CHAPTER- ONE

WAR OR PEACE

God created mankind and bestowed his blessings on human beings to live in peace and harmony. However, mankind found ways and means to disturb the basic phenomena of peace by associating itself with harmful acts related to conflicts and wars. The fact remains that wars have aided the individuals, communities and nations to satisfy their false egos. It is not to be forgotten that wars are related to temporary phases which have been in existence since times immemorial and shall continue for times to come, till replaced ultimately by peace. No meaningful progress can take place without peace. Hence, to ensure permanent peace ways and means have to be thought to avoid disruptions and allied causes, which negate peace.

Peace being a gift of God is indeed very essential for human survival. However, human desires do lead to the inevitability of war. Let us also recognize that merely hating war and loving peace does not prevent war. People of the world have hated war and longed for peace from the very beginning but that has not gained them peace. The fact is that love of peace, by itself, has never been sufficient to deter war1.

If we critically examine various religious and moral theories we find that all systems are based on the principle of respect for human life. Killings, as a method of resolving human conflicts are almost condemned universally. Yet, the mass killing of soldiers and of innocent civilians as well in war is not only permitted but also glorified in many modern cultures 2 Further, it is a pity that even at the cost of blood baths, war is accepted as an effective and justifiable way of protecting national interests and achieving diplomatic goals. We must accept a hard known fact that there is always peace and violence in human character. It is a natural instinct which inherits generation after generation and local environments also do supplement in the development of its vision. Human beings do have some individual negative and positive potentialities to guide and to lead people who come under their influence to follow their action plans,3 it's immaterial whether the same are justifiable or not.

Further, disturbance, violence, destruction and ruination are not conducive to the human race at all and cannot solve any problem to mitigate any differences. On the other hand, there is only peace, mutual understanding and respect which can help to solve the complications and other differences having arisen between the parties concerned4. The truth is that peace and peace alone can contribute to the overall growth and prosperity of humanity.

---

1 Dulles, John Foster, ‘War or Peace’, p. x
2 Charles, R. Beitz and Theodore Herman, ‘Peace and War’, p.3.
4 Ibid, p.1
All of us are aware that our life together in society depends upon our mutual respect for each other and adherence to the principle that we must do no harm to our neighbours. Each of us is extremely vulnerable; our safety and welfare are secure only so long as the temptation to kill and to commit mayhem, to destroy property and to plunder are suppressed both internally by moral instructions and externally by the severe sanctions of law.\(^5\) In civil society, those who inflict severe injuries upon their neighbours are condemned, convicted and confined. Such actions by the society are bound to reduce violence and avoid loss of human blood.

Archaeology and the science of Anthropology, somewhat guided long before thousand years, when human race had been living in different groups and every group had its own peculiar social order. There were frequent violence, clashes and fighting for their self interests, resulting in massive destruction. During ancient times the emperors and kings also used to discuss and negotiate through their representatives sent alongwith their peace proposals. It is also revealed from the old records that the monarchs, social reformers and religious preachers of the world advocated the path of peace and harmony for peaceful living. The epics of the Hindu and Roman religions give pointed references regarding war and peace. A detailed study of the sacred record of Hindu religion gives information that before invading Sri Lanka, Lord Rama tried his level best to avoid war with King Ravana of Sri Lanka. This war made a complete destruction and annihilation, which changed the map of Sri Lanka.

Then, we come to the era of Lord Krishna who exerted his influence and efforts to prevent war of Mahabharata. The aggrieved party, the Pandavas had a desire to solve their problem through peace. The relatives of Pandavas conveyed their message to Korwas for the settlement through peaceful negotiations, but they were reluctant to budge even an inch from their obstinate determination. Efforts to the maximum extent were made by Lord Krishna in the capacity of a herald to beware the consequences of war. He tried to make them realize about the human annihilation and ruination, which would happen in the war operation. Unfortunately, all his efforts and advices remained futile and peace was put at stake. Under unsuccessful circumstances, the great war of Mahabharata thus started to settle the dispute. There was massive annihilation and most of the population was wiped out from its existence.\(^6\) Total frustration and discontentment of havoc prevailed all around.

In the next stage, reference is made to Bhagwad Geeta, a sacred book of Hindu religion, which is a compilation of epics of Lord Krishna and is popular all over the world since it deals with full measures of just and unjust wars. Inspite of elaborated rules laid down in the Artha-Shastra of Koutilya and Niti-Shastra of Kamandoka to establish peace permanently, the wars still could not be prevented. Manu, the greatest lawgiver of that time had also framed some guidelines for peace so as to resist from any conflicts, but all these teachings failed to control the human interests to sort out the problems through peaceful means,\(^7\) which has indeed proved to be very unfortunate for the human race.

---

\(^5\) Ralph B. Potter, Jr. 'The moral logic of war,’ in e.d., Charles R. Beitz and Theodore Herman ‘Peace and War’, p.7

\(^6\) Bharadwaj, A.N, op. cit, p.2-3

\(^7\) Ibid, p.3
Afterwards, **Lord Buddha** concentrated to establish peace in the society for its prosperity and progress so that human race could not be degenerated, resulting in denouncing and sacrificing his royal life to save the humanity at large. Thereafter, **King Ashoka** followed his footprints and proclaimed non-violence as his Government’s policy, which came as a result of the famous **War of Kalinga** in which he saw the dreadful scene of blood spate and human annihilation.

The people of the world certainly know that **Lord Christ** preached for the **just actions** for the betterment of mankind. He **disseminated his peace message at the cost of his life**\(^8\) which he had sacrificed for the universal brotherhood. In the view of Ralph B Potter, Jr, it is indeed hard to believe that, **when one reflects upon the person of Jesus, his simplicity and gentleness and willingness to suffer, and then surveys the history of military actions conducted by those who claim allegiance to his name, it is impossible to avoid a grotesque sense of incongruity. How has the presumption against the use of force, established by his word and deed, by his life and death, been overcome?**\(^9\)

The **Greeks** developed theories concerning the proper conduct of **War and Peace** but still there were religious wars, which posed a threat to humanity. It is also quite apparent that the historical events of the **Roman Empire**, which extended over the settled part of Europe and much of Asia-Africa, also had a number of great wars to their discredit. In the Arab countries, **Hazrat Mohammad** had done a lot for the **betterment of humanity**.\(^10\) He did so by coming forward to challenge the existing social evils and marched ahead to establish peace and confidence among the people.

All above narrated examples are the guidelines for human beings to follow the ideology of peace, which saved the humanity. All the above Gods sent human beings sacrificed their precious lives for the cause of peace. This, in fact, has acted as an inspiration to the world at large except those who find war to be rational and just. In spite of the above, **God sent messages**, man has dared to be fool hardy by way of exercising the animal instinct in him of making his own self and his surroundings uncomfortable by organizing mutual fights and wars on some pretext or the other. **Quincy Wright**, in his Study of War, lists 278 wars fought between 1480 and 1941 i.e. an average of 3 wars every 5 years. Several of these wars, including **World War II**, were fought after the **League of Nations** was formed and after the Pact of Paris had pledged all the nations to abolish war. **Needful to state that the never-ending process of war continuation is still carrying on inspite of the fact that United Nations was formed in 1945.**\(^11\) Some of the major wars of recent past being the Korean war, the Indo-China War, the Arab-Israeli wars, Iran–Iraq war, Afghanistan war and the war in Iraq in this century.

---

\(^8\) *Ibid*  p.4

\(^9\) Charles R. Beitz and Theodore Herman, *op. cit*, p.8

\(^10\) Bharadwaj, A.N, *op. cit*, p.5

\(^11\) Dulles, John Foster, *op. cit*, p. ix
Let us not forget that the basic thesis of *War or Peace* states that peace will only be won if there is constant effort to win it and any relaxation in this effort brings with its peril. **If we are to live in peril, it is far safer although not pleasant, to see the peril, then there is a better chance that it will be avoided.**

We must appreciate that war has varied variety of dimensions and viewed differently by individuals all over the world. The basic belief that ‘all is fair in love and war’ has indeed encouraged human beings to initiate wars on any pretext. This may well be evident from the facts that *men have fought each other for every conceivable purpose and reason ranging from a simple quest for wives as in the Rape of the Sabine Women, ambition, as in the case of Alexander, religion, as in the wars of the Protestants, Catholics and Mohammedans, or for the sake of pure deviltry and plunder as in the case of Timur the Lame or the Mongol, Temujin, who was called Ghengiz Khan. There have been bloody conflicts involving the question of the divine right of kings, social philosophies, trade routes, water holes, markets and sources of raw materials. There has been, in fact hardly a question in human history in which one side or the other has not finally had recourse to violence.* Thus, it would not be wrong or out of place to mention that much of the genesis of the present conflicts are to be found in the revolutionary character of our times.

Webster’s Dictionary defines **war** to be a state of open and declared hostile armed conflict between States or Nations. This captures a particularly political rationalistic account of war and warfare, i.e. **war needs to be explicitly declared and to be between States to be a war.** We find **Rousseau** arguing this position: ‘War is constituted by a relation between things, and not between persons ….. War then is a relation, not between man and man, but between State and State.’ Further, the definitions and perception of various writers and philosophers do enlarge the arena of war.† Each definition has its strength and weaknesses, but often is the culmination of the writer’s broader philosophical position.

One would agree that **war couldn’t be justified without a just cause.** However, even with a just cause the instrument of enforcement is so faulty that further restraints upon the right to wage war must be imposed and that not every just cause is to be prosecuted. There may be situations in which a just cause is undoubtedly present but conditions are such that resorting to force would not serve the welfare of the national or international community. Hence, in addition to the certitude of a just cause, other criteria of the justifiable use of force are required.

---

12 Ibid, p.264 - 265


† Cicero defines war broadly as ‘conclusive by force’; Hugo Grotius adds that *war is the state of contending parties,* Thomas Hobbes notes that *war is also an attitude: War means a state of affairs, which may exist even while its operations are not continued;* Denis Diderc comments that war is ‘a convulsive and violent disease of the politics;’ for Karl von Clausewit, *war is the continuation of politics by other means* and so on.

14 Charles R. Beitz and Theodore Herman, op.cit, p.11-12
On the contrary, Hosburgh’s argument is that military force should not be regarded as a morally acceptable instrument of justice. In this he relies heavily on the Gandhian critique of violence. War, Horsburgh holds, is first of all irrational. It is vastly inefficient, costly, unreliable and divisive way of settling conflicts. Secondly, war is morally erosive i.e. the atmosphere generated in a country at war is usually charged with such hatred and bitterness toward the opponent that objective moral judgments about strategies become all but impossible. Each war, Horsburgh says, ‘traces a path of moral descent’ Finally and most critically, Horsburgh contends that war violates the moral principle of respect for persons. This most basic moral principle holds that every human being has the right to be treated as a person capable of his or her own fulfillment, with legitimate desires and needs, with values and preferences that are just as valid as anyone else’s.

War, being undesirable in itself, may well be considered to be rational on at least four conditions: Firstly, that the outcome for the two sides is different, one being able to do things or make decisions which the other is unable to do or make; Secondly, that the posers conferred by victory could not be attained without resort to war; Thirdly, that these powers are sufficient to enable the victors to realize the ends for which the war is supposed to have been fought; The ends including such positive objectives as the preservation of a certain way of life as well as the negative aims associated with enmity; and Fourthly that the victors retain the will to use these powers to achieve their positive ends.

It would, thus, be appropriate to state that to understand peace one must understand war. In a general way war is the use of physical force to fulfill self motive by one State against another State. Thus, ‘War is an affair of the State.’ Modern war is total and deceptive blitzkriz since it has become more mechanical by use of machines. In the words of SUN TZU ‘War is a state of affair; the realm of life and death, the road of defeat and victory; a thing to be studied with great diligence’.

Needful to further state that war is too serious a business for the destinies of nations to be controlled by mere strategists. The power to maintain modern war, if not to launch it, has passed out of the sphere of the soldier into that of business. As machine-power gains a growing domination over mere man-power on the battlefield, so in a realistic view the industry push the armies at the front in the background of grand strategy. Thus, war far from being the concern of the military forces alone directly touches the life and soul of every single member of the belligerent nations. Total war, is thus, directed not only against the fighting forces but indirectly also against the nations themselves.

---

15 Ibid, p.4-5
16 Ibid, p.23
18 Singh Rajender, ‘Words of Wisdom on War’, p.5
If we review the whole of military history as far as we have access to it, we become aware of an infinite series of different forms of war. War says Clausewitz\textsuperscript{19} ‘is a perfect chameleon, because in each separate case it changes somewhat its nature’. Human mind is bugged with a series of questions pertaining to War and Peace. Infact, its necessity is indeed questionable which would be evident from a number of queries raised in ones mind.

One such query could be as has been considered by G.T. Wrench i.e. ‘Is war a necessity of human life or is it the voluntary creation of man? If it is the formed, if it is inevitable, there can be no fundamental question of ethics, of the choice of right or wrong. It is absurd to speak of death, inevitable to all mankind, as right or wrong. There are no ethics of death, and, if war is inevitable, there are no ethics of war. If, on the other hand, war is the deliberate and willful act of one set of men against another, then war becomes a subject of ethics, and a war will be named a holy or a wicked war according to the ethical view of the speaker. If war is a subject of ethical consideration, then by teaching one set of ethics, war could be made more frequent by teaching another’ it could be made less frequent or even abolished.\textsuperscript{20}

It may, thus, be stated that war is not, therefore, a subject for ethical consideration, nor is it’s repugnant to religion, provided the heart of the warrior is pure from lust and passion\textsuperscript{21} in the true religious attitude towards the things of this world. War is one of the facts of life, as yet inevitability in the fate of man, a fact that needs to be well understood and reconciled with. The more one studies war, the more one comes to feel that the cause of war is fundamentally psychological rather than political or economic. When we come in contact with a militarist, his stupidity depresses us and makes us realize the amount of human obtuseness that has to be overcome before we can make much progress towards peace. However, contact with pacifists too often has the effect of making us almost despair of the elimination of war.

Why do soldiers fight? It’s indeed a very pertinent question which comes to everyone’s mind because man is not merely an animal to be dictated by instincts. Psychologically, large number of men does not want to get involved in fighting, war or destruction and the like. Yet anthropologically, psychologically, sociologically and politically they do get engulfed in the vortex of war and soldiering.\textsuperscript{22} In light of the above, the prime characteristic of the military personnel is not that they use violence, nor even that they use violence legitimized by virtue of their function as instruments of the State, it is that they use that violence with great deliberation. Such violence, purposeful, deliberate and legitimized is normally known as Force and the use of force between States is what we mean by War.

\textsuperscript{20} Wrench, G.T., ‘The Causes of War and Peace’, p.1
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid, p.3
\textsuperscript{22} Sardeshpande, SC, ‘War & Soldiering’, p.28
War consists of such deliberate, controlled and purposeful acts of force combined and harmonized to attain what are ultimately political objectives. It indeed goes without saying that such acts may be horrifying in their political objectives and consequences. Further, their object is quite precisely the infliction of massive destruction and dreadful deaths and sufferings, the trial of moral & physical force, to quote Clausewitz again ‘through the medium of the latter’.

Thus, it is pertinent to highlight that a State may resort to war only if it has exhausted all plausible, peaceful alternatives of resolving the conflict in question, in particular diplomatic negotiations. One wants to make sure something as momentous and serious as war is declared only when it seems the only reasonable alternative to effectively punish aggression. War is sometimes, but of course not all the time, morally right. The idea here is not that the war in question is merely politically shrewd, or prudent, or bold and daring, but fully moral and just. It does make sense to ask whether a war is just, but the result of such normative application, in the case of war, is always that war should not be resorted to. Where just war theory is sometimes permissive with regard to war, pacifism is always prohibitive. For the pacifist, War is always wrong.

Needful to further state that war is carried out by men making conscious choices and obedient to hierarchical commands. Orders can be given to spare as well as to destroy. Whatever the objective aimed at or the weapons used, the plea of military necessity has to be brought into focus with two other requirements arising from the nature of man as a moral and as a social being. The first imposes an ethical rule: one does not cease to be a moral being when one takes up arms, even if required by military necessity to commit immoral acts. The second, however, imposes a prudential rule ‘one should not behave to one’s adversary in such a way as to make subsequent reconciliation impossible’. War is instrumental, nor elemental: its only legitimate object is a better peace.

It has indeed been very well thought and said that, ‘Future generations will look back with amazement if war is averted. It will be an achievement without precedent. Yet that is our task. It is a task that requires an effort like the one required to win a great war. Why should we not make that effort? Neither voice nor pen can portray the awful horror of World War III. Why should we not, for the averting of war, develop and use the qualities that would be evoked in the effort to win war? Mankind will never win lasting peace so long as men use their full resources only in tasks of war. If this time we wait that long, we shall have waited too long. No one will be able to win the next war’.

---

23 Howard, Michael, ‘Restraints on War’, p.3
25 loc. cit
26 loc. cit
27 Howard, Michael, op. cit  p.13-14
28 Dulles, John Foster, op.cit,  p.3-4
Any reasonable man must hope that war will have no future, but experience does not lend encouragement to the hope. Working on experience may even suggest whether war has not some purpose that is beyond the ambit of the human reason, despite its palpable unreasonableness as a way of settling any human issue.

The invention of ‘Atom Bomb’ has changed the very shape of modern warfare. In the years ever since Hiroshima was practically destroyed, the war system has evolved into a far more subtle and complex phenomena than in previous history. A century ago, Clausewitz explained that war was simply an extension of diplomacy by other methods; war was then a straight forward instrument of coercion used by one nation against another. At the international system level, war has been regarded, at least since the Peace of Westphalia (1648), as the principal means of deciding conflicts among nations over boundaries, access to resources, etc. Because the potential costs of total war in the atomic age are so great, war is no longer allowed such an unambiguous status among the various modes of international interaction. Even military men now justify preparations for war as ways of keeping peace\(^\text{29}\), a fact to reconcile with.

Today, it’s for the first time in history that man has enough military power to eliminate his species from the earth, weapons against which there is no conceivable defence. It has been said by Max Lerner in a book titled ‘The Age of Overkill’ that ‘War has become, so destructive and terrible that it ceases to be an instrument of national power. It is, thus, a fact that for the first time in human history, men have bottled up a power, which they have so far not dared to use’.\(^\text{30}\) The power referred here is the ‘Nuclear Power’ whose devastating affects can well be gauged.

Thus, it is often said that war is a natural manifestation of innate human aggressiveness, or that human nature itself makes recurrent war inevitable. It seems to follow that efforts to prevent war are misguided attempts to change the eternal order of nature. The simplest form of the claim that human nature itself is the cause of war is based on the observation that group conflict seems to be a universal characteristic of all but the most primitive of human cultures. \textit{It is said that war is the result of the division of labour, the fragmentation of the extended family, and the rise of communities with relatively distinct political institutions.}\(^\text{31}\) Since these characteristics are the facts of social life in all but primitive cultures and War is thus thought to be inevitable.

Yet another claim regarding the relationship of human nature and war is that, while it is clearly not true that all or most of us are so innately aggressive that war is \textit{in our blood},\(^\text{3}\) some men are so aggressive that they will always resort to violence to achieve their objectives. More so, we may state that, \textit{war is violent behaviour by organized groups of these aggressive individuals (Armies) used as a means of controlling the behaviour of others}. Advocates of this position see war as the result of two connected factors: the innate aggressiveness of some individuals and the dynamics of group behaviour.

\(^{29}\) Charles R. Beitz and Theodore Herman, op.cit, p.69

\(^{30}\) Ibid, p.78

\(^{31}\) Ibid, p.109
The weight of psychological and anthropological thought now indicates that any formulation of the argument that human nature makes recurrent war inevitable is bound to be misleading. Regardless of whether war is seen as a social invention or as a mode of group behaviour specific to a particular evolutionary period, it remains possible that other, less violent and costly ways could be found to serve the social functions now served by war and its threat. We should once and for all renounce group violence for conflict resolution in favour of politics on an international scale since there are no psychological or anthropological reasons why this should not be possible.\(^{32}\)

Yet another question that may come to one’s mind is, ‘Is war a biological necessity, a sociological inevitability or just a bad invention?’ War is nevertheless inevitable unless we change our social system and outlaw classes, the struggle for power, and possessions; and in the event of our success warfare would disappear, as a symptom vanishes when the disease is cured. A leading anthropologist and author Margaret Mead\(^{33}\) has highlighted this fact. A lot more has been said about the wars, which have only proved to be a temporary phenomenon and have been followed by the permanency of peace. Peace is needed to maintain harmony and balance within the surroundings and thus has been advocated by the saints as the teachings of God.

Having seen the War as one side of the coin, let us now see the other side i.e. Peace too, which may be taken to be a state of affair when there is no violence in the world and among nations. Eternal peace is a dream; it is quite difficult to have prevailing conditions of peace for a long period. Peace includes a state in which no one is enemy of anyone. Brotherhood, co-operation and liberty in principles are accepted and followed by all nations. This seems to be an autopen scheme or ideal condition. Nations can achieve some kind of peace with the neighbouring country or with the country which is following same principles and isms.\(^{34}\)

The tragedy of the last century is that it began with the promise of no war but it ended with 108 million war dead.\(^{35}\) Even today, at the beginning of 21\(^{st}\) century the world is facing war crises involving very heavy expenditures and loss of valuable human life. Further, world is still full of ongoing violent struggles, wars and conflicts. The potential use of nuclear armaments for war is still a possibility. World is not only divided on traditional lines of ideologies, have and have not's, north and south, developed and developing, rich and poor but has found new grounds for division such as ethnicity, religion, and technology.

\(^{32}\) Ibid, p.111

\(^{33}\) Margaret Mead, Asia, Vol 40, no.8 (August 1940). pp 402-405 in ed., Charles R.Beitz and Theodore Herman, op.cit, p.112

\(^{34}\) Yadav, A.S, op.cit, p.3-4

\(^{35}\) Dadhich, Naresh, ‘Towards a more peaceful world’, op. cit, p.iii
In the economic sphere, globalisation and liberalisation are setting the tone of development. The just war theory is again gaining acceptance in the name of ‘human intervention’. Peace workers associated with NGOs will have to work over time in campaign and field work of the peace movement for pushing the world towards a more peaceful future. Peace is the core of progress, both internal and external. Absence of war and weapons alone can’t bring perennial peace. Peace can be attained by harmonizing human minds. A peaceful world is not a world of voids. Peace is neither the peace of the grave nor that of status quo which perpetuates existing inequalities in justice or increase violence and exploitation. Peace is required which has resulted from realization of justice and ensured equality and independence for one and all in this universe.

Needful to highlight that ‘Those who love and want peace must recognize that unless they exert themselves as vigorously for peace as they do for victory, and as vigorously for justice as they do for peace, they are not apt to have either peace or justice’. Peace is a coin, which has two sides. One side is the renunciation of force; the other side is the according of justice. Peace and Justice are inseparable. This fact is also recognized by Article of the United Nations Charter and has been accepted universally.

The scene is constantly shifting. There is no simple formula for peace and single act that will assure peace. Any one who preaches that is dangerously deluded. Only the combined result of many efforts at different levels, and at many places, will assure peace. In these efforts, everyone has a part to play. It has indeed been very thoughtfully said that, ‘If we are going to embark upon the great task of waging peace, we should know what we mean by ‘peace’. Some people have conception of peace so strange and distorted that to seek it really means war’.

Needful to state that in India the vision of a peaceful world is an ancient one. In Yajurveda, we find prayer for a peaceful world such as May all the personifications of God bring us peace. But only praying for peaceful world will not bring peace on this planet. The history of mankind is largely a history of wars, class struggles and preparation for wars. War has such an important place in human history that many considered it to be a natural and unavoidable phenomenon of human history. Some do say that war is but ‘the continuation of politics by other means’. The invention and deployment of nuclear weapons has added a new dangerous dimension to the existing war-peace syndrome. Einstein stated that, ‘the unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking’. It highlights the fact that mankind is actually drifting toward unparalleled catastrophe even in the most advanced and modernized times of 21st century.

---

36 Ibid, p.iii
37 Dulles John Foster, op.cit, p. x
38 Ibid, p.17
† Yajurveda Chapter 36. Hy 17
39 Dadhich Naresh, op. cit, p. iv
Pertinent to further stress that peace can never be based on perpetuation of injustice and exploitation. A world in which the vast majority of people enjoyed neither political independence nor civil rights or even control over their national resources, could never provide the basis of durable peace. Mahatma Gandhi’s non-violent struggle for India’s freedom mobilized the Indian masses in a people’s movement which led to the peaceful overthrow of colonial rule.\textsuperscript{40} It finally resulted in winning for the people of India their Independence but without the conduct of any war. Peace cannot also be based on fear and hatred. Pandit Nehru was one of the first to realize the inherent limitations and dangers of a world divided by ideology and military alliances. Nehru’s unique and most memorable contribution to the evolution of India’s foreign policy was the concept of Nonalignment. He offered Nonalignment and its component concept of peaceful co-existence to a war-weary and ideologically divided world.\textsuperscript{41}

As Indira Gandhi had pointed out, peace is also threatened by the growing economic disparities between the rich and the poor nations. There can never be durable global peace so long as millions of people across the world remain mired in poverty.\textsuperscript{42} Major international effort is needed to redress the factors underlying global poverty, including more equitable terms of trade, the growing problem of indebtedness and greater financial flows. Her thoughts have proved to be totally correct as today the world is addressing these problems with great deliberation.

Further, to aspire for peace, belligerent nations must stop violent deed or declare unilateral ceasefires, where applicable. God has given life for social living in co-existence; yet, history is full of examples where the violence has been mitigated by peaceful efforts. A great deal of efforts are required by citizens of all nations to bring eternal peace which can be achieved by exercising control over passions, greed and wants, contentment in existing state without ambitious nature, avoidance of inferior and superior complex and finally ensuring amicable settlement of disputes, issues and tussles.

It is observed that war and peace conditions are not permanent but may be said to be transitional. War quells the struggles of the society and compels those fighting nations as well as defeated ones to switch over to peace. It has been further observed that various nations have progressed during peace time as well as in the times of war. Moreover, eternal peace remains as a dream for all nations because after almost every decade one finds that a war is generally waged. It is very unfortunate that many nations have lost their identity on globe while bringing peace among nations which leads to a basic question whether to have peace or wage war. The majority, one supposes are biased for ultimate attainment of peace.

\textsuperscript{40} Indira Gandhi Memorial Lecture (1989 – 90) by the Prime Minister V.P. Singh on 1\textsuperscript{st} May 1990.

\textsuperscript{41} Singh V.P., ‘India’s Contribution to International Peace’, Strategic Digest, July 1990. p.2588

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, p. 2592
Hence, we may now start advocating that, ‘if we want peace, prepare for peace’ instead of the earlier universally accepted concept which stated, ‘if you want peace, prepare for war’\textsuperscript{43}. We cannot run away from the most evident facts that war will be an ever present danger until there are better developed institutions for peace, such as an adequate body of international law, an effective international police force, and massive reduction of armaments. Today, we live and one fears, for how long we shall live under the shadow of war. Only if we are vividly conscious of this fact, will we make the exertions needed to prevent war. Deterrence will play a very vital role to prevent war by having the will and the capacity to use force and punish the aggressor. This involves an effort, within the society of nations, to apply the principle used to deter violence within a community. This principle of deterrence does not operate in totality even in the best ordered communities. But the principle is conceded to be effective, and it can usefully be extended into the society of nations.

Another aspect of the problem is that there can never, in the long run, be real peace unless there is justice and law. Change is the law of life. New conditions are constantly arising which call for change lest there be injustice. Such injustices tend ultimately to lead and resort to force unless other means of change exist. While we are yet at peace, let us mobilize the potentialities, particularly the moral and spiritual potentialities, which we usually reserve for war. That is perhaps asking a good deal, but is it asking too much? Peace must be a condition where international changes can be made peacefully. So, as we strive for peace, let us not see peace in isolation, or as world domination by the United States, or as stagnation. Peace is a condition of community, of diversity, and of change. It has, thus, been very aptly said, ‘When the world thermometer registers, ‘Not war, not peace,’\textsuperscript{44} it is hard to decide whether to follow military judgments or political judgments.’

In the First World War President Wilson sensed the discontent of the German people with their dictatorial, militaristic rulers. Even before the days of radio he was able to make an appeal, which reached the German people and shook their determination to carry on the war. Later, in the Second World War, the Nazis fought bitterly to the end and victory was a far longer and more costly operation. That was because one did not capitalize upon the inner weakness and rottenness of Hitlerism. The slogan of ‘unconditional surrender\textsuperscript{45} helped Hitler keep the Germans fighting until the very last.

\textsuperscript{43} Special address by the Honourable Vice President of India, Shri Krishan Kant in ed., Singh Jasjit, ‘Peace in the New Millennium’, p. xxxiv

\textsuperscript{44} Dulles, John Foster, op.cit, p .233

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, p. 242
It is a hard known fact that the world had never known sustained peace, and certainly there is no place now for easy optimism. ‘More so, there is also no place now for a panicky assumption that war has become inevitable. There is a good reason to believe that peace can be preserved. We possess today such assets for peace, which no generation has ever had before. All the efforts made to-date and the sufferings of past generations, do place us nearer to the goal of peace’. Needful to state that there is a world wide moral condemnation of war such as never existed before. Today, it seems almost unbelievable that after the First World War, there developed a world wide sentiment that war was wrong, and that it ought not to be used as an instrument of national policy. Throughout the earlier centuries, war had always been looked upon as a lawful international process. The Hague Peace Conferences did not attempt to end war; rather, they were designed to make war less cruel and more tolerable.

Now, after World War II, the moral condemnation of war has become so well-nigh universal and so intense that it has to be reckoned with as never before. We belong to a generation that has already subjected countless human beings to incredible horror and we know that millions were sustained in their agony by the thought that the very intensity of their suffering would make total sufferings so immense as to compel those who survived to find a way to live in peace. We may not yet have found that way in any mechanical sense; but at least we and others are moved as never before to reject war as a means for achieving good ends. Many would concede to the fact that there is greater recognition than ever before that peace is not a static and stagnant condition of the world, but can be, and should be, a condition of selective change. In the past, war was partly a consequence of the fact that change was inevitable, and that, internationally, there were no means of change except war. That is why, for so long, war was lawful form of any national action.

Our attention must be directed to the fact that world peace cannot be maintained as long as we have glaring disparities between the rich and the poor countries. The earlier we address this issue with additional deliberations, the better chances of peace we can look forward to. Further, the perception of various writers and philosophers do enlarge the arena of peace.

---

46 Ibid, p.262

† Some of the commonly accepted definitions of peace are: a state of mental or physical quiet, tranquility, calm, and freedom from war or civil strife. According to these definitions, the world of humanity has never experienced a state of complete peace. Today, the minds of peoples are agitated, with anxiety and fear prevailing in the lives of many, and anger and distrust pervading the world. A state of tranquility is difficult to find. Likewise, the other definition of peace, ‘freedom from war or civil strife,’ exists only to a limited degree and only in some parts of the world.
It is rather puzzling that humanity at large has not learnt from the experiences of the First and Second world wars and is continuing to behave as it had in the past. A look at the contemporary world shows that several factors of a psychological, socio economic and spiritual nature play a role in the maintenance of an atmosphere of hostility and war.\textsuperscript{48} The contemporary situation in respect to peace is not completely negative. There is, at present, an emerging worldwide awareness of the critical conditions of our times, reflected by the extremely volatile atmosphere of conflict and animosity between major military powers and economic blocs, as well as the ever present threat of a nuclear conflict that could result in the annihilation of the whole human race.

The emerging awareness concerning peace therefore is based on solid grounds, scientifically and historically. Both these processes have brought us to our present level of readiness to contribute to the cause of peace. Still, before we proceed, we need to further understand the nature of peace and the conditions required to ensure its achievement.

Adelai Stevenson once noted, ‘There is no evil in the atom; only in men’s souls’.\textsuperscript{49} ‘The truth of this statement lies in the fact that humanity has always paid more attention to war than to peace. Consequently, mankind is much more knowledgeable about the nature of war than that of peace; the scientific community is engaged more in the development of the science and technology of war than of peace; and the governments of the world are much more aware of the dynamics of war than those of peace. More important, the majority of people, the scientific community, and the leaders of humanity are all convinced that mankind is by nature, more inclined toward war than peace. They see war as natural, real, and inevitable, and peace as a fantasy, unnatural and unobtainable.’\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, p.121

\textsuperscript{49} Adelai Stevenson, from a speech given in Hartford, Connecticut, September 18, 1962

\textsuperscript{50} Shreesh Juyal and Ramesh Babu, op.cit, p.129