CONCLUSION
In this changing international scenario and the existing clash of opinion within the world Organization, it is very difficult to define the position and activities of a particular nation. Especially when that country happens to be ‘non-committed’ and it does not move within the prescribed limits of a known ideological group but at the same time tries to judge each issue on its merits irrespective of the attitude followed by the other two blocs. India in ‘ploughing a lonely furrow’ has been on the one hand blamed for ‘sitting on the fence’ but also praised as an ‘interpreter’ between the East and the West. This blame and praise at the same time has made the confusion worse confounded.

However India played a very significant role at the United Nations during Nehru era. Indian delegates, under Nehru’s instructions, often exerted influence and leadership in the United Nations. The role-played by Nehru as a reconciliator and the stance he took in “judging issues on merit” enhanced her prestige and position among the member nations. For India, the United Nations was not merely an international Organization whose sole purpose was to prevent war and promote peace but it was something more. It was also conceived as a forum to bring about the ideal of one world. Nehru’s philosophy and thought found full expression at the United Nations. Consequently, India is counted as “one of the nations that has enabled the General Assembly to render decisions on controversial issues”.

Nehru was anxious that the United Nations should not meet the fate of the League of Nations. He had witnessed the destruction brought about by the two World Wars. Thus the terrible experiences of wars, and his close
observation and clear understanding of international affairs, casted him in the mould of an uncompromising champion of international peace. He wanted the United Nations to succeed. But if it is to avoid the fate of its predecessor, the world must change. Nehru would often complain that our minds are forever static the attitude that “today is the same as yesterday and tomorrow will not differ greatly” must be given up, he exhorted all the time. He thus stood for a change in psychological atmosphere in international relations. His ideal was a peaceful world and his life’s mission was to save the succeeding generation from the scourge of war. He thus devoted his life and energy for the establishment of a world free from war and fear of war. He was ready to pay every price for peace for without peace all our dreams of prosperous world would die out.

Nehru agreed with other peace loving statesmen that in the present scenario, which involved the danger of war, every country should direct its efforts to the easing of International tensions. He was against the arm race and warned the bigger nations of the world that mere glory of wealth and show of arms would not take them anywhere. In order to achieve prosperity in the real sense we should develop our character and personality. He mainly emphasized on the proper cultivation of mind in the right direction because he believed that war arises in the minds of men and it was mind that required proper training so as to rule out the possibility of malice, rancor and jealousy in individual, national and international spheres.

Nehru believed in this space age, states based on nationality are out of time with the contemporary world. His argument was that “systems like individuals have their own life span and they cannot go beyond it”, nations,
like individuals, must try to think of their independence and freedom in terms of the global cooperation, because “the days of isolated national existence were past beyond recall” and the only alternative to world cooperation was world disruption, war and continuous conflicts between nations till they were all involved in common ruin. It was difficult for him to conceive of an effective world Organization at that time, but he felt it desirable to lay the foundation of such cooperation and understanding. He even admired President Wilson for his statesmanship towards realizing a world order, but to his dismay war treaties and the statesmen of that generation scotched the idea, and the great pile of the League of Nations “rises mournfully today in Geneva like a mausoleum enshrining the dead body of great hope. Its cry for peace meant the continuation of unjust status quo all over the world; its democracy was a cloak for the subjection of many peoples and nations. It had to die because it was not brave enough to live. There can be no resurrection of the idea that the League enshrined, not in the limited, twisted and perverse way that took shape in Paris and Geneva, but in manner fuller, more powerful and organic and based on collective peace, freedom and democracy”.

Nehru believed that the League of Nations failed because it was an attempt to stabilize something which could not endure, to protect the imperialist and special interests of the victor nations.

According to Nehru “The choice before the world is a choice which has never been posed before, it is a choice of self extinction or survival”. He further says, “There really seems to be no alternative between world conquest and world association; there is no choice of a middle course. The old divisions and the quest of power politics have little meaning today and do not fit in with our
environment...The interests and activities of states overflow their boundaries and are worldwide...If there is no cooperation there is bound to be friction with its inevitable results”.

Nehru believed that the worldwide cooperation should be based on equality and mutual welfare. Racial domination should cease. Moreover no nation shall tolerate the exploitation by one another. Nor will the people in the backward nations remain indifferent to their abject poverty when other parts of the world are rich and prosperous. It is in its own enlightened self-interest that every nation would be driven to this worldwide cooperation. Nehru even opposed the idea of European federation where countries like India can only be a hanger on of semi colonial status. But it was in favour of Eastern federation, which consisted of a powerful combination of free nations, joined together for their own good as well as for the world good. This Eastern federation will be intimately connected with Soviet Union and USA.

According to Nehru “A World union is necessary today. Such a Union can have nothing to do with imperialism or Fascism and must be based on the fullest democracy and freedom, each nation having autonomy within its borders and submitting in international matters to the union legislature to which it sends its representatives. Inevitably it will have to work under a planned and socialized economy in order to end the conflicts of today. To such a federal union India would gladly belong and contribute to her utmost for the peace and progress of the world”. In other words he wanted sovereign nation states to exercise their freedom with constraint and concern for the larger interests of the universe. To think of particular interest of a nation, at the expense of other
nations, is only to weaken the new world body and to invite the fate of its predecessor.

Nehru was an uncompromising critic of colonialism. Even before India attained its independence it had become a “symbol and catalyst of self-determination” for most of the international movements in Asia and African countries. In a speech in the United Nations General Assembly on Nov.3, 1948, he exhorted: “Great countries like India who have passed out of......Colonial stages do not conceive it possible that the other countries should remain under foreign yoke”. Nehru was opposed to the doctrine of self-determination to every tiny national group. In a letter to H.N. Spalding on March 22, 1940 he wrote.

“It is clear enough that there can be no independent small states in the future. There may possibly be huge group of states united together in each group and in each group in a state of latent hostility to the other. Though this is a possibility, it is obviously a very undesirable possibility and it leads to no stability, but to future wars on a tremendous scale. Therefore, we come back to the conclusion that the independent sovereign states must be put to an end to, and the political and economic Organization of the world must keep pace with the technique of science, which has united the whole earth. That is to say that there should be a real Commonwealth of interdependent states, each state foregoing that part of its independence, which is necessary for the sake of this Commonwealth or federation.”

Nehru visualized a United Nations that could bring all nations together to serve as a Commonwealth of Nations, where every member state could give
up that part of its freedom, which is necessary for international cooperation. For no country could be given complete independence to do whatever it wants. The United Nations should serve as “an umpire” to check the misbehaviour or interference with other countries and the independence of each country must be limited to that extent.

Since the United Nations represented the world community and a mighty cause of preventing future wars and preserving peace and security lies on the shoulders of United Nation. Therefore every nation must adhere “completely and absolutely to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter” and India to work with all her ability and strength “for the realization of those principles and purposes”.

Since Nehru had a vision to transform the United Nations into world government. Therefore he resisted all attempts to reduce the world body into a forum to serve the interests of the power blocs.

Nehru repeatedly stressed that the United Nations in order to be an effective world body, should be universal in character and all the countries big or small should be represented in it. The League had its demise because it was a limited Organization right from the beginning. Some big powers did not join it and some were kept out of it whereas the United Nations is based on the principle of universality because “it symbolized the longing among all people for the return of peace”. If the United Nations does not comply with the principle of universality it is likely to suffer the same fate as the League. He had very often told the General Assembly that the United Nations should not be an exclusive club but should reflect the world as it is. During the Korean
Crises an issue that was brought before the Security Council was regarding the admission of Communist China into the United Nations by Nehru. But unfortunately India's efforts failed because of United States opposition. The USA suggested to India to except up permanent seat in the Security Council ousting China. But Nehru reacted very sharply against this offer and felt that it would do little good and would bring a great deal of trouble in the train. According to Nehru it was improper for a great and powerful country consisting of over 450 million to remain unrepresented as it had an urgent bearing on the major issues of the world such as disarmament etc and without which the United Nations is incomplete. He was of the opinion that by adopting delaying tactics in this matter we would cause more harm to the United Nations and to the consideration of major problems like the Korean crises. He was fully convinced that there would have been no Korean war if China had been in the United Nations because it would have been easier to deal with China across the conference table then on the battlefield.

India under Nehru has been a passionate and constant advocate of the principle of racial equality and there is—perhaps nothing, more which arouses the ire of all Indians than racial discrimination. Nehru believed that no solution of the African problem could be based on racial discrimination or on the suppression of the African people who had suffered terribly for centuries and command our sympathy. He even landed a struggle for the independence of the former Italian colonies particularly in Libya and opposed South African refusal to place South-West Africa under the Trusteeship Council. He also insisted upon the principle of self-determination for Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia etc. He even mobilized the world opinion against the policy of
apartheid in South Africa and considered discrimination on grounds of race, as the violation of United Nations Charter. He provided full cooperation to the Asian and African countries in removing this evil from different parts of the world as it was a menace for world peace and engulfed the world in "racial war".

India under Nehru has been a champion of disarmament and was the member of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee. She was also a signatory to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty of August 1963. Nehru believed that just as military pacts undermine the process of peace, militarization only leads to tensions and conflicts. Therefore Nehru was of the opinion that general and complete disarmament is the sine qua non to prevention of wars and the preservation of peace in this world. So he asked all the nations to follow a policy of demilitarization and through his speeches and appeals made an important contribution to the process of demilitarization. According to Nehru disarmament was imperative if world is to survive. Therefore one of the important tasks for the United Nations according to Nehru was to ensure an effective machinery to achieve disarmament, which alone could bring confidence and hope for survival among people.

Nehru greatly emphasized on the specialized agencies of the United Nations as they could provide economic and social aid to the under developed countries. Hence India participated in the work of specialized agencies of the United Nations and finds this international approach to economic and technical help preferable to assistance through bilateral relations as it could lead to some kind of domination by the advanced countries to an under developed countries. Nehru also appreciated and quoted the preamble of the Constitution of
UNESCO which stated that war begins in the minds of men and felt that it was undoubtedly a step towards changing the mind of the man by providing social, economic, educational and cultural relief.

Nevertheless, India has often been suggesting some structural changes in the United Nations in view of the emergence of many independent countries of Africa and Asia. Nehru while acting in a very reasonable manner on this important issue pointed out that the United Nations Charter should be interpreted liberally, keeping in view the social justice so that this body may prove a forum for widening areas of freedom and progress.

Regarding the frequent use of Veto by the USSR compelled the other members to find an alternative to the United Nations and it led to the most important developments in the form of military pacts, aggression and threat to territorial integrity. But Nehru believed that the presence of these Super Power i.e. USA and USSR in the United Nations was a matter of prestige which the League lacked. Nehru even criticized the “Uniting for Peace” Resolution, which recognized that the failure of the Security Council to exercise its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security did not “deprive the General Assembly of its rights or relie it of its responsibilities under the Charter”. Regretting that the United Nations was changing gradually Nehru while making a speech on June 12, 1962 said “Instead of looking upon it as a great Organization for peace, some of its members have gradually begun to think of it as an Organization through which war can be waged. The original idea behind the formation of the United Nations was vastly different and though the Charter remains some how facts began to believe it more and more”.

Conclusion
Regarding the Veto Nehru felt that however undemocratic the Veto might be in theory it should not be abolished from the Charter because the voting right given to the big powers reflected the reality of international power politics though the United Nations was severely criticized for its structure and for some of its activities. But Nehru however took into account the broad picture and though that the United Nations had amply justified its existence and had repeatedly forestalled the recurrent crises from developing into war. Though Nehru realized that certain structural defects existed in the Organization, but he warned the nations of the world to proceed slowly with agreement and should not press for any change, which would involve an immediate amendment of the Charter and the raising of heated controversies. He felt that if any radical change in the Charter were made without the prior consent of all the big powers it would only increase tension and confusion. But on the contrary, if the present tendency of Vetoing important matters continued the United Nations could hardly face the realities of the world and would come closer to the fate of the League of Nations. He believed that merely transferring the principle of unanimity from the General Assembly to the Security Council would not help in solving the problem. However, Nehru stuck to the presence of Veto, but in his view what was needed was not to restrict the area of Veto but to regulate its use and that was a matter for the big five to consider themselves.

However India's contribution in the field of political activities within the world Organization has been no less significant.

During the Palestine issue Nehru was equally conscious of imperialist designs for maintaining colonialism in the Arab countries. In order to intensify
the Indian independence struggle, he became the spokesman for the independence of the Arab countries too. The Balfour Declaration was a betrayed of Arabs by the British. For Nehru the Arab struggle against British imperialism in Palestine was as much a part of this great world conflict as was India’s struggle for freedom.

Nehru knew that it was the British who were responsible for the Palestine issue and therefore the problem would never be solved by them. Nehru at Bandung Conference in 1955 said “Palestinian refugee problem is above all a human problem and Afro-Asian community should make fullest endeavour to get this solved”. However, he believed “Palestine essentially is an Arab country and therefore Arabs interest must prevail there. Therefore, it was understood that the Arab people could resist any attempt to deprive them of their own country. He believed that the solution of the problem lies in the option where the two parties come in agreement with each other and not by crushing the Arab people.

Nehru in 1947 while addressing the Constituent Assembly suggested, “A federal state with, naturally an Arab majority in charge of the federal state but with autonomy for the other region of the Jewish region,” as the solution to the problem. For him this was not only a fair and equitable solution of the problem, but also the only real solution to the problem. Any other solution would have meant fighting and conflict. Though India’s proposal was included in the Palestine Committee, it did not find favour with most people in the United Nations. When partition of Palestine became inevitable, it was realized that the Indian solution was probably the best, but it was too late to realize.
Partition of Palestine thus brought permanent trouble in the West Asia, which at present is extremely explosive with the possibility of a great deal of trouble in the future. Had Nehru's plan been accepted, the problem perhaps might have been solved much earlier.

It was the beginning of India's independence when the Korean issue was discussed in the United Nations. It was in effect the 'baptism of fire' of the World Organization. The United Nations action in Korea comes under two heads:

(a) Attempts for a peaceful adjustment of the solution.
(b) By enforcement action.

But India from the very beginning felt that a military solution to Korea would not be advisable. India's outstanding contribution towards securing a solution of the Korean crises is an example of her unceasing efforts in this direction. India desiring to implement the Security Council Resolution through some positive aid sends to Korea a medical mission, which earned high praise for its work. Secondly his personal appeals to Stalin and Dean Acheson for the admission of Peoples Republic of China into the United Nations and for a conference between the USA, USSR and China with a view to achieving a solution to the Korean crises. Nehru even showed his disapproval of the crossing by the United Nations forces of the 38th parallel in Korea and was opposed to the Communist China being branded as an aggressor in Korea, and made efforts to get classification of the stand taken by the Peoples Republic of China with regard to the negotiation of cease-fire in Korea and a compromise plan to solve the deadlocked prisoners of war issue and her chairmanship of the
Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission for Korea in 1953-1954 are worth mentioning. Thus India under Nehru undoubtedly played an important role during the Korean crises. In the words of Nehru “Whatever may happen today or in near future with regards to Korea, we may feel in all humility that we used our endeavour in helping to bring hostilities to an end.

Peace in Asia was of paramount importance to India. Asian peace during this period was generally threatened by the rise of internal Communist forces, which in turn drew the American and the Russian on to the Asian stage.

As normal the Indian policy during this phase of Vietnamese crises was also the same i.e. her concern for peace and stability in Indo-China, appeal for political solution through a Geneva type Conference to end the crises for good and to ensure peace and security of the Vietnamese.

In this Asian drama Nehru played many roles but mainly those of mitigator of fear of Communism among the Asian nations, a peacemaker between the two power blocks and a proud and sensitive nationalist. He maintained an incomparable ideological firmness between his different roles but in times of conflict, he chooses sometimes reluctantly to act in India’s national interest for which he had to face a lot of criticism.

In the very beginning Nehru had been very vocal on the issue of Vietnam. He always spoke in favour of the Vietnamese and viewed the Vietnam crises from an angle diametrically oppose to that of USA, which even had strained relations between the two countries.

Since India has always been distrustful of the Western powers whose main aim is subverting independence and establishing colonial rule? biased by
this view India saw American move in Vietnam as a struggle for world domination in some form of imperialism. Moreover Nehru was of the opinion that American interference in Indo-China would draw Chinese into the arena and the Korean story would be repeated. Thus he was prepared to accept the Communist rule in North Vietnam in preference to the possibility of a Super Power confrontation in the region because that would lead to the possibility of a World War III.

But later on Indian attitude and reaction towards the development in Vietnam were conditioned by the imperatives of her relations with the PRC and her own domestic problem because during the mid sixties, India was passing through an acute food shortage cause by successive failure of crops. As a result India had to heavily depend on United States aid (PL-480) to obtain food grains. Therefore Nehru was forced by circumstances to slow down his voice reluctantly to act in India’s national interest.

Thus for a country like India, which was extremely, anti-colonialist and which favoured nationalism rather than Communism, The situation in Vietnam looked very complicated. Thus India’s policy towards Vietnam from 1945 to 1960 can be divided into three phases.

During the first phase (i.e.1945 to 1949), India strongly opposed French colonialism and was sympathetic towards the Communist dominated national movement led by Ho Chin Minh, but she did not carry this sympathy to the point of actually strengthening this movement materially, morally and diplomatically to the advantage of Communism. During the second phase i.e. from 1950-1954 India was still showing sentimental preference for Ho Chin
Conclusion

Minh, but was strictly neutral politically and diplomatically and during the third phase, India progressively moved closer to the nationalist to the disadvantage of the Communist.

India as a Chairman of the International Control Commission made a proposal for the development of Afro-Asian force in Vietnam to control the demarcation of land between the North and South Vietnam. But this proposal was however rejected. Later on July 7, 1986 India again proposed a 6-point formula for ending the war in Vietnam. Regarding India's attitude towards Vietnam issue Nehru said that it was a positive attitude because we do not want to make the situation more difficult for Indo-Chinese fight for Independence. Thus India adopted a policy of neutrality in Vietnam in order to help facilitate the solution of the problem. Thus India only reacted to developments that were circumscribed by the demand of national interest.

The Congo Crises in 1960 plunged the United Nations into serious crises with Soviet Union threatening to withdraw from the United Nations system. It raked up East-West tensions, thus giving the Cold War a new twist. While Khruschew declaring a war on United Nations, it looked, as though the split in the United Nations was inevitable. The efforts made by Nehru to defuse the United Nations crises are worth appreciating. As Reuter reported it was Nehru who undertook the “greatest peace mission” of his life to save the United Nations from disaster. It in reality became a rescue mission.

India as always tried to be objective in its appraisal of every issue pertaining to the ONUC, and to ensure that it did not become a part of the Cold War between the two Super Power. When Khruschev sought the support of Nehru for his efforts to bring about a structural re-Organization of the United
Nations with special reference to Secretariat Nehru refused to oblige. Though he also wanted certain structured changes but he believed that a re-Organization of the United Nations at this stage would likely to hinder the working of ONUC.

Nevertheless, no student of international relations can dismiss except with cheap scepticism the role-played by Nehru on the world stage and his contribution to the theory and practice of international relations. The future is constantly emerging from the past carrying with it most of the debris of the past, but is shaped, in its essential thrust, by statesmen like Nehru. The greatness of Nehru lies in the fact that his concepts and ideas have stood the test of time.

And it was under Nehru’s leadership that India played an important role in world affairs. But we feel sorry seeing the current picture of India’s role in international affairs, which is completely different to what it was during the Nehruvian era. During Nehruvian era India had just attained its independence and was facing acute problems from all sides but still Nehru showed the guts of taking over the most delicate task in international affairs and often received high praise for his work. But now, India avoids even reacting to international crises; let it be United Nations operation in Iraq or United States operation in Afghanistan. Now our leadership prefers silence to international incidents. But this is definitely not a good sign because this kind of attitude would definitely blur India’s image in the eyes of the world. Today we do not have single statesmen like Nehru. So today, if we wish to regain our past legacy of activity participating in world affairs with which Nehru lived his whole life. Our leaders will have to cultivate the similar vigour and vitality that was exhibited by Nehru in resolving the world crises.