CHAPTER IV
UNITED NATION: CHALLENGES, CONSTRAINTS AND GANDHIAN ALTERNATIVES

The United Nations came into existence in 1945 on conclusion of World War II in which the world witnessed unprecedented death and destruction, made possible by the harnessing of advanced technologies in the instruments of war. The United States use of atomic bombs against Japan at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the massive destruction in its wake vividly illustrated how horrific future wars could be.

Gripped with this fear and horror, the victorious nations and other nations got together and established the United Nations Organisation. The Charter of the United Nations spelt out that the primary objective was “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

In the last sixty years of its existence, the United Nations had to manage and cope with security conflicts ranging from the Cold War era to post-Cold War and now the abominable spectacle of global terrorism of the Islamic Jehad variety as exemplified by the Al Qaeda, Taliban and Pakistan state-sponsored terrorism against India in Jammu and Kashmir, more specifically.

The traditional model of UN peacekeeping developed during the Cold War era as a means of resolving conflicts between States and involved the deployment of unarmed or lightly armed military personnel between belligerent parties. The rise in the number of intra-state conflicts, following the fall of the Berlin Wall, has resulted in a shift towards multidimensional peacekeeping operations that are often mandated to support the implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement between parties to a civil war. This has, in turn, led to an expansion of the non-military component of peacekeeping operations whose success is increasingly dependent on the work of civilian
experts in key areas such as the rule of law, human rights, gender, child protection, and elections.

The difficult experiences of the mid-1990's in countries such as Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda prompted the UN to reassess its approach to peacekeeping. In March 2000, a Panel on United Nations Peace Operations issued a report that has come to be known as the “Brahimi Report” (A/55/305-S/2000/309), named after the Panel’s chairperson, Under-Secretary-General Lakhdar Brahimi. The report offered an in-depth critique of the conduct of UN peace operations and made specific recommendations for change. The report also underlined consent by the warring parties, a clear and specific mandate and adequate resources as minimum requirements for a successful UN mission. Consequently, the UN and Member States initiated a number of reforms aimed at improving UN peacekeeping, such as the establishment of a pre-mandate financing mechanism to ensure that adequate resources are available for new mission start-ups.

The United Nations has largely failed to maintain international peace and security, promote self-determination and basic human rights, and protect fundamental freedoms. While the conflicting interests of member states have led to many of these failures, the U.N. system itself is partly to blame. The U.N. and its affiliated organizations are plagued by outdated and redundant missions and mandates, poor management, ineffectual oversight, and a general lack of accountability. In recent years, the U.S. Congress itself has neglected its responsibility to exercise proper oversight. Congress should press for U.N. reform and withhold funding when necessary to encourage reform. The working of UN in the direction of its main objective is not an easy task. There are so many challenges and constraints in achieving the desired goals. Some of the challenges are listed below:
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CHALLENGES

PREVENTION OF CONFLICT & CONFLICT RESOLUTION:

If the primary aim and role as envisaged by its founders was to spare humanity from the “scourge of war” then it would not be wrong to argue that the United Nations has failed, as the following brief examination would indicate:

The United Nations in the last sixty years, as the record would show, was unable to prevent conflicts and wars breaking out all over the world e.g. Korean War, Vietnam War, Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan, the United States sponsored Islamic Jehad via Pakistan on Afghanistan against the Soviets, the three Gulf Wars and the wars leading to the break up of Yugoslavia.

Unable to deter conflict, the United Nations has been a failure in conflict resolution also. In fact it seems that over the years, vested interests have impeded conflict resolution as it served the purpose of keeping in being a large number of United Nations missions, observer groups and ‘Advisers’ to the United Nations Secretary General. Cambodia seems to be the only exception.

The United Nations was created to maintain international peace and security. promote self-determination and basic human rights, and protect fundamental freedoms. Regrettably, the past 65 years have yielded more disappointment than success in realizing these high aspirations. A great deal of the blame for this failure is due to divergent interests among the member states that have prevented the organization from taking decisive, timely action.

However, the U.N. system itself is partly to blame. The U.N. and many of its affiliated organizations are beset by outdated or duplicative missions and mandates, poor management practices, ineffectual oversight, and a general lack of accountability. As former U.N. Deputy Secretary-General Mark Malloch Brown recently stated to The New York Times, “There’s a huge redundancy and
lack of efficiency” in the U.N. system, and the budget is “utterly opaque, untransparent and completely in shadow.”

These problems waste resources and undermine the U.N.’s ability to discharge its responsibilities effectively. The past six decades have seen dozens of initiatives from governments, think tanks, foundations, and panels of experts aimed at reforming the U.N. to make it more effective in meeting its responsibilities. Although these reform efforts have seen rare success, for the most part they have failed due to opposition from the majority of the U.N. member states. Indeed, the U.S. almost always finds itself on the losing side in U.N. debates and votes when it proposes reforms to improve U.N. management, oversight, and accountability.

This happens because the bulk of the U.N. member states simply do not pay enough to the U.N. for inefficiency, waste, or corruption to trouble them. For instance, Sierra Leone is assessed 0.001 percent of the U.N’s regular budget and 0.0001 percent of the peacekeeping budget. In contrast, the U.S. is assessed 22 percent and 27.1 percent, respectively. Therefore, while Sierra Leone and the dozens of other countries with the same assessments pay less than $35,000 per year to these budgets, the U.S. pays billions. With this in mind, is it surprising that the U.S. cares about how the U.N. is managed and how the funding is used, while most countries do not?

Yet these are the countries that control most of the votes. The combined assessment of the 128 least-assessed countries—two-thirds of the General Assembly—totals less than 1 percent of the U.N.’s regular budget and less than one-third of 1 percent of the peacekeeping budget, even though that group alone can, according to U.N. rules, pass the budget. These countries, combined
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with influential voting blocs in the U.N., can and do block U.S. attempts to implement reforms and curtail budgets.5

There is another problem. American administrations are often interested in pressing for reform, but frequently that long-term agenda is abandoned in favour of achieving more immediate political objectives. Pressing for reform ruffles feathers at the U.N. When the U.S. is lobbying for votes on a resolution, the last thing U.S. diplomats want to do is anger a mission by pressing for budgetary cuts or other reforms.

The U.S. should support U.N. peacekeeping operations when they further America’s national interests. Legitimate questions must be asked as to whether the U.N. should be engaging in the current number of missions and whether these situations are best addressed through the U.N. or through regional, multilateral, or ad hoc efforts.

U.N. peacekeeping operations can be useful and successful if employed with an awareness of their limitations and weaknesses. This awareness is crucial because the demand for U.N. peacekeeping shows little indication of declining in the foreseeable future. This requires the General Assembly to press for substantial changes to address serious problems with U.N. peacekeeping. Without fundamental reform, serious problems will likely continue and expand, undermining the U.N.’s credibility and ability to accomplish the key mission of helping to maintain international peace and security. The General Assembly should re-evaluate all U.N. operations that date back to the early 1990s or earlier—some date back to the 1940s—to determine whether each U.N. mission is contributing to resolving the situation or retarding that process. If an operation is not demonstrably facilitating resolution of the situation, the U.N. should emulate the U.N. Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) model in which Greece and Cyprus pay for over 40 percent of the mission’s cost. Stakeholders wishing to continue U.N. peacekeeping operations that have not

resolved the conflicts despite being in place for decades should be asked to assume the financial burden of the continued operation. These missions are generally small and among the least costly, but such a re-evaluation would help to reduce the enormous peacekeeping budget and send a welcome message of accountability and assessment that too often has been lacking in the rubber-stamp process of reauthorizing peacekeeping operations. Together, five of the older U.N. missions (MINURSO, UNFICYP, UNDOF, UNMOGIP, and UNTSO) cost nearly $243 million. If the U.N. could shift these missions to voluntary funding, the U.N. could save more than $54 million per year and perhaps focus the most affected parties on resolving these outstanding disputes.

The U.N. has no standing armed forces and is entirely dependent on member states to donate troops and other personnel to fulfill peace operation mandates. This is appropriate. Nations should maintain control of their armed forces and refuse to support the establishment of armed forces outside of direct national oversight and responsibility. However, the current arrangement results in an ad hoc system plagued by delays and other shortfalls. The member states should support increasing peacekeeping resources under its Global Peace Operations Initiative, which has significantly bolstered the capacity and capabilities of regional troops, particularly in Africa, to serve as peacekeepers for the U.N., the African Union, or other coalitions.

The members states needs to consider carefully any U.N. requests for additional funding for a system in which procurement problems have wasted millions of dollars and sexual abuse by peacekeepers is still unacceptably high and often goes unpunished. Indeed, the decision by the Administration and Congress of U.S. to pay U.S. arrears to U.N. peacekeeping without demanding reforms sent entirely the wrong message and removed a powerful leverage point for encouraging reform. Without fundamental reform, these problems will likely continue and expand, undermining the U.N.’s credibility and ability to maintain international peace and security.
MISMANAGEMENT AND CORRUPTION

Audits and investigations over the past few years have revealed substantial mismanagement, fraud, and corruption in procurement for U.N. peacekeeping. An OIOS (Office of Internal Oversight Services) audit of $1 billion in U.N. peacekeeping procurement contracts over a six-year period found that at least $265 million was subject to waste, fraud, or abuse. According to a 2007 OIOS report, an examination of $1.4 billion of peacekeeping contracts turned up “significant” corruption schemes that tainted $619 million (over 40 percent) of the contracts. An audit of the U.N. mission in Sudan revealed tens of millions of dollars lost to mismanagement and waste and exposed substantial indications of fraud and corruption. Moreover, the OIOS revealed in 2008 that it was investigating approximately 250 instances of wrongdoing ranging from sexual abuse by peacekeepers to financial irregularities. According to Ahlenius, “We can say that we found mismanagement and fraud and corruption to an extent we didn’t really expect.”

Incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers and civilian personnel are widespread and often go unpunished. There have been numerous reports of U.N. personnel committing serious crimes and sexual misconduct, from rape to the forced prostitution of women and young girls. U.N. personnel have also been accused of sexual exploitation and abuse in Bosnia, Burundi, Cambodia, Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea, Haiti, Kosovo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Sudan. The U.S. and other
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member states successfully pressured the U.N. to adopt stricter requirements for peacekeeping troops and their contributing countries. Contact and discipline teams are now present in most U.N. peacekeeping missions, and troops are now required to undergo briefing and training on behaviour and conduct.\textsuperscript{11} However, these crimes continue, and the U.N. reported that allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. civilian and uniformed personnel totalled 106 in 2009 and 83 in 2010.\textsuperscript{12}

The U.N. is to end sexual exploitation, abuse, and other misconduct by peacekeepers, it must do more than adopt a U.N. code of conduct, issue manuals, and send abusers home.\textsuperscript{13} The abusers and their governments must face real consequences to create incentives for effective enforcement. Member states must commit to investigate, try, and punish their personnel in cases of misconduct. U.N. investigatory units need to be independent, quick to deploy, and possess ample capabilities and authority to investigate situations, including full cooperation by mission personnel and access to witnesses, records, and sites where crimes occurred so that trials can have sufficient evidence to proceed. Equally important, the U.N. needs to be stricter in holding member countries to these standards. States that fail to fulfill their commitments to discipline their troops should be barred from providing troops for peace operations.

The end of the Cold War did not ease, but rather probably intensified, human insecurity. The UN recognizes that dangers to international peace and security now equate less with inter-state military violence, and more with other threats, varied and multiple, to local, regional or global survival. The priority reaction to these altered threats must be changes and flexibility in human


\textsuperscript{12} Csaky, Corinna, “No One to Turn to: The Under-Reporting of Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by Aid Workers and Peacekeepers.” Save the Children, 2008 at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/27_05_08_savechildren.pdf.

response. Human perceptions, priorities and institutions must adapt to situations. The necessary process of reaction is so grave, urgent and universal that it must be addressed collectively, as at the UN World Summits.

Since the end of the Cold War, while conflict between states has become rare, intra-state violence has increased. Self-determination, ethnic and religious differences have replaced resource gain and even ideology as reasons for inter-human combat. The proliferation and lethality of new weapons alone demands the reduction and eventual elimination of mass conflict. There is a continuum of things the UN can and must do. Through prevention and mediation, varied military or other sanctions, peacekeeping, and other intervention or assistance designed to stabilize or defuse situations, the UN must act as it was designed to do - further the building of global peace. A shrinking world makes peacemaking everywhere enlightened self-interest for all.

TERRORISM:

The subject of “terrorism” seized the world’s attention in late 2001 as a result of one fairly brief, yet highly dramatic and destructive, attack on two of the core symbols of the world’s most powerful political actor, the United States of America. The targeting of the World Trade Center in New York City, the symbol of the United States’ enormous global economic power, and the Pentagon Building in Washington, DC, the symbol of the United States’ overarching military superiority, was well planned, coordinated, and executed. The attack itself attained symbolic stature as an affront to the established global order, a challenge to the world’s dominant power, and an announcement that the prevailing US-led global order was not viewed, or valued, equally by all those whose daily lives are increasingly caught in the vortex of post-Cold War change.

Of course, the problem of terrorism was already well-known when the planes struck their targets in full view of a vast, global, tele-connected audience and created their indelible psychic images of sophisticated savagery. The
politics of terror, and the overpowering fear that terror produces in its wake, lay at the very foundation of the evolution of social order. And it is the ultimate irony of societal development that modern acts of savagery have attained such high levels of sophistication. In its most simple terms, terror has stood as the stark alternative to civility in social relations from the time of humankind’s earliest recorded reflections. As Hobbes explained in his 17th century treatise, “Out of civil states, there is always war of every one against every one...the nature of war, consists not in actual fighting; but in the known disposition thereto...and which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death; the life of man [sic], solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” At their roots, terror, force, and violence are integral and, as such, terrorism as a course of action is hardly distinguishable from coercion as a strategy or violence as a tactic.

Contemporary analyses of the problem of terrorism have usually foundered between the perceptual extremes that are inherent in the amorphous ideas of terror: conceptualizations of terrorism are either too broad to be analytically useful, too narrow to be analytically meaningful, or too complex to be applied systematically. The conceptualizations themselves are all too often politically motivated as the analyst attempts to rationalize a distinction between civil and uncivil applications of violence: (useless) terror and (useful) enforcement, (undisciplined) terrorism and (disciplined) war, and (dishonorable) terrorists and (honorable) “freedom fighters.” Conceptual confusion is further exacerbated by the often cavalier usage of the pejorative term “terrorist” to refer to any political opponent, much as “communist” was used for political effect in the West during the Cold War. Hoffman offers an example of a broad definition, “[Terrorism is] the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change.”

The organizations of the UN system mobilized immediately in their respective spheres to step up action against terrorism. On 28 September, the
Security Council adopted resolution 1373, under the enforcement provisions of the UN Charter, to prevent the financing of terrorism, criminalize the collection of funds for such purposes, and immediately freeze terrorist financial assets. It also established a Counter-Terrorism Committee to oversee the resolution’s implementation.

The tragic events of 11 September also underlined the potential danger of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of non-state actors. That attack could have been even more devastating had the terrorists had access to chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. Reflecting these concerns, the General Assembly, in 2002, adopted resolution 57/83, a first-time-ever text on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring such weapons and their means of delivery.14

In 2004, the Security Council took its first formal decision on the danger of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly to non-state actors. Acting under the enforcement provisions of the Charter, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1540,15 obliging states to refrain from any support for non-state actors in the development, acquisition, manufacture, possession, transport, transfer or use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery. Subsequently, the Assembly adopted the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism,16 which was opened for signature in September 2005.

The Vienna-based United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) leads the international effort to combat drug trafficking and abuse, organized crime and international terrorism. It analyses emerging trends in crime and justice, develops databases, issues global surveys issued, gathers and disseminates information, and undertakes country-specific needs assessments and early warning measures — for example, on the escalation of terrorism.

16 http://www.un.org/security_council.htm
I1 2002, UNODC launched its Global Project against Terrorism with the provision of legal technical assistance to countries on becoming party to and implementing the 12 universal anti-terrorism instruments. In January 2003, UNODC expanded its technical cooperation activities to strengthen the legal regime against terrorism, providing legal technical assistance to countries on becoming party to and implementing the universal anti-terrorism instruments.17

In the legal sphere, the UN and its related bodies — such as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) — have developed a network of international agreements that constitute the basic legal instruments against terrorism.18

These include conventions on offences committed on board aircraft; unlawful seizure of aircraft; acts against the safety of civil aviation; crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents; the physical protection of nuclear material; acts against the safety of maritime navigation; and the marking of plastic explosives for the purpose of detection. In addition, they include protocols on acts of violence at airports serving international civil aviation; and on acts against the safety of fixed platforms located on the continental shelf.

The General Assembly has also concluded the following five conventions: the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages; the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel; the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings; the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism; and the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.19

17 http://www.un.org/unodc.htm
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Sadly, major terrorist assaults have continued over the years since 9-11 — including attacks on UN headquarters in Baghdad\(^{20}\) (August 2003), on four commuter trains in Madrid\(^{21}\) (March 2004), on an office and an apartment block used by Westerners in al-Khobar, Saudi Arabia (May 2004), the London Underground\(^{22}\) (July 2005), a seaside area and shopping hub in Bali\(^{23}\) (October 2005), multiple sites in Mumbai (November 2008), the Marriott and Ritz-Carlton hotels in Jakarta (July 2009), and the Moscow Metro (March 2010), to name only a few.

As part of the international effort to stem this deadly tide, the General Assembly, in September 2006, unanimously adopted and launched the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Based on the fundamental conviction that terrorism in all its forms is unacceptable and can never be justified, the Strategy outlines a range of specific measures to address terrorism in all its aspects, at the national, regional and international levels.

**NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND DISARMAMENT**

In 2009, world military expenditures exceeded some $1.5 trillion. The need for a culture of peace and for significant arms reduction worldwide has never been greater. And this applies to all classes of weapons.

On the danger of nuclear weapons, Albert Einstein reportedly said: “I do not know with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones.”\(^{24}\) But the human and material cost of conventional weapons is also extreme. Of at least 640 million licensed firearms worldwide, roughly two thirds are in the hands of civil society. The legal trade in small arms and weapons exceeds $4 billion a year. The illicit trade is estimated at $1 billion. And such conventional weapons as landmines

\(^{20}\) http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/iraq/un_hq_baghdad_bombing.htm  
\(^{21}\) http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/madrid.htm  
\(^{22}\) http://www.news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/uk/2005/london_explosion/default.stm  
\(^{23}\) http://articles.cnn.com/bali.blast/2005.10.01.htm  
take a toll on life and limb that continues for years after the conflicts that spawned them are finished.

And yet, beyond the obvious effects of these weapons is their deeper cost — a cost that stems from misplaced priorities and an absence of vision.

Former United States President Dwight D. Eisenhower (1952-1960) and General Commander of the Allied Forces during World War II, put it this way. Speaking early in his term as President, he said: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities."

Since the birth of the United Nations, the goals of multilateral disarmament and arms limitation have been deemed central to the maintenance of international peace and security. These goals range from reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons, destroying chemical weapons and strengthening the prohibition against biological weapons, to halting the proliferation of landmines, small arms and light weapons.

These efforts are supported by a number of key UN instruments. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the most universal of all multilateral disarmament treaties, came into force in 1970. The Chemical Weapons Convention entered into force in 1997, the Biological Weapons Convention in 1975. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty was adopted in 1996. The 1997 Mine-Ban Convention came into force in 1999.

UN-supported regional treaties ban nuclear weapons in Antarctica, Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific, South-East Asia, Africa and Central Asia. Other instruments adopted through the UN ban nuclear weapons in outer space in the sea-bed.

Responding to the rise of international terrorism, the General Assembly adopted resolution 57/83 aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons

The General Assembly and the Security Council address disarmament-related issues on a continuing basis. The Assembly also held special sessions on disarmament in 1978 and 1988. Some UN bodies are dedicated *exclusively* to disarmament. Among them is the Conference on Disarmament. As the international community’s sole multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament agreements, the Conference successfully negotiated both the *Chemical Weapons Convention* and the *Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty*.

At the local level, UN peacekeepers often work to implement specific disarmament agreements between warring parties. This approach has been used successfully in West Africa, for example, where the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General has organized regional meetings to harmonize programmes for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants. The situation in Liberia provides a good example of how this works:

Established in September 2003, the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) was charged with assisting in the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and repatriation of all armed parties. The process was launched in December. Within 12 months, nearly 100,000 Liberians had turned in guns, ammunition, rocket-propelled grenades and other weapons. On 3 November 2004, Liberia’s warring militias formally disbanded in a ceremony at UNMIL headquarters in Monrovia. By the end of February 2006, more than 300,000 internally displaced Liberians had been returned to their home villages. After
15 years of conflict, the people turned out in massive numbers for UN-assisted elections in 2005.25

The situation following Iraq’s 1990 invasion of Kuwait and the conclusion of the first Gulf War is a unique example of a UN ceasefire agreement requiring enforced disarmament. When the war ended, the Council adopted its resolution 687 of 8 April 1991, setting the terms of the ceasefire. Among them: the elimination of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).26

To that end, the Council established the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) on the disarmament of Iraq, with powers of no-notice inspection. It entrusted the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with similar verification tasks in the nuclear sphere, with UNSCOM assistance. Over the ensuing 12 years, this process succeeded in reducing Iraq’s WMD stash considerably. Unfortunately, the inability to certify that all of those weapons and systems had been destroyed led, in part, to the second Iraq war in 2003.27

UN Peacekeeping also employs the strategy of preventive disarmament, which seeks to reduce the number of small arms in conflict-prone regions. In El Salvador, Sierra Leone, Liberia and elsewhere, this has entailed demobilizing combat forces as well as collecting and destroying their weapons as part of an overall peace agreement. And in keeping with the sentiment expressed by General Eisenhower, the UN is also supremely mindful, in all these efforts, of the direct relationship between disarmament and development.

The prevention of Nuclear Proliferation should have been accorded topmost priority along with nuclear disarmament. Here again the record of United Nations agencies charged with this task has been deplorable. The United

26 http://www.politybooks.com/up2/casestudy/un_and_the_gulf_war_casestudy
Nations did not focus, highlight or condemn any of the following developments:

- China’s assistance to Pakistan in development of nuclear weapons.
- China’s supply of nuclear capable missiles and missile technology to Pakistan.
- China’s assistance in building up of North Korea’s long-range and nuclear capable missiles.
- Pakistan’s supply of nuclear weapons technology to North Korea.
- United States permissiveness in tolerating all of the above developments. Inaction despite CIA evidence was sought to be justified by the United States on grounds of lack of “actionable intelligence”.

Obviously, structural inadequacies of the United Nations, the resolve and political inclinations of the United Nations Secretary General and the strategic interests and preferences of the United Nations Security Council permanent members were at play.

The end of the Cold War brought new hope for peace dividends, but left a world awash in arms, surplus arms-making capacity, and unemployed arms professionals. Traffic increased in both scale and recipients, as prices fell. Control over the development, manufacture and deployment of lethal weapons and substances, particularly nuclear, biological and chemical, has become no longer the preserve of the superpowers and their allies. UN concern and activity has grown, but will be constrained by: continued weapons research, driven by fear, greed and curiosity; global diffusion of both weapons and relevant knowledge; the increasing difficulty of verification; and the vulnerability of complex modern society to disruption. All demand global reaction.

The collapse of major institutions, both national and international, including numerous failed states, is foreseen as a delicate predicament for the
international community. The UN may be the only acceptable resident physician in many cases. Two problems inevitably arise: the degree of global control and help that is tolerable yet sufficient, and the enormous cost and possibly time-scale involved. For many reasons, however, a political-security black hole can no longer be left unattended by an interdependent community.

The influence, wealth and activities of many non-state trans-national organizations (NGO's, corporations, ideological movements, media, etc.) is approaching or exceeding that of sovereign states. The international rules in regard to such bodies remain very limited. One reason is that they may have no genuine nationality and/or can play one state off against another. Somehow such organizations must be persuaded to respect a minimal system of supranational norms, or jurisdiction if necessary. Only the UN system has any hope of accomplishing this.

**HUMAN RESOURCE:**

Behind most sources of global instability lie two inter-related factors. First, in many places and ways, humanity already exceeds the carrying capacity of both its biosphere and institutions. Its rapidly increasing capabilities have enabled it to expand its global impact and numbers much faster, and to conduct activities more destabilizing, than either the ecosystem or existing social arrangements can handle. Second, the global order, while knowledge-based, wastes most of the vast pool of human intelligence that might remedy or constrain these human numbers and profligate activities. Only a tiny handful of the humans now alive will ever approach their full potential. Billions live marginal lives; 30% of the world's labour force are not productively employed; 1.5 billion are condemned to the strait-jacket of illiteracy. Moreover, 80 million are added annually to human numbers - and to growing pressures on institutions and resources. Any alleviation of expanding human pressures and wasted human capacities - through responsible development and fertility, accelerated education and competence - is the most truly global challenge facing the international community, and UN.
Of course, the work of the UN for promotion of Human Rights is largely impeded by certain built-in limitations. There is in the first place the domestic jurisdiction clause in the principles of the UN, which acts as a double-edged sword. On the one hand it prevents even minimal interference of the world body in the domestic situation of the state accused of consistent human rights violations. On the other, it provides an easy defence of Governments for doing little about human rights.

Secondly, because of widespread differences in the social system and their sustaining ideologies, disagreements among governments at to which rights should get what priority often become irreconcilable. Liberal democracies of the west would mostly uphold political civil liberties such as freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and movement, competitive political campaigns and so on, so as to treat economic rights like the right to work, unemployment relief and other social security measures as secondary. The emphasis is reversed in the case of socialist states who attach greater importance to social, economic and cultural rights. Workers' security rather than political freedom in the abstract. Certain rights like equal rights for women may challenge the conservative order in many societies, especially in the Islamic world. Also the capacities of states to uphold different types of rights vary considerably. Economic backwardness may prevent with a well-intentioned elite from implementing fundamental economic rights.

Two trends cause increasing health concerns. First is the rapid and relentless escalation in the global movement of both people and things. Every conscious transfer also carries the threat of transmitting human, plant or animal disease, and inevitably raises the likelihood of pandemics. Second, the very widespread (over)use of antibiotics etc. has produced more resistant mutations, and a global race to keep ahead. All this calls for tighter global biological preventive and control measures. Fortunately many can be integrated to a degree with other security screening, and control of toxic goods movements. Again, any impervious system demands all-inclusive global coverage.
The formation and acceptance of universal human rights and democratic norms raises questions. While some governments argue that human rights are culturally based, in practice the body of those globally accepted is expanding. In any event, any universal code must be developed through the gradual buildup of norms. The process of formulation and acceptance is constantly underway in various UN fora, and has been for many years. Movement, though slow, is clearly forward and increasingly intrusive within states.

Humans now move in unprecedented numbers, not simply because there are more people, but because both the need and opportunity have grown: both push and pull forces are powerful. The UN officially recognizes well over 20 million refugees forced unwillingly out of their own country. Globally, about one person in a hundred is either a refugee or displaced, i.e. forced unwillingly to move within their country.28 Other mass migrations are more ambiguous, particularly the uncontrolled flows in poorer countries from country to city. When either or both the migrant and the place of immigration is unwilling, problems are bound to arise beyond mere acculturation. These truly global issues can best be dealt with at the global level.

In a knowledge-driven world, the maximum and most rapid exploitation of accurate information and essential technology should be facilitated, if only to the general welfare. Assisting in raising global access to information is a challenge so big and beneficial that it falls on the UN. Third World states can be assisted electronically in gaining entry to the most essential pools of knowledge, particularly to exploit modern technology for rapid and general education. The distortions and instability that accompany the global revolution can thus be absorbed as quickly and painlessly as possible, and the Third World make a major contribution to global sustainable development.

The avoidable frustration, hopelessness and anguish of billions of humans, brought about by absolute privation, and extreme and growing income

http://www.un.org/refugee.htm
divergence, both within and between states, must be addressed - if only for enlightened self-interest in global stability. The international community through the United Nations has a unique capacity, and so responsibility. We must try; there is no rational excuse.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Humanity's fixed global heritage is being destroyed or exploited at an accelerating rate, a process ultimately unsustainable. This applies to both renewable and non-renewable resources; to those claimed by individuals or organizations and those seen as humanity's common heritage and/or as valueless externalities. From now on, all exploitable reserves must be at least roughly calculated, valued, and used on a broadly sustainable basis. If these difficult aims are to have meaning and some hope of success, global accords and close cooperation are essential; the UN is already taking the lead.

Since the scientific revolution, and particularly since the population and technological explosions, certain human activities have done such dangerous and costly damage to the biosphere that *Homo sapiens* has no choice but to try to make corrections. At minimum, widespread and/or trans-boundary biospheric disruptions (e.g. air pollution; soil erosion, pollution and depletion; desertification; water misuse; deforestation) must be controlled or reversed. The scale and wide-spread nature of most of these problems, and the limited financial and technical ability of many of those worst affected, require that most can best or only be addressed collectively on a worldwide basis.²⁹

We confront or create serious physical phenomena of global impact, many caused by forces that can only be indirectly influenced, or even understood. These may or may not be avoidable, but many can now at least be predicted, or reduced in force or effect. Examples may be climatic (global warming, ozone depletion); geological (earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, tsunami); meteorological (floods, storms, droughts); or space-originated

²⁹ Earth Summit, Rio 1992
Almost any human counter-action can only or best be undertaken collectively by the global community.

Almost all the challenges identified raise the possibility of catastrophe, however prescient the UN's efforts. World interdependence increases chances that local events have global effects; the colossal and ever-growing scale of human intrusions on the biosphere make catastrophes both more likely and serious; and the omnipresent media, combined with the appalling discrepancies in wealth, make assistance politically unavoidable. Geography, resources and technology alone make UN-coordinated action preferable.

With the proliferation of weapons comes the profusion of those who could and might use them. The desperation of unemployment, the anger of those masses who perceive themselves deprived in a grossly unequal but more-informed world, and the boldness of ethnic and religious certainties, sows contagious seeds of terrorism, fanaticism and martyrdom. Arming and financing extremists are inter alia the growing numbers and wealth of drug dealers and other international criminals, and new thousands of well-trained and armed international mercenaries and activists. Miniaturization, the diffusion of lethal knowledge and components, and multi-use equipment and substances, impede surveillance, while the vulnerability of energy- and information-dependent society makes it more susceptible to focussed attack and blackmail. Counter-action must therefore involve all governments to eliminate sanctuary and safe transit. Counter-intelligence must become as airtight and coordinated as possible. Only global coverage is truly effective.

One major aspect of globalization is the interdependence of national finances. This reflects the vast, expanding scale and global nature of: international trade (goods; services; technology), investment (short-term; direct), migration (personal assets; remittances), and the related or speculative financial transfers (now worth about $1.5 trillion daily). This reality limits all governments' control over national fiscal policies, exchange rates, economic success, and debts, and can threaten national stability - increasingly through
external financial developments. Resulting world-wide issues include: the need for terms of global financial rules and assistance; the nature, control and value of (national) currencies; the optimum rules for foreign trade, investment and migration; the damping of irrational confidence, price, stock-exchange frenzies; the elimination of tax havens and money laundering. All involve the UN system (particularly the IMF-World Bank).

As the volume and value of international trade grows, it raises new problems of negotiation, regulation and adjustment. The World Trade Organization will have a key role in dealing with the rapidly growing trade in services, chronic problems with agriculture, the issues of international investment and corruption, environmental and labour standards, and the taxing of international trade between parts of supra-national corporations. Many economic agreements are already global. They will inevitably grow in number and complexity as trade blocs form.

STRUCTURE OF UN

All Member States are represented in the General Assembly. Yet its decision is not binding on anyone. The Security Council consists of the representatives of only a few states. Yet its decision is binding. If a single permanent member vetoes, all other members cannot pass any resolution. Thus through the Security Council a permanent member like the USA may use the entire United Nations for its imperialistic and hegemonic designs. Yet they are not satisfied. At the time of his address in the United Nations on 12 September 2002, before launching his attack on Iraq, US President Bush asked. “Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant?” As if the United Nations is relevant only if it enacts the wishes of the US President. If it fails to do so, it is irrelevant. He really proved the United Nations irrelevant by launching a unilateral, unjust attack on "sovereign" Iraq without any authorisation from the United Nations on the false plea that Iraq under Saddam Hussein had Weapons of Mass Destruction and Saddam had connection with Osama bin Laden. The Coalition Force under the USA
attacked and occupied Iraq, killed more than 2,00,000 Iraqis, and installed its puppet government there so that they might control the Iraqi natural resources like oil. Even after two years of occupation of Iraq, Bush could not find even a single WMD. The Commission appointed by him also could not find any proof of Saddam's connection with Osama.

Before that on 24 March 1999 NATO started an air campaign on Kosovo to bring President Slobodan Milosevic to terms. It also clearly revealed the helplessness of the United Nations. Incidents like these tarnished the image of the Organisation to a great extent.

On this background, "in his address to the General Assembly in September 2003 United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan warned Member States that the 'United Nations had reached a fork in the road. It could rise to the challenge of meeting new threats or it could risk erosion in the face of mounting discord between States and unilateral action by them. To enable the United Nations "to rise to the challenge of meeting new threats" he appointed a 16-member "High-Level Panel". They submitted the report entitled "A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility". After that, the Secretary General himself submitted his report "In Larger Freedom; Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All" on 21 March 2005. Introducing this report to the General Assembly, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan urged Member States to adopt this year a package of specific, concrete proposals to tackle global problems and enable the Organisation to better respond to current challenges. What are the proposals for changing the composition for Security Council? No proposal for abolishing veto power. "No proposal for extending the veto power. The proposal is simply to increase the number of some members without any veto power. The

Secretary General himself and the members of the High-Level Panel appointed by him knew it well that the permanent members would not agree to give up the undemocratic, autocratic, tyrannical power of veto and permanent membership of the Security Council. So they did not dare to recommend so. They recommended either the introduction of six new permanent members without veto power and three two year term non-permanent members (Model A) or eight four-year term renewable non-permanent members and one two-year term non-renewable non-permanent member (Model B). What they have recommended will in no way alter the basic undemocratic, partial character of the United Nations. They are not bothered about it. The permanent members are only interested to polish the image of the United Nations, which had faded considerably by their misdeeds. They did the same thing with the League of Nations. They increased the non-permanent members of the Council of the League of Nations from four in 1920 to six in 1922 and nine in 1926. This increase in no way salvaged the League of Nations and, when the permanent members like Japan and Italy began to invade other countries in defiance of the League, the League became irrelevant. The League was dissolved in 1946. But it became nonexistent long before that. It did not meet again after December 1939. Similarly the United Nations will remain intact as long as the permanent members do not defy it and the other members digest the unjust activities of the powerful permanent members. If the permanent members defy it or others oppose their misdeeds, the United Nations is destined to collapse. The Coalition attack on Iraq is an indication of that collapse.

The powerful permanent members will not allow United Nations to be just and democratic. They will bypass the United Nations when it suits them. But they expect others to honour it. Hence arises the need of breaking it. All other nations should boycott the unjust United Nations and create one new World Organisation, on the principle of sovereignty equality and impartiality.

---
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and compel the permanent members to join the new just organisation, or face isolation.

The Charter established six principal organs of the United Nations:

1. the General Assembly,
2. the Security Council,
3. the Economic and Social Council,
4. the Trusteeship Council,
5. the International Court of Justice, and
6. the Secretariat;

The United Nations family, however, is much larger, encompassing 15 agencies and several programmes and bodies.

The General Assembly

The General Assembly consists of the representatives of all the Member States, each of which has only one vote. It can deliberate on any matter subject to the limitation imposed by Article 12 of the Charter. The regular session of the Assembly generally begins in the month of September each year. In addition, the Assembly may meet on special sessions. Resolution on peace and security, admission of new members and budgetary matter requires two-third majority. Resolution on other matters requires only simple majority. Though consisting of all the Member States, the decision of the General Assembly is not binding on anyone.

Security Council

Were the United Nations a just, impartial and democratic organisation for preserving world peace in the true sense, the General Assembly should have been the most powerful organ and all other organs must have been subordinate to it! But the Allied Powers had no such intention. They wanted to safeguard their own interest, sometimes their unjust greed, at the expense of weaker
nations. So they drafted the Charter in such a way that the Security Council is the repository of the real power of the United Nations and no "substantive" resolution in the Security Council can be passed without their consent. Here lies the greatest malady of the United Nations.

**Money Power**

Money power is a big power. Naturally the Member State which contributes more enjoys more clout in the UN.

Each Member State contributes the amount assessed on a scale approved by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Committee on Contribution. "The fundamental criterion on which the scale of assessments is based is the capacity of the country to pay. This is determined by considering their relative shares of total gross national product, adjusted to take into account a number of factors, including their per capita income."  

The scale of assessment (that is contribution in percentage) for 2004 is that USA alone contributes 22%, the maximum for any one contributor. The five permanent members (USA 22%, UK 6.127%, France 6.030%, Russian Federation 1.100% and China 2.053%) together contribute 37.310%. And along with other four developed countries (Japan 19.468%, Germany 6.662%, Italy 4.885%, and Spain 2.520%), nine countries contribute more than 70% (70.845%) and the remaining 182 countries contribute only 29.165%. USA contributes 22%. But there are as many as 48 countries which contribute only 0.001%. Each of the poorest 48 countries contributes only one-twenty two thousandth part of what USA contributes. That is, USA contributes 22000 times that of the contribution of each country, and 466.667 times that of all the 48 countries together. Naturally the UN is more dependent on US contribution than that of any other country. Withholding of contribution by USA will affect the UN more. Naturally, the USA commands more respect and

---
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power in the UN than any other country. But the power emanating from the Structure of the UN has got precedence over the money power also.

If money power was the only criterion, then Japan with contribution of 19.468% should have been the most powerful Member State in UN, second only to USA, and its clout should have been more than the joint clout of other four permanent members together. But that is not the case. Everyone knows that UK, France, Russia, or even its immediate neighbour China holds more power and prestige in UN circle than Japan. This is because being the permanent members of the Security Council they possess veto power.

The USA is so powerful because veto power has given leverage to money power. It can buy with money and cut with veto.

**Misuse of Veto Power**

The veto is of course only a symptom of Great Power disagreement. The veto was introduced because the idea was that the Great Powers had the responsibility of enforcing peace and as such there should be unanimity among Great Powers on any issue affecting world peace. The United States was the first to propose the introduction of veto in the Security Council. There is great possibility of veto being misused by the permanent members of Security Council. The entire UN—machinery is paralysed if any permanent member of Security Council exercises veto against any resolution. In case any resolution defeated in the Security Council due to exercise of veto, there is remote possibility of its being adopted by 2/3 majority of the members of the General Assembly because of the manoeuvres of the Great Power exercising veto. On certain occasions the permanent members of the Security Council have tried to pursue their national interests and exercise the veto to achieve them. Under President Truman the American government had announced that it would veto all candidates for the post of Secretary General except Trygve Tylie, President Eisenhower also announced that the United-States would use the veto to prevent the admission of People's Republic of China in the United Nations. By
the end of 1960 out of the total number of 99 vetoes which had been mast the 
Soviet Union exercised veto for 92 times. On certain occasions the Great 
Powers have adopted partisan approach. For instance in case of Kashmir issue 
the United States, Britain and France had unduly supported Pakistan's position 
and failed to realise the legality of India's stand on Kashmir. Similarly, these 
Western countries have not exercised veto on various proposals demanding 
imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the government of 
Union of South Africa which is practising the policy of apartheid to the 
detriment of the coloured people. If any of the five permanent members is an 
aggressor or decides to favour or help an aggressor state no action can be taken 
by the United Nations. Commenting on the privileged position of the 
permanent members of the Security Council, Lord Winster has aptly remarked 
thus "This organisation will be one for keeping small boys in order by 
prebects-who-are-themselves exempt from the rules they administer." 
Commenting on the hegemony of Great Powers in the World body Dr. Murray 
has said" I strongly suspect that the first real strain on the new league will 
come when it attempts to give orders to some nation accustomed to freedom. It 
is a new provision that the Security Council should have the power to issue- 
orders, while the fact that the Great Powers need not obey such order will great 
weaken such moral authority as they might have had.

EQUAL WEIGHTAGE TO ALL STATES

Taking advantage of the arbitrary, undemocratic and unjust nature of the 
Charter, the imperialist powers like the USA and UK have been using the 
United Nations since its inception as an instrument of oppression of the weaker 
states. On the one hand, they are using United Nations for the justification of 
their misdeeds, even wanton aggression for their imperialist interest. In the 
name of United Nations, time and again, they are waging wars against the 
weaker nations, who are slowly trying to get out of the imperialistic hegemony 
of the big powers. If you are weak and no veto-wielding power is behind you, 
then you may be condemned, sanction may be imposed against you to cripple
you, even military force may be used against you, for bringing you in their line. Any attempt to get justice against these big powers or their allies, is ruthlessly frustrated by the veto power. On the other hand, if you are a big power with permanent membership in the Security Council or at least you enjoy the blessing of one such power, you can go on doing anything you like, even you can trample the Security Council Resolutions which are binding on all Member States including the permanent members of the Security Council; nobody can touch you. You may blatantly violate the Resolutions of the Security Council, but any punishment against you may be imposed only through the Resolution of the Security Council, and if you have a veto power on your side, you can equally blatantly block that resolution. Yes, the General Assembly may consider the matter, and there you can give vent to your grievances. But nobody is bothered about that. Security Council is there as a shield to protect the offender. Such is the greatness of the present United Nations. A few examples will make the point clearer.

Libya in the African continent was an Italian colony since 1911 till it was captured by Franco-British Allied Forces during the Second World War. It attained independence in 1951- In 1959 oil reserves were discovered. So the big powers like the USA, UK and France were interested in controlling it in the form of neo-colonialism. In the 1970s and 1980s the Libyan leaders were not blindly obeying their dictates. For that, they had to pay a very high price. United Nations could not give any relief to them against the veto-wielding powers and their allies.

On 4 February 1986, two Israeli fighter aircraft, in gross violation of the international law/forcefully intercepted, diverted and detained a private Libyan civilian G-2 type aircraft, while flying over the international airspace over the Mediterranean. Syria brought this flagrant violation of international law to the Security Council. At the 2655th meeting of the Security Council, USA vetoed the revised draft resolution submitted by Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates. The resolution wanted to condemn
Israel for "its forcible interception of the Libyan civilian aircraft in international airspace and its subsequent detention of the same aircraft" and call upon "Israel to desist from" such act. The US representative stated that "although the United States opposed Israel's action in this case, it would not accept the said draft resolution as it did not take into sufficient account the need to address practically and appropriately the overriding issue of terrorism."  

On 15 April 1986, the United States aircraft bombed targets in the Libyan capital Tripoli and its second largest city Benghazi. The same day Libya requested for an immediate meeting of the Security Council. At its 2682nd meeting, on 21 April 1986, USA, UK and France vetoed the revised draft resolution submitted by Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates. The resolution, inter alia, wanted to condemn "the armed attack by United States in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct" and call upon "the United States to refrain forthwith from any attacks or threat thereof." The United States representative rejected the said draft resolution as totally unacceptable."  

In its letter dated 4 January Libya requested the President of the Security Council for an immediate meeting of the Council to consider the drowning of two reconnaissance aircraft by the United States Armed Forces. At the 2841st meeting on 11 January 1989, USA, UK and France vetoed the draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Columbia, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia. The resolution wanted to "deplore the drowning of the two Libyan reconnaissance planes by the armed forces of the United States" and "call upon the United States to suspend its military man oeuvres off the Libyan coast in order to contribute to the reduction of tension in the area." The US representative claimed that "the two Libyan aircraft in question had not flown in routine observation pattern. They flew flight patterns consistent with

aggressive, hostile intent and when the United States pilots attempted to evade them the Libyan pilots pursued them repeatedly.\textsuperscript{39}

The list is long. The cases of Iraq and Palestine are more revealing.

**RULE OF LAW**

A final challenge explored by participants was the UN’s ability to engage in comprehensive peacebuilding efforts through the establishment of post-conflict rule of law. This issue was found to be extremely pertinent to the future of peace operations, considering the increasing scope of UN peacekeeping missions in aspects relevant to the rule of law. According to Gantz, the immediate priority when first deploying a peacekeeping mission must continue to focus on ensuring a basic level of security, without which daily activities cannot commence. In the longer-term, however, he advised that the priority should shift to enhancing local institutional capabilities while simultaneously devolving authority to local establishments and actors. The challenge in establishing this local rule of law, Gantz argued, rests in the multiple issues at play, including the types of rules and laws that must be implemented, and the model (if any) to follow in doing so. The process requires, among other things, the elaboration of a constitution and the implementation of transparency mechanisms. It also requires training professionals, government officials, and a judiciary, including police, prisons and court officials, all of which demand special skills and special guidance.

Gantz used the example of Haiti to demonstrate how the accomplishments of the international community can be as easily reversed if all factors for good governance are not in place before UN forces are withdrawn. He explained that while the police were fairly effective, the courts and prisons were not, causing an increase in extra-judicial responses to crimes and offenses. In the end, the lack of institutional capabilities was a major factor in the reversal of the

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid, pp. 272-274
situation in Haiti, and resulted in the efforts of the international community being compromised.

Every (binding) interstate agreement constrains sovereignty, and every resolution passed in a universal forum contributes to creating global standards/norms. The general trend is thus for the body of international practice, precedent and law to grow at an unequalled rate. The reason is practical. A world whose international inter-connections grow exponentially must establish and maintain relevant rules, controls and principles. The development of international law and tribunals must keep pace with interdependence. If global, the UN is involved.

**CONSTRAINTS**

**POLITICAL WILL**

The political will of western nations to engage in peacekeeping missions was a point of interest throughout the conference. Although participants acknowledged a decline in political will of developed nations to contribute larger contingents to UN peacekeeping missions, there was some disagreement over the extent of the phenomenon. Several participants pointed to a growing aversion on the part of developed countries to troop casualties and reluctance to deploy large contingents under UN command. These reasons, along with the increasing engagement of many western nations in Iraq and Afghanistan, led Ray Crabbe to suggest the future involvement of western states in peacekeeping to be questionable at best.

While agreeing with Crabbe on the importance of the West’s strategic leadership, Jeremy Kinsman noted that perhaps the apparent waning willingness of western nations to commit forces to peacekeeping is overstated. While he admitted that there has been a decline in western troop contributions to UN missions relative to the contributions of developing nations, he argued that other factors are also responsible for this decline. In his view, the case for humanitarian intervention was stained by its use as an excuse for the United
States (US) to enter Iraq. While he acquiesced that public opinion is beginning to regain confidence in the international system, electorates throughout the developed world remain split on the question of humanitarian intervention and governments remain risk averse in their foreign policy. Despite this setback to the case for humanitarian intervention, Kinsman sees a chance for progress on the horizon. As the Security Council is no longer paralyzed by Cold War politics, and as the setbacks of the 1990s and beginning of the 21st century are slowly dissipating, he saw a reason to be cautiously optimistic about the future of UN peacekeeping. Russia and China are showing a new willingness to cooperate and the US is learning the inadequacy of unilateralism.

In light of the weakening political will on the part of developed countries, participants discussed the growing willingness of developing countries to get involved in UN peacekeeping. The last five years have seen an unprecedented growth in UN peacekeeping, contributing to a considerable increase in the demand for peacekeepers. As a result, developing countries have stepped up and are now assuming the burden by contributing the majority of peacekeepers.\(^{40}\) Once again, however, opinions varied widely as to the underlying reasons for such an increase.

Crabbe, for example, suggested that the increase in the contributions of developing countries partly reflects the desire of African states to assume greater responsibility in the area of peace and security. He questioned the motivation of some UN peacekeeping contingents, by pointing to the monetary incentives for countries to contribute troops, which can add up to a significant windfall for a developing economy. Skeptical of the phenomenon, he further noted that the growing involvement of developing countries in peacekeeping has created the negative perception that “developing country soldiers are being sent to keep western soldiers safe.” Kinsman offered a different view, suggesting instead that it is simply a division of labour according to capacity.

as many of the developed states are operating at close to full capacity in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

Closely related to political will are the challenges posed by troop and financial constraints. Troop and financial support are crucial elements of a peacekeeping deployment, without which a peacekeeping mission cannot assume its full range of capabilities. Within this theme, participants addressed the challenges that an increase in the number of peacekeepers coming from developing countries poses to peacekeeping.

Most participants agreed that many of the concerns surrounding the increasing role of developing countries in peacekeeping stem from their lack of capacity. While it was acknowledged that there have been many good contingents from developing countries, several participants pointed to the fact that many of these contingents are under-funded and lack training and/or equipment. This view was echoed by Pierre Kyer, who stated that many of the developing country contingents he saw while working in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) were much less efficient. While on location in the field, he witnessed troops with little preparation (e.g. lacking a driver’s license) and with limited knowledge of the local culture and language.

With these examples in mind, Greg Cran noted that the absence of developed nations poses new challenges to peacekeeping operations. Wider and more challenging mandates not only require more money, but also more specialized capacities (i.e., army engineers and logisticians, heavy-lift aircraft, proper command-and-control and intelligence gathering, etc.). As Crabbe explained, peacekeeping missions rely on the command and control, logistics, as well as leadership strategies offered by western militaries and in the absence of this expertise, peacekeeping becomes much more challenging. This is an operational challenge which must be addressed, as specialized armies and
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capacities are in short supply. While the capacity exists, it is mostly concentrated in western countries with established militaries, and it requires each member state to voluntarily contribute their capacity and equipment to a UN mission. In response to this challenge, Cran remarked that the focus should be on improving the capacity of developing contingents.

An increase in peacekeeping operations also translates into financial implications for the UN system and its member states. The surge in operations witnessed in the past few years has not only raised the demand for peacekeepers, but also caused the annual budget of UN peacekeeping to triple from its level ten years ago, putting more pressure on member states. The annual budget is currently in the range of $6 billion.\(^\text{43}\)

**MANPOWER FOR PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS**

A third issue under discussion was that of rapid deployment and the possibility of building a standing capacity under UN auspices. Rapid response to crises and post-conflict areas remain difficult to achieve, and as such, constitute a considerable obstacle to the effectiveness of UN peacekeeping. It is increasingly recognized that to respond to the challenges posed by contemporary conflicts, forces must be mobile, flexible, effective, and sustainable. As the UN does not have a standing peacekeeping capacity, it must rely on voluntary contributions from member states, causing the process of planning, authorizing and deploying a peacekeeping operation to be extremely complex.\(^\text{44}\)

Crabbe noted that according to the Brahimi Report, soldiers must be on the ground within six weeks for most peacekeeping missions to be successful and the majority of missions to date have failed to respond in a timely manner.

---


\(^{43}\) The full deployment of the operation in Lebanon and the Mission in Darfur could raise the budget to $7 billion.

He described organizations that study the UN structure as well as those conducting country background studies as absolutely invaluable for mission success. In his view, it is crucial to have an understanding of the multifaceted approaches to peacekeeping and to have command and control headquarters that possess regional knowledge. He suggested that there is a need for more multinational regional headquarters around the world if the UN is to create the ability for rapid deployment. He further explained that there is a need for greater flexibility in UN deployment requirements. Instead of reinventing the wheel for every mission and counting individual soldiers and equipment based on the monetary will of contributing nations, he advocated for working with set peacekeeping “packages” that can be deployed much faster. Examples of such ‘force packages’ include SHIRBRIG, the NATO Response Force (NRF), the EU Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF), the EU Battlegroups, and the African Standby Force (ASF). Crabbe also recognized that the UN has collected rosters of military and civilian personnel; however, these rosters, in his opinion, are largely unmonitored and have not worked in the past.

Regarding the issue of standing capacity, Gantz argued that a significant standing capacity for UN peacekeeping would not be created any time soon. He did note, however, that there is a small standing police capacity of about fifteen police officers in the UN system. The UN Standing Police Capacity (SPC) is a new UN mechanism to help establish police components in new UN peace operations. The SPC can also support ongoing operations. Although few in number, Gantz sees the initiative as a foot in the door for those advocating a permanent military and police force that could rapidly deploy to conflict situations as the need arises. In his view, while the will to create a standing capacity for UN peacekeeping forces remains elusive, it is difficult to overstate the value of having core staff in place to ensure that each mission builds on previous experiences. This would allow for continuous improvement in the speed and efficiency of future UN missions.
Participants discussed rules of engagement and the use of force. The fundamental principles of UN peacekeeping — consent, impartiality, and the non-use of force except in self-defence — have, in specific cases, become obstacles to the deployment and success of UN peacekeeping missions. In particular, respect for the non-use of force has, in many cases, proven to be impractical in the face of large-scale massacres and detrimental to the mission both morally and physically. Rwanda, Bosnia, Somalia, and East Timor are stark examples of the consequences of the non-use of force. In response to the new strategic environment, today’s missions are for the most part deployed under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, authorizing peacekeepers to use “all necessary means” to protect themselves and threatened civilians. For example, the missions in the DRC, Sierra Leone, Côte d’Ivoire and Haiti have, as part of their mandate, the explicit authorization to use force to protect civilians. However, this use of force raises a number of questions, such as the level of force at which it becomes too much and the extent to which peacekeepers should protect civilians if such protection can jeopardize a mission’s objectives.

Kinsman noted the need for military peacekeepers to have clear rules of engagement that are suited to the particular mission to avoid repeating situations where peacekeepers lacked in both capacity and mandate. Indeed, it is crucial that when a force is deployed, the mandate under which it will operate matches the needs on the ground. Boutilier agreed that there is a need for a much stronger UN in current missions and that this must start with robust rules of engagement. Crabbe, on the other hand, argued that mandates have improved in strength and clarity since the early days of peacekeeping, and rules of engagement are now very detailed. In Afghanistan, for example, he claimed that soldiers know exactly what they can and cannot do. In his view, the real issue with rules of engagement is the need for UN forces to develop a credible deterrent capability. According to him, the major mistake made in the Balkans was to offer no assurances as to the consequences of breaking the ceasefire. As
a result, he argued that the UN must act as a greater deterrent by creating a fourth principle of “credibility of force” to compliment the three principles already in place. One aspect of this credibility would be to force the UN to be clear about the consequences of violating cease-fires.

While all participants agreed that the UN has made progress on rules of engagement, the problem, according to Gantz, is that rules of engagement are still decided in an ad hoc way. In his view, the UN should develop a more professional approach to peacekeeping by developing doctrine. He argued that the UN should identify the desired outcome and identify how they are going to reach it. While Crabbe argued that UN peacekeeping operations already have an end-state in mind, he admitted that, since missions are often deployed hastily, defining an end-state can indeed be difficult. The process, he added, is further complicated by the need to draft rules of engagement appropriate for each national environment in which these missions operate.

Responding to Gantz’ proposal for a peacekeeping doctrine, Kinsman stated that because the UN is made up of member states, weaknesses in doctrine are simply a reflection of the inability of member states to come to a consensus. He pointed out that general guidelines would likely be too difficult to sell and that perhaps ad hoc rules of engagement are better. He further suggested that a case-by-case approach offers material reasons to support ad hoc rules of engagement. More specifically, Kinsman expressed the need for the UN to create a case-by-case ability to employ strong Chapter VII mandates to make peace in conflict zones, and argued that Canada should be at the vanguard of this movement. While the UN used to be divided along East-West lines, the new divisions, he explained, are between the haves and have-nots, the democratic and non-democratic states, and those worried about sovereignty and those who feel this sovereignty should be broken in cases where humanitarian intervention appears necessary. Kinsman noted that in Rwanda the international community failed to see the aggressor, failed to authorize resistance, and ultimately failed to protect citizens at risk. In his opinion, there has been a
paradigm shift from the security of states to human security that sometimes necessitates force by the international community. Building on previous points, Webb argued that perhaps the best option for addressing peacekeeping is to have a balance between a case-by-case approach of building precedents and having guidelines in place from which to work.

On the question of the protection of civilians, Gantz recognized the need for a strong mandate to use force in order to offer security for civilians, but suggested that we need to be careful that this does not derail the larger mission. To clarify his point, he used the example of Darfur where both the Government of Sudan and the rebel groups are attacking civilians. If UN forces abide by the principles of consent and impartiality, both the Government and rebel groups become partners in peace. If, on the other hand, UN forces are forced into combat with members from either group in order to protect members of the civilian population, they run the risk of driving a partner in peace out of the peace process.

Overall, participants stressed the need to ensure that UN forces receive mandates appropriate for each mission, including a credible deterrent capability when necessary. At the same time, the UN must study the effects of supplying a strong mandate to use force on the wider goals of the mission. When defining rules of engagement, the UN must strike a balance between an ad hoc approach specific to each mission, and a general framework allowing for consistent and timely deployments.

GANDHIAN ALTERNATIVES

The context is the 'Global Peace' in the modern world and the text is 'Gandhian philosophy for its attainment. The broad hypothesis is:" World peace can only be realized through non-violence. There is no alternative to non-violence".

The modern world is facing a multi-dimensional crisis; a crisis that poses challenge to each and every aspect of our life. Among the outstanding aspects
of this crisis are; over-militarization, nuclear proliferation and global reach of arms, overdevelopment and underdevelopment resulting in mal-development. A vast number of people suffering from poverty, hunger and marginalization. Added to these are environmental injustice, crisis in the field of energy, mounting insecurity and violence, terrorism, war and conflicts, drug trafficking, AIDs. Besides, there are corruption, communalism, unemployment, regionalism, problems of language, ethical and moral degradation in private and public life. All these together pose a grave challenge to the world. Peace is far away so long as these problems exist.

Among the various political ideologies, democratic governance appears to be best because it is this very system which provides maximum opportunities of public progress and development. People can themselves decide the mode of their welfare. But, is the democratic system of governance free from above problems? Therefore Gandhian Philosophy is very much contextual today on this accord.

Mahatma Gandhi treated his individual life in accordance with his ideas. He said "my life is my message". Therefore Gandhism is a mixture of Gandhi's concepts and practices. The basic groundship happens to be "Non-violence". He practiced and prescribed non-violence as a remedy against all social evils. It is the most ancient eternal values and culture of India. He said on this account. " I have nothing new to teach you Truth and non-violence are as old as hill." Non-violence and Truth are two sides of a same coin.

Total non-violence consists in not hurting some other one's intellect, speech or action per own thought, utterance or deeds and not to deprive some one of his life. In essence, abstinence in toto from violence is non violence. In this context Gandhi clarified in an edition of young India.

"..... to hurt someone, to think of some evil unto some one or to snatch one's life under anger or selfishness, is violence. In contrast, purest non-violence is an epitome in having a tendency and presuming towards spiritual or
physical benefit unto everyone without selfishness and with pure thought after
cool and clear deliberations. The ultimate yardstick of violence or non-violence
is the spirit behind the action.\textsuperscript{45}

From beginning unto now man has been ultimately treading path of non-
violence. It came into existence along with man. It is co-terminus with life. In
case, it has not with man from the very beginning, there might have been self-
dom by man. Besides there has been gradual enhancement in development and
proximity in spite of presence of various obstacles and hurdles.

Non-violence and Truth both are complementary to each other. It is
more appropriate to say "Truth is God," rather than saying "God is Truth". He
equated God with Absolute Truth as ultimate reality, Soul is the spark of this
God of Truth. It is the moral, The spiritual force, the divine spirit which
regulates our body and mind. It is the voice of God, the voice of Truth within
us.

Both are two sides of the same coin. Both have same value. Difference
consists in approach only. The derivation is that Truth stays with permanence
and that Truth is permanent. Non-violence on account of being permanently
present stays to be true. Non-violence is both a means and an end in itself.

It is not a weapon of the weak. It has no place for cowardice. It is an
active force. Non-violence is impossible without bravery/courage/ fearlessness.
Doing at any cost something that one ought to do. The courage of dying
without killing. Having decided upon the rightness of a situation, Gandhi
would not like one to be passive spectator to evil. This is the essence of Non-
Alignments which is different from neutrality. When freedom is menaced or
justice is threatened or where aggression takes place we can not and shall not
be neutral.

Non-Violence has individual and social aspects too. It fosters co-
operation and cooperative progress. Progress is difficult to achieve without co-
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operation. Co-operation is possible only when there is no violence. To him, regulation of mutual relations in society is through non-violence to considerable extent. He wished it to be developed on large scale. He called upon the people to continue to develop it in practice throughout life as the basis of life. It is all - timely and all welfaristic. A non-violent is always ready to face punishment for the maximum benefit of all whereas a utilitarian is not.

Complete unity and integrity of body, mind and soul are in the individual human being. The body should be controlled by mind and the mind by the soul - a harmony among three. But this control is not to be achieved by despising or neglecting either the body or mind or soul.

Means are at least as important as, and often more important than, ends. It is, of course, desirable that ends should be good and reasonable. They give direction to life while the means adopted constitute life itself. The means confirm to the test of truth and no-violence, even mistakes, errors, and failures aid the growth of the individual. We can not get a rose by planting a noxious weed. There is an inviolable connection between the means and end as there is between the seed and tree. The relationship between the two is organic. There must be purity of means. Those who grow out of violence, they will end in violence. This is what makes Gandhi distinctly different form Kautilya, Machiavelli, Bentham, Karl Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and others.

Examination of Gandhi's view on State may, perhaps, lead to a better understanding of his vision of democracy. Sometimes a confusion is made between the acts of the individuals and those of the State, and it is expected that Gandhi's State is to be non-violent. But how is the State act non-violently when it represents violence in a concentrated and organized form? Indeed a non-violent state is a contradiction in terms. It could only be called a non-violent stateless society. This is the ideal for Gandhi. Non-existence of State as cherished by Gandhi is impossible instantly or in near future. At the level of imperfect nature of man, among the existing states, democratic governance appears to be best.
But the paradox is that being theoretically the best system of
government, there is tidal waves of violence and other related problems
sweeping across the world and seems to be having no respite.

Gandhi is certainly a staunch supporter of democracy. He believed that
state is best which governs least and this is his second best ideal. He held the
view that there are certain things which cannot be done without political
powers, even though there are numerous other things which do not at all
depend upon political power. While in ideal society, there is no room for the
military and police, yet in the actual state there is provision for it according to
the moral level of its citizens. Democracy should be intermingled with non-
violence in even manner and governmental interference is minimum. The
present democratic systems can overcome the problems most importantly
"violence and terrorism" only when non-violence is accorded supreme status in
practice as well as in principle and at social as well as individual plane. Only
such a democracy can be successful in its real goal. The existing democratic
deficit can be overcome by incorporating "Gandhism in democracy". Violence
is not sacred, pure or welfaristic from any point of view. Whatever is gained on
the basis of it is impure and temporary. Democracy and violence can never be
mutual. The basis of democracy is non-violence in toto. In it, people will grow
accustomed spontaneously to observe their social obligations without the
operation of the State The more the individuals have imbibed the spirit of non-
violence, the less the necessity of state. This is the implication of Gandhi's
concept of Swaraj. "The attempt to win Swaraj is Swaraj itself. It is a
developing ideal and is "better than the best". Gandhi calls it "indefinable".
Whatever political institutions Gandhi accepted, he did so as a transitional
device, to be transcended by better ones. No institutional device is final. They
must involve with the evolution of the individuals. The state should work in the
direction of development of non-violence at individual, community, social and
national levels. Gandhi believes that politics can remain pure and free of
corruption only if and so far it is based on ethical principles- ethics which are
He stands for the spiritualization and secularization of politics. Gandhi said: "If they are to be truly made democratic, they must be valiantly non-violent. In case of its absence, democracy shall be there for namesake only and it would be better for it clearly be supporter of dictatorship".\textsuperscript{46} This democracy must be such that it should not warrant power of punishment. In it people will certainly be conscious of their duties. Peace requires peaceful method. There is no alternative to non-violence.

Gandhi's experiences in South Africa became his laboratory where he conducted experiments and formulated his worldview. The discovery was Satyagraha. The policy of apartheid by the white Minority Government made the lives of the millions of the coloured people deplorably miserable. Colonialism was legitimized. He valiantly fought against racialism, apartheid and colonialism. The historic challenge before him was whether the weak could fight the strong. Through his constant experimentation he realized that non-violence was the strongest weapon of the colonized masses and taught them to use it. He was able to induce courage and strength in the weakest of the weak and remorse in the hearts of the crudest of the cruel and his belief that good exists in all humans, one only has to awaken that good within.

On his return from South Africa, Gandhi took the leadership of Indian National Congress and adopted a positive and dynamic stand on international affairs. He said: "My idea of nationalism is that my country may become free. that if need be the whole of the country may die so that human race may live. There is no room for race hatred here. Let that be our nationalism".\textsuperscript{47}

He also said: "I do want to think in terms of the whole world. My patriotism includes the good of mankind in general. Therefore my service of India includes the services of humanity isolated independence is not the goal of the world states. It is voluntary interdependence. The better mind of the world desires today not absolutely independent states warring one against another, but
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a federation of friendly, interdependent states. The consummation of that event may be far off. I want to make no grand claims for our country. But I see nothing grand or impossible about expressing our readiness for universal interdependence rather than independence. I desire the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence”.48

From the beginning of the Non-cooperation Movement, Mahatma Gandhi emphasized the view that free India would have friendly relations with other countries. In the issue of Young India, Gandhi wrote: "An India awakened and free has a message of peace and goodwill to a groaning world. Non-cooperation is designed to supply her with a platform from which she will preach the message."49

In November 1921 All India Congress Committee (AICC) passed a resolution, drafted by Gandhi, conveying to the neighbouring countries that the foreign policy of the then Government of India did not represent the Indian opinion and was formulated by the British Government for holding India in subjection rather than protect her border. Freedom movements in Asian countries drew inspiration, sympathy and support of the Congress.

Under his leadership the Congress did not want to limit its outlook to fighting against British imperialism in India and thought of combating imperialism elsewhere in the world. In 1927 at its Madras Session the Congress declared that India could not be a party to any imperialist war and in no case should India be made to join a war without the consent of its people. In September 1933 Mahamta Gandhi wrote to Pandit Nehru: "We must recognize that our nationalism must not be inconsistent with progressive internationalism I can, therefore go to the whole length with you and say that we should range ourselves with the progressive forces of the world." Gandhi criticized the aggressive policies of Hitler and Mussolini. For India it is one of complete opposition to Fascists; it is one of opposition to imperialism. All India
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Congress Committee reaffirmed its determination to oppose any attempt to involve India in the war without the consent of the Indian people.

After the outbreak of the Second World War, Gandhi supported the cause of Poland. Even despite British deception, Gandhi did not want to embarrass Britain when she was engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Nazi Germany.

It may be noted that after outbreak of the Second World War, Gandhi's insistence on the application of non-violence in the international arena led to his ideological break with the Congress organization. Realizing the futility of war in June 1940, Gandhi went to the extent of urging Congress to declare that free India would not use any armed force for its defence.

In September 1940 the A.I.C.C. passed the resolution. The A.I.C.C. stated its commitment to the policy and practice of non-violence, world disarmament and world peace. During the war, the nationalist movement in Afro-Asian Countries gained momentum. The end of the World War II was followed by the Cold War between the two Superpowers. In such a state of affairs, Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru propounded their doctrine of international amity and cooperation and resurgence of afro-Asian countries for the sake of liberation from colonial rule. India made it categorically clear to keep aloof from all alignments.

Asian Relations Conference was held from 23 March to 2 April 1947 in New Delhi. In this gathering both Gandhi and Nehru stressed the role of Asia and India in the promotion of world peace. Gandhi declared "I would not like to see that dream realized in my life time". Gandhiji advocated "voluntary inter-dependence" of nations as against their isolated independence", and "universal interdependence rather than independence". The AICC in its resolution 1942 under Gandhi subscribed to an idealistic approach to India's foreign policy. It expressed "the future" peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a World Federation of free nations and on no other basis can
the problems of the modern world be solved”. Such a World Federation was advocated for the sake of the freedom of the member nations, prevention of aggression and exploitation of one nation by another, protection of national minorities, advancement.

Gandhi advised the Asian delegates to convey to the whole world, particularly the west the message of Love and Truth. He said: "The west today is pining for wisdom. It is despairing of the multiplication of atom bombs, because the multiplication of atom bombs means utter destruction not merely of the west but of the whole world, as if the prophecy of the Bible is going to be fulfilled and there is to be, heaven forbid, a deluge. It is up to you to deliver the whole world, not merely Asia, from that sin. That is the precious heritage your teachers and my teachers have left us”.50

Gandhi was in favour of building up of a "World Commonwealth". Gandhi in his speech on 15 September 1931 at the Round Table Conference (Second Session) said: "Time was when I prided myself on being, and being called, a British subject. I have ceased for many years to call myself a British subject, I would far rather be called a revel than a subject. But I have aspired- I still aspire to be citizen, not in the Empire, but in a Commonwealth; in a partnership if God wills it an indissoluble partnership but not a partnership super-imposed upon one nation by another”51

Pandit Nehru formulated India's foreign policy adopting Gandhian prescription. It found its expression in the formulation of Panchasheel. Panchasheel are five principles of peaceful coexistence signed between India and China in April 1954. These are:

i) Mutual respect for each other's territorial Integrity and sovereignty

ii) Mutual non-aggression

iii) Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs

50 Young India, 31.12.1931, p. 421
51 Ibid, p. 465
iv) Equality and mutual benefit and
v) Peaceful coexistence.

The policy of Non-Alignment reflected the essence of Gandhian prescription and reiteration of 'Panchasheel'. It has grown in to a gigantic movement having 118 countries as members and completing its 14th Summit. In fact, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) is rightly described "History's biggest peace movement", it stood for 'Atom for peace'. The only possible answer to the atom bomb is non-violence.

As Pandit Nehru used to say "I would call ours the authentic Gandhian era and the policies and philosophy which seek to implement are the policy and philosophy taught to us by Gandhiji. There have been no break in the continuity of our thoughts before and after 1947".

Mahatma Gandhi is a practical idealist. He is not a pacifist. The impact of Gandhian message on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was so profound and electrifying that he practiced the message and techniques for the liberation of the black people in America. He also deserves to be considered as the first public figure who sensed and articulated the common concern in respect of environment. He taught "Earth is our mother and we are her children". A mother can satisfy the needs of her children but not greed, hence limitation of human wants. He strongly pleaded for liberation and upliftment of women. If women are empowered and reign the world, it would be a peaceful world. Gandhi is a postmodernist in the sense that he has harmoniously balanced the multiple identities. There is no private Gandhi and public Gandhi. He has prescribed basic education for cultivating and nurturing moral life.

The ultimate ideal of 'Non-violence and Truth' is unrealized and unrealizable; its value consists in pointing out the direction, not in their realization. Striving after the ideal is the very essence of practicing Gandhi's philosophy. This consciousness should make one strive to overcome the
imperfection. Mahatma Gandhi did not have a shadow of doubt that the world of tomorrow will be, must be, a society based on non-violence.

Mahatma Gandhi inspired the world with his faith in truth and justice for all Mankind. He was a great soul who loved even those who fought against his ideals to bring about peace with non-violence.

How could a meek and fragile person of small physical stature inspire millions to bring about a profound change in a way the mightiest had never achieved before? His achievements were nothing less than miracles — his creed was to bring peace to not only those who suffered injustice and sorrow but to espouse a new way of life for Mankind, with peace and harmony. His life was a message — a message of peace over power, of finding ways to reconcile our differences, and of living in harmony with respect and love even for our enemy.

The force of power never wins against the power of love. At this hour of greatest unrest and turmoil in our world, the greatest force to be reckoned with lies within our hearts — a force of love and tolerance for all. Throughout his life, Mahatma Gandhi fought against the power of force during the heyday of British rein over the world. He transformed the minds of millions, including my father, to fight against injustice with peaceful means and non-violence. His message was as transparent to his enemy as it was to his followers. He believed that, if we fight for the cause of humanity and greater justice, it should include even those who do not conform to our cause. History attests to his power as he proved that we can bring about world peace by seeking and pursuing truth for the benefit of Mankind. We can resolve the greatest of our differences if we dare to have a constructive conversation with our enemy.

A war always inflicts pain and sorrow on everyone. History has witnessed countless examples of dictators, including Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin to name but a few, who inflicted sorrow and destruction on our world.
world of peace can be achieved if we learn the power of non-violence, as shown by the life of Mahatma Gandhi.

Mahatma Gandhi has proven that we can achieve the noble causes of liberty, justice and democracy for Mankind without killing anyone, without making a child an orphan, and without making anyone homeless with the damage caused by war.

We live for our values and passion but at the core of our existence lies our innate desire to live a peaceful life. The greatest noble cause is to display our desire to bring about peace in this world by our own sacrifice and not that of those who oppose our views. The strength of cowardice is in using power to cause death and destruction for others. The strength of courage is in self-sacrifice for the benefit of all.

Mahatma Gandhi sacrificed his own lucrative law practice in Durban, South Africa to lead a simple life and to share the pain of the powerless and destitute. He won over the hearts of millions without ever reigning power over anyone — simply with the power of altruism. We too can bring peace to our world by showing our willingness to sacrifice our self-centered desires. Our utmost cause in life should be to win the hearts of others by showing our willingness to serve causes greater than ourselves.

History can attest to the fact that most human conflicts have been as a result of a stubborn approach by our leaders. Our history would turn out for the better if our leaders could just learn that most disputes can be resolved by showing a willingness to understand the issues of our opponents and by using diplomacy and compassion.

No matter where we live, what religion we practice or what culture we cultivate, at the heart of everything, we are all humans. We all have the same ambitions and aspirations to raise our family and to live life to its fullest. Our cultural, religious and political differences should not provide the backbone to invoke conflicts that can only bring sorrow and destruction to our world.
A great leader always leads with an exemplary life that echoes his ideals. Mahatma Gandhi sacrificed his thriving law practice and adopted a simple life to live among the millions who lived in poverty during his freedom struggle. Today, we see modern leaders cajoling the masses with promises that they never intend to keep – let alone practicing what they preach in their own lives. One cannot bring world peace to all unless a leader demonstrates peaceful acts of kindness daily. Mahatma Gandhi believed that we are all children of God. We should not discriminate amongst ourselves based on faith, caste, creed or any other differences.

An outstanding example of Mahatma Gandhi’s leadership was his famous Salt March, which brought about a profound change. On March 2nd 1930, as a protest at tax on salt, Gandhi wrote a remarkable letter to Lord Irwin, the Viceroy of India. He wrote, “Dear Friend, I cannot intentionally hurt anything that lives, much less fellow human beings, even though they may do the greatest wrong to me and mine. Whilst, therefore, I hold the British rule to be a curse, I do not intend to harm to a single Englishman or to any legitimate interest he may have in India...” With these words, he inspired millions to fight for this righteous cause and eventually forced the British to leave India without inflicting harm to any Englishman. Such were the quintessential qualities of justice and peace that made Mahatma Gandhi the man who changed our world for the better with his ideals of faith, love and tolerance.

Mahatma Gandhi taught us that we can bring harmony to our world by becoming champions of love and peace for all. The task is daunting, but he has shown that a fragile, meekly man of small physical stature can achieve feats of incredible magnitude with a staunch belief to practice peace through non-violence.

There has been no greater advocate of one humanity in One World, and no stronger opponent of violence and war than Gandhi, for, his faith in non-violence was absolute and he believed that peaceful means alone could lead to peaceful ends. Once Gandhi said: “My goal is friendship with the world and I
can combine the greatest love with the greatest opposition to wrong...Through the realisation of freedom of India, I hope to realize and carry on the mission of the brotherhood of man."

The concept of One World is fascinating indeed. Behind every attempt at permanent world peace and even in the background of world organisations, snob as the League of Nations and the United Nations Organisation, there lurks the hope that one day there will be One World. Whatever the shape of that One World, we all hope that war as an instrument of solving conflicts of interests shall have no longer any place in human affairs. Instead, there will be peaceful ways of resolving conflicts through friendliness and mutual help and cooperation towards common ends. One World and World Peace are practically synonymous. Neither of them can exist without the other. The strong desire and the frequent attempts for both are rooted in the hunger of the human heart for peace and happiness.

How heartening it is to imagine that when there is One World, all the natural and human resources, all the sciences and technology which are today being marshalled and arrayed for destructive purposes will be used for the elimination of poverty, ill-health and ignorance. They shall be used for promoting goodwill and for creating better conditions of life for the whole of humanity. Though this rosy picture is today the privilege only of the poets and the dream of idealists, there is no doubt that this is the cherished hope of every one who strives for peace. It has been the living faith of persons like Gandhi. He once wrote: "Not to believe in the possibility of permanent peace is to disbelieve in the godliness of human nature."

Both World Peace and One World are inherent in Gandhi’s philosophy and the Gandhi-an way of life. He believed in Truth and for him Truth was God. Man may deny the existence of God. Very many have an agnostic attitude. But none dare deny Truth, though people may have different conceptions about particular truth. Truth is a matter of experience. To deny Truth would be to deny cue’s own existence. But what was far more important
in the case of Gandhi was his declaration that "There is no way to find Truth except the way of non-violence: "Non-violence was not merely an ethical principle nor a temporary policy. His nonviolence was a positive principle, the principle of love which springs from the inner experience of the identity of interest with those whom we love.

He once declared, "All life is one"; for him life meant not only human beings, but all sentient creatures. He said, "Non-violence is not a mechanical thing. You do not become non-violent by merely saying I shall not use force'. It must be felt in the heart... When there is that feeling it will express itself through some action." That action, for Gandhi, was ceaseless service of mankind. His constructive approach to life, his whole constructive programme of action for the betterment of human life at all levels, arose out of his intense love, his deep sense of identity with all life and with the whole of humanity. "My constructive programme is rooted in non-violence" he said.

For Gandhi, man was the measure of all things. The basic purpose of human life was to reach higher levels of consciousness; man was mind and consciousness more than body and the senses. Therefore, Gandhi emphasised the spiritual progress of man. He carried on a relentless quest of Truth, of the Truth of life, of the law, and discipline necessary for elevating the human soul. He came to the conclusion that love was the law of the human species and not violence 'which seemed to reign supreme in the animal kingdom. He saw that truthfulness and non-violent adherence to it through thick and thin strengthened the human soul. Purification of the mind by purging selfishness and strengthening of it by selfless service was a positive step in developing soul-power. It was this kind of developed soul-force which he hurled against all evil and injustice which he came across.

Gandhi realised that if the embodied human spirit was to progress, muffled as it was by selfish desire, man must be free, full of dignity, and earnest about his own advance. Socially, all men and women, irrespective of caste, creed, or sex must be equal and be given equal opportunities. Thus he
conceived a world in which all would be equal and all would uphold the dignity of each and help achieve spiritual progress. Seemingly, his earlier life and youthful energy were devoted to the cause of equal rights for Indian residents in South Africa. After coming to India, he engaged himself mainly in the struggle for Indian independence.

But never for a moment was the cause of the whole of humanity or of world peace and harmony out of his mind. In fact, Tolstoy, in one of his letters to Gandhi while he was fighting for the rights of Indians in Transvaal, 'wrote that 'what Gandhi was doing in Transvaal was of world significance. He referred to the purity of the means which Gandhi adopted to fight evil which in South Africa had taken the form of racial injustice. Gandhi too was well aware of his mission in life, that of 'peace on earth and goodwill unto men.' He wrote in Young India, "My ambition is much higher than independence. Through the deliverance of India, I seek to deliver the so-called weaker races of the earth from the crushing heels of Western exploitation... India's coming into her own will mean every nation doing likewise."52 This has proved prophetic.

He wrote more expressly on this subject many a time. He said, "Through the realisation of freedom of India, I hope to realize and carry on the mission of the brotherhood of man." There has been no greater advocate of one humanity in One World, and no stronger opponent of violence and war than Gandhi, for, his faith in non-violence was absolute and he believed that peaceful means alone could lead to peaceful ends.

Because Gandhi believed in nonviolence, he did not look for just subduing violence. He wanted to conquer violence as far as he was concerned. His leadership turned any protest movement into a "peace with justice" movement showing equal concern for justice to the opponents.

In his concept, peace was something positive which included Sarvodaya (welfare of all, not just the greatest good of the greatest number), trusteeship.

---
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brotherhood of mankind. The means, Gandhi clearly stated to achieve any goal must be as noble as the end. The end cannot justify the means. And the man must always be nonviolent.

Non violence, according to Gandhi, offer meant conscious suffering - "it means the pitting one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of our being it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire."\footnote{Ibid., August 11, 1920, pp. 5-10.}

Gandhi did not apologize for suffering that might come as one sticks steadfastly to peace and nonviolence, because "Love ever suffers, never revenges itself. Love never claims, it gives."\footnote{Ibid., July 9, 1928, 284.} This is a unique characteristic which Gandhian approach to peace added to the practice of non-violence. It underscored that nonviolence is not a substitute for inability to use violent means. "Self suffering is the essence of non-violence and is the chosen substitute for violence to others."\footnote{Gandhi, M. K., Nonviolence in Peace of War (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing Press), n.d., p. 49.} For that, fear must be conquered when one acts. One must act when conscience stirs, and the consequence thereof must be accepted.

In an age of utmost violence (1861-1948), stood Gandhi the fearless and did demonstrate to the world that "there can be a strength far greater than that of armaments and that a struggle can be fought, and indeed should be fought without bitterness and hatred."\footnote{By Jawaharlal Nehru, addressed to J. Bondurant in original ms, "Gandhian Satyagraha and Political Raj: An Interpretation", quoted in preface of Conquest of Violence by J. Bondurant, p. xvii.}

In India's peace movement in Gandhi's time, he was the wave and the people of India were on the crest of that wave during 1939-45 and later, until 1948. Gandhi said and wrote much about the use of nonviolence in preventing external aggression besides using it for the liberation of the oppressed in his won country. The common statement from many scientists, leaders and even
generals that can be heard today, in the eighties of the 20th century, is the
collision that Gandhi a technique alone can redeem today's world threatened
by the nuclear weapons. As Gandhi said: "unfortunately for us, we are
strangers to the non-violence of the brave on a mass scale — I hold that
nonviolence is not merely a personal virtue. It is also social virtue to be
cultivated like the other virtues. Surely, society is largely regulated by the
expression of nonviolence in its mutual dealings. What I ask for is an extension
of it on a larger national and international scale."57

The secret of the unbelievable success of the peace move-meat in India,
perhaps lay in the fact that human beings under Gandhi's leadership meant a
great deal to him. He stopped at the threshold of the huts of the thousands of
dispossessed, himself dressed like one of their own. He spoke in their language.
Here was the living truth—not just quotations from books. Tagore sums up.
"At Gandhi's call India blossomed forth to new greatness, just as once before.
in earlier when Buddha proclaimed the truth of fellow feeling and compassion
for all living creatures."58

In an age of conflict within a given nation and in the international
world, the individual must rediscover the "right mind." Gandhiji worked for
the rediscovery of the "right mind" which would reach out to unity, love and
peace, emphasizing the fact that there are certain indisputable, eternal values
ethical, universal, spiritual and philosophical—which man has needed
everywhere, which he acquired in the past because these are values without
which he cannot, live but which are now in large measure lost, to him because
of his carelessness and insensitivity toward them. He is now, in a way,
unequipped to face life in a fully human manner, and is inevitably heading
toward destroying his own self. Bharata Kumarappa was underscoring this
aspect of Gandhian thought, when he said: "While pacifism hopes to get rid of
war chiefly by refusing to fight and by carrying on propaganda against war.

Gandhiji goes much deeper and sees that war cannot be avoided so long as the seeds of it remain in man's breast and grow and develop in his social, political and economic life. Gandhiji's cure is, therefore, very radical and far reaching. It demands nothing less than rooting out violence from oneself and from one's environment.59

The "right mind" that Gandhiji envisioned is universal, inclusive, non-exclusive. It is not, a mind of intolerance, of accusation, of division. Rather, it is a mind of unity, understanding, and infinite love that works for harmony, for peace. It is a spirit that would heal division. Gandhiji knew, the reality of hatred and intolerance because he had experienced them in his own life in South Africa, in British dominated India, in the caste-ridden society of India of his time. Indeed, he succumbed to the reality of intolerance and hatred when his life was taken on January 30, 1948. No peace could be built on exclusivism, absolutism and hardness of hearts which must result if individuals made no efforts to rediscover the "right mind."

Peace cannot be built on vague slogans or pious programmes. There can be no peace on earth without, the kind of interchange that restores man's mind to the facts that all life is one emanating from one universal self—"What though we have many bodies? We have but one Soul. The ways of the sun are many through refraction. But they have the same source."60 All forms of necessity can contribute to man's freedom—material and economic need, spiritual need. The greatest of man's spiritual needs is the need to be released from evil and untruth that are in himself and in Society. One important question in today's world is the crisis of sanity that surrounds us all in a fragmented society, in fragmented national structures, in schizoid military and business complexes. "We are at war with ourselves, and therefore at war with one

Non-violent means were vital to Gandhi's peacebuilding efforts for several reasons. First, nonviolence means not harming others either in thought or deed. Second, Gandhi viewed non-violence as also having more dynamic and positive state, i.e. love and compassion to the opponent. This love served as the means to get to the ends of truth. Gandhi held absolute Truth as God, and there was no difference between the absolute Truth and God in his belief. Since all human beings belonged to God, each and every person had the property of Truth - Further he held that the Truth known to human beings was never absolute but relative and shared among them. Therefore, a seeker of Truth (God) had to adhere to the path of nonviolence because unless he used the method of nonviolence, he would not be able to be receptive to the notions of Truth held by others. For Gandhi, excluding the use of violence was the best because humans are not capable of knowing the absolute truth and therefore not competent to punish.

Gandhi designed Satyagraha movement as an initiative in search of Truth by purifying self and the opponents. He did not inflict any violence rather than his soul force against the British during the Satyagraha movement. It later pricked the conscience of the British to rectify their errors. In short, Satyagraha became a Joint search for Truth by the conflicting parties. Gandhi held the view that change of mind would definitely bring peace in the World. Through the Satyagraha movement he was trying to change the mind of his opponents. Success of Indian independence proved the potential of Satyagraha as a positive peace-building strategy on a larger societal level. This later imparted an ideological capital to the civil disobedience and non-violent movements across the World. Non-violent movements led by Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela, Vaclav Havel, and Aung San Suu Kyi come under this category.

The Satyagraha movement virtually was an effective peace-building tool through non-violent means. Gandhi developed Satyagraha as a moral equivalent to war and violent conflict. Both war and conflict are waging to conquer the opponents. They suppress human virtues of kindness, love, compassion and forgiveness as well as encourage the feelings of hatred, anger and hostility towards opponents. War and violent conflict do not respect the opponent. On the contrary, the Satyagrahi while resisting injustice, shows respect for his/her opponents and appeals him/her to be responsive. A Satyagrahi avoids the possibility of physical confrontation with the other side. A Satyagrahi leads opponents to the negotiation table by gaining their trust. Gandhi himself attended round table conferences with the British while he was leading the Satyagraha movement against the latter. Peace talks are always possible even during the course of Satyagraha. Since a Satyagrahi does not have any hatred to the opponent, an agreement can be easily achieved. Moreover, the very nature of Satyagraha itself is helpful to transform the milieu of the conflict affected area into a place of sustainable peace, because, more than concluding a peace agreement between the parties to conflict. Satyagraha is a reconciling process between the parties to conflict. Satyagraha is a struggle for winning the heart of the opponent, as well as a positive approach to vanishing evil force, hatred and fault lines of the self and opponent. Such things, are not possible between the parties to conflict during the course of violent confrontation.

Gandhi developed a participatory peace-building strategy by involving all parties to conflict. For instance, the partition of India witnessed communal riots, genocide and mass level displacement of people in various parts of the country. One of the crucial affected areas of violence was Noakhali in Bengal. Death toll figured double digits in a short span of time during the riots at Noakhali. Gandhi visited every nook and corner of Noakhali village and painstakingly did his best to cool down the tension there. He engaged in dialogue with various religious community leaders to end misunderstanding.
and hostility among them. In order to put an immediate end to violence, Gandhi started fasting on 2 September 1947. By the next day the parties involved in conflicts came to Gandhi and laid down their arms. Mixed processions for communal harmony took place in various parts of Noakhali. A delegation of prominent political and religious leaders visited and assured Gandhi that there would no communal violence in future.\textsuperscript{62} Gandhi organized prayer meetings to facilitate inter-faith understanding and communal unity. By involving all parties to the conflict in peace process and cultivating inter-faith understanding, Gandhi could successfully build peace in the violent-torn areas.

Satyagraha in South Africa was to resolve ethnic question so that the interest of Indians were protected in the continent. Satyagraha movements at Champaran, Kheda and Bardoli had economic connotation, in the sense that these movements were trying to transform the economic reasons of conflicts and violence. More than protesting against the exploitative policies of the British, Gandhi set forth Swadeshi movement as a constructive and destructive strategy to heal root-cause of economic conflict. Swadeshi was constructive in the sense that, it was intended to create employment opportunities by adhering to indigenous and eco-friendly technology.

Swadeshi is not harmful to environment, less prone to resource depletion and in favour of creating more job opportunities and empowering the workforce in the country. Swadeshi is destructive in the sense that, it conduces to end dependency to the exploiter by boycotting their goods. Advocates of World System Theory and Dependency Theory hold the same notion on economic integration and growing inequalities. They argue that, dependency of the Periphery (people who have being exploited or the developing countries) over the Core (the exploiter or the developed countries) is the root cause behind the growing economic disparities between the developed and developing

countries. The best way to avoid disparity, in their view, is to end economic relations with the Core.  

Market integration at a global scale is transforming the World into a basket and waste box of the mass produced goods. It conduces to increase the number of unemployment, the pace of resource depletion and environmental degradation. The global economic meltdown that we have witnessed recently also raises doubts about the positive outcomes of neo-liberal programmes. At the same time, the World witnesses the massive protest against the neo-liberal programmes and rolling back of welfare measures by the governments. Today protest is not confined to the four-borders of nation-states but it spills over to the international level. Global civil society movements such as World Social Forum gather together on the sidelines of WTO Ministerial Conferences and organize protests against the neo-liberal programmes. It is visible that the ongoing neo-liberal programmes and its development agenda marginalise the poor. Mass level displacement of people is also seen in the light of neo-liberal programmes. On such occasion, people are evacuated from their native land for two reasons: first, for the accomplishments of big development projects, second, as the result of environmental degradation. For instance, raising sea level compels people to leave their native places. Mass level migration, their accommodation to new areas, growing number of unemployment followed by crimes lead to violent conflict. In the light of these developments, we have to understand Swadeshi movement as an effective method for peacebuilding. 

Gandhi held a view that a struggle for noble cause need not use violence. Through employing non-violent means a Satyagrahi could attain his goal. Though the intention was noble, use of violence might create an opposite result. Gandhi set forth his concept of the purity of ends and means from this notion. He never resorted to violence in his Satyagraha against the British.

---

There were numerous instances in the freedom struggle, for provocation to die use of violent force. The massacre in Jallianwala Bagh aggravated extremists to intensify armed conflict against the British. While blaming the British in committing such an extreme evil action against the Indians, Gandhi admonished his fellow people not to unleash counter-attack. Gandhi held that the socio-economic and political institutions established or restructured by the British had the genesis of violent conflicts. If the people in India were able to delink them from the British institutions by setting up their own institutions, then it would mark the end of British Raj. He wrote in the Hind Swaraj that British rule sustained in India with the co-operation of Indians. Non-cooperation movement indeed was an initiative for Home Rule for Indians in all sense. Throughout the movement, Gandhi appealed people to set up alternative mechanisms for dispute settlements, administration and education; because, the British courts, police force, law making, educational and administrative systems were designed to exploit the people in India and lock them in perpetual dependence. If Indians follow the same system even after getting freedom, Gandhi commented in Hind Swaraj that it would be nothing more than a British rule in the absence of the British. As far as Gandhi was concerned, the non-cooperation movement was a preparatory step towards Swaraj by restructuring the Indian society. Gandhi felt it was necessary to sustain peace in the post-independent India. It is pertinent to discuss the relevance of the Gandhian concept of Square of Swaraj in ensuring sustainable peace in society. Like its equal measurement of each side of a square, each individual had to attain economic, social, educational, and political freedom in an equal volume. These four elements are major determinants of peace and conflict. Even though a human being was educated, lack of economic resources might throw him/her to perpetual dependency or conflict with other human beings- The outcome would not be different in case of unequal distribution of other elements also. Having enlightened through attaining the Square of Swaraj, each and every person in society would be a responsible citizen to his
fellow beings and society. Such a society would be a replicable model for sustainable peace and there was no room for violent conflict there. The alternative institutions were, therefore, entrusted the mission of building peace in the Indian society. The ashrams set up by Gandhi were the effective institutions to attain that supreme goal.

Gandhi's relentless adherence to non-violence was clear with the call of non-cooperation movement and the strategies adopted in the Salt Satyagraha. It was the Chauri Chaura incident that compelled Gandhi to halt the non-cooperation movement. Even though the number of people killed in the Chauri Chaura massacre was much lower than that was made by the British, Gandhi was not ready to justify that action. The Chauri Chaura incident convinced Gandhi about the need to train the Satyagrahis. In the following years, Gandhi was training each Ashramite to be able to acquire the qualities of true a Satyagraha. The Ashram life imparted the calibre to Satyagrahis to adhere to non-violence even though they had to submit their life before the brutal British force. In short, Gandhi was empowering Ashramites to be the agents for building peace. It is pertinent to state that Gandhi started Salt Satyagraha with a few selected Ashramites who had successfully proved their adherence to non-violence in any difficult situations. The success of Salt Satyagraha largely depended on its strict adherence to non-violence.

Gandhi was much concerned about the socio-economic and political elements as determinants of conflict. Through the Constructive Programmes, Gandhi set forth 18 points to tackle the root causes of violence in society. These Programmes were practical methods to build peace by facilitating inter-religious harmony, upliftment of poor and weaker sections, creating employment without harming environment etc. In his famous book Hind Swaraj, Gandhi criticized the impact of Modern Civilization on humanity. For Gandhi, peace was not separated from Justice, development and environment. The World had to take decades to conceive me message of the life and thought

---

of Gandhi. Many of the social scientists today seriously study the influence of development programmes and environmental issues on conflict. For instance, Bjorn Hettne, whose study is focused on the relationship between models of development and peace, is largely indebted to Gandhi in shaping his perspective. Ame Naess, who coined the term deep ecology, also expressed the influence of Gandhi on his work. In the similar way Johan Galtung, a well known peace researcher, acknowledged Gandhi in the evolution of his concept of structural and cultural violence. His advocacy of ideas such as self-reliance and models of development focused on basic needs also have a strong Gandhian influence.

Violent conflict in a large-scale normally erupts, when a section of society deliberately marginalised by the dominant community or by the Government. Disparities created by the unequal distribution of resources are major determinants of conflict. The classical example in this regard is the Sri Lankan experience. Developments since the Official Language Act (1956), framing of new Constitution and the Land Colonization policy fuelled ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. The strategy to pacify Tamils' protest was the coercive apparatus of the Sri Lankan state, eventually transformed this island nation into the hot burner in South Asia. Equal distribution of resources and accommodation of all sections in society is vital to build peace in such condition. For this end, Gandhi set forth the ideals of Sarvodaya. Decentralization of Power, and wealth, Trusteeship, social Harmony and communal unity, Economic equality, Sarva Dharma Samabhava etc. His approach for peacebuilding had been always holistic as human being is a synthesis of a large variety of components, which cannot be divided into watertight compartments of social, religious and political life.66

The Gandhian way to understand conflicts and his methods for building peace has largely influenced the contemporary peace initiatives across the

World. Observing Gandhi Jayanti as International Day of Nonviolence is a real tribute to its mentor. Gandhi could successfully set forth an alternative framework to look into conflict. For him, violent conflict was not mere a state of the distortion of law and order. Rather, he considered it as the reflection of the socio-economic and political factors that existed in that area. Therefore, he appealed for a constructive approach to resolve conflicts rather than resort to physical force for the same purpose. He further held that such constructive approach should address the socio-economic and political factors that led to the outbreak of violent conflicts. In traditional approach peace was enforced above from a political authority. But Gandhi successfully proved that peace could be built from the bottom level by involving the parties to conflict in the peace initiatives.