CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

More than six decades ago the United Nations was born amidst great hopes and expectations of a generation, which had seen the most devastating war in human history. It was devised to "to save succeeding generations from the courage of war" and "ensure fundamental human right, dignity and worth of the human person" and equal rights for all nations large and small. It was to usher in an area of peace and prosperity and provide machinery for the pacific settle temporarily as it now seems the capacity of the national politicians to turn each international problem into an international disaster. The framers of the charter were, however, shrewd politicians who circumscribed UN ideals in a structural design based on big-power politics. The big-USA, UK, France, Russia and China must share responsibility for the sandy foundation on which they built this impressive edifice. They made the Security Council the sole instrument of peace keeping and made themselves its permanent members with the power of veto.

They had pledged to maintain unity in peace as they had done in war but it did not survive even a year. The General Assembly, where members are equal, was given few powers. It is now a truly universal representative body. Its membership has risen from 51 in 1945 to more than three times in 2004. It could play a significant role in achieving the purposes and objectives of the United Nations and assist in the realization of peace, disarmament and development but it has got enmeshed in cold war politics. All efforts of Non Aligned Nations to rescue it from super-power diplomacy thus make little headway. Apartheid, racism, neo-colonialism, Zionism survives because some great powers are not willing to carry out the resolutions of the General Assembly in letter or spirit.
The Charter enjoins promotion of a "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom" and devotes a Chapter on "international Economic and Social Cooperation". The resolution passed by the General Assembly in 1982 on the New International Economic Order remains inoperative because of the intransigence of the affluent North. Powerful nations have tried to bend the machinery of the United Nations to their own selfish interest. And if they do not succeed in it, they resort to other methods to paralyse United Nations action. Namibia, Palestine, South Africa and many other similar cases have become intractable despite UN resolutions because these powers are not yet interested in their solution.

Outside the domain of politics, the UN and its agencies like FAO, WHO, ILO, UNESCO and UNICEF have an impressive record of achievements to their credit. Their area ranges from deep oceans to the space and celestial bodies; environment, communication, transfer of technology, trans-nationals, copyright and many similar activities which vitally affect the lives of people all over the globe. Thanks to modern technology and economic organization, the world has become interdependent and it is as well that international mechanisms for its regulation are available and are being used in the interest of humanity.

There are people who say that the United Nations have had a chequered history since 1945. They tend to forget that the last forty years have been one of the most momentous in the history of mankind. Revolutionary changes have taken place in science, technology, industry, economic organization. Mighty empires have crumbled before our eyes and the political map of the world has entirely changed. New nations have burst upon the international scene, claiming their right to be heard, the super-power confrontation has led to the cold war and proxy wars are being arranged and fought. In such a tense and fast changing world, it is itself a wonder that the United Nations still exists and continues to provide a forum for the nations to talk and not resort to gun.
The poor nations have been exploited by colonialism for too long and are now exposed to the exploitation of neo-colonialism. They now ask for their fair share for economic development. They insist on disarmament because there can be no peace without it and peace is a pre-condition for development. It is now for the rich nations of the North to show vision and help development processes of countries in the South.

There is an equal need for the powerful nations to positively respond to the call of United Nations for disarmament for their own sake. The next war will finish them as well. Disarmament will release billions of dollars being wasted on perfecting weapons of mass-destruction which could then be recycled for mass development.

United Nations with all its weakness still remains the only glimmering hope for humanity. It was set up for peace and conflict-resolution. It promised fair deal to the deprived peoples. It was expected to bring about a better world and free humanity of colonialism and racism. During these years of its existence, its achievements have by no means been inconsiderable but its failures have been dramatic in areas which vitally affect future peace. It however still remains the only world forum where glowering nations can still meet and talk and not cut each other’s throat and in the process destroy humanity.

Yet in these years of its existence the UNO, more specifically the Security Council, has often failed to act efficiently. Drawn in to the maelstrom of veto, it has been hypnotized into dull helplessness.

Thinkers in international law are divided between two extremes of opinion. One view is that the Security Council is inert. Unless veto is either abolished or circumvented it cannot function effectively. The other view is that the obligation of self-preservation supersedes all other obligations and therefore, if the Security Council fails to function effectively, other means must be used even if the UNO dies in the process.
There is no doubt in it that United Nations-like all human institutions, is far from perfect but its value to the governments and peoples of the world and the unique promise it holds for the future cannot be underestimated. To maintain peace and to build a better world-order are immensely ambitious tasks. Those who undertake them must be determined and dedicated. The UN was founded on the belief that human race is capable, by an effort of will, of improving its lot and fulfilling in a more satisfactory way its promises and genius. Unless one believes this, the work of UN has little or no meaning.

The world of 2004 is radically different from the world of 1945, and the organisation has also radically changed. With more than three times its original membership, it is active in a variety of new fields scarcely dreamt of by its founders. Admittedly its plan and objectives are sometimes more impressive than its practical performance but, that is not unusual for human institutions especially one reflecting a new world in the process of active evolution. As Dag Hammarskjold the former UN Secretary General once remarked, "The UN reflects both aspirations and a falling short of aspirations, but the constant struggle to close the gap between aspirations and performances now, as always, makes the difference between civilization and chaos". The struggle to close the gap widened and diversified since Hammarskjold's time, but the task and rationale remain the same.

Underlying all the activities of the UN is the problem of balancing and reconciling national sovereignty and interests with international responsibilities and the long term interests of the world community as a whole. Dr. Kurt Waldheim, Ex-UN Secretary General has discerned three main threats in the work of this organisation within this basic task.

The first of these is the maintenance of international peace and security, without which all other tasks would soon become meaningless. The shortcomings of the UN are nowhere clearer than in its efforts to maintain the peace and nowhere are the reasons for them more manifest.
The UN can only achieve what its sovereign members wish it, or are willing to allow it, to achieve. With their assent and co-operation it can do much to forestall conflict, to put an end to violence. On several occasions, the Security Council has provided the means and the pretext to retreat from a dangerous confrontation. But conflicting economic and political considerations crystallized around conflicting ideologies. Cold war saw cold-shouldering of erstwhile allies. The picture has even more blurred in the post cold war era. Divided on their issues, the permanent members have remained united on one - they continue to use the right to veto. It is a prerequisite of victory, more than often the device was used and is being used by the permanent members to cover acts of aggression, committed by them or their protégées. It was used in Spanish, Albanian, Greek, Czech and several other cases. These developments created a virtual paralysis of the collective security system.

The second main threat in the work of the United Nations is its function as an agent of peaceful change. From its inception the organisation has played a crucial role in the great movement of decolonization. Without UN this process would have been far more bloody and disruptive, far more difficult for the former colonial powers, as well as for the newly independent nations. and, certainly far more protracted. On the political side the original mechanism of peace keeping has played an important role in maintaining quiet during periods of transition and, on occasion, in filling the vacuum created by the withdrawal of old colonial powers.

Meanwhile the political scene continues to charge. Almost all the emerging nations have joined the UNO. Simple majority in General Assembly has passed out of the hands of the permanent members and their associates. More than once the power to veto was used either to keep out of the UN certain nations or to make package deals on a *quid-pro-quo* basis. The spectre of challenge to the powers of permanent members has raised its head.

The world is now facing an even more fascinating change in the management of change; the effort to adjust the relationships of developed, and
developing nations in the new world, North-South dialogue has replaced the East West problem as dominating themes of UN activity. It has also to tackle the global problems that have arisen from technological change and the growing interdependence of nations, and in the current efforts to establish a new international economic order. The readjustment of the economic relationships of all nations and the groups of nations in the world is an immense challenge- I do not believe that it could be undertaken anywhere else, than in the United Nations, with its nearly universal membership.

The third threat in the world of United Nations is the attempt to plan in advance, on a co-operative global level, for the future. As In all political organisations, UN is also occupied with the problems and the concerns of the present but the pressing and immediate duties should not be allowed to exclude a vision of the future. Rather it is essential to have such a vision constantly in mind if UN is to maintain any equilibrium or sense of direction in the turbulent and confining world in which we live. Each task undertaken, each response to a particular situation should not only fulfil its immediate purpose, but should, if possible, carry a step further towards a more reliable, equitable and just world order. The UN must evolve a better system-for managing the affairs of the world through the give and take of debate, facing dangers together, learning to co-operate and through the development of an overwhelmingly strong sense of common interest. There are already a number of areas - peace, disarmament, the environment and energy for example - where the world must co-operate or face the greatest risks of chaos and decline, if not destruction. No task of United Nations is more important than the steady expansion of the areas of common interest among nations and provisions of acceptable means by which governments will voluntarily limit their sovereign rights in the long term common interests.

In the post cold war era today some new and Crucial developments have taken place in the international politics. After the collapse of Soviet Union. United States have assumed the self styled role of the World Policeman. The
outcomes were at least predictable in the cold war period. But how the things will shape today, nobody knows, The Super cop (U.S.) wants all the rights but is not willing to fulfil its obligations. The unfortunate pressure tactics of the U.S. and its protégées have hit the United Nations hard. The world remained a silent spectator of how the UN was hijacked and used during the Iraq-Kuwait war by the US and its allies. Such happenings were out of question during cold war period.

Again, the budget of UN has multiplied. But some of the major powers are not fulfilling their obligations. The US and UK are applying pressure and have walked out of UNESCO and UNCTAD. From 1980s onward they are trying to blackmail UN by threatening substantial reduction in their contribution. The UN owes millions of dollars in arrears, instead of paying it US is continuously threatening further heavy cuts unless the UN toes its line of thinking. The attitude of US on the issue of the re-election of Dr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, which was all, set to block Ghali’s appointment and is even prepared to use the veto in the Security Council. While almost whole of the world was supporting his re-election. The USA, for long, has been opposing the format of UN where even the poorest and weakest nations have the equal number of votes as the strongest ones in the General Assembly. There have been talks over changing the format to have a two or three tier system under which the powerful nations will hold most of the aces. Luckily this has not found favour with most of the UN member- including US allies. The UN was created to rise above such vested and limited interests. The threat to UN is from the great powers and not from the developing world.

This does not, however, mean that the Organisation cannot be strengthened or made more responsive to changing international needs. The growing involvement of this body in international economic issues is itself a reflection of momentous change that has taken place in the consciousness of the world community, in seeking to strengthen the Organisation, increasing efforts have been directed at securing mechanism that would make its tasks in
the political and economic fields more effective. Today the UN represents a vast bureaucracy. Each year the documentation in the General Assembly increases by leaps and bounds and has reached almost unmanageable proportions. It has been said that if the documentation of the UN is placed end to end it would straddle the globe around the Equator one and a half times over!! Resolutions adopted tend to be repetitive, and in some respects even incomprehensible except to the jaded professional. Preventive diplomacy is rarely practised and the confidentiality of consultations rarely observed. All too often, the stress is on public diplomacy through a repetition of established positions and pre-occupation with polemical, sometimes sterile, debates. Isn't it time for us to take a fresh look at not so much the institutional set up of the United Nations but the style of our multilateral diplomacy today? There is a strong case that can be made for bringing the UN Secretariat within more manageable limits and seeking a tighter control over the functioning. The volume of documentation can be rationalised and curtailed provided individual delegations practise greater self-discipline both in the tasks assigned to the Secretariat and even in the length and drafting of resolutions placed before the General Assembly. To some extent this will also involve giving a greater area of discretion to the Secretary General. In the Security Council there is scope for greater informal consultation and the development of a collegial spirit as well as the preservation of confidentiality in negotiations and discussions particularly where disputes or conflicts simmer below the surface and call for preventive diplomacy. Several suggestions have already been made to the Secretary General regarding standby forces, fact finding missions etc. all of which deserve careful scrutiny. The essential requirement, however, is a greater preparedness on the part of the individual states to deal with issues in substantive terms at the United Nations rather than utilize this Organization as a mere sounding board for the propagation of their own set positions.

We cannot afford a retreat from multilateralism. The attitude of some states in recent times has been clearly indicative of such a trend. The disregard
of the role and contribution of the UN and the suspicion of multilateral approaches where they do not directly and measurably promote the immediate interests of states had become evident in the attitudes and statements of important leaders in the world. Ratings have been assigned to individual countries on the basis of their record of votes and where they coincide with the perceived interests of some countries. Clearly these actions are intended to change the attitudes of the smaller and more vulnerable states to suit the predispositions of powerful ones. Can we afford a situation where the UN is left to fend for itself without presence of even one of the permanent members of the Security Council? The answer to these dilemmas has to be found in introspection on the part of the smaller and medium states and a greater sense of responsibility on the part of the more powerful ones.

Under the scenario there is an urgent need for the democratization of working of UN especially of Security Council. More permanent members should be added to it. By its own merit the largest democracy in the world, India deserves a permanent place in it. If national sovereignty, national interest and world peace are still the primary motivations of governments, UN is still available as a unique mechanism for this purpose.

GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE

The supreme tragedy of our time is that we are trying to fit old, habitual solutions to a problem of epic proportions, the like of which man had not faced since he first took to a gregarious life on earth. We have lost, or perhaps never achieved, the capacity for epic thinking. We seem unable to accustom ourselves to the bizarre challenges that face us. The revolutions in science have given us the power of quick and disastrous invention but not the power of dauntless thinking. Our machines increasingly resemble men and imitate their subtle ways—but alas, how near we ourselves are to the condition of a robot, tottering along set grooves of thought and action, afraid to venture out into new and unknown ways, and pathetically suspicious of anything that might upset
our accustomed ways and valuations. History is full of examples of such persons who tried to use their original thinking (for the betterment of all) becomes the soothsayers of the time and society. Of course Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was one among those who left his imprint on each and every class and mass of the human society for his ideas and their pursuits.

Gandhi fervently hoped for "a world federation of free and independent state." His concept of World Government transcended the traditional thinking", the pattern of conventional international organisations could not satisfy the condition, for bringing genuine peace. He held that peace could not be established through mere conferences." He was not optimistic about the League of Nations and the U.N. Since they lacked the spirit of non-violence and failed to serve as vehicles of peace in the absence of a force to enforce their decisions.

Gandhi believed that the doctrine of non-violence held ‘good’ in the matter of relationship between states and within states also. This conviction impelled him to unequivocally recommend total disarmament. He was optimistic enough to advocate unilateral disarmament. "If even one great nation agrees unconditionally to perform the supreme act of renunciation many of us would see in our life-time visible peace established on earth. His call for unilateral disarmament betrayed his idealism, while the realist Gandhi appreciated that with the establishment of a democratic world federation disarmament would be practicable in all countries.

We are living in fantastic times-let us face this fact-and only an act or acts of fantastic courage and daring can deflect us from the path of certain disaster. This is no time for lukewarm attitudes or a gradualist, empirical approach. Nor for leisurely feeling our way, one little step at a time. This is the time for a bold, reckless leap, even a leap into the unknown. This is the time for a revolution in our thinking; for an agonizing reappraisal of our basic concepts of peace and human brotherhood. This, in short, is the time for a new realism in international relations.
This realism is most in evidence in Gandhi’s hitherto unheeded call for unilateral disarmament. In our current phantasmagoria of the megaton bomb, the Polaris missile and mega-death, the only step that makes many coherent sense is for each nation, big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, to take the lone decision of scrapping its own armoury all on its own without waiting for others to make a start. A negotiated disarmament is a political fiction. We shall await till dooms-day and how near dooms-day is, if we hope that agreement will be reached on all the minutiae that have kept disarmament negotiations going endlessly for the best part of two generations.

Even a cursory study of the history of disarmament will reveal that every so-called disarmament proposal is a veiled move in the game of international hide-and-seek, an essential factor in the strategy of power. It would be the height of imagination that the ever-new disarmament proposals that often catch the headlines have been motivated by a genuine desire for peace. On the contrary, every one of them can be shown to be a sinister move to gain a strategic advantage over one’s opponent. This being the case, it will be unpardonable folly to expect anything to come out of the present merry-go-round of disarmament talks. Multilateral disarmament is a contradiction in terms. Someone must lay down arms first. Disarmament will never get a start except unilaterally. It must begin with some one nation, big or small. There is no other way. And this is the only way to break the ice. Here lies the practical and functional approach of Gandhi. He believes very aptly what is the Goal and what is the realistic term to achieve it rather than to enter into the intellectual jugglery.

Disarmament is not a new problem. In the sense of a penal destruction or reduction of the armament of a defeated country, disarmament is perhaps as old as war itself. In the sense of a reduction and limitation of national armament by general international agreement-what now mostly goes by the vogue-word of Arms Control—it was first discussed in The Hague Conference of 1899 and is thus virtually a product of the twentieth century. In the more
comprehensive sense of an abolition of all armament—the only sense that can have any meaning to us in the thermonuclear age—disarmament came into the arena of international discussion only after the Great War and the founding of the League of Nations, and even then only in a lackadaisical, half-hearted way. It took Hitler, the World War and Hiroshima for nations to think of disarmament seriously.

But the disarmament issue that faces us today is of an entirely different complexion and magnitude. We have no longer the luxury of time at our disposal to weigh the pros and cons and to go into the political niceties of the available traditional approaches to disarmament. Failure to achieve a quick solution can have only one relentless result: disaster. The extraordinary urgency of our present situation is not one that could be argued about. Men who ought to know have told us in unmistakable terms what the consequences of our folly could be. Herman Kahn has categorically asserted that “one must eventually introduce a major change in the situation or expect to get into a war anyway”. For, as he rightly argues, “it is most unlikely that the world can live with an uncontrolled arms race lasting for several decades”. A recent report of the National Planning Association of America has this alarming conclusion: “Not only does the danger of war remain a possibility, but the probability totalled over time increases, becoming a certainty if sufficient time elapses without succeeding in finding alternatives.”

What major change have we introduced into the present situation of bewilderment and drift? What alternatives have we found? None whatsoever. We are victims of our own clichés. We are a race of bewildered, impotent men trying to fit disarmament, in its nuclear overtones, into our frozen, pre-nuclear stereotypes and being rather dismayed at the result. For though it looks like an old problem, disarmament as we know it today is, in fact, a stark new problem and it can only be solved in a stark new way. Our crisis is thus essentially psychological; a crisis of failure to break away from habits of thought which have no relevance to the problems of our time. To ascribe it to the rapid
advances in weapons technology or the misuse of scientific knowledge is to misunderstand the true implications of our problem.

The general objection against unilateral disarmament is that it is quixotic, unrealistic, and utopian. Maybe it is all these. But are we not living in a very quixotic age? What is realistic about the nightmare world that is unravelled, say, in the yearly proceedings of the Pugwash Conference? And why should any man be apologetic about being utopian when the only alternative to a Utopia is the extinction of man?

But, fortunately, unilateral disarmament is neither quixotic nor utopian. In fact, if there are any lessons to be learnt from the woeful history of disarmament, the unilateral approach is the only probable and realistic way to achieve disarmament in our time. For consider the conflict between national security and disarmament. Every government gives first precedence to its own security and will in no case agree to any change in the existing armament balance unless it is satisfied that such change will not endanger its security. Add to this the axiom that one nation’s security is another’s insecurity, and we at once see what a hopeless mess we would land ourselves in if we believed in the myth of negotiated, multilateral disarmament. The security demands of even two nations are hard to reconcile, not to speak of the security needs, whether real or imagined, of the five score nations which sit around the United Nations table.

No, we cannot have national security and international disarmament at one and the same time. One will eventually have to be sacrificed to the other and which shall that one be? The answer is clear. Unless we are either insane or inhuman, or both, there is no doubt we shall all opt for the saving of humanity and human civilization rather than the illusory pursuit of our own private, national safety.

In the final analysis, the case for unilateral disarmament stands or falls by how we answer two simple questions:
(a) Is there any known method, other than a unilateral act of courage and sacrifice, by which the besetting fear of one nation for another can be rooted out? And

(b) Even if unilateral disarmament were to fail, will the failure be as catastrophic to humanity as the continuance of the arms race which is implicit in the never-ending process of negotiated disarmament?

We can improve upon many things that Gandhi taught us—his religion and philosophy, even his economics and politics—but we cannot improve upon this central theme-song of his whole life, this concept of daring, unilateral action—Satyagraha—which finds its culmination in his call for unilateral disarmament. Many of us swear by Satyagraha and some of its more fashionable modern variants, little realizing that unilateral disarmament, the phrase we shun like the plague is nothing other than Satyagraha in its international dimension. We are universal in our condemnation of armaments but we are blind to the logical corollary of our condemnation; that if we are genuine in our belief that all arms are evil the honest thing for us to do is to strip ourselves of the evil at once, regardless of whether others do likewise.

Gandhi believed that disarmament was possible only through "the matchless weapon of non-violence." And it was his hope that "India will ... prove herself worthy of being the first nation in the world to give lead to other nations for the delivery of earth from the burden of war. He wanted the great powers to lead the rest by disarming themselves: they should give up ambitions and exploitation and revise their mode of life. Thus according to Gandhi, disarmament cannot crystallise, unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. Exploitation must go ... that is the essential pre-condition for the establishment of a world free from blood-spilling and destruction.

Gandhi advocated Satyagraha as the sure and potent weapon of combating Inter-state aggression/s. Satyagraha is universally acceptable. Non-violence according to him, excludes war and ushers in peace. Gandhi's ideas
about peace suggest that the solution he offered for effecting world peace transcended the frontiers of international diplomacy. The chief limitation of international diplomacy is that it is based up on recognition of the power-system. The Gandhian way claims to stand for non-violent and non-exploitative social order which alone can ensure just and enduring peace. It may be argued that the Gandhian declarations on peace bristle with some practical difficulties. But Gandhi would ask that if an individual could practice nonviolence why whole nations could not do so. He believed that one must make a beginning and the rest would follow. The Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed within the universal frame work of his philosophy of ahimsa. A proper appreciation of his doctrine of ahimsa would facilitate comprehension of the logical application of that doctrine.

Sceptics consider Gandhian plea for disarmament Utopian. In fact, it is not so. Its success depends on the nature of human beings. Gandhi has great faith in the godliness of human nature." Human nature is essentially peace loving. Even when man fights violently, he does so out of a desire to live in peace. The way of world peace lies in cultivating the spirit of non-violence and peace in the hearts of men. As the individuals are built, so the nations are built. And as the nations are built, so the world is built. Gandhi says: there is not one law for the atom and another for the universe."

The life-style of Mahatma Gandhi is quite enough to prove that he was able to reduce himself virtually to "the level of the poorest of the poor." As for an ordinary human being, it would be too much to expect what would have been possible for a great man like Gandhi. We must however, have to learn a lesson from Gandhi's style of living, for as an effective means to achieve Socialism there is no alternative to simple living and noble thinking and this is more so for a developing country like ours.

It goes without saying that a world of peace and prosperity can never be achieved by the use of force. It was Mahatma Gandhi who invented a new weapon that alone could save mankind from a war of total annihilation. Gandhi
and the atom bomb were in fact "the two originalities of our time and one would defeat the other before it ended".

Jayaprakash Narayan has very aptly said about Mahatma Gandhi that "He was specifically a prophet of the atomic age in which in which the engines of violence which man has invented for the first time in history threaten to destroy the whole of mankind. Gandhi not only preached non-violence as a Philosophy and an ideal but practised it on a very colossal scale and did it, if not with complete success, with very great success. As long as there is violence which threatens the very future of the human race, the relevance of Gandhi would continue. Gandhi will remain relevant till the change of total annihilation of the human race is removed."

Peace is a relationship between people and between people. Peace begins with a harmony between individuals. Gandhi lived and worked for the establishment of such relationship among individuals and groups. This is a unique contribution to peace in the modern context. Gandhi's style of life and the techniques he propounded deserved to be studied and applied so that the world may be and remain a safe place to live.

Cautama Buddha preached the message of Ahimsa and Compassion. Asoka, one of the greatest emperors had followed the Buddha's teachings in giving up wars and to tread the path of peace though only after being vexed with the carnage which the Kalinga was had brought about. Jesus Christ whom the Christians worship as the Saviour and Lord is described as the prince of peace. He has lived and preached the message of love, forgiveness and peace. In contemporary times Gandhi has relentlessly voiced the efficacy of non-violence as against violence. Therefore it will not be an exaggeration to deduce that Gandhi truly carries the legacy of The Buddha and Jesus Christ as far as the ways and means to achieve a peaceful world is concern.

H.G. Wells in one of his last writings had predicted that man is unfit to live in this world as he knows what is good but does not know how to do
'good'. Man wants peace but does not know how to achieve it. Hence he being incapable of doing what he knows to be the right would destroy himself. The future would show whether H.G. Wells is right or wrong. However, a survey of the contemporary world is ominous. Since has perfected the weapons of war and nations have manufactured and stored them in enough numbers to such an extent that an outbreak of war would not only destroy the living and the products of civilisation, but also would make the surface and atmosphere of the earth uninhabitable for hundreds of years if not for ever. Leaders of nations and man in general are aware of this fact and they dread another war. War is an international nightmare. Man would like to avoid or escape wars if possible. Although the million Dollar question is that how to achieve the peaceful world and avoid war, everybody just want to know those means.

It is known that Gandhi is opposed to violence and wars. Gandhi is an advocate of non-violence and peace. Though nonviolence is "as Old as the hills", Gandhi's exposition, clarification and forceful advocacy of non-violence is unique. The Gandhian way of peace springs from the basic concept of non-violence.

War is said to be a way of ending wars. As a matter of fact, the Second World War was fought by the allies with a view to end all wars. Gandhi is of the firm opinion that war can never end wars. And here Gandhi follows the legacy of Buddha who has said in Dhammapada that “Hatred cannot be eliminated by hatred. Hatred can be eliminated by friendliness alone and nothing else.” So we can deduce that the violence cannot be finished by violence. It can only be removed by non-violence. Violence breeds only violence but can never end violence. War is destructive where as peace is constructive. They are two opposite processes. Further violence, being destructive, is a negative process, whereas peace, being constructive is a positive process. Peace is a positive force of cementing people. War which is a destroying and divisive force can never contribute to the establishment of peace- Hence the search for peace should be in the way of non-violence alone.
Napoleon had sent this appeal for peace at the height of his glory and success. He saw the futility of war to end hostilities and appealed for peace. Napoleon subscribed to the Gandhian view when he said, "There are only two powers in the world, and those powers are the spirit and the sword. In the long run the Sword will always be conquered by the Spirit".

Gandhi writes, "There will be international league only when all the nations big or small, composing it would fully independent". An International league based on non-violence leads to the establishment of world peace. Such a league implies and it is possible only when it consists of independent nations. As long as any nation is not independent, there would not be world peace. It is necessary that all nations should be independent to be equal partners in the League of Nations in order to have peace.

Gandhi in adopting non-violent means to get Swaraj for India aimed at achieving international peace by doing so. Gandhi said, suggest to the friends of peace for the world, that the congress in 1920 took a tremendous step towards peace when it declared that it would attain her own, namely Swaraj by non-violent and truthful means. And I am positive that if we unflinchingly adhere to these means in the prosecution of our goal, we shall have made the largest contribution to the world peace."

According to Gandhi there are certain conditions which are conducive for international peace. They are:

(i) All nations should be independent;
(ii) The equality of all nations should be recognised;
(iii) Disarmament should be accepted by the nations both in principle and their practice.

Wars are the result of lust for power. In some way or other some nations want to establish supremacy over at least some of the other nations. They derive to create and perpetuate inequalities so as to maintain their superiority.
Self aggrandisement gives rise to inequality and inequality in return affords scope for self-aggrandisement. It is a vicious circle which can be broken only by an international law by which all nations are treated as equal. The spirit of self-aggrandisement is killed to some extent, though it requires to be more nullified by education, by the proclamation of equality of all nations by an international law. Such a law in the course of time would become a convention and de-facto accomplishment. Equality of nations would go a long way- to establish peace in this world.

In the present day world all nations have become independent. Political independence of nations which looked like a mirage and dream has become an actuality. There is still ideological imperialism and also economic domination of one nation over others. Such dependencies also would disappear in course of time. Independence is bound to pave the way for the complete independence and equality of nations.

Is peace the real answer to solve conflicts and violence? The problem arises as to how man can realise peace. According to Toynbee, "The source of peace and war is the interior of life of each individual human spirit." We should not forget that man is the source the centre and purpose of all life. Peace begins in our own hearts. The universality of spirit lies not in knowing much, but in loving extensively. Peace is really the reflection of heaven upon earth. In the Hebrew language, the word "Shalom" means peace with justice. It means inner security and external excess. He will be a man of Peace who has in him the combination of both. Arnold Toynbee espousing the cause of peace observed: "When the pursuit of peace is whole-hearted, it covers every aspect of human affairs.

Today, we live in a violent world. But man fundamentally desires peace: it is recognised by all that no positive civilisation, no just social order or stable peace can flow from violence, war and repression. A true social order must be based, upon persuasion, conviction, and a positive will to co-operation and fellowship among them. These are the only bonds which can hold society
together with any permanence and to any real advantage. But because of the differences in world-out look, thinkers, statesmen and politicians differ as to the effective way of establishing just and lasting peace. Gandhi made singular contribution to the cause of world peace and his views therefore demand close scrutiny.

Gandhi has often been described as an apostle of peace. Certainly he was. He strove and died for peace. Gandhi advocated "peace-but not at any price", for his philosophy was a philosophy of commitment—it was based upon the concept of moral responsibility, as well not that of "peace at any price" which under lay his ethic of intention.

Gandhi's philosophy of peace is to be sharply distinguished from the conservative plea for "Peace at any cost" which is in essence a plea for the maintenance of status quo. Peace, Gandhi advocated is integrally related to justice. As Gandhi wrote: "Peace must be just" Peace is not mere cessation of hostilities. Gandhi did not share the diplomatic view of peace. Peace for him connoted a positive state of affairs, the pre-condition being freedom from exploitation. What he advocated was non-violent and just peace which alone in his opinion could ensure lasting peace. Gandhi's ideas about peace suggest that the solution he offered for effecting world peace transcended the frontiers of international diplomacy. The chief limitation of international diplomacy is that it is based upon recognition of the power-system.

The Gandhian way claims to stand for non-violent and non-exploitative social order which alone can ensure just and enduring peace. Non-violence, according to Gandhi, excludes war and ushers in peace.

One may argue that the Gandhian declarations on peace contain some practical difficulties for them to be implemented in the present day world. But Gandhi would not countenance such a "practical" difficulty. He would counterpoise by saying: "If an individual can practise non-violence, why not whole groups of individuals and whole nations? He believed that one must
make a beginning and the rest would follow. The Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed as an integral part of his philosophy of life and one should try to appreciate his attitude within the general framework of philosophy of ahimsa. Good means alone can lead us to everlasting peace. If peace is established by violence it will be of no use. Now days, quite often we read in the newspapers that police, in some places army, marching into an agitating place and peace being established. But that peace is undoubtedly that of the graveyard." But when the non-violent person wins, he wins the heart of the foe.

Gandhi's concept of peace on earth and goodwill among mankind lead to the development of Sarvodaya Social order which India's distinctive contribution to world of thought. The application of moral truth to the facts of social life is the essence of Gandhian and Valluvar's way of life. Their dynamic Philosophy can make possible the advent of a radically transformed society. They serve as a system of norms and moral values that can guide our conduct and action in society and state. The truth of a few will count; the untruth of millions will vanish even like chaff before a whiff of wind. The message of Gandhi and TiruvalIluvar will remain permanent in the hearts of one and all. TiruvalIluvar really transcends Jesus who only wants to forgive them. In advising to forget the trespasses TiruvalIluvar is only in the positive degree. Mahatma Gandhi and TiruvalIluvar have become the symbols of peace, truth, non-violence and dharma. If an individual can practise non-violence why not whole groups of individuals and again why not whole nations? Gandhi believed that one must make a beginning and the rest would follow. Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed as an integral part of his philosophy of life and one should learn to appreciate his attitude within the general framework of his philosophy of ahimsa.

Human nature is essentially peace loving. Even when man fights making use of violence he does so, to be able to live in peace. The way of world peace lies in cultivating the spirit of nonviolence and peace in the hearts of men.
The end of the Cold War and the simultaneous beginning of the process of globalization brought about changes both in the structural and operational dynamics of the world. These developments have both positive and negative implications for the world in general and for developing countries in particular.

Positively, the era of competitive influence building in a bipolar ideologically divided world is over. Even the unipolar hegemony of the only surviving superpower could not be established in the form predicated in terms of the 'end of ideology' or a 'triumph of capitalism.' Gradually, a 'non-polar' world order is becoming the reality in which multiple groups of states are enjoying predominance in a limited area, leaving space for the workings of other states as well. Besides, with the collapse of centripetal forces in terms of global institutional structures, some regional economic realignment of force can be witnessed. In this process, new regional economic forums are enhancing their strength not to compete with other such groupings felt to strengthen the position of their member states. Regional free trade is consolidating and enhancing interaction between the member states. Simultaneously, inter-group cooperation in terms of trade, FDI and joint ventures is being witnessed. However, negative competition among these groups is not being witnessed to a greater degree.

Despite the twin positive fallouts, the negative dimensions of such developments are also strong and visible. Politically, the end of bipolarity has on the one hand created an unstable condition in the world system and on the other an edge towards the hegemony of only a hyper power. The latter has not only created the problem of an interventionist role on the part of the USA but also motivated it for war against non-compliant states in the name of 'preventive attacks.' Besides, the very structure of international organization has crumbled due to the enhanced role of the only available military alliance system “NATO” under the leadership of the USA. Simultaneously, developing countries are being marginalized by the weakening of their forums like NAM. Hence, the global system is passing through a phase in which the developing
countries are finding it difficult to protect their autonomy or find space in the
global system.

Economically, the beginning of the process of liberalization, privatization and globalization (LPG) led to the crumbling of the tariff barriers of developing economies against developed states on the one hand but on the other also consolidated the capitalist mode of production and distribution. This globalization of the economy is not contributing to the growth of an equalitarian and just global order. Rather, the demand of the developing countries for the establishment of a new international economic order (NIEO) has been pushed further back. Besides, it has led to the consolidation of the Bretton Woods model with the establishment of the third institutional arrangement in the form of the World Trade Organization (WTO) despite the presence of other twin institutions in the form of the IMF and World Bank. The 'South' opening up its markets to the countries of the 'North' in the form of large scale trade, FDI or Joint Ventures has failed to ameliorate the economic conditions of the recipient states, instead creating glaring disparities in society. The rising gap between rich and poor in these states has resulted in social tensions, political upheavals and other such problems.

The Humanitarian concern, in the form of arms race, terrorism and environmental degradation has reached an alarming stage with the onset of a new world scenario in the wake of the end of the Cold War.

- Though the problem of the arms race has existed for numerous decades, today the issue has potential consequences of serious magnitude given the increasing threat of the use of WMDs. Besides, the approval of extending the NPT for an indefinite period has not been able to stop the process of nuclear proliferation. The CTBT has not only been rejected by some of the countries outside the purview of the NPT but has also not been approved by the Senate of the USA, the very country that proposed the Treaty. Rather, the addition of three new members (South Korea, India and Pakistan) to the nuclear club of P-5 has made the club of P-8.
Whatever be the justification and counter-arguments for and against such an increase, one thing is certain. The arms race has acquired serious proportions. Though efforts are being made to control the new entrants by engaging them through coercive diplomacy, uncertainty still looms large about the dangerous consequences of such developments.

• Terrorism, especially its increasing high-tech nature is another serious problem faced by the present day international system. This has acquired all the more significance since the event of 9/11 in the States, because it has exposed the susceptibility of even the mightiest power of the world. Consequently, many parts of the world have been demolished to finish Al Qaeda. But the latter cannot be wiped out despite the use of heavy bombing in Afghanistan and similar such actions taken in other parts of the world. Terrorism is, in fact, post-modern warfare illusive, amorphous, personal, emotive, enduring and scattered. Hence, it has moved beyond the competence of the state. International organizations have not only failed to curb the menace of terrorism but have also failed to define the very term. Hence, in this situation of gross anarchy and chaos, nations are finding it difficult to find their way and are groping in the dark.

• Finally the swift pace of industrial development has created a severe problem of ecological degradation. Despite the organization of four international UN conferences at Stockholm (1972), Nairobi (1982), Rio de Janeiro (1992) and Johannesburg (2002) the problem of environmental degradation has not been solved. Rather, the last conference seems to have been influenced by the wave of globalization. The role of corrective measures was left solely to be handled by NGOs and MNCs, and states have been bereft of their accountability towards people at large. Some important protocols like Kyoto have not been implemented so far. Nor have effective steps been taken to deal with the issue of global warming. Even the pertinent policy directive to make efforts
towards 'sustainable development' could not been operational. The greed of the advanced industrial nations has dominated the global agenda. They are pressing the lesser developed world to adhere to the norms and principles of preserving the environment while they themselves are busy destroying the same.

Solutions to the above problems can be found in the Gandhian ethos. Strategies based on the core values of Gandhism can resolve these issues, if these values are extended in the following manner:

Most of the political problems seem to be based on a lack of trust between the states. Consequently, there is urgency to restore faith among nation states. Such conflict can be resolved through the use of non-violent techniques propagated by Gandhi. This can be achieved either through the evolution of new institutional arrangements or by altering the behaviour of the concerned states. In this context, the initiation of CBMs (confidence building measures) among the states involved can be a step in the right direction. This mechanism is likely to restore faith among the states by way of building goodwill in the concerned parties. It can be further strengthened with the use of Track-11 diplomacy in the form of people-to-people contacts. This process would not only resolve the immediate problem but is also likely to open new vistas for durable peace.

Economic disparities exist in the present world order either due to concentration of wealth or due to non-equalitarian distribution of the same. The demand for a just and equalitarian order raised by the poor countries is not addressed. Rather, this issue has been marginalized on the sidelines of the core global economic agenda. Even in the post-Cold War era, the process of globalization has created more problems for the developing states than it has ameliorated their conditions. This calls for the trusteeship system envisaged by Gandhi wherein the rich should contribute for the well-being of deprived
sections of humanity. Under such a system, any kind of exploitation would be done away with and people treated at par whether they become rich or poor. It is the moral duty of the rich to take care of their deprived fellow brothers. This is also likely to meet the old demand for NIEO by the developing states and simultaneously strengthen global development with a human face.

Similarly, humanitarian problems involving the arms race, terrorism and environmental decay can be solved through the application of Gandhian values. The problem of the arms race is more a problem related to misperception than the growth of arms. This stems mainly from a lack of trust between states. Hence the most important question is how to inculcate trust among neighbouring states. This can be achieved through a change in the states' behaviour and attitude. When one state exhibits this through its actions, the other will follow suit. Hence, it is the moral force of a fellow nation-state which can do away with prevailing tensions in regions. In this context, Gandhi always favoured unilateral disarmament by states irrespective of the policy followed by others.

The problem of terrorism is more a political and social issue, rather a war-like development. The roots of terrorism are attached to socio-psychological factors- Hence the individual's behaviour is a pertinent factor. Consequently, any solution that does not call for changing the psychology of the terrorist is not going to be successful. This is where Gandhian values come in. Gandhism believes in the potential for a change in the heart of the man involved in such activities. Gandhi believed that without a transformation of the individual's soul, society cannot be reformed. Hence, reform in the behaviour of the individual is a must for durable peace and a complete resolution of the problem of terrorism.

Similarly, today's environmental problem is largely caused by the technological advanced states' and their lust for more wealth by all means as
they desire to accumulate all the wealth and resources of nature to strengthen their country's strength and economic position. This exploitative nature of the few states is causing problems for a large stratum of the world society. Gandhism believes in limiting one's demand and sharing the fruits of nature with humanity at large since nature has provided everything in abundance to meet the needs of everyone but not the greed of all. Therefore, the Gandhian percept allows the sustainable development to continue in order to meet the needs of humanity.

The parameters of defining peace vary from the traditional approach to Gandhian approach. In traditional approach, peace was defined just as the absence of violence and an acceptance of unbalanced power relationships, inequalities and lack of access to resources which may be associated with such a condition. In such condition, major concerns are early detection of conflict, prevention of conflict turning into violence, limiting the spread of violence if it does occur, or to avoid reoccurrence of violence. Early warning system and troop deployment are used in this mechanism. Even though the traditional approach acknowledges socio-economic and political reasons of conflict, the priority goes to prevent the outbreak of violence or contain its intensity rather than eliminating the root causes of conflict; Absence of violence does not indicate peace if its root causes are remaining unhealed. Violence may erupt at any time in this situation, if early warning mechanism or troops fail to fulfil their entrusted responsibility. Unfortunately, state leaders have always been guided by this negative notion of peace. Physical force has been largely deployed to curb communal or ethnic violence at the state level to international level. For instance, the United Nations Organization was formed to prevent another World War and maintain peace across the globe. Major mechanism to maintain international peace is its peacekeeping forces.
Chapter six and seven of the UN Charter lay down the provision of deploying peacekeeping force to halt violence. Here peacekeeping is considered as a surveillance mechanism to monitor developments in the violent-torn area or limit the intensity of violence through light military intervention. The definition of peacekeeping in its traditional sense also reflects the requirement of military intervention to maintain peace.

Peacemaking process in the traditional approach is participated by the heads of the states or governments and the top brass in the military and bureaucracy (primary parties). For instance, war between two nation-states is normally ended with the conclusion of peace agreement. Even though the common people are the victims of war, they are treated only as the secondary parties to the conflict. They do not have any role in peace process other than accepting provisions laid down in the agreement.

A major flaw of this approach is its weakness to resolve protracted, intractable, and deep-rooted conflicts. For instance, India-Pakistan conflict is protracted, intractable, and deep-rooted in nature. India-Pakistan conflict is protracted because it has been continuing for sixty-four years. It is intractable in the sense that the conflict is an obstacle to make any positive change in relations between the two countries. Moreover, the conflict is primarily between the two governments but it is also deep-rooted in the thinking and attitudes of people in all walks of society across two sides. In such cases deployment of multi-track approach is inevitable to have an amicable solution to the conflict. Multi-track approach opens up various channels of interaction between the parties to conflict. This approach accommodates the initiatives of people from all walks of life; therefore, it involves common people, academic community etc. in the peace process.

The end of the Cold-War necessitated a new approach to analyse conflict and peace initiatives. The disintegration of Soviet Union challenged
the top-down approach in determining the state of affairs in a political society. Rather it proved that the mandate of citizens is also important in shaping the programmes and policies of state. Dismemberment of Soviet Union also confirmed that heavy military build-up will not be the sole element in strengthening the national integration process and state security. Emergence of civil society groups into international peace initiatives is a new development in the Post-Cold War period. The 1993 Oslo Accords in the West Asia is a prime example. The civil society initiatives, especially a series of problem-solving workshops and dialogues between Israeli and Palestinian academics could bring Oslo Accords into reality. Such developments are enhancing the scope of peace-building and involving more actors in the process.

Neo-liberal policies, rolling back of welfare measures and growing number unemployment, environmental issues followed by health issues and displacement of people are some of the major sources of conflict today. These elements compel the policy makers to develop a human-centred approach to resolve conflicts. Having conceived by the changed global scenario, the UN also redefined the role of its Peacekeeping Force from a narrow view of surveillance and light use of force to larger and more complex UN peacekeeping missions. Now peacekeeping forces are assigned to help in implementing comprehensive peace agreements between the parties to intra-state conflicts and civil wars. In addition to that, the UN Peacekeeping Forces are involving non-military functions to promote peace in the violent-torn areas. The UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations was established in 1992 to fulfil this mission.

The concept of peace has been changed from its earlier notion of 'absence of violence' to a positive one. Today peace is conceived as an environment where people strive to transform society and communities into fairer and more just places to live. In such environment, concern is not limited
to tackle direct experience of violence, but also focused on the structural elements in society (socio-economic and political components) which perpetuate potential sources of conflict. In this broad concept, peace-building means empowering people to become involved in non-violent change process themselves, to build sustainable conditions for peace and justice. Peace-building process includes providing humanitarian relief, protecting human rights, ensuring security, establishing non-violent modes of resolving conflicts, fostering reconciliation, providing trauma healing services, repatriating refugees and resettling internally displaced persons, supporting broad-based education, and economic reconstruction.

Peace-building is an all encompassing approach that includes conflict prevention in the sense of preventing the recurrence of violence, conflict management (efforts to prevent, limit, contain, or resolve conflicts), and conflict transformation (addressing structural roots of violence through applying non-violent means). Peace-building is aimed at creating an environment of peaceful relationships and governance structures, a mechanism to address the root causes and effects of conflicts, as well as building institutions that can manage conflict without resort to violence. Apart from the traditional peace process, peace-building is a participatory approach involving all the parties to conflict. Peace-building is much broader notion than that of peacemaking, whereas the latter is focused only on the activities to halt ongoing conflicts and bring hostile parties to partial agreements or broader negotiated settlements. It is necessary, in this context, to understand the contributions of Mahatma Gandhi in the arena of peace-building.

Even though Gandhi did not use the term peace-building, he is acknowledged as its mentor. He has transformed the concept of peace from its negative sense to a constructive one. Gandhi developed a distinct framework to understand conflict and bring sustainable peace. This was integrally related to
his conception of human nature. It is pertinent to compare the traditional paradigm that conceived human nature, conflict and peace with that of Mahatma Gandhi. Thomas Hobbes is considered as the precursor of traditional realist approach, who set forth a paradigm to resolve conflicts in accordance with his understanding of human nature. For Hobbes, human beings were motivated by self-interests and often contradictory in nature. Therefore, the period before the birth of political authority, human beings were in constant conflict with one another. In such a condition life was "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. Upon realizing the danger of the anarchy, human beings became aware about the need of a mechanism to protect them. As far as Hobbes was concerned, rationality and self-interests persuaded human beings to combine in agreement, to surrender sovereignty to a common power. Hobbes called this common power, state, as Leviathan. According to the view of Thomas Hobbes, human nature itself was the source of conflict. Since it is a condition of all against all, it was impossible to evolve a mechanism for conflict resolution within society. Rather, a political authority was inevitable to prevent conflict. His view supported a unilateral state action instead of voluntary initiatives for conflict resolution. There was no room for consensus among people, but the application of armed force was the only way to maintain peace. These notions have largely influenced in shaping traditional approach to conflict but proved to be inadequate in the present period.

Gandhi believed in the inherent goodness of human beings. He held that all human beings had the capacity to develop their full potential of non-violence. He believed that all human beings belonged to God. Since God and human beings were interdependent and interrelated, non-violence was the inseparable quality of the latter. For him, the path to non-violence was none other than the path to God. Having belief in the inherent goodness of human beings, Gandhi developed a human-centred approach for peace-building. Apart
from physical force deployed by the political authority, Gandhi held that human beings had the potential to resolve conflicts through non-violent means. Non-violence remained as the most fundamental principle of his philosophy of peace. According to Gandhi, the universal human value of nonviolence ought to be cultivated not only at the individual level, but also at village, national and global levels. This was the effective approach to bring sustainable peace in the world. In its ostensible sense non-violence is the absence of violence, or the absence of mental intention of injuring, harming, disturbing and agonizing opponent. But Gandhi imparted a positive meaning to non-violence by inculcating an altruistic approach.