

UOT 327

## THE ROLE OF CONFERENCE DIPLOMACY IN THE FORMATION OF THE YALTA-POTSDAM SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Irina KUNINA\*

Məqalə redaksiyaya daxil olmuşdur: 7 yanvar 2024; çapa qəbul edilmişdir: 25 yanvar 2024; online-da çap edilmişdir: 21 mart 2024.

Received: 7th of January, 2023; accepted: 25th of January, 2024; published online: 21th of March, 2024.

**Key words:** *war, diplomacy, Yalta, Potsdam, conference, system*

### Introduction

In the modern world system, there is a need to create a new form of interaction between states, which will be aimed at solving global problems of mankind. It is precisely these imperatives that dictate the transformation of bilateral diplomacy towards a multilateral forum. Multilateral diplomacy is conditioned by the emergence of such global problems, which many States are interested in solving, while the solution of these problems depends on many participants in international relations. Thus, because of the diversification of the state's contacts, the expansion of its responsibility in solving not only national, but also regional and global problems characteristic of the beginning of the XX century. bilateral diplomacy, which was carried out in the form of an exchange of embassy missions, increasingly became multilateral in nature, attracting many actors to participate in international activities. Conference diplomacy is not only one of the most effective methods of a multilateral approach to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the establishment of political balance in post-conflict situations. Currently, it is also an important tool in solving global problems and in the search for innovative methods that allow us to turn to fundamentally new revolutionary strategies for the benefit of millions of people. That is why studying the work of conference diplomacy through the prism of history, using the example of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, as well as identifying their role in the formation of the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations, is of particular interest.

### 1. The Yalta or Crimean Conference and its significance for the Post-war World Order

In anticipation of the conclusion of World War II, it became imperative for the leaders of the three major nations comprising the anti-Hitler alliance to convene once again. Following the Tehran summit, the organisation of the subsequent meeting, which aimed to convene the leaders of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union for a second time, encountered some challenges. The first disagreements over the meeting arose from the choice of venue. The proposal for the conference included selecting Great Britain as the host country, situated geographically between the United States and the Soviet Union. Alternative locations under consideration were Cairo, which was under the hands of Great Britain, Athens, where recent military engagements known as Dekemvriana had concluded, and Rome, which had just been freed from Nazi domination. To showcase

---

\* *PhD in Political Science, Azerbaijan University of Languages*  
e-mail: kunina.irina@mail.ru

the magnitude of the devastation inflicted upon the Soviet Union by Germany, the Soviet leadership advocated for hosting the summit inside their own borders, therefore emphasising the gravity of the situation to their allies. Ultimately, a decision was made to convene the conference, referred to as "Argonaut," via covert communication among the involved parties. This gathering took place in May 1944 in Crimea, a region that had been liberated from Nazi occupation. The Crimean summit, which took place 78 years ago, had a pivotal role in shaping the global order for the subsequent 45 years, as well as influencing the outcomes of the concluding conflict.

The Yalta conference, which occurred from February 4 to 11, 1945, was a very significant gathering of the leaders from the Big Three nations during the wartime period (2, p. 36). On February 4, 1945, Franklin Roosevelt, the inaugural American president to visit the Soviet Union, and W. Churchill, who made a visit to Sevastopol and Mount Sapun with the intention of commemorating the British soldiers involved in the Crimean War of 1853-1856, convened with J. Stalin, who Churchill perceived as a "Russian dictator" while his own nation regarded him as "the leader of the USSR people", at Levadia Palace, previously served as the summer abode of Emperor Nicholas II (12, p. 218).

The conference was conducted under the circumstances of a predisposition to find a common ground about the successful conclusion of the war and the essential choices to be taken around the post-war new global order. Following the comprehensive briefing on the ongoing developments at the fronts during the conference, the participating parties reiterated the preparedness of the allied forces to launch an offensive against Germany from many strategic directions, and they emphasised the significance of sustaining military operations until the complete and unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany. It is important to acknowledge that the Yalta conference served as the platform where the leaders of the Big Three engaged in discussions, ultimately arriving at an agreement, and establishing a preliminary decision about the dismantling of Germany inside its boundaries and the appropriation of its territories.

The primary topics of discussion among conference attendees revolved around the post-war challenges, including the terms of Nazi Germany's surrender, the partitioning of the country into occupation zones, the repatriation of prisoners of war, concentration camp detainees, ostarbeiters (Eastern workers), and the provision of reparations for war-related destruction. Initially, in accordance with the directive of the Soviet leadership, the deliberation on political matters started with the subject of Germany. The statement and communiqué pertaining to Germany explicitly articulated the Allies' objective of occupying the nation with the aim of eradicating German militarism and Nazism, while establishing safeguards to ensure that Germany would not disrupt global peace in the future. In the 20th century, despite being responsible for two global conflicts within a span of 25 years, the Allies contemplated the termination of the occupation regime after the eradication of all discernible indications of Nazism. To accomplish this, it was planned to dismantle and annihilate the German General Staff and armed forces, *"seize or demolish military equipment, liquidate or take control of German industry's militarization, punish war criminals fairly and swiftly, annihilate the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organisations, and structures, and to eliminate all Nazi and militaristic impacts from public institutions, cultural life, and economic life of the German people"* (9, p. 225). At the same time, the allies emphasised that their objectives did not involve the *"destroying of the German people"* and expressed the hope that *"the German people will live in integrity while establishing a place for themselves in the community of nations only when Nazism and militarism are rooted out"* (9, p. 266).

The intended arrangement was for the whole of Germany to be partitioned into occupation zones among the allied powers. The agreements titled "On the German occupation

zones and management of Greater Berlin"(7, p. 314-316) and "On the control mechanism in Germany"(7, p. 318) were accepted by the Allies on September 12, 1944, and November 14, 1944, respectively. These agreements were developed by the European Consultative Commission. Based on the initial agreement, the eastern region of Germany, specifically the northern portion of "Greater Berlin" falling within the Soviet occupation zone, was designated for the USSR. Great Britain was assigned the north-western region of the country, including "Greater Berlin," while the United States was allocated the south-western region and the southern part of "Greater Berlin" for occupation by their armed forces (7, p.315). As outlined in the proposed plan, the Central Control Commission is designated to assume the role of the highest governing body in Germany. Its headquarters are planned to be situated in the "Greater Berlin" area, including the occupation zones of all three states inside the city. However, it is important to note that the plan stipulates that British and US forces were not intended to have access to Berlin. The Big Three nations' commanders-in-chief would exert coordinated control and oversight over Germany via the Central Control Commission. The three Allied Powers resolved to extend an invitation to France to assume control of the occupation zone in Germany as the Commission of Control's fourth member if it so desired. The delineation of the occupation zone intended for France, which was initially expected to be determined by the representatives of the Allies in the European Consultative Commission, ultimately resulted in a portion of the British and US zones being allotted to France (11, p. 277-278). The demarcation lines delineating the occupation zones, as outlined in the annexes of the officially issued communiqué, remained unaltered throughout the duration of the war. The demarcation line that initially divided the Soviet occupation zone from the other zones thereafter acquired significance as a representation of the inter-system struggle along the boundary between the Federative Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. This, in turn, came to symbolise the period of the Cold War.

During the convened assembly of government leaders on February 5, 1945, the topic of dividing Germany was revisited, after a proposal made by J. Stalin. During the Tehran meeting, President Roosevelt put out a proposal to divide Germany into five distinct pieces. Winston Churchill, known for his cautious approach, refrained from endorsing any plan but expressed his support for the concept of Germany's partition. As per the statement made by the Prime Minister, the act of surrender conferred upon the Allies the authority to present a supplementary request for the fragmentation of Germany, with the intention of "*deciding the destiny of Germany.*" Joseph Stalin, who refrained from explicitly expressing a particular stance on the matter, sought to elucidate the positions of the parties involved and emphatically asserted that the call for disintegration is not an *ancillary demand, but rather a very significant one.* The decision was made to establish a special committee on Germany's post-war concerns and to address the question of the partition of Germany there after the discussion of this matter by the foreign ministers on the leaders' orders (9, p.64-66).

The following disagreements in the Congress concerned the question of reparations, which were to be given to "*states that bore the heaviest burden of the war, endured the most losses, and organised victory over the enemy.*" An Inter-Allied reparations committee made up of members from the Big Three nations was created in Moscow in accordance with the "*Protocol on the negotiations between the three heads of government at the Crimean Conference on the issue of reparations in kind from Germany.*" According to the protocol, the American representatives agreed with the Soviet side's suggestion that the total cost of reparations should be \$20 billion, with half going to the USSR, while the British representatives believed "*no figure for reparations can be offered*" until the

Commission has had a chance to consider the matter. As per the agreement established between the representatives of the Soviet and American parties, it was stipulated that the *commission would adopt the proposal put out by the Soviet government as a foundational point for deliberation during the first phase of its proceedings*" (9, p.272).

The "Declaration on a Free Europe," which was ratified during the Yalta Conference through mutual agreement and compromise, established the shared principles guiding the governments of the Big Three in their approach towards the populations liberated from the control of Nazi Germany and the countries aligned with the Nazi bloc. The Declaration urged the liberated peoples to eradicate the final remnants of Nazism and fascism, establish democratic institutions, and reinstate the sovereign rights of the peoples who had been stripped of their form of government for the Allies "to accomplish the establishment of order in Europe and the reconstruction of national economic life" (9, p.276-277). During the Yalta conference, the allied powers conducted a comprehensive assessment of the Balkan matters and then allocated the several states within the area among themselves. The operations of Josip Broz Tito were underestimated by the Allies, leading them to form a Provisional United Government in Yugoslavia. Greece was allocated to Great Britain while Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania were given to the USSR, in accordance with the "Percentage Agreement" between J.V. Stalin and W. Churchill on the partition of South-Eastern Europe into spheres of influence at the Moscow discussions conducted on October 9, 1944 (13, p.448-449).

Furthermore, the conference deliberated on the viability of finalising the alliance treaty between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, the delineation of borders between Italy and Yugoslavia, as well as Austria and Yugoslavia. Additionally, discussions were held regarding the establishment of a control commission in Bulgaria, Greece's demands against Bulgaria encompassing reparations, the presence of oil field equipment in Romania, the propositions put forward by the Soviet government pertaining to the Montreux Convention of 1936, which reinstated Turkey's authority over the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, as well as the prevailing circumstances in Iran.

Intense disagreements emerged among the Allies on the prospective trajectory of Poland. According to the communique on the Crimean meeting, the Allies "*gathered to fully address all aspects of the Polish question*" and "*to settle differences of opinion on the Polish question*"(9, p.269-270). During the convened sessions, the participating parties exhibited divergent stances pertaining to the makeup of the Polish government and the prospective delineation of the country's boundaries. However, the new circumstances brought about by the Soviet soldiers liberating Warsaw in January 1945 substantially bolstered the USSR's position, and the interim government set up under their guidance was based in the capital. In opposition to the Soviets' insistence on acknowledging the Provisional Government functioning in Poland, the Western Allies, who were unable to adequately safeguard the legitimate rights of the government-in-exile in London, suggested the establishment of a national unity government once more, with the involvement of both factions. Following extensive deliberations, the Declaration on Poland was ratified, encompassing a mutually agreed-upon compromise among the involved parties. The declaration stipulated that the "*existing Provisional Government in Poland ought to be restructured to encompass a more inclusive democratic framework, incorporating esteemed democratic figures from within Poland as well as Polish individuals residing abroad*", "*the new government would be referred to as a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity and*" "*should commit to holding free and unimpeded elections as soon as possible, based on the principle of universal suffrage by secret vote*". Great Britain and the United States will only establish diplomatic ties with the temporary Government of National Unity and exchange ambassadors if these requirements are satisfied"(9, p. 279-280).

During the discourse on Poland's borders, distinct divergences of opinion over its eastern and western boundaries were evident. The "Curzon line," which Lord Curzon, the British foreign minister, first advocated in 1920 and which the USSR expanded (in the direction of Bialystok and Lviv) when it invaded Poland in 1939, became the new western boundary of the Soviet Union. The United States President Franklin Roosevelt implemented modifications to the "Curzon Line" that favoured Poland, while also proposing a compromise to the Soviet Union about the city of Lvov and its adjacent oil deposits. Winston Churchill, who asserted the legality of the Soviet Union's claim to these areas, underscored the potential for incorporating some modifications in alignment with the suggestions put up by the President of the United States. Nevertheless, due to Joseph Stalin's refusal to make any compromises, his counterparts from the Western nations were compelled to accept the prevailing circumstances. Due to the absence of a conclusive resolution about the western boundaries of Poland, the matter was deferred to be addressed at the next peace conference. As per the conclusive resolution reached by the attendees of the conference, it was determined that "the eastern boundary of Poland ought to align with the "Curzon Line," with minor deviations of around five to eight kilometres in some regions, favouring Poland". Additionally, it was agreed that "Poland should substantially expand its territorial holdings in the northern and western directions" (9, p. 270, 280).

Despite its omission from the final communiqué of the conference on grounds of confidentiality, the matter of the Soviet Union's involvement in the war against Japan emerged as a prominent subject of deliberation at the Yalta conference. The leaders of Great Britain and the United States were prepared to make significant compromises about this matter, which held great importance to them. Utilising strategic acumen, the Soviet leader adeptly consented to "*participate in the conflict against Japan in coalition with the Allies, subsequent to the cessation of hostilities in Germany and the conclusion of the European theatre of war,*" in return for substantial compromises pertaining to Far Eastern matters. All of the requests of the Soviet leader were met in the covert agreement that the heads of the three main nations signed on the conference's last day: sustaining the status quo in relation to the Mongolian People's Republic, the restoration of Russia's rights, which were infringed upon during the war of 1904-1905, involved the return of the southern portion of Sakhalin Island and its surrounding islands to the Soviet Union (Restoration of Port Arthur, internationalization of the commercial port of Dayren, joint operation of the East-China and South Manchuria railway), handover of the Kuril Islands to the Soviet Union" (9, p. 273).

As a result, in February 1945, the leaders of the three main countries met at Yalta, where they had great diplomatic success and set the groundwork for the contemporary global order against the background of a fundamental shift in the situation at the front. The unresolved inquiries pertaining to the post-war global arrangement, which were not addressed at the meeting, were afterwards settled during the Potsdam or Berlin conferences.

## **2. Compromise trends of the Potsdam or Berlin Conference**

Following the signing of two acts of unconditional military surrender by the German Armed Forces on May 7 in Reims, France, and a day later in Karlshorst, a suburb of Berlin, the war in Europe was declared to have come to an end. On June 5, 1945, a fortnight following the apprehension of Cross-Admiral K. Dönitz, the final administration of Nazi Germany, the governments of the USSR, Great Britain, the United States, and the Provisional Government of France assumed authoritative control over Germany. This transfer of power was formalised through the signing of the "Declaration on the Defeat of Germany" in Berlin, which served as the legal framework for the legislative and administrative

undertakings of the occupying authorities. The first draft of the statement was created by the European Consultative Commission on July 25, 1944, with further revisions and amendments being introduced on May 12, 1945(1, p. 237). Following the acceptance of the act of surrender, the Soviet Union refrained from signing an independent peace agreement with Germany, prolonging the official state of war until January 25, 1955.

In contrast to preceding conferences, the Potsdam or Berlin conference took place after the conclusion of the European conflict (9, p.11). The selection of the conference venue in the city of Potsdam has symbolic significance due to its historical association with Adolf Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany on March 21, 1933. Additionally, Potsdam saw comparatively less devastation during the war in comparison to the capital city. The last meeting of the leaders of the "Big Three" nations, known as the "Terminal" conference, occurred between July 17 and August 2, 1945, in the Cecilienhof Palace in Potsdam, located around twenty miles away from the former capital of the Third Reich, which had just been vanquished in Europe. The Potsdam Conference, a significant event in global history, brought together the leaders of the triumphant nations, namely J.V. Stalin, H. Truman, and W. Churchill (later replaced by C. Attlee after the elections in Great Britain), with the aim of establishing a new global order in the aftermath of World War II.

Even though it was noted that anti-Soviet sentiments significantly rose throughout the conference's work, compromise tendencies ultimately won out. The primary objective of this discussion was to formalise the military triumph of the prominent states within the anti-Hitler coalition over fascist Germany and its allies in a political context. Additionally, the aim was to elaborate on the resolutions made during the Yalta conference regarding post-war settlement matters, prevent future acts of aggression in Europe, establish enduring peace, and address concerns pertaining to the ongoing war against Japan. Regarding the last topic, the USSR's confirmation of its intention to launch a war against Japan was a key factor in the conference's ability to successfully resolve complicated issues that led to significant differences of opinion.

During the meeting, a consensus was reached to establish the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs with the objective of facilitating the preparation and finalisation of peace accords with Germany's previous allies, namely Italy, Finland, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. Additionally invited were China and France, and a council made up of the foreign ministers of those five nations was tasked with drafting peace treaties and formulating ideas for resolving associated territory disputes. The leaders of the Big Three deemed *it advantageous to rectify the existing anomalous status of Italy (with its colonies, - K.I.), Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, and Romania by means of entering peace treaties* (9, p. 427-429).

The primary objectives of the overarching policy towards post-war Germany were established, and consensus was achieved on key negotiation topics, including political and economic principles, as well as the political requirements proposed by the involved parties. These requirements, commonly referred to as the "4 Ds," encompassed democratisation (the reinstatement of civil liberties, implementation of multi-party elections, and the division of powers), demilitarisation (the complete disarmament of Germany), denazification (the eradication of all Nazi entities), and decartelization (the dispersion of economic influence). This pertains to the comprehensive demilitarisation and disarmament of the German armed forces during the initial phase of control, the elimination of all categories of military personnel and the military-industrial complex, the dissolution of the National Socialist Party, all Nazi institutions and organisations, the prosecution of individuals responsible for war crimes, the prevention of Nazi and militaristic propaganda, the reestablishment of political processes based on democratic principles, the repeal of all laws promoting racial discrimination, the facilitation of a peaceful transition for German industry, the

reinstatement of local self-governance, and the resumption of activities by democratic parties, trade unions, and other public entities .

Furthermore, a consensus was reached about the matter of reparations. However, the US modified its stance and rejected the establishment of a precise sum for each state with respect to the Yalta resolution about the in-kind reimbursement of the damage inflicted on the ally nations during the war. In accordance with the established system of reparations allocation based on zones, the Soviet Union asserted its claim for an extra 25% of equipment from West Germany. The parties eventually came to a settlement. In relation to this matter, a separate agreement was signed, including the stipulations ratified at the Yalta Conference (9, p. 434-436). Except for 30 submarines that were lost, the allocation of the German merchant and naval fleet was agreed upon during the meeting, and it was decided to distribute them evenly among the three winning governments. Furthermore, the conference "decided in principle with the proposal of the Soviet government to hand over to the Soviet Union the city of Königsberg, Germany, and its adjacent territory," with the precise limits being discussed later at the level of specialists.

At Potsdam, key points of the Yalta Conference's ultimate political decision on the establishment of an international military tribunal for the prosecution of the principal Nazi war criminals were reached. Here, J. Stalin requested the publication of the first list of war criminals, and the British idea that allows for the swift trial of the major war criminals was endorsed (5, p.664-691). It is important to acknowledge that concurrently, the London Conference commenced its proceedings on June 26 with the objective of preparing for the Nuremberg trial of the officials from the four victorious nations of the Second World War. Subsequently, on August 8, an agreement was reached to establish a distinct international judicial entity known as the International Military Tribunal (3, p. 448-458). The commencement of the Nuremberg trial took place on November 20, 1945, and its conclusion occurred on October 1, 1946, resulting in the condemnation of 12 primary perpetrators of war crimes who were subsequently condemned to death. Additionally, 3 individuals received life sentences, while 2 were sentenced to 20 years, and 2 others were given sentences of 15 and 10 years, respectively.

The establishment of diplomatic ties between Great Britain and the United States with the Polish Provisional Government may be seen considering the agreed statement of the Polish problem within the framework of the Soviet project, in line with the decisions made at the Yalta Conference. They agreed to help with the transfer of all the money, valuables, and other assets in the possession and under the control of T. Artsyszewski, the prime minister in exile in London who led the Polish Provisional Government. They also suspended their recognition of the Polish Provisional Government. A decision was made to establish Poland's western border along the Oder River's course, the Western Neisse River, the portion of East Prussia that was not under USSR control, and the former free city of Danzig under Polish state control, all in accordance with the Yalta decisions.

One of the resolutions made at the meeting was to the repatriation of a segment of the German populace residing in the areas of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary back to Germany. The Allies reached a consensus that *the relocation of the German populace, either in whole or in part, who were residing in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, should be executed.* The conference's agenda covered oil equipment in Romania, the evacuation of allied forces from Tehran and later from Iran, the Tangier zone, which has a specific strategic significance, and the Black Sea straits.

### **3. The establishment of the Yalta-Potsdam system in the realm of international relations**

The decisions made at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, together with those that defined the post-war global order, were intended at sustaining international stability and collaboration after the war amongst the nations that made up the anti-Hitler alliance. The establishment of the United Nations Organisation was undertaken to achieve the ultimate objective, with its Charter being formally accepted. Nevertheless, the United Nations had inherent challenges in effectively carrying out this objective. The escalating conflicts between the Soviet Union and the United States, the primary architects of the global organisation, rendered its realisation unattainable. After the war, the post-conflict era saw the emergence of a new international relations framework, which was established at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. This framework evolved within the context of a bipolar system.

The Yalta-Potsdam system had many distinct characteristics that set it apart from the preceding Versailles-Washington system. The nascent system of international relations lacked a robust foundation in terms of formal treaties and legal frameworks. Consequently, after the conclusion of the war, the use or potential employment of force in the context of international relations had a heightened significance. The Yalta-Potsdam system, which resulted in the establishment of a bipolar international relations framework, necessitated adaptation within the confines of a bipolar global order. The new international order, which was built on the ideological war between the capitalist and communist camps, had the appearance of a battle accompanied by an unparalleled armaments race. The advent of nuclear weapons has significantly influenced the evolution of international relations, introducing new aspects into the global landscape. Following the period of atomic monopoly held by the United States from 1945 to 1949, the Soviet Union's acquisition of nuclear weapons introduced a level of equilibrium to the prevailing circumstances of warfare.

Simultaneously, it is important to acknowledge the stabilising function of both the bipolar system and the nuclear capabilities possessed by the opposing parties within the delicate framework of international relations. The Yalta-Potsdam system, characterised by intense competition in international relations, was notable for its centralised control since it relied on the will of the two dominant global powers.

### **Conclusions**

Both conferences are very significant historically and internationally, even if the Yalta-Potsdam system, which lasted for more than 40 years, started to progressively disintegrate with the fall of the USSR and the end of the Cold War. These conferences, which in the middle of the 20th century illustrated the viability of cooperation between states representing various systems, continue to be relevant to the point where they will serve as models for resolving the most challenging issues the world will face in the first four years of the 21st century. The Yalta or Crimean conference, which was a crucial step in the development of a new post-war international order, assured victory over Nazi Germany for the Allies unified in the anti-Hitler alliance in the last phase of the war. The Potsdam or Berlin conference served as a platform to further deliberate upon the judgments made at the Yalta conference about the challenges associated with post-war settlement. Despite the presence of divergent viewpoints, this meeting laid the groundwork for a novel global order by making determinations that would ultimately shape the destiny of Europe. As a result, the new system of international relations' basis was established.

## REFERENCES

1. Declaration of the defeat of Germany // The Great Patriotic War 1941-1945: encyclopedia. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1985, 832 p.
2. Manykin A.Z, Conflicts and Crises in International Relations: Problems of Theory and History. Moscow: MSU, 2001, 275 p.
3. Rekunkov A.M. Nuremberg Trials: sat. Material in 8. T. 1. Moscow: Legal. lit., 1987, 688 pp.
4. Gromyko A., Zemskova N., Zorina V., Semenova V., Kharlamova M. Potsdam Conference // history of diplomacy / (Ed. A. A. 2nd. M. Politizdat), Vol.,1975, 752 pp.
5. Potsdam Conference / The History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union 1941-1945. M.: Military Publishing House of the Ministry of Defense of the USSR, 1963, Vol. 5, 652 p.
6. Protocol of the Crimean Conference / Collection of Existing Treaties, Agreements and Conventions Concluded by the USSR with Foreign States. Issue XI. M., 1955, pp. 82-83
7. Russian Archive: The Great Patriotic War. Vol. 15 (4-5). The Battle for Berlin (The Red Army in defeated Germany): Doc. and materials / In-t military. history of the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation, Center. archive of the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation; Author-comp. I.M. Popov et al. M.: TERRA, 1995, 616 p.
8. Sidorov A. The Bretton Woods Conference and the Construction of the Delayed World Order. (Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 25: International Relations and World Politics), No. 4, 2014, p. 140-184.
9. The Soviet Union at international conferences during the Great Patriotic War. Vol. IV. Crimean Conference of the Leaders of the three Allied Powers - the USSR, the USA and Great Britain (February 4-11, 1945): Sat. doc. / M-in foreign. affairs of the USSR. M.: Politizdat, 1979. 338 p.
10. The Soviet Union at international conferences during the Great Patriotic War. Vol. V. United Nations Conference in San Francisco (April 25-June 26, 1945): Sat. doc. / M-in foreign. affairs of the USSR. M.: Politizdat, 1980, 722 p.
11. The Soviet Union at international conferences during the Great Patriotic War. Vol. VI. Berlin (Potsdam) Conference of the Leaders of the three Allied Powers - the USSR, the USA and Great Britain (July 17-August 2, 1945): Sat. doc. / M-in foreign. affairs of the USSR. M.: Politizdat, 1980, 551 p.
12. Churchill W. The Second World War. (Alpina Publisher), 1998, Vol. 4, p. 218-236
13. Churchill W. World War II. (Mjscow: Military Publishing House). In 3 vols. 1991, Volume 3, pp. 448-449.

*Xülasə*

*İrina Kunina*

### *Yalta-potsdam beynəlxalq münasibətlər sisteminin formalaşmasında konfrans diplomatiyasının rolu*

Müasir dünya sisteminə dövlətlər arasında bəşəriyyətin qlobal problemlərinin həllinə yönəldiləcək yeni bir qarşılıqlı əlaqə formasının yaradılmasına ehtiyac var. Məhz bu imperativlər ikitərəfli diplomatiyanın çoxtərəfli foruma çevrilməsini diktə edir. Çoxtərəfli diplomatiya bir çox dövlətin həll etməkdə maraqlı olduğu belə qlobal problemlərin yaranması ilə əlaqədardır, bu problemlərin həlli isə beynəlxalq münasibətlərin bütün iştirakçılarından asılıdır. Çoxtərəfli diplomatiyanın bir növü kimi konfrans diplomatiyası zamanla beynəlxalq problemlərin həlli yollarının axtarışı və əlaqələndirilməsində əhəmiyyətli bir vasitə halına gəlmişdir. İkinci Dünya müharibəsindən sonra xüsusilə əhəmiyyətli bir inkişaf əldə etdi və Yalta və Potsdam konfransları bunda mühüm rol oynadı. Yeni dünya nizamı ilə bağlı bütün məsələlər anti-Hitler koalisiyasına birləşən müttəfiqlərin iradəsi ilə yuxarıda göstərilən konfranslarda həll edildi. Bu konfranslar çərçivəsində müharibə bitdikdən sonra yeni dünya nizamının təməlinin formalaşdırılması üçün real planlar razılaşdırıldı. Hitler Almaniyasının tam məğlubiyyəti, bu ölkənin gələcəyi, dəymiş ziyana görə kompensasiyanın ödənilməsi,

işğaldan azad edilmiş Avropa dövlətlərinə münasibətdə ümumi siyasi xəttin müəyyən edilməsi, beynəlxalq təhlükəsizlik və əməkdaşlıq Təşkilatının yaradılması, yeni formalaşmaqda olan beynəlxalq münasibətlər sisteminin sabitliyinin təmin edilməsində həlledici amilə çevrilməsi və s. bununla bağlı məsələlər Yalta və Potsdam konfranslarında əsas müzakirə mövzusunda çevrilib. Lakin ümumi düşmənin məğlubiyyətindən sonra faşizm və militarizmə qarşı mübarizədə anti-Hitler koalisiyasına birləşən müttəfiqlər arasında mövcud fikir ayrılıqları gücləndi və tezliklə iki böyük bloka bölünməyə səbəb oldu. Beləliklə, Yalta-Potsdam sistemi beynəlxalq münasibətlərin bipolyar sistemi kimi xarakterizə olunur. Bu beynəlxalq münasibətlər sisteminin müsbət cəhətlərindən biri bu günə qədər dövlətlər arasındakı münasibətlərdə dünya mədəniyyətinin ən yüksək səviyyəsi və bütün dövlətləri və xalqları birləşdirən beynəlxalq münasibətlərdə ən yaxşı ardıcılıq mexanizmi olan Birləşmiş Millətlər Təşkilatının yaradılması idi.

**Açar sözlər:** *müharibə, diplomatiya, Yalta, Potsdam, konfrans, sistem*

*Резюме*

*Ирина Кунина*

***Роль конференционной дипломатии в формировании Ялтинско-Потсдамской системы международных отношений***

В современной мировой системе назрела необходимость создания новой формы взаимодействия между государствами, которая будет направлена на решение глобальных проблем человечества. Именно эти императивы диктуют трансформацию двусторонней дипломатии в многосторонний форум. Многосторонняя дипломатия обусловлена возникновением таких глобальных проблем, в решении которых заинтересованы многие государства, в то время как решение этих проблем зависит от всех участников международных отношений. Конференционная дипломатия как разновидность многосторонней дипломатии с течением времени стала значимым инструментом в деле поиска и согласования решений международных проблем. Особенно значительное развитие она получила после Второй мировой войны, и Ялтинская и Потсдамская конференции сыграли в этом заметную роль. Все вопросы, касающиеся нового мирового порядка, решались на вышеупомянутых конференциях волей союзников, объединившихся в антигитлеровскую коалицию. В рамках этих конференций согласовывались реальные планы формирования фундамента нового мирового порядка после окончания войны. Полный разгром гитлеровской Германии, будущее этой страны, выплата компенсации за причиненный ущерб, определение общей политической линии в отношении освободившихся от оккупации европейских государств, создание международной организации безопасности и сотрудничества, превращение ее в решающий фактор в обеспечении стабильности вновь формирующейся системы международных отношений и др. связанные с этим вопросы стали главной темой обсуждения на Ялтинской и Потсдамской конференциях. Однако после разгрома общего врага существующие разногласия между союзниками, объединившимися в антигитлеровскую коалицию в борьбе с фашизмом и милитаризмом, усилились и вскоре привели к расколу на два крупных блока. Таким образом, Ялтинско-Потсдамская система характеризуется как биполярная система международных отношений. Одним из положительных моментов этой системы международных отношений было создание Организации Объединенных Наций, которая и по сей день является наивысшим уровнем мировой культуры во взаимоотношениях государств и наилучшим механизмом согласованности в международных отношениях, объединяющим все государства и народы.

**Ключевые слова:** *война, дипломатия, Ялта, Потсдам, конференция, система*

Redaksiya heyətinin üzvü s.e.d., prof. İbrahimova Gülzar İsaxan qızının rəyi əsasında çapa məsləhət görülmüşdür.