CHAPTER I

THE CONCEPT OF CONFLICT AND PEACE
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Conflict and Peace as concepts are significant in developing an understanding of the fabrics of inter-relationships among nations and groups of people, both organised and unorganised in nature. They rest on human values and peoples' perception and behaviour. Process responsible for one, with a little change may lead to another. Much is being written on these two concepts and their impacts on international relations. This chapter endeavours to analyse and develop the conceptual framework for "conflict" and "peace", their typologies, inter-relationship and role in the contemporary international relations. It is, therefore, essential to divide the chapter into two main parts: (A) the concept of conflict, and (B) the concept of peace - for having an indepth analysis.

(A) The Concept of Conflict

The available literature in social sciences makes it discernible that there have been sustained efforts designed to acquire scientific knowledge about "conflict". There exists countless generalizations, hypotheses and theories in many disciplines (of social sciences) on "conflict". During the last four decades, "conflict"
has been the subject of serious academic discussion and a pertinent force was placed by starting a multidisciplinary journal in 1957 on the subject

The editorial in the first issue of the Journal of Conflict Resolution, while espousing for general theory of "conflict" focused on:

... conflict, which is perhaps the key concept in international relations... is a phenomenon studied in many different fields by sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, economists, and by political scientists. It occurs in many different situations among members of a family, between labour and management, between political parties, and even within a single mind, as well as among nations. Many of the patterns and processes which characterize conflict in one area also characterize it in other areas.... It is not too much to claim that out of the contributions of many fields a general theory of conflict is emerging. The isolation of these various fields, however, has prevented the building of their contributions into an integrated whole...(3)


2. A multidisciplinary journal, Journal of Conflict Resolution has had its inaugural issue in March 1957 published by the Centre for research on Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan, Michigan, USA and is quarterly in character.

It also implies that a specialized concentration on a given type of conflict could lead to the neglect of certain facts or principles which are necessary for the proper understanding of that kind of conflict. Thus the scientific worth of a general theory lies in its ability to provide greater understanding of each particular kind of conflict within a generalised framework.

However, this general theory of conflict is disputed by some writers who are of the view that several kinds of conflict could not be treated in a single empirical domain and framework. It is further argued that the general theory overlooks the crucial aspects of each particular type of conflict. Hager, Glock and Chein4 have expressed that the religious conflicts cannot be understood in the same framework as racial and ethnic conflicts as espoused by Robin Williams.5 They further add that there are fundamental peculiarities between the religious conflicts on the one hand and racial and ethnic conflicts on the other.


Similar view has been expressed by M. Janowitz. According to him the phenomenon of war can be analysed under the general theory of conflict because there are peculiar traits of nation-states and their military institutions which call for a detailed analysis and general theories of conflict do not provide such framework. While contradicting the general theory, these writers opined that a special theory for a given kind of conflict can provide better understanding of the relevant phenomenon as compared to the general theory. Thus the advocates of specialist theory opine that true knowledge about war or about religious conflict can be derived by comprehending the unique traits peculiar to each class of phenomenon rather than through general theory.

The specialist theory if pursued in detail becomes closer to idiographic approach to knowledge which is called by Kurt Singer as "true knowledge is of particulars". This view is further supported by Raymond Aron when he argued that war is best studied by historical sociology rather than by theoretical sociology because each war is


a peculiar configuration of diverse and not necessarily repeatable elements. Accordingly, each conflict would have to be analysed in its own right from a historical or clinical viewpoint. However, according to Clinton F. Fink, the specialist theory or idiographic approach to conflict is also not satisfactory. He opines that "once one admits the possibility of a special theory for one class of conflict phenomena, the entire discussion is shifted into a nomothetic framework, since even the most limited special theory aims to generalize about properties shared by all instances of a given type". Thus he prefers the general theory of conflict.

Besides the advocates of general theory and specialist theory, there is another group of writers who make a case for a "Middle Range Theory" to which Fink calls "The Gradualist Argument". Rolf Dahrendorf and Robert K. Merton are the leading exponents of this theory.


10. Ibid.
However Dahrendorf concedes that a general theory of conflict is an essential component of a comprehensive theory of society. But at the same time he does not feel the need for constructing a general theory. For him, the sociological theory of conflict "would do well to confine itself for the time being to an explanation of the frictions between the rulers and the ruled in given social structural organizations".\textsuperscript{11} His surmise is based on Merton's view that empirically testable "theories of Middle Range"\textsuperscript{12} are the immediate task of sociological research. Thus Dahrendorf asserts that a theory of class conflict is a "middle range theory".\textsuperscript{13}

Dahrendorf and Merton’s advocacy of Middle Range Theory is based on a broadly "inductivist" image of scientific progress where in the more general levels of theoretical integration are attained gradually. However,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} For details see, Robert K. Merton, \textit{Social Theory and Social Structure} (Glencoe, 1957). Also see his, \textit{On Theoretical Sociology} (New York, 1967).
\item \textsuperscript{13} Ralf Dahrendorf, \textit{Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society} (Stanford, 1959), p. x.
\end{itemize}
the concept of "Middle Range Theory" is somewhat ambiguous. Merton himself concedes this when he writes that such theories are "sufficiently abstract to deal with differing spheres of social behaviour and social structure, so that they transcend sheer description or empirical generalisation". Thus one can agree with Fink that a theory of conflict is obviously not a general system of sociology and "a general theory of social conflict would be an example par excellence of a 'Middle Range Theory'.

Besides these, other theories have appeared in recent years, covering such phenomena as community controversies, international conflict, revolution war and revolution or intra-organization conflict.

As none of these theories have been tested adequately and each theory is an effort to organize scattered findings

15. Fink, n.9, p. 415.
or to improve upon previous theories covering the same class of phenomena render them vulnerable to acceptance.

Thus there is a strong case for the adequacy of general theory of conflict. The need for a general theory becomes more acute because of the inherent difficulties in identifying the domain of special theories, dependence of specialist theory on the general theory and conceptual and terminological confusions in other theories. 21

Towards Definition

The definition of the term "conflict" is subject to the theories of conflict. The literature on conflict is replete with a great diversity of terms and concepts. The theories analysed supra differ widely in their definitions and usage of such terms as "conflict", "competition, tensions, disputes, antagonism, quarrel, disagreement, controversy, violence, etc. Such a situation is aptly assessed by Biddle and Thomas who while analysing the role

21. For detailed analysis see Fink, n.9, pp. 417-429.
of conceptual framework in the theory have opined that one is encountered with a bewildering profusion of labels and ideas and a disconcerting absence of agreement among experts concerning the definitions of terms. They have further added:

... when the ideas are examined closely... they will not be found to comprise a complete inventory, nor will all be denotatively precise. These problems of thought. Imprecise terms lead to fuzzy thinking, and a limited battery of concepts means that an arbitrarily selected portion of the world will be set apart for analysis with the remainder being ignored. Theory, research and application alike are adversely affected by these problems of language.

The various definitions on conflict advanced by different writers suffer with conceptual and terminological diversities. The term "conflict" owes its derivation to Latin confligere which means to strike together and to clash. A detailed analysis of these definitions is uncalled for. As we have accepted the General Theory of Conflict as being adequate for the purpose of the present study, hence a definition identified with this theory is


23. Ibid.
viable as well as tenable. Thus Clinton F. Fink has defined conflict "as any social situation or process in which two or more social entities are linked by at least one form of antagonistic psychological relation or at least one form of antagonistic interaction". The term "antagonism" used in this definition is quite comprehensive to cover other terms proximate to "conflict". Fink further adds that it is a disjunctive definition which subsumes any form of social antagonism, thus making the theory of conflict equivalent to a theory of antagonistic social relations in general and strongly implying the need to develop a systematic classification of these phenomena as an essential supplement to the definition.

Conflict and War

The terms "conflict" and "war" are generally used interchangeably. The Military Balance and other publications of the London based International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS), have frequently used both terms interchangeably. David Wood has shown the interchangeability of the term "conflict" and "war". According to him:

...... a conflict is a situation where no regular forces of a country or community are involved (either on both sides or on one side only) and

24. Fink, n. 9, p. 456.
25. Ibid.
where weapons of war used by them intent to
kill or wound over a period of at least one
hour; the identification of the term conflict
with war is strengthened by the classification
based on the definition, where civil riots (only
police or para-military forces involved),
mutinies and coup d'etat (force is not used),
as well as unopposed movement of military forces
into the territory of a foreign country are not
included. (26)

The Oxford Dictionary defines "conflict" as "fight, struggle,
collision or clashing and opposed principles". (27) It defines
the term "war" as "quarrel usually between nations conducted
by force, state of open hostility and suspension of ordinary
international law prevalent during such quarrel, military or
(aire or naval attack or series of attacks." (28)

It can be surmised that except for the use of force,
the terms "conflict" and "war" are very proximate to each
other. War entails the use of force. In other words, it
can be assumed that a conflict involving the use of force
turns into war. According to Quincy Wright:

War, in the ordinary sense, is a conflict among
political groups, especially sovereign states,
carried on by armed forces of considerable
magnitude for a considerable period of time. (29)

26. David Wood, Conflict in the Twentieth Century,

27. Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English,

28. Ibid., p. 1444.

29. Quincy Wright, "War", International Encyclopaedia
Besides, conflict is a more generic term than war. As Withey and Katz have opined:

Wars and lesser struggles between nations are in their nature conflicts between organized structures. (30)

However, in all general schemes of conflict, war is seen as an extreme form. There is no generally agreed method of classifying conflicts, and the range of proposals made suggests the variety of basic approaches to an understanding of the nature of war. (31) As the main thrust of the present chapter is to analyse linkages between conflict and peace and thus to suggest how peace can be maintained by resolving the conflict, the interchangeability of terms "conflict and war" would be understood in succeeding pages to trace out the genesis of endeavours made for reduction of war possibilities and thus brightening the prospects of war.

At this juncture it deems appropriate to briefly analyse the Soviet and Western especially the US perceptions about the general theory of conflict. As has been analysed in the preceding pages, the western including American scholars have tried to develop a general theory of conflict


with a view to explain some essential features of war, especially on its outbreak.

However, the Soviet scholars regard attempts to create a general theory of conflict, including war as both impossible and undesirable. The contention of the Soviet scholars to treat the undesirability of developing a general theory of conflict is based on the main contention that the inclusion of a multitudes of sources, causes, factors and such like conditions affecting the occurrence of a different kinds of conflicts would result in equating the primary with the secondary and direct with the remote. Such a situation would render it impossible to identify the primary roots of social conflict.\(^{32}\) According to Soviet scholar, A. Filyov, what is basically wrong is the very attempt to reduce causes of such an intricate phenomenon as war to the correlation of power.

Initially this position rests on the nation which struck root in the bourgeois science that wars the inevitable, that the aggressiveness of all states is imminent and is displayed every time a definite co-relation of their power makes it possible.... An approach to the problem with the only intention of the correlation of material power, for all its importance, makes it impossible to disclose the true origins of wars, their economic social and ideological roots and leads to wrong conclusions.\(^{33}\)

---


33. A. Filyov, "In the Labirnth of Numbers", *International Affairs* (Moscow), No.7, July 1974, p. 147.
The Soviet scholars argue that the purpose of incorporating war into a general theory of conflict is to misdirect the attention of the masses from the real sources of conflicts and wars, namely imperialism. Thus, in other words, they believe in specialist theory and middle range theory of the conflict. It emerges from the foregoing analysis that there is a difference of approach towards the theory of conflict and war between the Western scholars and Soviet scholars. This diversity of approach at the theoretical level affects the structural and functional approach as well.

Causes of Conflict

Cause-effect relationship is as old as the history of civilization. Every cause has an effect and vice-versa. The occurrence of a conflict or war can take place because of a particular cause or due to sumtotal of various causes. Robert Strausz-Hupe and Stefan T. Possony have identified ten major causes which can lead to the occurrence of conflict between the countries.

These are as follows:

(i) Difference in the mental outlook
(ii) Psychological differences
(iii) Difference in the social structure
(iv) Cultural differences
(v) Population pressures
(vi) Economic issues
(vii) Territorial claims
(viii) Political differences
(ix) Security interests
(x) Aggressive designs

Though these causes were identified by Strausz-Hupe and Possony in the late 1940s in the aftermath of the second war, yet they have not lost their strategic significance in the contemporary international relations. However, of these, the first five causes have almost little role to generate international conflict whereas the other five are potential factors for generating conflict. These are analysed in the succeeding pages.

(i) Differences in the Mental Outlook

Strausz-Hupe and Possony are of the view that conflict can occur between the two countries on account of differences in their mental outlook, especially in one of the two attempts to impose upon the other its ideas — political ideologies — as the dominant ones. This


35. Ibid., p. 27.
factor is a very close to the "political differences" hence its analysis in the succeeding pages.

(ii) psychological Differences

Strausz-Hupe and Possony are of the view that psychological differences like fear, hatred, arrogance as divergent manners and customs can be instrumental in envisaging misunderstandings which could generate into conflict.36 This factor still holds validity in the contemporary international relations. The sense and fear from each other, mutual hatred, mutual suspicion etc., between the two countries can certainly lead to conflict. The period of Cold War which was inaugurated in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War had witnessed the psychological differences between the United States and the Soviet Union being contributory in escalating the tensions between the two.

In case of India and Pakistan, the factor of psychological differences have been degenerated into conflict on some occasions. The Pakistan's leadership especially under President Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Z. A. Bhutto whipped up "a pathological hatred towards India to entrench itself

36. Ibid.
in power". president Ayub during his presidency enjoyed the "reluctant support" of Pakistani people mainly because of the "fear and suspicion of India which however ill justified, still seems to be shared by the vast majority of Pakistanis." Thus the psychological differences do constitute one of the causes leading to the occurrence of conflict.

(iii) Differences in the Social Structure

According to Strausz-Hupe and Passony, "Differences in the social structure evoke opposition as a result of the apprehension on the part of one state about the security of its own social organization." This has been evidenced from the Iran-Iraq war, Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and even during the Cold War period, the "McCarthyism" stance in the US policy towards Soviet Union and People's Republic of China.

(iv) Cultural Differences

The cultural differences crop up when one culture - the sway of language, a literature and a "national style"
--- is more dynamic than the other and when there are cultural minorities in either one of the countries. The cultural differences between the two wings of Pakistan, prior to the emergence of Bangladesh as per independent country in December 1971, had led to the degeneration of conflict between the then East Pakistan (Now Bangladesh) and West Pakistan (now known as Pakistan). This factor was highlighted by Abul Mausur Ahmad in his speech before the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan:

the language, the tradition, the culture, the costume, the customs, the dietary, the calendar, the standard time, practically everything, is different. There is in fact, nothing common in the two wings, particularly in respect of those which are the *sine qua non* to form a nation.(41)

The cultural differences between the two wings of Pakistan led to frequent recurrence of conflict within the political and social system of Pakistan and which coupled with other factors led to its dismemberment in December 1971.

Some writers who support the theory of "mutual differences" as the cause leading to conflict or war have expressed the view that certain cultures tend to generate more aggressiveness than others. According to their culture

---

40. Ibid.

differences between socio-political units can obstruct communication, give rise to suspicions and misrepresentations of each others intentions which ultimately could lead to wars.\textsuperscript{42} Some scholars have argued that similar cultural interests can also lead to conflict. Malinowski is of the view that the essence of war or conflict is a clash between the cultures in the form of independent tribes or nations.\textsuperscript{43} He defines war as an armed contest between independent political units, by means of organized military force in the pursuit of a tribal or national policy.\textsuperscript{44} However, this is an anthropological interpretation of conflict or war.

(v) **Population Pressure**

Some writers, who are called neo-Malthusians, are of the view that overpopulation can be fundamental cause of violence, or conflict and war. According to them, the struggle for a material base sufficient for the satisfaction of human needs can take the form of war or might be carried out by means of war.\textsuperscript{45} Some scholars have even suggested

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, vol.II (second edn.), (Chicago, 1965), p. 1231.
\item \textsuperscript{43} For details see, Bronislaw Malinowski, "An Anthropological Analysis of War", *American Journal of Sociology* (New York, 1941), pp. 38-52.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{45} For details see, W.M.S. Russell, *Violence, Monkeys and Man* (London, 1968).
\end{itemize}
that war can fulfil two fold functions: it may provide the victor with needed space and resources and at the same time help alleviate the burden of population which the given resources must support. The main objection raised against this cause is that the problem of over population has been tackled by different countries even in the absence of war-like activity and hence it is not the only option.

(vi) Economic Issues

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, there has appeared voluminous literature devoted to the economic factors influencing the outbreak of wars. Accordingly, wars occur between the countries because their respective societies have conflicting economic interests which they try to advance or project. Peter Weellenstein holds that "... the most constant cause of war is the determination of a people to raise national living standards or to protect existing standards". The supporters of the non-Marxists theories of imperialism as a source of war contend that war between two countries can break because of the influence

47. Lider, n. 31, p. 13.
of powerful economic groups who profit by war. J.A. Hobson denounced the "financial capitalism" for organizing wars for economic reasons. He opined that "imperialism was the use of the machinery of government by private interests, mainly capitalists to secure for their economic gains outside their country." 49

Richard J. Barnett in his study which analyze the socio-economic roots of war, has recognized three causes of wars waged by the United States during the present century -- the pressure of the capitalist economy toward economic expansion and military presence abroad, the concentration of power in a national security bureaucracy and the vulnerability of the public to manipulation on national security issues. 50

This approach appears to be one-sided. War is a complete phenomenon to which are attached various dimensions and causes. As Lider has pointed out:

of economic interests is not a sufficient condition for war since such conflicts can also be resolved in other ways. (50a)


(vi) **Territorial Claims on Boundary Disputes**

Territorial claims or boundary disputes constitute one of the most potent cause of conflict between two countries. "Territory may be disputed on historic, economic, demographic, ethnic, military aid and numerous other grounds." The problem of territorial claims or boundary disputes are very common in contemporary international relations. It has assumed serious dimensions especially after the emergence of new states after decolonization. The colonial powers were concerned with the political and economic exploitation of the colonies and thus imposed their own boundaries. However when these colonies attained independence especially after the second world war, the new boundaries cut across the ethnic lines and traditional land holdings, leading to territorial claims and counter claims.

This problem is very common in most of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Even in the South and South-West Asia this problem is prominent. India has border disputes with Pakistan and China; Pakistan-Afghanistan, Iran-Iraq, Arab-Israel are some of the glaring examples of the region where border disputes have frequently led to conflicts and wars.

51. Strausz-Hupe and Possony, n.34, p. 23.
(vii) **Political Differences**

Strausz-Hupe and Possony are of the view that "political disputes arise if the objectives of the two states are not compatible (the maintenance of status quo versus the change of status quo) or of their political systems (dictatorship versus democracy) differ and one deems itself threatened, potentially or actually by the other." ⁵³

This factor has assumed the connotation of super power rivalry in the contemporary international relations. Soviet Union heads one bloc—called Eastern bloc and the United States heads the Western bloc. Both super powers have patronised military alliances. The Soviet Union and its allies have the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) founded in 1959 and the United States and its allies founded North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. Both these super powers and other respective allies have different political and economic systems. They are the main contestants for winning new spheres of influence" in the Third World. According to Paul Keal, "a sphere of influence is a determinate region within which a single external power exerts a predominant influence, which limits the independence or freedom of action of political entities within it." ⁵⁴

---

⁵³ Strausz-Hupe and Possony, n. 34, p. 23.

Both the super powers have been vying with each other to win new "spheres of influence" in the Third World. The detailed analysis follows in succeeding pages. It is suffice here to say that political differences do lead to a conflict.

(ix) **Security Interests**

Each country is conscious of or is alive to its security interests. As Strausz-Hupe and Passony have opined: "The Security interests of states may lead into conflict by many routes: armaments may call for counter-armaments, troop movements for counter troop movements and the conclusion of foreign alliances for counter-alliances", one country can perceive threat to its security from the neighbouring countries. As Quincy Wright has observed, that during the early years succeeding the second world war, "many people on both sides of the iron curtain were obsessed by the fear that the government on either side was determined to attack or subvert them that war might be necessary to their survival... the arms race resulting from these perceived threats tended to augment fear on each side..."56

The concept of perceived threat has played a dominant role in South Asia especially in the Indian sub-continent.

55. Strausz-Hupe and Passony, n. 34, p. 28.
The strained relations between India and Pakistan since 1947 have mainly been determined by the fear psychosis between the two countries. India chose to become a leading exponent of non-aligned during the 1950s, cultivating self-reliance. Pakistan, on the other hand, saw American containment policies against the Soviet Union as an opportunity to increase its military strength against India and thus joined the US sponsored military alliances like SEATO and CENTO. The flow of cheap or free U.S. arms to Pakistan between 1954 and 1965 did not help and rather hindered Pakistan's domestic security and it "exacerbated tensions and hostility between India and Pakistan".

Thus the differing approach to security interests between the countries can also lead to conflict.

(x) **Aggressive Designs**

According to Strausz-Hupe and Possony, a state may harbour aggressive designs against another state on which can lead to a conflict. The aggressive designs to be harboured by a country against another country can be governed


59. Strausz-Hupe and Possony, n. 34, p. 28.
by factors like boundary disputes, political differences etc., which have been analysed in the preceding pages. Quincy Wright holds that continued disorder and poverty or the failure of economic planning inspired by revolution as in the case of China, can also make some government's develop aggressive designs against their neighbours.⁶⁰

These are the main factors which contribute to conflict - sometimes one factor or combination of other factors can lead to the exacerbation of tension resulting in an open war.

(B) The Concept of Peace

The attainment and maintenance of international peace and security is the upper most objective of world community like the United Nations and each member country is enjoined upon to help the UN fulfil this objective.

The global concern for peace is so prominent that the charter of the United Nations and the constitution of UNESCO have also laid emphasis on "Peace". Article 1(1) of the UN Charter envisages as the purposes of the UN "to maintain international peace and security and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention

---

⁶⁰. Quincy Wright, n. 56, p. 1460. Also see John Dollard, Frustration and Aggression (New Haven, 1939).
and removal of threats to the peace..."\(^6\) Similarly the purposes of the UNESCO are "to contribute to peace and security in the world by promoting collaboration among nations through education, science, culture and communication..."\(^6\)

Thus it becomes evident from this that peace is the most cherished goal.

**Definition of Peace**

The term "peace" has been defined differently by scholars and statesmen. The major religious and philosophies of the world also emphasize on the attainment and maintenance of peace. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines the term "peace" as "freedom from cessation of war, treaty of peace between two powers of war, treaty of peace between two powers at war, and freedom from civil disorder."\(^6\) This implies that peace can be achieved by: (i) ending the war, and (ii) means of a treaty between the two countries which were at war. The second part seems to be a corollary of the first part. In other words, it can be said that the peace can be achieved by ending the war.

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 358.

According to Rudolf Pannwitz: "We may have all possible reasons against war - but how does this help us when we are unable to say what peace is, can be, shall be". In other words, Pannwitz opines that there are main dilemmas that needed to be tackled before a relationship between war and peace are clarified. These are: (i) to determine the true nature of peace as experienced currently as in the past; (ii) to ascertain what kind of peace can be achieved practically in the future; (iii) to define the character of the ideal kind of peace which ought ultimately to be realized. Thus Pannwitz conceives peace in three senses - the empirical, the practicable and the ideal.

Quincy Wright regards peace as "the condition of a community in which order and justice prevail, internally among its members and externally in its relations with other communities". Similarly, Prof. Robert Walder refers to the lasting peace which "may be called the peace of mutual recognition of rights".


Some social scientists have conceived peace as "non war" or "warlessness". Leo Hamon and Jules Moch have defined peace in terms of warlessness. This approach has been criticized by Johan Galtung who is of the view that such an approach has had a residency "to become utopia and to be oriented towards the future, it has been speculative and value contaminated rather than analytical and empirical." Thus Galtung envisaged two concepts of peace - Negative Peace and Positive Peace. He defines Negative Peace as "the absence of organized violence between such major human groups as nations, but also between racial and ethnic groups because of the magnitude that can be reached by internal wars". And positive peace is "a pattern of cooperation and integration between major human groups".


70. Ibid.

71. Ibid.
Johan Galtung provides further elaboration of these two concepts of peace that led to a fourfold classification:

(i) War - which is organized group violence;

(ii) Negative Peace - where there is no violence but no other form of interaction either and where best characterization is 'peaceful coexistence';

(iii) Positive Peace - where there is some cooperation interspersed with occasional outbreaks of violence;

(iv) Unqualified Peace - where absence of violence is combined with a pattern of cooperation. (72)

The above can be analysed as the elimination of war is the ultimate goal (and which is akin to unqualified peace). In order to attain this goal, the first stage to be a Heinea is that of negative peace and positive peace. The elimination of war or attainment of unqualified peace is the long term ultimate objective which is desirable. Thus the attainment of negative peace as the first step leading to the positive peace are short term objectives which belong to the realm of possibility. Since the attainment of desirable objective is difficult in the immediate future, an attempt to achieve the possible is the only alternative. (73)

Thus on the basis of the above analysis, it deems appropriate to define the concept of peace as the absence

72. Ibid.
73. This idea is borrowed from Mahendra Kumar, Current Peace Research and India (Varanasi, 1968) p. 6.
of violence and any sort of violent interaction which subsequently leads to cooperation between the two countries.

Approaches to Peace

The urgency and need for peace arises in the wake of ever constant threat of war and conflict. The rapid proliferation of nuclear weapons has further enhanced the sense of insecurity among nations. The available literature on international relations abounds with thousands of proposals of alternatives to war and of approaches to peace. Bulk of these peace proposals are utopian and impracticable. Some lay emphasis on tackling the causes of the war, others attach significance to methods of peaceful settlement of international disputes, still others concentrate on the development of various types of security systems etc. Most of these approaches are based on simple formulae calling for the improvement in the existing system and some seek to replace the existing system with some form of world government or other alternatives. According to Palmer and Perkins, the following three approaches are recognized as more acceptable approaches to peace - the

74. Even during the second World War years such proposals were given serious thought. See Edith Wynner and Georges Loyd, *Searchlight on Peace Plans* (Dutton, 1944).

Institutional Approach; the Functional Approach and the Creative Approach.

(i) The Institutional Approach

The establishment and maintenance of peace through the institutions is a phenomena of recent origin. Till the beginning of the present century, there had been no global institutions to maintain international peace. Global and regional institutions aiming at the establishment and maintenance of peace sprang up in various numbers especially after the conclusion of the Second World War. The founding of such institutions was facilitated by virtue of treaties signed between the countries. The United Nations and its various specialized agencies are operating at the global level. The regional organizations like Organization of African Unity (OAU), Organization of American States (OAS), Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), League of Arab States, South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC), etc., are also in existence to help maintain regional peace and security.

The institutions, both at global and regional level, are needed and they serve a highly useful purpose. Despite their shortcomings, these institutions have played a commendable role in brightening the prospects of peace by helping resolve the local conflicts through peaceful
Detailed analysis of these institutions is uncalled for in this chapter. One is prone to concede with Palmer and Perkin, that these institutions are despite their merits, merely instruments, and their value depends upon the way in which they are used. 77

(ii) The Functional Approach

The functional approach also attaches considerable importance to institutions and organizations. However, as the term suggests, it aims at encouraging international agencies, especially those having economic and social objectives, rather than political ones. According to Palmer and Perkins this approach envisages that:

"cooperation between nations i.e. extremely difficult to achieve on the political level... on the other hand, nations are willing to work together in the wide area of economic, social and technical activities and such cooperation is not only valuable in itself but it also helps to create the atmosphere and to forge the ties that bind nations and people together". 78

This approach also lays emphasis on creating common interests and interdependence than to set up security

78. Ibid.
organizations. As Philip E. Jacob has opined, "the only means through which political cooperation can ultimately be achieved is through gradual expansion of the existing areas of cooperation until the circles overlap and common national interests render closer political cooperation essential". In mid 1940s, David Mitrany also strongly espoused for the functional programme in international relations. These years also saw E.H. Carr more optimistic about the growth of international functional agencies than in those of a basically political nature.

Palmer and Perkins are of the view that functional approach by laying emphasis on economic and social means to promote cooperation among nations and not on political means, stand dim chances of immediate success. Political problems are more pressing and require urgency for solution otherwise inability to solve them can obliterate the prospects of each having negative peace.


81. For details see E.H. Carr, Conditions of Peace (London, 1942), and also by the same author, Nationalism and After (London, 1945).

82. Palmer and Perkins, n. 75, p. 1209.
iii) The Curative Approach

This approach also envisions the creation of organizations to fulfil its objectives. This approach is long-term one. It calls for a frontal attack on basic socio-economic and political evils like poverty, hunger, amine, racial and caste discrimination, human oppressives and misery. The UN and its specialized agencies are already engaged in these activities at the bilateral multilateral levels. In the light of the above analysis, the curative approach seems to be the most fruitful of all. Ironically, however, most of the developed countries are pending more on conventional and nuclear armaments than on promoting developmental activities. Such situation renders the contemporary world, more vulnerable to war and their carrying more miseries for the developing world.

The above analysis reveals that all the three approaches are interrelated with institutional approach being the more viable approach as the remaining two can effectively be implemented through organisations like the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

33. Ibid, p.1210.
The analysis reveals that by obliterating the causes of conflict, the prospects of peace can be brightened up. The stepping stone for establishing peace is to have negative peace which would instrumental in envisaging the positive peace. The unqualified peace being the ultimate goal can be had after having achieved the first two stages. It also reveals that the institutional approach is more viable for establishing and maintaining peace in the contemporary international relations. These hypotheses will be applied for their validity in the succeeding chapters. In the present study, the advent of Afghanistan crisis in the wake of Soviet intervention and the continued presence of Soviet troops on Afghan soil and its impact on the geopolitical developments in the region constitute cause of conflict. To what extent this conflict can be resolved through institutional approach within the framework of the United Nations forms the subject matter of indepth analysis in succeeding chapter.