professor Keeton's obituary of Harold Temperley when he recalled how, from his sick-bed, Temperley had "steered the Institute through that crisis of growth which is rarely spared to any vital and expanding body and which led, in this instance, to a complete reorganisation of the Institute in the course of this year."¹⁹

The principal changes are recorded in "The Institute's Diary," a regular feature in the *Quarterly*, and in the minutes of the Council of the Institute. The most important item was the formation of a governing council, independent of any external controlling organisation. Apart from the *ex officio* membership of the various officers of the Institute, the members of the Council were to be elected from the general body of members of the Institute, who could thus in future direct its policy. The composition of the new Council, which held its first meeting in June 1939, is worth recording. It consisted of the following members: Captain Edgar Abraham, Sir Montague Burton, Lord Davies, Dr. F.R. Demuth, Dr. T.R. Derry, Mr. N.B. Foot, Miss E. Gedge, Captain Liddell Hart, Mr. R.H.C. Holland, Dr. Pryn's Hopkins, Professor G.W. Keeton, Señor Don Salvador de Madariaga, Mr. Harold Macmillan, M.P., Mr. Edward Mousley, Professor Denis Saurat, Dr. G. Schwarzenberger, Major-General A. C. Temperley, Sir Arthur Willets and Dr. Temple, Archbishop of York.

Another major concern during this period of growth and reorganisation was that of providing the Institute with the minimum degree of financial security without which many of its ambitious plans could not be realised or its independence guaranteed. How extensive these ambitions were is clear from the records of the time.²⁰ Five national research committees dealing with the political, legal, military, psychological and economic aspects of federalism were "being established in those countries in which freedom of thought is still permitted" and there were plans to establish corresponding international committees to be co-ordinated by a general international committee. In addition, four special research com-

¹⁹ V N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1939), p. 95.

²⁰ See, e.g. "A Call to Action" published in V N.C.Q. Nr. 1 (1939), pp. 3–5 and "The Institute Diary" V N.C.Q. Nr. (1939), pp. 170–176.

mittees were established in Great Britain, dealing with Central Europe, the refugee problem, public relations (propaganda in the international sphere) and far eastern questions. The ambition of the Council to extend the library, to make it gradually available for members and eventually to place at their disposal accommodation within the institute for study was of course a more substantial undertaking which would probably require new premises and therefore substantial funding.

The problem of funding an independent research institute is always a difficult one, with the ideal of complete freedom and generous funding seldom attainable. For most institutes it is a case of securing the best possible compromise which circumstances permit. The way in which this question was tackled at this point in the Institute's fortunes is still of interest and relevance today.

At the first meeting of the new governing Council in June 1939, it was resolved to establish an Endowment Fund "in order to put the Institute on a firm and permanent financial basis." At the same time, the Institute launched a membership campaign with the distribution of 3,000 reprints of a stirring "Call to Action," published in the June 1939 issue of the *Quarterly*. Clearly, the proceeds of such appeals, augmented by the publishing and lecturing activities of the Institute, would leave the Institute free of extraneous influences on its activities and some elements in the Council felt that funds so raised should be made to suffice. Others, aware of the limitations which such minimal funding was likely to imply, were in favour of seeking more generous support from the major research foundations. Thus, it was reported to the Council in June 1939 that negotiations with the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations had been initiated and were to be continued during a planned visit by Professor Keeton to the United States. The Nobel Institute was also approached at this time to obtain a special grant for research work which the Institute proposed to undertake for the various peace organisations.²¹

Even by September 1939, the campaign for an Endowment Fund and for members had borne encouraging fruit, the outstanding contribution being an anonymous donation of £200 in memory of the work of the distinguished psychologist, Dr. William McDougall, F.R.S. Bearing in mind that the annual membership subscription was then 25 shillings, this was a much appreciated contribution and became even more significant when it became known during September 1939 that Lord Davies intended to discontinue his donation

²¹ Minutes of Council Meeting held on June 15, 1939.

to the New Commonwealth Society upon which the Institute had until then been dependent for a large part of its funding.

III—THE WAR YEARS 1940—1945

1. *Continuing reorganisation*

In common with other learned institutes and societies—but to a lesser extent than in the case of those with less flexible and more top-heavy administrations—the Institute was obliged to tighten its belt and curtail its activities as a result of war-time conditions. These difficulties would have existed in any event but they were considerably aggravated by the fact that they had to be endured at a time when the Institute was still in the course of completing the fundamental changes in structure and funding referred to above.

On the outbreak of war, the Director and Secretary of the Institute moved to Aberystwyth, both being members of the teaching staff of University College London which was to be evacuated to the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth. Lord Davies preferred to move the New Commonwealth Society, on the other hand, to Sarn, in Montgomeryshire.

Having established themselves in Wales, the Institute officers initiated fresh discussions with the Society on the financial position. Prior to 1939 the whole of the resources of the Institute (other than what was earned by its activities) had been derived from money which had been given to the New Commonwealth movement as a whole, and which had remained under the control of the Society. As has been seen, one of the objects of the changes introduced in 1939 was to establish an Endowment Fund, to be supplemented by membership revenue. It was assumed, nonetheless, that the bulk of the Institute's income would continue to be provided out of the resources of the New Commonwealth movement. Unfortunately, with the withdrawal of Lord Davies's donation, these resources were now seriously diminished. Already in 1938-39 the reduction of the Institute's income from £3,750 to £1,750 had created serious difficulties for the Institute in maintaining the standard of its work. This was now reduced by more than half to £800 for the budget year October 1939—October 1940. Nor was any support forthcoming from the Rockefeller and Carnegie Trusts despite, in the case of Carnegie, a further appeal after the outbreak of war when the financial situation had become acute.

In retrospect, this development can be recognised as a fundamental watershed in the Institute's history. Services formerly performed by paid employees were henceforth to be discharged on a voluntary basis. One result was that the Information Department had to be

closed altogether and it became impossible to continue publication of the *Information Bulletin*, recently renamed the *New Commonwealth Digest*. There is perhaps a note of bitterness detectable in the Director's Report on the work of the Institute (July 1939–June 1940) where he wrote that, "It is a matter for the very greatest regret that none of the public trusts which we approached at this time saw fit to assist us even to the very limited extent which would have been necessary to preserve these obviously valuable services."²² Nonetheless, the Institute's response was a positive one; it was to produce a new Monthly Forum entitled *Union*, which first appeared in January 1940, with a substantial part of its cost guaranteed for its first year by the generosity of two Institute members, Dr. Pryn's Hopkins and Dr. Ernst Cohn. In the circumstances this was a brave venture and, as it turned out, a very fortunate one, since the Government was to issue an order prohibiting the publication of any new journal.²³

Not unnaturally, the outbreak of war also adversely affected the recently launched membership campaign. When separate membership of the Institute was initiated in June 1939, the subscription was set at 25 shillings but it was reduced to 15 shillings on the outbreak of war, it being then calculated that the essential activities of the Institute could be maintained on this basis with 1,000 members. The campaign was moreover on target and indeed, "We were always slightly in advance of schedule until the Germans invaded Holland and Belgium."²⁴ By June 1940 membership stood at 250 and it was then calculated that, provided the officers of the Institute were prepared to continue to work in an honorary capacity, the Institute could carry on free of financial worries if 500–650 members could be secured.²⁵

The stay in Wales was short-lived. The Institute returned to the South-East in August 1940. If finances were low, spirits were remarkably high. Professor Keeton generously solved the accommodation problem by offering the Institute a wing of his house near London and "Barrows," Roydon, near Ware in Hertfordshire was to be the Institute's home for the remainder of the war. As was noted at the time, "so long as London remains the unimpaired centre of the country which it is, to be close to the metropolis confers benefits with which even the Welsh hills and the sea do not compare."²⁶

²² VI N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1940), p. 145.

²³ *Ibid.* at pp. 146–147.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.* at p. 147.

²⁶ 1 *Union*, Nr. 9 (1940), p. 287.

That all was not bliss, however, is made clear in the contemporary description of the Institute's new abode, "where, despite the local bombs, work can be carried on in as peaceful surroundings as any to be found in England."²⁷

As the subsequent history of the Institute amply demonstrates, a very tight budget and the lack of both full-time salaried staff and permanent accommodation do not necessarily prejudice unduly a dynamic policy of research and education. Some would argue indeed that they positively encourage it. Nonetheless, towards the end of this period, the Institute had certainly not abandoned its earlier wish to purchase "adequate headquarters in London" and sought to raise a building fund of £15,000.²⁸

2. Personnel

The changes in personnel among the institute's officers which occurred during this period were partly a result of the war and partly of the ordinary course of events in the life of the Institute. In June 1939, it was announced that Dr. Temple, Archbishop of York as he then was, had consented to become Vice-President of the Institute²⁹ and he was joined by Mr. Harold MacMillan in September.³⁰ Following the death of Harold Temperley, Dr. Temple succeeded him as the Institute's second President in the early months of the war.³¹ He in turn was succeeded in 1940 by Dr. A.D. (later Lord) Lindsay of Balliol College, Oxford who served until 1951. Another notable personality who became a Vice-President during this period was H.G. Wells. As was noted in the Institute Diary in April 1940,³² Mr. Wells initiated his active collaboration with the Institute by publishing his "Declaration of the Rights of Man" in the January 1940 issue of *Union*. He appeared again in the May issue with a "Memorandum on the Federal Idea."

Less happy was Dr. Schwarzenberger's fate at this time, "swept away," as he was in June 1940, "to some unknown internment camp beyond any immediate hope of recall."³³ Quite apart from the personal trauma, this was a serious blow for the Institute at perhaps the most difficult time in its history. Since its inception, Dr. Schwarzenberger had played a key role in the development of the Institute and its publications and even his temporary loss could be ill afforded.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ XI *London Quarterly of World Affairs*, Nr. 1 (1945), inside back cover.

²⁹ V N.C.Q. Nr. 1 (1939), p. 59.

³⁰ V N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1939), p. 171.

³¹ V N.C.Q. Nr. 3 (1939), p. 249.

³² V N.C.Q. Nr. 4 (1940), p. 322.

³³ I *Union*, Nr. 9 (1940), p. 286.

The spirit of the times, as well as the recognition of Dr. Schwarzenberger's contribution to the Institute's early years, is very well reflected in this passage from the Director's Report, published in October 1940: "At the beginning of June, the Institute's Secretary, Dr. Schwarzenberger, was interned. Although under the conditions which now exist, one may understand the necessity for internment of persons who left Germany when the present regime came into power, we can nevertheless regret a situation in which this has become a necessity. Dr. Schwarzenberger has been, throughout his six years' service as Secretary, an indefatigable and loyal worker, whose one object was to see this Institute, in which he sincerely believed, established upon a broad and firm foundation. Unfortunately, we lost him at the moment when his labours were beginning to be crowned with success, and when the status of the Institute had received very widespread recognition."³⁴

Dr. Schwarzenberger was succeeded as Secretary by Charles Verker, one of the founders of *The Federal News-Letter*, which, as from August 1940, was incorporated in *Union*. Fortunately, Dr. Schwarzenberger's internment was of relatively short duration and he was released in October 1940. By July 1941 he was editing *The New Commonwealth Quarterly* and in 1943 he became Director of Studies.

3. Publications

Mention has already been made of the series of monographs published by the Institute. In September 1940 members had their attention drawn to "A Programme of Winter Reading," the bulk of which consisted of these works, recommended as being "of the very first importance for the work of study groups."³⁵ If this diet needed to be supplemented, a wealth of material continued to be made available in the pages of the *New Commonwealth Quarterly* and *Union*. While it is impossible to do justice to the range and quality of this periodical literature in a brief survey, the contribution which the Institute was able to make even in war-time may be illustrated by reference to some of the more memorable themes and authors.

An account has already been given of the Institute's interest in federalism and work continued on the question of regional federalism in the early years of the war. The December 1939 issue of the *Quarterly* was given over to the question *Union Now?* and included Professor Keeton's article on "Anglo-French Union—a Sugges-

³⁴ VI N.C.Q. Nr. 2 (1940), p. 148.

³⁵ 1 *Union* Nr. 9 (1940), p. 282.

tion.”³⁶ This suggestion was explored further in the collection of essays published in the issue of April 1940 devoted to *Anglo-French Union*?³⁷ It must have been very gratifying for the Institute to report a few months later that, “Late on the night of June 17 [1940] it became known that the communication made by Mr. Churchill to M. Reynaud on the previous day contained a proposal for Anglo-French Union.”³⁸ The proposed permanent union would have covered foreign policy, defence, finance and economics and a common citizenship. Despite the collapse of France, the Institute advocated that the offer should be left open and, having justly claimed for itself “the almost unique distinction of having concentrated its efforts during the past twelve months upon a study of the question of Anglo-French Union,” felt “doubly encouraged to continue the task” of exploring the fundamental problems of “union.”³⁹ Mention should also be made here of the symposium of essays on *Federal Union* edited by M. Channing-Pearce, a member of *Union’s* Editorial Board, to which both Professor Keeton and Dr. Schwarzenberger contributed.⁴⁰

Although large themes of this nature demanded and received a major collaborative effort by the Institute, they did not of course exclude full coverage of other aspects of world affairs. Many of these contributions illustrate another of the Institute’s valuable assets during this period of austerity: its capacity to attract major public figures to contribute articles without there being any question of paying honoraria. Thomas Mann’s piece on “Germany’s Guilt and Mission,” published in April 1942, and an article on “The USSR and US” by Sir Stafford Cripps, which appeared in July 1944, both fall into this category.

When, in 1943, the Institute was renamed the London Institute of World Affairs, it was decided that the title of the *Quarterly* should also be changed to *The London Quarterly of World Affairs*.

4. *Research methods and techniques*

Another interesting development, both as a reflection of the Institute’s service to its members and as a precursor of an educational tool to be further developed later, was the publication in *Union* of a series of “Study Outlines” on post-war reconstruction. Their purpose was explained as being “to provide our members, individually and in study groups, with handy material for their own research on

³⁶ V N.C.Q. Nr. 3 (1939), pp. 230–236.

³⁷ V N.C.Q. Nr. 4 (1940).

³⁸ VI N.C.Q. Nr. 1 (1940), p. 68.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Cape, 1940.

the urgent problems within the purview of the Institute.” The intention was to “try to avoid equally the Scylla of an over-technical approach and the Charybdis of over-simplification.”⁴¹ Over four issues of *Union*, Dr. Schwarzenberger provided such guidance on “The International Society: Forces and Structure”; “The Failure of the League Experiment”; and “The Issues at Stake.”⁴² Members were encouraged to proceed further to the first edition of Dr. Schwarzenberger’s *Power Politics*, published in 1941. The same technique of “Study Outlines” was greatly developed later in successive editions of Dr. Schwarzenberger’s *Manual of International Law*.⁴³

It was in relation to this same problem of post-war planning and reconstruction that Dr. Schwarzenberger first developed the relativist approach to the problem of international planning and the technique of transcendental and immanent criticism. Proceeding from the premise that there is always more than one solution for a social dilemma, the first task of the relativist method is to survey the available patterns and analyse the conditions on which their realisation depends. Transcendental and immanent criticism fulfils an additional function—the provision of tools for the critical analysis of proposed plans. Transcendental criticism serves to identify, elaborate and clarify the often inarticulate or half-hidden assumptions on which plans are based and to examine the prospects of realising such projects in the light of social forces likely to oppose or to support them. Such transcendental criticism has to be complemented by immanent criticism, which is concerned not with the major assumptions on which plans are based but with the identification of shortcomings of plans from all possible points of view.⁴⁴

IV—POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION AND AFTER 1945—1984

By the beginning of the post-war period the Institute’s characteristic features had been clearly formed and the history of this final period is one of the further development of the Institute’s activities in research, publication and education.

1. *Research and publication*

The fruits of the Institute’s labours in promoting research and writing on world affairs during this period appeared in the Institute’s

⁴¹ “Preface to Study Outlines” II *Union*, Nr. 3 (1941), pp. 94–95.

⁴² II *Union*, Nrs. 4, 6, 7 and 8 (1941).

⁴³ See latest edition: G. Schwarzenberger and E.D. Brown, *A Manual of International Law* (6th ed., Revised Second Impression, 1978), at pp. 326–533.

⁴⁴ See further G. Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics* (1st ed. 1941), Chap. 1.

Quarterly periodical (down to October 1951), in the 38 volumes of *The Year Book of World Affairs* and in 69 volumes published in *The Library of World Affairs*.

It was announced in October 1946 that, since the title *The London Quarterly of World Affairs* implied “a certain restriction of the field covered by the *Quarterly*,” the “Old Series” would terminate with Volume 12 and a “New Series” would come out under the title *World Affairs*, thus indicating that it was “intended to cater for those interested in World Affairs in the widest sense.”⁴⁵ Lest it be thought that this reflected a mere whim, it should be added that the first issue of *World Affairs* carried Dr. Schwarzenberger’s editorial “Defining World Affairs,” in which it was explained why “world” was preferred to “foreign” or “international,” and “affairs” was favoured rather than “politics.”⁴⁶

In 1950 the purpose of the *Quarterly* was reconsidered in an Editorial Note which also reflects the gratifying reception accorded to the *Quarterly* by its readers.⁴⁷ The *Quarterly* had been conceived as a means of popularising for the benefit of a wider public the research published in more extended forms in the *Year Book* and the *Library of World Affairs*. Recognising, however, that its readers tended to belong to a rather uniform group of serious students of world affairs, it was decided to abandon this distinction and to bring *World Affairs* into line with the other Institute publications. Acknowledging the support received from teachers who had found the *Quarterly* useful in their university and adult educational work, the editors pledged themselves to fulfilling even more effectively in the future the functions of providing for readers material of a factual character, as well as interpretations of long-term trends on a more technical level. Alas, it was not to be; in October 1951, ever-mounting increases in printing costs and the price of paper forced the Institute to suspend—in fact, as it turned out, terminate—publication of *World Affairs*.⁴⁸ Thus ended the Institute’s *Quarterly* which, under various names and in varying sizes, had appeared for 16 years and had even managed to come out on its appointed dates during the War. As the last issue sorrowfully recorded, “. . . the fate which has overtaken *World Affairs* is symptomatic of the growing difficulties which are experienced by voluntary associations bent on their independence from governmental quarters, sectional private interests, and groups with any particular axe to grind.”⁴⁹ However, the

⁴⁵ 12 *London Quarterly of World Affairs*, Nr. 3 (1946), p. 193.

⁴⁶ 1 *World Affairs*, New Series, Nr. 1 (1947), pp. 1–3.

⁴⁷ 4 *World Affairs* Nr. 1 (1950), pp. 1–2.

⁴⁸ 5 *World Affairs* Nr. 4 (1951), p. 385.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 386.

Council philosophically took the view that what might be lost in topicality would be gained by concentrating still more on what was of permanent significance. The role of the *Year Book* was thereby enhanced for the future.

Volume 1 of the *Year Book of World Affairs* was published in 1947. The intention was to enable the Institute to deal adequately with topics which required a fuller and more thorough treatment than it was possible to give in the *Quarterly* but which did not require the space of a book.⁵⁰ The format adopted for the first volume set the pattern which was followed for the first 25 volumes down to 1971. Volume 1 contained 12 substantial articles and a series of "Reports on World Affairs," the title given to extensive surveys of current literature on the various aspects of world affairs—economic, geographical, institutional, legal, psychological, educational and sociological. Only those involved in the organisation or writing of these invaluable surveys could appreciate the work involved in supplying them over a quarter of a century and it was with great regret they were abandoned after 1972.

Two new features appeared in volume 26 (1972): "Research Programs" and "Trends and Events." Under the heading of Research Programs, the Institute announced its intention of sponsoring the following research programs in the fields of international law and organisation: (1) comparative study of the history of international law; (2) functional sovereignty; and (3) the use of blueprints of international organisation for purposes of international legislation.⁵¹

The introduction of the annual survey of "Trends and Events" was prompted by the realisation that, "with every additional volume of this *Year Book* . . . , it becomes more difficult for new readers to derive the fullest benefit from the material available in the previous volumes."⁵² Noting the "stereotyped and, largely, repetitive character of international affairs," it was hoped that these surveys would demonstrate to readers, that, "frequently, a 'new' happening or 'modern' development [had] been dealt with and largely anticipated in one or more earlier volumes of the *Year Book*."⁵³ Five issues were selected for such treatment in 1972 and this had grown to 10 in the 1983 volume. While it would be invidious to try to identify the more memorable or seminal *Year Book* contributions which have appeared over the 38 years of publication, the reader will find a use-

⁵⁰ 1 *Year Book of World Affairs* (hereafter "Y.B.W.A.") (1947), p.v.

⁵¹ 26 Y.B.W.A. (1972), pp. 1-2.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

ful analytical guide in these annual reviews, as well as in Mr. Burnham's survey of the first 29 volumes of the *Year Book* as "A Living and Expanding Library of World Affairs," published in the 1979 volume.⁵⁴ A more comprehensive guide to the *Year Book's* coverage will be found in the cumulative indices published in the 1971 volume (covering volumes 1-25)⁵⁵ and in the present volume

Little need be added about the third tier of the Institute's publishing activities. It was natural that an Institute endeavouring to offer an independent centre for the constructive study and teaching of world affairs should include among its functions the establishment of a *Library of World Affairs*. The best measure of the success of this enterprise is provided by the list of 69 books in the *Library* list of publications which will be found at the end of this volume.

No account of the Institute's publishing record would be complete without reference to the many individuals who have contributed to its success. The roles played by Professors Keeton and Schwarzenberger pre-war and during the war have been referred to above. This fruitful partnership has continued down to the present time and, as a token of the Institute's affection and gratitude, Volume 36 of the *Year Book* was dedicated to Professor Keeton on his eightieth birthday in 1982. During the post-war period, Professor Schwarzenberger in particular provided the dynamic, creative leadership needed to ensure the publication of a continuous flow of high quality research work both in the Institute's periodicals and in the monographs which appeared in the *Library of World Affairs*. He was aided by a series of able Assistant and Managing Editors, Dr. Suse Schwarzenberger, Professor L.C. Green, Dr. F. Parkinson and the present Managing Editor, Colin Burnham. No less important was the support, especially in the early years, of Stevens & Sons Ltd. Taking over from Hammond, Hammond & Co. Ltd. as the Institute's publishers in 1946, Stevens helped to launch the *Year Book of World Affairs* in 1947 and undertook publication of the *Library of World Affairs*. Particularly valuable was the encouragement offered by Hilary Stevens, a director of Stevens who became a member of the Institute's Council in 1946. Writing in the *Year Book* in 1962, following his death, the Editors recalled that, "it was one of the remarkable features of this relationship that it was hardly ever necessary for the officers of the Institute to persuade him of the value of any of the projects put before him by the Institute. If anything it was he who continuously prodded us to be more forthcom-

⁵⁴ 33 Y.B.W.A. (1979), pp. 9-14. See also C.G. Burnham, "Focus on World Affairs: Selected L.I.W.A. Material, 1934-1984" in the present volume.

⁵⁵ 25 Y.B.W.A. (1971), pp. 303-343.

ing with new and challenging ideas.”⁵⁶ His associates and successors have continued in the same tradition.

2. *Education*

The Institute has been concerned with education in world affairs since its inception in 1934 and, as has been seen, promoted discussion groups among its members and organised series of lectures and short conferences before the war and, to the limited extent possible, during the war years. In particular, the Institute had played its part in satisfying the increased demand for education in international relations shortly before the outbreak of war. As was noted earlier, the Institute’s close collaboration with the Extra-Mural Department of the University of London resulted in the first University Extension course in international relations, given in 1938–39 by Professor Keeton and Dr. Schwarzenberger. Continuity was preserved during the war when the Institute’s officers found themselves evacuated to Aberystwyth in 1939 and Cambridge in 1940, evening lectures on international relations being delivered in both places.

The Diploma in International Affairs. Towards the end of the War, at one of several Council meetings arranged in London “enemy action permitting,” it was agreed that one of the post-war activities of the Institute should be “The promotion of University Extension courses in international affairs, colonial problems and allied political and economic subjects in co-operation with the Extension Department of the University of London.”⁵⁷ Already, discussions had taken place with the University and proposals made for additional University Extension Diplomas. The result of this initiative was the inclusion among the University’s diplomas in the Humanities of a Diploma in International Affairs in November 1945.

In the beginning, candidates for the Diploma were drawn from a wide cross-section of the community and were not required to possess formal education qualifications such as matriculation. They earned their Diplomas by attending part-time courses over a period of four years and passing examinations in one area of international relations at the end of each year. Before long, however, a new demand for more intensive, full-time study was recognised. As the first Organising Tutor of the Institute has put it, “With the progress

⁵⁶ 16 Y.B.W.A. (1962), pp. 1–2.

⁵⁷ Minutes of Meeting of Council held on July 1, 1944.

of constitutional development in the Asiatic portions of the British Commonwealth and the growing awakening of national consciousness in the Middle East, it was found that many students from India, Pakistan, Burma, Siam, Israel and the Arab countries were anxious, while studying in this country for the Bar or similar professions, to acquire a wide knowledge of international affairs."⁵⁸ The Council and Board of Studies of the Institute realised the difficulty of organising any such course within the established format for the Extra-Mural Department's diplomas in the humanities. Nonetheless, aided by the goodwill of the Department's Director, Dr. McPhee, the Institute was able to persuade the University to accept, as an alternative to the four-year scheme, a new two-year, day-time scheme covering a slightly wider range of subjects. The new scheme started in October 1948, initially on an experimental basis. Perhaps recognising the valuable purpose which this experiment served by providing crash courses for potential leaders of emerging Third World countries, the Extension Council, of which Professor Keeton was a distinguished member, soon agreed to the continuation of the new scheme on a permanent footing.

In re-designing the scheme of studies for the new Diploma courses, the Board of Studies was able to draw upon the experience gained in conducting the part-time courses. During their first year, students were required to study International Relations since 1870; International Law, and International Economics. Successful candidates then proceeded to the study in the second year of International Institutions and International Economic Law. When, in 1975, it was decided to terminate the Diploma courses, the scheme of study had, by and large, stood the test of time and was little altered. International Relations since 1870 had been replaced by International History since 1914 as a first-year subject and English Language had been added to assist the large proportion of overseas students attending courses. The second-year subjects had been expanded to include International Relations and candidates were also required to take the final essay paper, designed to test their capacity for the more extended treatment of one of a number of topics.

As the numbers attending the Diploma courses swelled, the duties of the Organising Tutor correspondingly became more onerous, as did the problem of securing adequate teaching accommodation and library facilities. Throughout the 30-year period during which Diploma courses were organised, the organising tutors, in

⁵⁸ L.C. Green, "A New Departure in the Teaching of International Relations" 3 *World Affairs*, New Series, Nr. 3 (1949), pp. 310–320.

keeping with the Institute tradition, worked on a part-time basis with nominal honoraria. The Institute similarly benefitted from the generous co-operation of Dr. S.D. Malaiperuman, Director of the Y.M.C.A. for Indian Students, which provided teaching accommodation in its premises in Gower Street and later in Fitzroy Square for a period of 12 years down to 1964. Thereafter, courses were held in the Extra-Mural Department's premises in Tavistock Square.

At its peak in 1966, the Diploma courses were being attended by 48 first-year students and 23 second-year students. With few exceptions, students were recruited from other countries, especially Third World States, with a fair proportion of young diplomats serving in the London Embassies and High Commissions. The decision to discontinue the Diploma Courses in 1975 was based mainly on the fact that, reflecting the increased provision made elsewhere for higher education in international relations, the supply of adequately qualified applicants had fallen away. However, by that time, the Institute had performed the task it had set itself: to make a significant contribution to the training at a very modest cost, of the post-war generation of Third World leaders.

The Associateship of the Institute. For the small proportion of Diploma students and other advanced students wishing to proceed to further studies and to be trained in research techniques, the Institute introduced Associateship courses in 1962. The Associateship is awarded on the basis of a dissertation prepared over, usually, one academic session under the supervision of a teacher appointed by the Director.

Education in air and space law. A further educational experiment commenced in 1954, when it was decided to establish a Diploma in International and Comparative Air Law. Reflecting technological advances and corresponding changes in the law, the title of the Diploma was subsequently changed to Diploma in Air and Space Law. Candidates for the Diploma examinations are largely drawn from the evening course given under Professor Bin Cheng's direction at University College London. Though it has now been in existence for 30 years, the Diploma remains one of the very few professional qualifications in Air and Space Law available throughout the world. Like the Diploma in International Affairs, this Diploma caters for students from all parts of the world and, during the past decade, the Diploma has been awarded to an average of about nine candidates per annum.

3. *Institute organisation and finance*

Organisation. The Institute's form of government remained remarkably stable throughout this period. The Council, on which Institute officers are joined by distinguished colleagues from many areas of academic and public life, is the principal policy-making body, chaired by the President. The Board of Studies, chaired by the Director, advises the Council on matters of educational policy. Its members have included the Organising Tutor, teachers of Diploma courses and officers of the Department of Extra-Mural Studies of the University of London.

There has been relatively little change too in the division of responsibilities among the key Institute officers. In 1943, when the Institute adopted its present name, the opportunity was taken to introduce a number of constitutional changes, partly to provide safeguards against takeover bids from other organisations and partly to amend the designations and functions of the principal officers. Professor Keeton was appointed Principal and Dr. Schwarzenberger Director of Studies. In 1952 Professor Keeton succeeded Lord Lindsay of Birker as President and the office of Principal was dispensed with. Dr. Schwarzenberger was appointed Director of the Institute in 1962.

The other key administrative posts have been those of the Secretary, the Organising Tutor and the Treasurer. In 1949 Mr. L.C. Green added the burdens of Secretaryship to those of the Organising Tutor which he had assumed in 1946. He served in both capacities until he was appointed to the Chair in International Law in Singapore in 1960. His considerable contribution to the development of the Institute as teacher, editor and administrator was recognised by his election to Life Membership in 1960. Since 1960 a number of colleagues have served in these positions, Dr. F. Parkinson, Dr. Hilde Jacobi, Mrs. Olive Curry, Mr. R.H.F. Austin, Mr. A.M. Sutton and Mrs. J.A. Brown. The present writer has been privileged to serve the Institute since 1962, first as Organising Tutor and Secretary and subsequently as Deputy Director.

Reference has already been made to the constructive, supportive role played by officers of the Department of Extra-Mural Studies in launching the full-time Diploma course. The Institute is especially indebted to a number of those officers who took a particular interest in education in world affairs. Dr. McPhee helped to establish the strong links between the two bodies in the early post-war years and Werner Burmeister, who had been associated with the Institute and served on the Council since the War, re-enforced and developed these links when he succeeded Dr. McPhee in 1961. The Institute also enjoyed the helpful collaboration of his Deputy, Mr. Cyril Tho-

mas and of Mr. Douglas Maylor, both in his capacity as a senior officer in the Department and as a teacher of History on Diploma courses.

Finance. Throughout its 50-year history, the Institute has had to reconcile itself to one of the financial facts of life: a centre for research and education in world affairs which insists on independence from governments, companies or foundations has to learn to deploy its minimal resources with maximum efficiency and to rely heavily upon the goodwill and loyalty of its staff and members. In such an Institute the role of Treasurer is a vital one and the London Institute of World Affairs has been well served for the greater part of the post-war period by Professor Keeton, who includes among his many other virtues a shrewd financial acumen. This role is now played by Professor Bin Cheng.

In retrospect, it is possible to identify several characteristic features of the Institute's financial affairs. The negative consequence of independence is constant wariness of accepting financial support from governments, companies and foundations. The positive consequence is that it encourages self-reliance and economy. It has meant, for example, that the Institute has always tried to ensure that each of its activities should be at least self-supporting. It has in part been responsible for the Institute's practice of offering only a symbolic honorarium by way of a contribution to expenses to contributors to the *Year Book of World Affairs*. It says something for the reputation acquired by the *Year Book*, as well as for the enthusiasm of its contributors, that there has never been any difficulty in persuading leading specialists to write for the *Year Book*.

It cannot be denied that adequate accommodation, including a library, and full-time staff would have enabled the Institute to develop its works more fully than has been possible in recent years. Nonetheless, given the non-monetary assistance provided by a number of institutions, particularly the Department of Extra-Mural Studies and University College London, and the part-time labour of its officers, the Institute has survived and developed during peace and war and in times of prosperity and recession alike. Indeed, it is not perhaps immodest to suggest that the record of the Institute in research, publication and education over a period of 50 years compares not unfavourably with that of other educational centres which enjoy the luxury of ample external funding.

V—THE INSTITUTE'S FIRST 50 YEARS:
LESSONS IN RETROSPECT

In the introductory section of this brief history, it was suggested that there were lessons to be learned from the experience of the Institute, particularly in its earlier years. Looking back over the record of Institute activities presented above, a number of conclusions suggest themselves.

The most striking feature of the Institute's history is that, where enthusiasm and drive exist, an independent centre for research and education can do very valuable work on a very small budget. One is tempted at times to think that some variant of Parkinson's Law may well be operating in some centres at the present time. Too often, generous funding for a succession of dubious research projects leads to the recruitment of short-term research workers and the production of reports which impress more by their quantity than their quality. The unfashionable discipline of relative poverty may have its advantages.

A second lesson which can be drawn from the Institute's history is that there is perhaps an optimal size and range of activities which can be undertaken by an independent research centre of limited means. The Institute has learned over the years the desirability of never attempting to do more than can be handled by its officers working largely in an honorary capacity. Provided this restriction is accompanied by a determination never merely to duplicate work being done elsewhere, it still leaves room for a valuable and distinctive contribution to research and education. It is hoped that this necessarily brief survey has shown that this has indeed been the achievement of the Institute's first 50 years.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

FOCUS ON WORLD AFFAIRS

SELECTED L.I.W.A. MATERIAL:

1934-1984

By

COLIN BURNHAM

ABBREVIATIONS

A. *Institute Monographs*

- (i) New Commonwealth Institute Monographs:

See list at the end of G. Schwarzenberger, *The League of Nations and World Order* (1936).

- (ii) London Institute of World Affairs Monographs:

See list in the Institute leaflet at the end of this volume.

B. *Institute Quarterly*

- (i) 1935-43: New Commonwealth Quarterly (N.C.Q.)

- (ii) 1943-46: London Quarterly of World Affairs (L.Q.W.A.)

- (iii) 1947-51: World Affairs (W.A.)

C. *Institute Year Book*

1947-84: *Year Book of World Affairs* (Y.B.W.A.)

See also Cumulative Indexes in Vol. 25 (1971) and in this volume.

D. *Institute Monthly*

1940-41: *Union — Digest, Forum and Review* of the New Commonwealth Institute (*Union*).

(The sequence of papers included in the following survey is in chronological order under each heading.)

1 — INTERDISCIPLINARY ASPECTS

1. *World Society*

Schwarzenberger, Suse, *Trends of Thought in Germany* (2 W.A. 1948).

Strange, Susan, *In Praise of Inconsistency* (5 *ibid.* 1951).

Parkinson, F., *Social Dynamics of Underdeveloped Countries* (14 Y.B.W.A. 1960).

Vincent, R.J., *The Factor of Culture in the Global International Order* (34 *ibid.* 1980).

Zuckerman, Lord: *The Risks of a No-Risk Society* (34 *ibid.* 1980).

2. Study of International Relations

Green, L.C., *A New Departure in the Teaching of International Relations: The University of London Diploma in International Affairs* (3 W.A. 1949).

Alexandrowicz, Ch., *The Study of International Economics* (4 Y.B.W.A. 1950).

Lasswell, H.D., *The Scientific Study of International Relations* (12 *ibid.* 1958).

Burton, J.W., *Recent Developments in the Theory of International Relations* (18 *ibid.* 1964).

Banks, M.H., *Two Meanings of Theory in the Study of International Relations* (20 *ibid.* 1966).

Kaplan, M.A., *New Approaches to International Relations: Progress on Retrogression* (22 *ibid.* 1968).

Goodwin, C., *International Relations and International Studies* (27 *ibid.* 1973).

Kimminich, O., *International Relations and International Law* (27 *ibid.*, 1973).

Rosenau, J.N., *International Studies in the United States* (27 *ibid.* 1973).

Curle, A., *Peace Studies* (30 *ibid.* 1976).

Joynt, C.B., *Behavioural Science in International Relations* (33 *ibid.* 1979).

3. International Law and Society

Schwarzenberger, G., *International Law and Society* (1 Y.B.W.A. 1947).

Corbett, P.E., *Law and Society in the Relations of States* (4 *ibid.* 1950).

Schwarzenberger, G., *Neo-Barbarism and International Law* (22 *ibid.* 1968); *Détente and International Law* (35 *ibid.* 1981).

4. World Order

Lytton, Lord, *Conditions of International Order* (4 N.C.Q. 1938).

Falk, R.A., *The Logic of State Sovereignty Versus the Requirements of World Order* (27 Y.B.W.A. 1973).

Schwarzenberger, G., *Civitas Maxima?* (29 *ibid.* 1975).