



Diplomacy in the Second World War and the Construction of the New World

İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Diplomasi ve Yeni Dünyanın İnşası

Fatih BEYAZ*

*Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Uluslararası İlişkiler Anabilim Dalı Doktora Öğrencisi.

E-mail: fatihbeyaz9994@gmail.com

 ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-5189-6631

Abstract

The Second World War has had a profound impact on international relations, leading to significant shifts in power and the creation of new global structures. In response to the war, US President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill launched the Atlantic Declaration in 1941, promoting post-war political and economic cooperation. Diplomatic efforts between the Allies, including key conferences in Moscow, Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam, are crucial in shaping the post-war order. The different priorities and ideologies of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union influence their approaches to post-war reconstruction and peacekeeping. The Yalta Conference is crucial in laying the groundwork for the United Nations and addressing the future management of Germany and Poland. While tensions between the Allies foreshadow the coming Cold War, the Potsdam Conference further solidifies these plans. The article examines the complex diplomatic negotiations and strategic decisions that define the transition from the Second World War to the post-war world, highlighting the emergence of the US and the USSR as superpowers and the establishment of the United Nations as the cornerstone of international peace. This research assumes that wartime diplomacy and meetings construct the post-war world order.

Keywords: War, Diplomacy, Balance of Power, World War II.

Öz

İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın uluslararası ilişkiler üzerinde derin bir etkisi olmuş, önemli güç kaymalarına ve yeni küresel yapıların oluşmasına yol açmıştır. Savaşa tepki olarak ABD Başkanı Roosevelt ve İngiltere Başbakanı Churchill 1941 yılında savaş sonrası siyasi ve ekonomik iş birliğini teşvik eden Atlantik Deklarasyonu'nu yayınladılar. Moskova, Tahran, Yalta ve Potsdam'daki kilit konferanslar da dahil olmak üzere Müttefikler arasındaki diplomatik çabalar, savaş sonrası düzenin şekillenmesinde çok önemlidir. Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, İngiltere ve Sovyetler Birliği'nin farklı öncelikleri ve ideolojileri, savaş sonrası yeniden yapılanma ve barışı koruma konusundaki yaklaşımlarını etkilemektedir. Yalta Konferansı, Birleşmiş Milletler'in temellerinin atılması ve Almanya ile Polonya'nın gelecekteki yönetiminin ele alınması açısından çok önemlidir. Müttefikler arasındaki gerilimler yaklaşan Soğuk Savaş'ın habercisi olurken, Potsdam Konferansı bu planları daha da sağlamlaştırır. Bu makale, İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan savaş sonrası dünyaya geçişi tanımlayan karmaşık diplomatik müzakereleri ve stratejik kararları incelemekte, ABD ve SSCB'nin süper güçler olarak ortaya çıkışını ve Birleşmiş Milletler'in uluslararası barışın temel taşı olarak kuruluşunu vurgulamaktadır. Bu araştırma, savaş zamanı diplomasisinin ve toplantılarının savaş sonrası dünya düzenini inşa ettiğini varsaymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Savaş, Diplomasi, Güç Dengesi, İkinci Dünya Savaşı.

To Cite This Article/Bu Makaleye Atıf İçin: Beyaz, F. (2025). Diplomacy in the Second World War and the Construction of the New World. *Journal of Diplomatic Research*, 7(1), ss. 43-59.

Introduction

The beginning of the Second World War marked a crucial shift in global dynamics, leading to unprecedented international cooperation and the eventual establishment of the United Nations. This article explores the complex diplomatic maneuvers and geopolitical strategies that shaped the post-war order, focusing on the interactions and agreements between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. The main research question addressed in this study: How did diplomatic decisions and conferences during the Second World War influence the establishment of the United Nations and the geopolitical landscape of post-war Europe?

The hypothesis of this research argues that wartime diplomacy, particularly conferences and declarations involving the Allied powers, established the basic principles and power structures that defined the first United Nations and significantly influenced the post-war balance of power. By examining key conferences such as the Atlantic Conference, the Moscow Conference, the Tehran Conference, the Yalta Conference and the Potsdam Conference, this article aims to explain the intentions and strategies of Allied leaders and how these shaped the global order in the immediate future.

The unique value of this article lies in its comprehensive analysis of wartime diplomatic efforts prior to the formal establishment of the United Nations. Unlike other studies that may focus on a single conference or a specific aspect of post-war diplomacy, this research provides a holistic view of interconnected decisions and their long-term consequences. The article contributes to the literature by providing a detailed chronological narrative linking wartime conferences to the ultimate geopolitical realities of the Cold War. Unlike other studies, this article emphasizes the interplay between idealistic visions of global governance and pragmatic considerations of national security and balance of power. It highlights the contrasting approaches

of Roosevelt's idealism, Stalin's realism and Churchill's balance of power strategy, and provides a nuanced understanding of the complex motivations behind the creation of the United Nations and the partition of Europe. Providing a comprehensive examination of key diplomatic events and their consequences, it not only enriches historical understanding of World War II diplomacy, but also contributes to the broader discourse on international relations by providing insights into the fundamental dynamics of the Cold War.

1. Diplomacy in the Early Years of the War and the Major Conferences

World War II, which started in Europe and affected the whole world, shattered all international balances. In this situation, US President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill initiated a consultation process in the Atlantic in 1941 to discuss the course of the war and the path they would follow after the war. Following this meeting, the "Atlantic Declaration" was published in August (Öztürk, 2020). With this declaration, a Wilsonian idealism was pursued and the political and economic future of the post-war world was discussed (Lefebvre, 2005). Following the US entry into the war, the Allied states adopted the "United Nations Declaration" on January 1, 1942 within the scope of the Atlantic Declaration, thus laying the foundations of the United Nations (Öztürk, 2020). The UN is an organization whose foundations were laid as a result of cooperation against wartime German and Japanese aggression (Mazower, 2015).

By 1943, the course of the war had changed positively for the Allied states and in order to support this change with military and diplomatic means, the Allied states sat down at the diplomatic table. In this diplomatic traffic, many conferences were organized with the aim of determining how the post-war world would be shaped (Armaoğlu, 2019).

1.1. Moscow Conference

At the conference, where Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union were represented by their foreign ministers and China by its ambassador to Moscow, the agenda of the states included the course of the war and the post-war order. The Soviet delegation declared that they would continue their war against the Germans until a decisive result was obtained, that their country would be included in the international organization to be established after the war and that they would take a stand in favor of the organization (Çelik, 2005). With this conference, the UK, the USA, the USSR and China, which would shape the post-war world order and which US President Roosevelt referred to as the “Four Gendarmes of the World”, came together for the first time during the war period and discussed what they would do when the state of war they were in ended, showing that these countries were very eager to shape the order to be built.

As a result of the negotiations, the Soviet delegation demanded that the second front be opened rapidly and Turkey be included in the war in order to reach a conclusion as soon as possible. Emphasizing that this front should be opened in the spring of 1944 at the latest, the Soviet Union suggested that Swedish airfields could be used for aerial bombardments (Akşin, 2017). Another important demand of the Soviet side was the establishment of federation-type states in Europe at the end of the war. On the other hand, the four states participating in the conference issued a joint declaration, declaring that they would continue their cooperation in ensuring and preserving the peace order and taking steps for disarmament in the post-war period. In addition, it was declared that all colonized states would be administered under an international guardianship system and those who committed war crimes would be punished in order to prevent crimes against humanity and massacres in occupied countries (Armaoğlu, 2019).

In addition to these decisions, it was concluded

that Austria was a “friendly country under occupation” and the “Declaration for a Liberated Europe” was adopted in order to save Europe from the presence of two ideologies (Nazism and Fascism) that led Europe to war and destruction (Çelik, 2005).

1.2. Tehran Conference

It was the first trilateral meeting between the US, British and Soviet leaders in the course of the diplomacy that continued throughout the war (Mazower, 2015).

The “unconditional surrender” that the American delegation put forward for Germany at the conference was born out of the idea that after the war Germany should not be able to pose a threat to any country or geography. When Roosevelt and Stalin began to discuss the state of Europe, they both agreed that the future of Europe would depend on the future state of Germany. Therefore, the first issue they addressed was Germany (Özen and Kolasi, 2016).

One of the issues that came up as a problem of debate was the status of the Balkans. While Churchill was concerned about the hegemony that the Soviets might have over the Balkans, Stalin opposed the intervention of Western states in the Balkan territories. Stalin rejected the British views on the Balkans at the conference in order not to face any obstacle while protecting Soviet interests in the Balkans (Otaç, 2019).

The Soviet willingness at the Moscow Conference to open a second front in order to divide Germany’s power in the war continued at this conference. However, Churchill insisted on opening the second front in the Balkans in order to control Soviet expansionism (Armaoğlu, 2019). Stalin, on the other hand, wanted the second front to be opened in France in order to force German forces to fight on two distant fronts. As a result of the negotiations, it was decided that the front would be opened in France. According to the decision, the date set for the start of the war on the second front was May 1944 (Akşin, 2017). The

reason for Stalin's desire not to involve another state in the Balkans was the goal of moving the security line away from the center by building the security of the state in the form of a wide firewall, which the former Russian leaders also agreed on. Churchill's opposition to the Soviet demands was motivated by his desire to reestablish a balance of power in Europe as it had been in the 19th century (Kissinger, 2016).

When the issue of Poland came to the agenda, the Soviet delegation agreed to extend the borders of Poland to the Oder River, which was recognized as German territory. However, the Soviets declared that they did not recognize the Polish government in England and that they also claimed rights to Finnish territory (Armaoğlu, 2019).

The Balkan and Eastern European policies pursued by the Russians in Tehran show that they wanted to take permanent measures to prevent the recurrence of the threat of an enemy invasion that managed to reach the frontiers of Moscow in 1942. As a result of the goals and policies pursued, they want to exist in the new order as a state that has moved its security away from the center, beyond the Soviet borders. However, on the British side, Winston Churchill, while wanting to create a "balance of power" in Europe after the war, did not want such a powerful and hegemonic Soviet Russia to exist in the east of Europe. Because he thought that the presence of such a giant would disrupt the balance of power.

As a result of the decisions taken regarding Turkey and Iran, it was decided that Turkey would be included in the war and Iran would be supported by the Allied states (Öztürk, 2020). Another decision taken regarding Iran was that as a result of the victory of the Allied states, the presence of Allied forces in Iran would be terminated and the country's freedom would be recognized (Çelik, 2005).

The existence of an international organization for the establishment and maintenance of

international peace and security comes to the agenda at this conference (Lefebvre, 2005). Roosevelt wants to inform Stalin about the UN. He presents an organizational model in which the organization to be established will be a global power and will have a structure that will operate under the high authority and control of Britain, the USA, China and the Soviet Union. He also gave a briefing on the problems that the organization was likely to face in the future (Mazower, 2015).

No party objected to the UN idea. However, the Soviet delegation opposed the inclusion of China among the privileged states that would work as an upper body of the organization to be established. However, the Soviet demand was not accepted (Armaoğlu, 2019).

Roosevelt privately explained the "Four Gendarmes of the World" order, of which he was the architect, to Stalin, with whom he hoped to cooperate in building the post-war international order. His aim was to ensure that Stalin would not have any question marks in his mind. This idea, which was put forward in the name of international peace and security, included a policy of balance, the kind of balance that the British Prime Minister would have liked to see (Kissinger, 2016). Roosevelt assured Stalin that the United States would not enter a contest for hegemony in Europe after the Allied victory and tried to win his support for the UN. The biggest criticism of Roosevelt's efforts, contrary to Roosevelt's expectations, came from many different sectors in the US (Mazower, 2015).

Regarding the idea of the "Four Gendarmes of the World", Stalin stated that China was not a powerful actor capable of shouldering such a huge international security responsibility. Instead, he proposed the creation of specific zones where the four great powers would be in charge of supervising and maintaining peace and security. However, this time Roosevelt opposed this decision. He argued that Stalin's idea would divide the world into different poles and create an obstacle to the establishment of peace and

security in the global arena (Kissinger, 2016).

Regarding the post-war situation in Germany, the Soviet leader proposed a model of a dismembered Germany, but also a Germany that had lost its productive capacity in certain areas. The American president accepted the model of a divided Germany, after the necessary territorial division had been made by the USSR, France and Poland. He also stated that Germany's two major industrial regions, Hamburg and the Ruhr, should be handed over to a structure that would operate under the control of more than one state after the war. The conference decided to establish a commission to discuss and decide on the fate of issues related to Germany in more detail, and as a result, the European Consultative Commission was established (Özen and Kolasi, 2016).

1.3. Yalta Conference

In the period towards the end of the war, disagreements and conflicts of interest between the three great powers began to manifest themselves (Armaoğlu, 2019). All three statesmen evaluate and plan the war process and its aftermath from their own perspectives.

The American view sees the conclusion of the war against Germany as essential. At this point, it states that the necessary support should be provided to the Soviets, who are seen as powerful enough to determine the course of the war, and that the necessary contacts should be established for the new order to be established at the end of the war. Accordingly, Roosevelt endeavored to establish close and mutually trusting relations with Stalin throughout the war (Hook and Spainer, 2018). Roosevelt thought that the victorious Allies in the new order, the USA, the UK, the USSR and China, should be together as the powers that shape the world. He does not see France among these states and states that it is a state that must be kept under control together with Germany after the war. In addition, another issue on the American President's agenda for the post-war period was the colonized states. In order to show his determination on this issue to Churchill,

when they adopted the Atlantic Declaration, he expressed his desire that the declaration should also be implemented in the colonized countries (Kissinger, 2016).

Stalin also had certain ideas about the post-war order in order to pursue the interests of the Soviet Union. One of them was to extend the authority of the Soviet Union to the central parts of Europe and to create a ring of security. Despite the fact that victory was getting closer and closer, Stalin preferred to delay diplomatic contacts with Britain and the United States. In this way, he aimed to gain control over more territory and to have a stronger hand during the negotiations (Kissinger, 2016). In addition, Stalin interpreted the US and Britain's slow action in opening the second front in the war as the anti-Communism of their Western allies. As a result, Stalin found Roosevelt unreliable as a capitalist leader (Hook and Spainer, 2018).

After the establishment of peace in Europe, the ideological goals of the parties also differed. While Stalin aimed for a Central and Eastern Europe dominated and guided by Communism, Churchill and Roosevelt aimed for a Europe dominated by liberal and democratic principles (Özdemir et al., 2018).

The European Advisory Commission established at the Tehran Conference makes a detailed preparatory work for the Yalta Conference and creates a suitable ground for negotiations (Özen and Kolasi, 2016). The United States, Britain and the Soviet Union were actively involved in all diplomatic efforts related to the peace period in order to keep the gains they had made during the war period in their hands after the war. Because they do not want to give other great powers the opportunity to act as they wish in determining the conditions of the peacetime world.

On the one hand, negotiations on the state of Europe and peace were ongoing, and on the other, work was being done on the post-war global economic order. The US sees the economic

interests of its country as dependent on an integrated and global system that transcends the borders of the state. For this reason, the US, with the support of European states, works on a global economic order. In July 1944, representatives of forty-four different states came together in the United States to discuss the system prepared as a result of the studies. The system agreed upon was called the Bretton Woods system, named after the town where the meeting was held (Hook and Spainer, 2018). At this conference, a global economic system under the influence of the United States was established. The dollar became the main currency of international trade and it was decided to establish the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank to support this system (Akřın, 2017).

Between August 21 and October 7, the US, China, the USSR and the UK held two separate meetings at the Dumbarton Oaks estate in the USA (Otaç, 2019). In these meetings, the four states agreed on the necessity of an international organization to make international peace and security permanent after the war. As a result of the negotiations, the UN founding charter was adopted. The issue of the Security Council's decision-making process was the only issue that was disputed at Dumbarton Oaks and was postponed to be discussed at Yalta (Çelik, 2005).

On the one hand, the end of the war was approaching, and on the other, the advance and expansion of the Soviet Union in Europe continued. Britain wanted to limit the USSR's sphere of influence in Europe. For this reason, Churchill traveled to Russia in October 1944 to discuss this issue with Stalin (Özcan, 2020). As a result of their negotiations on the spheres of influence in Eastern Europe, Churchill and Stalin determined percentages about who would have how much dominance in which region. The decisions taken as a result of the negotiations are called the "Agreement on Percentages" (Özdemir et al., 2018). According to this agreement, it was decided that Greece would be left under the

control of Britain, while all countries in Eastern Europe except Yugoslavia would be left under the control of the Soviet Union (Kissinger, 2016). In addition, the straits of Turkey and the post-war situation of Germany were the subject of negotiations. It was decided to include France in the decisions to be taken on Germany. It was decided to make a new arrangement regarding the status of the straits (Armaoğlu, 2019).

With this move, Churchill, at a time when the war was not yet over, did not leave the European dominions to a single state and pursued a policy of balance for the post-war period. In this way, Britain gains something that will strengthen its hand regarding the situation in Europe in the peace negotiations.

As the war draws to a close, eastern Europe is almost completely dominated by the Soviet Union. Soviet forces want to gain as much influence as possible in the Balkans and Eastern Europe before dealing the final blow to Germany. In the west of Europe, the Allied forces defeat the German forces with their landings from Normandy Beach (Akřın, 2017).

Although the German retreat was seen as a success for Britain and France, Europe suffered a lot in this war. Although Britain was on the winning side in the war, it could not remain as strong as its allies, the US and the USSR. In an environment where Britain lost power, the task of determining the fate of Europe fell to the US and the USSR (Özdemir et al., 2018).

In the days approaching the end of the war, US President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill agreed to hold a trilateral meeting on the post-war order with the participation of the USSR. Roosevelt and Churchill tried to convince Stalin to attend the talks for a while. Stalin responded to these efforts by saying, "*Doctors do not allow me to go on long trips.*" After a long period of mutual consultations, it was decided to hold the conference in Yalta on the Black Sea coast of the USSR (Gromiko, 2013).

The USA, the USSR and the UK come together in Yalta to lay the foundations of the new world with the decisions they will take together (Akşin, 2017). The US President and the British Prime Minister attended the conference with a large team of 700 people (Ataöv, 2008). This crowd that arrived in Yalta on the Crimean Peninsula was a diplomatic army consisting of soldiers, bureaucrats and translators. The three heads of state and their entourages stayed in three separate palaces during the conference, where they carried out their work and preparations. During the conference, informal meetings also took place from time to time during the negotiations between the parties (Gromiko et al., 2013).

Stalin, as the host of the conference, participated in the negotiations as the leader of the strongest party among the Allies. Stalin holds the power of the Soviet Union, which has Germany cornered and dominates Eastern Europe. In addition, the fact that the negotiations took place on USSR territory strengthened the USSR's hand. Thanks to the information given to him by Russian spies, Stalin knew how to act against Britain and the United States at the conference. Due to his health problems and his wrong predictions about Stalin, US President Roosevelt was the weakest person at the Yalta Conference. Roosevelt saw Stalin as a friend who could serve democracy and world peace (Özdemir et al., 2018).

The parties come to the conference with specific demands and issues on which they will not compromise. For the American delegation, there were two priorities at the conference. Roosevelt's priorities were the establishment of the UN and the immediate end of the war with Japan. Roosevelt sees the existence of an organization that is obliged to ensure international peace and security as mandatory in order to permanently establish peace after the war (Armaoğlu, 2019). With regard to Japan, the US, which wanted to achieve a quick result, hoped to obtain a guarantee at the conference to ensure that the Soviet Union was on its side on this front (Kissinger, 2016). In

addition to these two priorities, the US brought up two other issues during the conference. First, the United States stated that it would pursue a path of friendship and assistance for states that had fallen behind after the war or had suffered great damage in the war. Secondly, the Soviet Union should not pursue a policy of spreading communism in the regions liberated from German occupation (Sarı, 2015).

The British delegation attending the conference also wanted to preserve the power it held before the war (Özdemir et al., 2018). Churchill had a different opinion than Roosevelt about his priorities. Churchill sees the post-war situation of Germany and Poland as important for the future of Europe. Britain prioritized the clarification of the issue of British domination over the Balkan countries and Iran (Armaoğlu, 2019). In addition, Britain came to Yalta with the hope that its ally France, which suffered great damage in World War II, would regain its strength after the war and have a say in world politics again. In addition, Churchill wanted to mitigate the reparations that Stalin planned to receive from Germany in return for his losses in the war (Kissinger, 2016).

Russian history shows that peace after wars is actually seen as a preparatory stage for possible future wars (Hook and Spainer, 2018). The Soviet delegation evaluated the Yalta Conference from this historical perspective and participated in the negotiations with this in mind. Stalin thought that the Soviet Union would compensate for the economic losses it had suffered during the war with the reparations and American aid it planned to demand from Germany. The USSR wanted to take precautions against a possible future invasion from the West (Armaoğlu, 2019). Therefore, it aims to create more spheres of influence in the east of Europe (Özdemir et al., 2018). Considering the ongoing war in Asia as an opportunity, Stalin thought that after a victory against Japan, he would be able to obtain what Japan had and desired to have (Kissinger, 2016).

On the second day of the conference, the parties discussed Germany. Regarding the situation in Germany, Stalin talks about the idea of a divided Germany and this disturbs Churchill. However, Roosevelt, like Stalin, also had the idea of a fragmented Germany. In this regard, the decision was taken to dismember Germany after the war and the Big Three assigned their foreign ministers to draw up a program on the details of this decision (Özen and Kolasi, 2016). Churchill and Roosevelt decided to open an occupation zone for France from their own occupation zones in Germany so that France, which had suffered great destruction in the war, could heal its wounds (Akřın, 2017). While the eastern part of Germany was designated as the occupation zone of the Soviet Union, the northwestern part was to be the occupation zone of the UK and the southwestern part of Germany was to be the occupation zone of the USA. The Big Three stated that the reason for these demands was to restrain the aggressive policies of the Germans and to prevent the world from ever facing a threat from Germany again (Gromiko et al., 2013). With a decision taken later on, Austria was also divided into occupation zones (Ataöv, 2008). The Big Three decided to establish a Berlin-based "Central Control Commission" to monitor their control over Germany (Çelik, 2005).

One of the most important decisions concerning the future of Europe was the "Declaration on a Liberated Europe". With this declaration, it is stated that democratic governments will be established in countries that were satellites of Nazi Germany during or before the war (Armaoğlu, 2019). With this declaration, the Big Three declared that they would act in line with the development of European states and the will of the people to dominate the countries (Çelik, 2005). In this direction, it was also decided to increase the feasibility of free elections in the post-war world (Lefebvre, 2005). It was decided that German war criminals should be tried and that Germany should compensate for the destruction it had caused (Erhan and Özkoç, 2015). With the

Declaration of Liberated Europe, which meant the dominance of free elections and democratic governments in Europe, Stalin made a sacrifice in line with the wishes of his allies (Kissinger, 2016).

One of the issues concerning Germany at the conference was the payment of reparations. The American view on war reparations was that the reparations to be demanded from Germany should not be so heavy as to prevent the development of the German people and should not leave Germany too weak to rebuild (Özen and Kolasi, 2016). Although the Moscow administration was very insistent on the issue of war reparations, Roosevelt and Churchill displayed a more reserved attitude on this issue. Because they were worried that the aggressive behavior of the German people, who had been crushed under the reparations decisions after World War I, would recur. Stalin, on the contrary, intended to crush Germany and demand high reparations (Özdemir et al., 2018). The Soviet Union stated that the amount of reparations that Germany should pay was 20 billion dollars according to their calculations and that half of this amount should be given to the Soviet Union. A different proposal regarding the way the reparations would be made also came to the agenda. The idea of confiscating German industry and taking reparations by using Germany's productive potential was agreed upon by the three great powers. It was decided to conduct a more detailed study on the issue of reparations and to make reparations in line with the decisions to be taken as a result of these studies. In order to realize this goal, a Compensation Commission was established in Moscow. The three major states appointed their representatives to carry out the necessary work in this commission (Gromiko et al., 2018). In other words, the form and amount of reparations to be paid by Germany were postponed to be determined after the Yalta Conference.

When the Polish situation came up at the conference, Stalin said the following: *"For the Russian people, the Polish question is not only*

a matter of honor but also a matter of security. Throughout history, Poland was the corridor through which the enemy passed; Poland is a matter of life and death for Russia." (Özdemir et al., 2018). Stalin stated that Poland should be a strong state on the border of the USSR in order to prevent the Soviet Union from facing such a danger again. After the war, Stalin proposed that Poland's borders should extend to the Oder-Neise rivers in the West and be accepted as the border, and that the Curzon line should be accepted as the eastern border. Churchill and Roosevelt accepted this proposal and the Polish border was agreed upon (Gromiko et al., 2013). At the end of the war, the issue of the administration of Poland caused a dispute between the Allies. The subject of the disagreement was that while the US and the UK proposed the "Polish Government in Exile" in the UK to form a government in Poland, the USSR proposed the government in Lublin (Ataöv, 2008). The Big Three agreed that the current provisional government in Poland should organize a free and democratic election immediately after the end of the war and determine the new government of Poland in this way (Armaoğlu, 2019).

The war was not yet over and the US and Japan continued to fight in the Pacific. The US wanted to end the war with Japan and thought and demanded that the Soviets should also be involved in the war (Akşin, 2017). The Soviets made some demands in Asia against this request of the USA. Stalin wanted the port of Darien and Port Arthur, the Manchurian railroad, Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands. Roosevelt accepted these requests of Stalin with a secret treaty between them (Kissinger, 2016).

When the discussion on international peace and security began, the United Nations was on the agenda. In addition to the decisions taken in previous negotiations on this issue, Stalin wanted to be able to use one vote in the UN for each republic under the sovereignty of the USSR, that is, 16 votes in total. This request was not accepted by the US and Britain, and instead a compromise was reached with the decision to give the Soviets

three votes (Özdemir et al., 2018). With the aim of establishing the United Nations, it was decided to organize a conference in San Francisco, USA on April 25, 1945, and to invite states that had signed the UN Declaration adopted in 1942 or had declared war on Germany and Japan by March 1, 1945 (Gromiko et al., 2013).

One of the issues that the Soviets brought to the agenda at Yalta was the issue of the Straits. On February 10, Stalin expressed his ideas on this issue at the conference and stated that the Montreux Treaty should be reorganized in a different way (Semiz and Akgün, 2007). Roosevelt found Stalin's suggestion justified and approved it. However, Churchill was more skeptical of Stalin's proposal and demanded that Turkey's interests should also be taken into consideration in the decision to be taken (Dokuyan, 2013). Although it was decided to reach a compromise as a result of the meeting between the foreign ministers, the issue of the Straits was left to the Potsdam Conference (Semiz and Akgün, 2007).

At Yalta, Britain and the Soviet Union clashed over the status of Iran. The Soviets, who occupied the north of Iran during World War II, wanted to benefit from the occupied territories after the war, which was not to Britain's liking. This issue was postponed to be discussed later (Armaoğlu, 2019).

Roosevelt thought that he had achieved what he wanted as a result of the conference and hoped that his country would accept the decisions taken (Kissinger, 2016). Roosevelt also believed that peace had been achieved permanently (Sarı, 2015). British Prime Minister Churchill, on the other hand, did not get the results he hoped for from the conference (Armaoğlu, 2019). After the conference, Churchill stated that the USSR was a power threatening world peace. What kept the Big Three together during the war was the struggle against a common enemy. However, with the end of the war in Europe and Asia, differences of opinion began to emerge among the allies and this immediately began to manifest itself with the

end of Yalta (Özdemir et al., 2018). Some issues were not clarified at the Yalta Conference, which was held while the war was still ongoing, and the postponed issues were addressed at the Potsdam Conference.

In the process leading up to Potsdam, a conference was held in San Francisco on April 26, 1945 to establish the United Nations (Şatıroğlu, 2012). In order to join the UN as a founding member, the condition of declaring war on Germany and Japan until the first day of March was set (Göktepe and Seydi, 2015). As a result of the conference, the UN Charter was signed by 51 countries and the organization was officially established. With the establishment of the UN, it was aimed to end global conflicts and create a world where states cooperate (Coşkun, 2012). At the UN, the USA, China, the UK, France and the USSR became permanent members of the Security Council and these states had the right of veto (Hook & Spainer, 2018).

US President Roosevelt dies on April 12, 1945 and Harry Truman becomes the new president (Armaoğlu, 2019). Before the Potsdam Conference, the US and the UK continued their contacts and Churchill sent some letters to Truman and evaluated the process. Stating that he was uncomfortable with the USSR dominating Europe, Churchill stated that it was important for the US to keep its military power in Europe in order to limit the USSR (Özen and Kolasi, 2016).

1.4. Potsdam Conference

The fact that elections were to be held in England in July caused Churchill to adopt a hasty attitude for the conference to be held as soon as possible. Churchill, who had managed Britain's diplomatic traffic throughout the war and was one of the architects of the current state of affairs, endeavored to be present at this conference against the possibility of losing the election (Gromiko et al., 2013). However, Churchill, who lost the election on July 25, could only attend half of the conference (Kissinger, 2016). The US, on the other hand, tried to postpone the conference as

much as possible. Because they wanted to use the nuclear weapons they had acquired as a trump card against the other parties at the conference (Özen and Kolasi, 2016).

Truman, who was a senator in the US at the time when the Germans were fighting against the USSR, expressed his hope that the two ideologies, which he disapproved of, would clash and destroy each other, and declared that the US should support the conflicting sides according to the balance of power in order for the outcome to be as they wanted. However, Truman, who became president after Roosevelt's death, continued to follow Roosevelt's policies by trying to convince Stalin at Potsdam that he was in favor of friendship and peace. At the conference, Churchill aimed to take measures against the growing Soviet threat in Europe, while Stalin took steps to further increase this power (Kissinger, 2016).

When the war is fierce, conferences between the allies are usually aimed at neutralizing the enemy as soon as possible. Therefore, the allies have a more solidaristic attitude. However, after the danger of the enemy subsided in Potsdam, the struggle for gains in the post-war world began among the Allies (Çelik, 2005).

According to the decisions taken on Germany, it was decided that Germany would be a demilitarized country so that it would not be able to revive such militarism again, that the Nazi ideology would be eradicated and that people who committed war crimes would be tried in the court to be established in Nuremberg (Akşın, 2017). At Yalta, it was decided to divide Germany into occupation zones. In Potsdam, it was decided to establish democratic structures in these occupation zones (Armaoğlu, 2019). Although a democratic structure was established in the Western occupation zones, a communist structure called "People's Democracy" was built in the occupation zone of the USSR (Çağrı, 1996).

On the issue of reparations, the US succeeded in getting its demands accepted. As planned by the US, states with occupied territories in Germany

would only be entitled to reparations from their own territories (Kissinger, 2016).

When the issue of Poland's situation came up for discussion at the conference, it was Stalin who wanted to have the most say in the matter. Referring to Poland's government-in-exile in London, Stalin asked his allies not to recognize any legitimate authority other than the provisional government in Poland during the war. He also reiterated his demands that Poland's western borders should extend to the Oder-Neise line. After a long negotiation, the UK and the US accepted Stalin's proposals regarding Poland (Gromiko et al., 2013). At the conferences, Stalin managed to get his demands accepted by the allied states to a great extent and to achieve the gains that would make him a superpower in the post-war world.

The issue of the Straits, which had been postponed to be discussed later at Yalta, was brought up again at Potsdam. The USSR reiterated its demands from Yalta and demanded a new treaty on the status of the Straits, that the authority to make decisions on the Straits should belong to Turkey and the USSR, and that the USSR should have military bases in the Straits for security purposes. On the one hand, the UK and the US rejected these demands, on the other hand, they stated that the decisions to be taken by Turkey and the USSR together should determine the status of the Straits (Semiz and Akgün, 2007).

Regarding the ongoing war in Asia, the Soviets stated that they would join the war against Japan, but the US ended the war before the Soviets were involved. At Yalta, the final decision was taken regarding Iran, whose situation was discussed, and a conclusion was reached regarding the termination of the occupation in the occupied regions of Iran (Armaoğlu, 2019). Spain was not involved in the war, but its relations with Germany and Italy during the war caused it not to be accepted as a member of the UN (Otaç, 2019).

2. Post-War World Analysis of Wartime Diplomacy from the Perspective of Balance of Power, International Cooperation and Hegemony

At the end of the war, the two great dictators Hitler and Mussolini are dead and their ideology, which led Europe to destruction, is destroyed. However, at the end of the war, not all dictators could be destroyed and Stalin, the communist leader of the USSR, remained a dictator who increased his dominance in Eastern Europe. Having led the USSR to victory, this dictator's new goal is to establish a Slavic union in the light of communism. In this way, he aimed to become a state that no one would dare to challenge (Kissinger, 2016).

At the beginning of the 20th century, Europe, the center of power that ruled and guided the world, was devastated by war and this devastation ended Europe's decisive role in world politics (Kissinger, 2016). New centers of power emerged to direct world politics and in the following years, international politics witnessed the struggles between these centers of power.

Diplomatic meetings during World War II played a major role in the establishment of the post-war world order. This process is shaped by the balance of power, international cooperation and the struggle for hegemony.

The term balance of power was particularly important in Britain's foreign policy in the 19th century and became one of Winston Churchill's strategic priorities during World War II. According to the balance of power theory, the distribution of power among the great powers should be equal and the overpowering of one state should be prevented. In post-war Europe, Churchill wanted Germany to cease to be a threat, but he did not want the Soviet Union to gain too much power. Churchill's approach at the Yalta Conference was to create a balance in Europe against Soviet expansionism. This strategy aligned with classical realist theories (Morgenthau, 1948), where states form alliances to counter rising powers. The post-war bipolar system, as later theorized by Waltz

(1979), emerged precisely from this logic: the U.S. and USSR, as two unbalanced poles, neutralized each other's influence through bloc politics (e.g., NATO vs. Warsaw Pact). Churchill's Percentage Agreement thus reflected an ad hoc balance mechanism, not systemic bipolarity – which only crystallized after 1947 (Gaddis, 2005). Stalin's growing influence in Eastern Europe was seen as a threat to Britain's interests. Soviet influence, especially in the Balkans, jeopardized Britain's strategic interests in the Mediterranean. For this reason, Churchill aimed to create a balance in the Balkans, but Stalin opposed British influence in the Balkans. The Percentage Agreement is a concrete example of this balance of power policy. In his negotiations with Stalin, Churchill divided the spheres of influence in Eastern Europe, leaving Greece under British control, while countries like Bulgaria and Romania came under Soviet influence. This agreement can be read as Churchill's attempt to prevent the Soviets from seizing hegemony over the whole of Europe. Discussions on the future of Germany were also shaped by the balance of power perspective. At the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, it was decided that Germany would be dismembered and divided into zones of occupation. Britain opposed the complete crushing of Germany because the destruction of Germany could lead to greater Soviet influence in Europe. Churchill thought that Germany should be kept in check, while Soviet control of much of Europe could upset the balance of power.

The perspective of international cooperation developed under Roosevelt's leadership gains importance especially during the establishment of the United Nations. Roosevelt was driven by an idealistic vision of world order and advocated the establishment of the United Nations as a guarantee of post-war international peace. Roosevelt's vision embodied liberal institutionalism (Keohane, 1984): the UN and Bretton Woods (1944) aimed to embed states in rules-based cooperation. The IMF and Marshall Plan (1948) institutionalized U.S. economic leadership, creating interdependence

to deter conflict (Ikenberry, 2001). This contrasted with Stalin's zero-sum sphere-of-influence approach, revealing a core Cold War tension: liberal order vs. realist spheres (Ruggie, 1982). The foundations of the United Nations were laid with the Atlantic Declaration issued in 1941, and with the participation of the United States, the Allies adopted the "United Nations Declaration". Roosevelt advocated the necessity of the UN as a mechanism to prevent inter-state conflicts and maintain peace in this new international order.

In terms of hegemony, in particular, the Soviet Union's emergence from the war victorious was based on Stalin's strategy to emerge as a superpower in the post-war world. Stalin wanted to establish Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe and secure its borders with the West. The Soviet Union's expansionist policy in Eastern Europe aimed to establish both an ideological and strategic hegemony by increasing Stalin's influence in the region. The cession of western Poland from Germany at Yalta and the ceding of the territory to the Soviet sphere of influence was part of this hegemonic policy. Stalin's security concerns also shaped his policy of hegemony. He saw Poland as a "security corridor" and therefore argued that Poland's borders should be shifted to the west. Moreover, the dismemberment and weakening of Germany was seen as necessary to prevent the Soviet Union from facing any future Western threat. Soviet pressure on Germany is a clear manifestation of the struggle for hegemony. However, this term requires nuance. Gramscian hegemony (Cox, 1983) implies ideological consent, whereas Stalin's control relied on coercion. The U.S.-USSR rivalry was better characterized as a balance-of-power conflict, since neither achieved true hegemony – a status requiring economic-cultural dominance (e.g., U.S. post-1991) (Gilpin, 1981). Stalin wanted to drastically reduce Germany's production capacity and dismantle its industry. This was a move to prevent Germany from posing a threat to the Soviet Union and to ensure that the USSR remained the strongest military power in Europe. The beginning of the

Cold War can be seen as a natural consequence of this struggle for hegemony. Stalin's influence in Eastern Europe was perceived as a threat by the US and Western Europe and a power struggle between these two blocs began. The expansionist policies of the Soviet Union led the West to try to balance the Soviets and a bipolar world order emerged.

3. Conclusion

The Second World War starts in Europe but turns into an event that affects the whole world. The expansionist and aggressive actions of Germany and Italy pose a threat to the future of the world. The Nazis in Germany and the Fascists in Italy are the ideological fanatics at the center of this threat. As the problem grew with the expansion of the fronts of the war, when it reached the stage of a clash of great powers, plans for the future of the world were being made while the war was still in progress. Forming an allied front against Germany and Italy, the US, the USSR and the UK cooperate first to ensure their own security, then to stop German and Italian expansionism and to root out their ideological obsessions that have turned Europe into a wasteland.

Britain and the Soviet Union are fighting a fierce battle against Nazi Germany in Europe, while the United States is fighting the Japanese in the Pacific Ocean. Britain was in a very difficult situation against the Germans, and without the help of the Allies, the country's security could not be ensured. Winston Churchill, the leader who was tasked with leading Britain through this difficult period, was convinced that a decisive victory over the common enemy was essential to ensure the security of his country. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was pushed back by the German attacks into the interior of Russia and the war continued for a long time in the form of fighting in the interior of Russia without any results. At the end of the war, the Soviet Union, which suffered more than 20 million casualties, became the most important actor in the defeat of the Germans. The USSR managed to repel the Germans as far as

Berlin, and this success ensured that Soviet leader Stalin, who had trapped the Nazis, would be in a strong position in the negotiations between the victors of the war. The US, on the other hand, clashed with the Japanese in the Pacific and with the Germans, initially in the Atlantic and later in continental Europe. The US, which suffered the least damage in the war compared to Britain and the USSR, became the state most eager to determine the post-war world order.

In the negotiations held during the war, US President Roosevelt took a more idealistic approach, seeing international control as essential for the establishment of a lasting peace and pushing for the establishment of the United Nations. The person whose support Roosevelt most wanted to see in the UN was Soviet leader Stalin. Roosevelt, who had positive and sincere thoughts about Stalin, thought that he would receive the necessary support and sincerity from the Soviet leader and shaped his policies with these thoughts. However, Stalin approached the war and the post-war order with a more realist perspective and participated in the negotiations with these realist wishes and plans. Stalin's idea was that the Soviet Union should create a security ring over as large a territory as possible and have an area of power and dominance to the extent that no one would ever attempt to attack again. At the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, he wanted to dominate or control strategically important areas in Asia and Europe, which shows that Stalin acted with classical realist thinking.

British Prime Minister Churchill wanted his country and Europe, weakened by the war against the Germans, to recover and rebuild Europe as the world's center of power. Churchill saw Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe as dangerous and worried that the USSR would threaten the lasting peace after the war. Churchill had the idea of reestablishing the Vienna Order of 1815 in Europe, but he thought that the Soviets, whom he saw as a threat to the balance of power he wanted to create in Europe, would prevent this.

As a result of the conferences held by the parties with these thoughts in mind, the common enemy was defeated and the danger of Naziism in Germany and Fascism in Italy was eliminated. However, this time, conflicts started between the victors of the war. While the Moscow and Tehran Conferences held in the years when the war was raging were more conciliatory and moderate in their approach to mutual demands, the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences held in the phase when the war was going to be concluded in favor of the Allied states became the meetings where discussions took place between the demands of each of the Big Three and their world designs.

At the end of the war and the negotiations, two powers become decisive in world politics. However, instead of being reconciling powers, these powers became contending powers with opposing views and ideologies. This new power struggle, in which the US and the USSR were the parties, had a different form than the struggles and conflicts between the great powers seen in the world before, and this new struggle between the great powers was called the "Cold War".

Wartime diplomacy had a profound impact on international relations, with the assumption that it would build a post-war world order. The Atlantic Declaration, published in 1941 by US President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill, laid the foundations of the United Nations by encouraging post-war political and economic cooperation and aiming for a Wilsonian idealism. Following this declaration, the Allied powers adopted the "Declaration of the United Nations" on January 1, 1942, thus taking the steps towards the establishment of the organization. With the first coming together of Britain, the US, the USSR and China (called the "Four Gendarmes of the World") at the Moscow Conference (1943), the shaping of the post-war order and their participation in the international organization to be established became clear. At the Tehran Conference (1943), Roosevelt presented an organizational model that

envisioned the organization to be a global power and to operate under the supreme authority and control of Britain, the US, China and the Soviet Union; these ideas were not rejected by any party. At Dumbarton Oaks (1944), these four states agreed on the necessity of an international organization to ensure permanent international peace and security, and the UN founding charter was adopted, but the decision-making process of the Security Council was postponed to Yalta. The Yalta Conference (1945) further strengthened these foundations and prepared the ground for the establishment of the United Nations and the future administration of Germany and Poland. At the San Francisco Conference (1945), the United Nations Charter was signed by 51 countries, and the organization was officially established, and the USA, China, England, France and the USSR became permanent members of the Security Council with veto power. Roosevelt's idealistic vision ensured that this organization was established as a mechanism to guarantee international peace.

Wartime diplomacy led to significant shifts in the balance of power and the formation of new global structures. The emergence of the USA and the USSR as superpowers in particular enabled them to become the decisive actors of post-war world politics. During this process, the different priorities and ideologies of the leaders deeply influenced the post-war reconstruction and peacekeeping approaches. Roosevelt displayed an idealistic approach, focusing on the establishment of the United Nations, considering international control as essential for lasting peace. He also attempted to establish a global economic system by establishing the economic leadership of the USA with the Bretton Woods system (1944). In contrast, Stalin acted with a more realistic perspective, prioritizing the interests and security of the Soviet Union. His aim was to create as wide a security belt as possible and to create an area of power and hegemony in Eastern Europe. British Prime Minister Churchill, on the other hand, aimed to create a balance of power

in Europe, as in the 19th century, to eliminate Germany as a threat but to prevent the Soviet Union from becoming too powerful. These different approaches led to tensions, especially at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, on issues such as Germany's situation, Poland's borders and reparations.

Bibliography

- Akřın, S. (2017). *Kısa 20. yüzyıl tarihi*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Armaoğlu, F. (2019). *20. yüzyıl siyasi tarihi (1914–1995)*. Kronik Kitap.
- Ataöv, T. (2008). *2. Dünya Savaşı*. İleri Yayınları.
- Cořkun, İ. (2012). San Francisco sonrası dünya. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3(12), 17–21.
- Cox, R. W. (1983). Gramsci, hegemony, and international relations. *Millennium*, 12(2), 162–175.
- Çelik, E. (2005). *II. Dünya Savaşı sonrası Avrupa’da barışı kurma ve sürdürme çabaları* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Dokuyan, S. (2013). İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında Sovyetler Birliği’nin Türkiye’den istekleri. *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, 18, 119–135.
- Erhan, Ç. (1996). Avrupa’nın intiharı ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında temel sorunlar. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 51(1), 259–273.
- Erhan, Ç., & Özkoç, Ö. (2015). Yirminci yüzyılda uluslararası siyaset. In A. Balcı & Ş. Kardaş (Eds.), *Uluslararası ilişkilere giriş* (ss. 33–55). Küre Yayınları.
- Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The cold war: A new history*. Penguin.
- Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and change in world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Göktepe, C., & Seydi, S. (2015). Soğuk Savaş başlangıcında Türk dış politikası. *Bilig*, 72, 197–222.
- Gromiko, A. A., et al. (2013). *Uluslararası ilişkiler tarihi (Diplomasi tarihi)* 5 (A. R. Dırık, Çev.). Evrensel Basım Yayın.
- Hook, S., & Spanier, J. (2018). *Amerikan dış politikası: İkinci Dünya Savaşı’ndan günümüze*. İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2001). *After victory: Institutions, strategic restraint, and the rebuilding of order after major wars*. Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Kissinger, H. (2016). *Diplomasi*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Kissinger, H. (2016). *Dünya düzeni*. Boyner Yayınları.
- Lefebvre, M. (2005). *Amerikan dış politikası*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Mazower, M. (2015). *Dünyayı yönetmek*. Alfa Yayınları.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations*. Knopf.
- Otaç, T. (2019). İkinci Dünya Savaşı’nda müttefik konferansları ve Türkiye için önemi. *Genel*

Türk Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1(1), 97-126.

Özen, Ç., & Kolasi, K. (2016). ABD'nin Almanya politikası ve yapısal belirleyenler: Savaş sonrası güç asimetrisi ve hegemonik düzen inşası. *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 15(2), 125-160.

Özcan, A. A. (2020, Mayıs 24). *Soğuk Savaş dönemi: Başlangıcı, gelişimi, sonu*. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/13723063/Soğuk_Savaş_Dönemi_Başlangıcı_Gelişimi_Sonu

Özdemir, M., Çalışkan, S., & Öztürk, F. (2018). Yalta Konferansı: Soğuk Savaşa giden yol. *Barış Araştırmaları ve Çatışma Çözümleri Dergisi*, 5(2), 62-79.

Öztürk, E. (2020, Mayıs 24). *İkinci Dünya Savaşı ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri*. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/16827039/İkinci_Dünya_Savaşı_ve_ABD

Sarı, Ç. (2015). Türk basınında Yalta Konferansı. *Belgi Dergisi*, 9, 1230-1246.

Semiz, Y., & Akgün, B. (2007). Dostluktan krize: İkinci Dünya Savaşı sürecinde Türk-Rus ilişkileri. *Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(14), 239-270.

Şatıroğlu, A. (2006). San Francisco Konferansı sonrası dünyada Türkiye'nin yer arayışı. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3(12), 23-40.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.