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Nehru Attitude towards World Organization:

Jawaharlal Nehru had a genuine passion to solve world problems and a keen concern for peace in the world. He had jumped into the nationalist struggle of India with a clear vision of Indian problems but as he advanced in it he gradually began to express concern with world problems also. His concept of nationalism was very wide and cosmopolitan. It was this distinctive aspect of his perception of nationalism that lent colour and meaning to his perception of internationalism. His implicit faith in, and scrupulous adherence to cosmopolitanism and internationalism influenced considerably his perception of nationalism. It was evident in his approach to Indian nationalism and the freedom struggle. He was among the very nationalist leaders in India and abroad to view nationalism in the wider context of internationalism. No doubt the Indian nationalist movement began long before the advent of Nehru on the Indian political stage, but it is a curious fact that until the late nineteen twenties, it was hardly aware of the outside world with the exception of Britain and possibly of Japan. It was Nehru who gave the Indian nationalist movement a worldview in the nineteenth, twenties and thirties.
Nehru had seen something of Europe as a student and read a good deal of world history and politics, but the crucial event in the moulding of his outlook was his visit to Europe in 1926-27.

The visit of Nehru to the Brussels Conference was an eye-opener for him because he came across a brilliant cross-section of leaders from different parts of the world. In the words of Michael Brecher "The Brussels Congress proved to be a milestone in the development of Nehru’s political thought...". His visit to Brussels widened his horizon and brought him in touch with nationalist and socialist politicians of four Continents. During the Brussels Conference he represented India on behalf of the Indian National Congress. The need for some action between oppressed nations inter se against imperialism in their struggle for freedom was the dominant idea behind the Brussels Congress. The colonial and foreign offices of Imperialist countries looked upon the deliberations of the Brussels Congress with dismay. It had far reaching impact on Nehru and on his future activities. "The Brussels Congress," he said, "as well as the subsequent committee meetings of the League, which were held in various places from time to time, helped me to understand some of the problems of colonial and dependent countries". Moreover it enabled him to connect the struggle for political liberation in India with similar struggles in other countries of Asia and Africa, and gave a radical edge to his politics which was sharpened by a four day visit to Soviet Union in November 1927.

It was from 1928 Nehru’s criticism of imperialism, capitalism and Fascism became strident. His nature rebelled against Fascism in Italy
and Nazism in Germany. He severely criticized the pro-Fascist and appeasement policy of the British Government. Ever since the invasion of Manchuria, Ethiopia and Spain he saw with pain and anguish how the appetite of the two dictators proved insatiable and how country after country were being betrayed in this notorious policy of appeasement and how the lamps of liberty were put out.

Nehru was an eyewitness to the two world wars. The horrors, the ruthless destruction, the mass annihilation and economic ruination which were the terrible consequences of these two world wars, caused and left acute panic in his mind. Thus the terrible experience of wars and his close observation and clear understanding of international affairs, casted him in the mould of an uncompromising champion of international peace. Thus it was during this period Nehru imbibed in him the ideology of peace. Thus being a man of great vision he was in search for a strategy of peace.

Nehru was ready to pay every price for peace for without peace all our dreams of prosperous world would die out. He believed that the major problem of the age was the question of Cold War rather than the lingering continuation of colonialism, which was historically a past phenomenon. Like other peace loving statesmen of the world Nehru also shared the same opinion that in the present situation which involved the danger of war, every country should direct its efforts to the easing of international tensions and to prevent the situation from deteriorating further, he warned the bigger nations on several occasions that mere glory of wealth or show of arms would not take them anywhere. Thus in
order to achieve real glory as well as material prosperity, we should develop our character and personality. Nehru's main emphasis was on the proper cultivation of mind in the right direction because wars arise 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. Thus his ideal was a peaceful world and his life mission was to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The future that took shape in his mind was one of intimate cooperation, politically, economically and culturally between India and other countries of the world. Nehru realized that the days of isolated nation's existence were gone 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. But it was difficult for Nehru to conceive of an effective world Organization at that time because there were forces and powerful nation, which were bent on following a contrary policy. However he felt it desirable to lay the foundation of such cooperation and understanding. Intelligent opinion all over the world and vast number of people were eager and anxious for this to happen, but government vested interests and group came in the way.

However, a faint glimpse of this world cooperation came to President Wilson and he sought to realize it. Nehru appreciated President Wilson for his statesmanship towards realizing this world order. Thus the foundation of the League of Nations in the year 1918 by
Woodrow Wilson, was the first attempt to create machinery for world wide International government, constitute a remarkable landmark in the world history, signifying the emergence of a new period that the United Nations now re-emphasize.

Both Nehru and President Wilson war an eyewitness to the evil designs of Nazism and Fascism. They had seen how the obnoxious Treaty of Versailles was imposed on the poor Germans. This treaty however was the monopoly of the victorious powers. It was naturally an eye sore for the poor Germans. Great injustice was done on the poor Germans under the peace settlement and the Covenant of the League was conjoin with it. Poor Germans were also called upon to disarm and were allowed to keep only a small army for police purposes. Moreover they had to pay a huge amount of war indemnity. This was called repatriation. Germany being conquered and ruined country at that time faced vast problems to make both ends meet for domestic purposes. In addition to this to have to shoulder the burden of the allies was an impossible task. Moreover the allies were full of hatred and the spirit of revenge and wanted not only their “pound of flesh” but also the last drop of blood from Germans prostrate blood. The whole purpose of all these clauses of the treaty was to tie up Germany in every possible way, to disable her, to prevent her from becoming strong again. The obvious lesson of history that it is impossible to tie up a great people for long period in this way did not strike the wise super statesmen who laid the foundation of this peace of Vengeance at Versailles for which they had to repent later on 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 a manner fuller, more powerful and organic and based on collective peace freedom and democracy”.

During this time Nehru was looking at the international scenario from a distance. He was a Persona-Non Grata and people were not listening to him because India had not yet attained its, independence and was under the imperial domination. No doubt Nehru fully appreciated the idea of the League. But he felt sad to see the functioning of the League. He said that the Organization is coming out but it has its set backs and so this was shocking development and one day it will die out as it contains the seed of death within it. Nehru believed that the first thing, which led to the failure of the League of Nations, was that it did not get the congenial atmosphere to survive. But he could not give it the required support for certain obvious reasons. Firstly Nehru was not happy to see how India was represented in the League but he had to remain a silent spectator because back to 1919 when India signed the Treaty of Versailles and the Covenant of the League of Nations. She had become a state in international law for external purposes. But the British power represented. A typical comment on the Issue of India's representation in the League was. “India may be an original member of
the League of Nations, but all the world knows that this means an additional voice and vote for the British foreign office. The people of India have no say in the matter and the British Government nominates their so-called representative. And so, inevitably the subject country concentrates on achieving national independence before it can think of playing an effective part in international affairs.”

2) Secondly the League lacked unanimity. Thus if one member state voted against a proposition, it fell through thus there was to be no coercion by a majority vote. Moreover, the national sovereignties remained as independent and almost as irresponsible as before and the League did not become a kind of super state over them. According to Nehru it was this provision, which weakened the League greatly and made it practically an advisory body.

3) Thirdly Nehru was sad to see that the League was being dominated by the great powers and they used it whenever it served their purpose to do so, and ignored it when this was found more convenient. In the year 1933, Nehru expressed his impressions about the League in the following words “there can be no doubt that the League has been a tool in the hands of the great powers. Its very basic function is the maintenance of the status quo that is the existing order. It talks of justice and honour between nations, but it does not enquire whether the existing relationships are based on justice and honour... The dependencies of an imperialist power are domestic matter for it. So that, as far as, the League is concerned, it looks forward to a perpetual dominance by these powers over their empires”.
4) According to Nehru the greatest cause of the downfall of the League of Nations lay in the deflection of the United States inspite of the fact that whose President had been its principal architect was not allowed to join the League, because the United States Senate refused to ratify the Covenant of the League. Influenced by both isolationist and utopian tendencies, the United States Senate refused to approve the Treaty of Versailles which the Senators feared would mean abandonment of the time honoured United States principle of non-involvement in European affairs. Thus the most important major power never joined the system of collective security.

5) Nehru as a student of history realized how the lack of universalism in the membership of the League was responsible for its failure and consequently untimely demise. From the initial stage the League lacked universality of membership. When it was founded it was assumed that all states in the world would joint it that is, its membership would be universal. But four countries i.e. Germany, Australia, Turkey and Russia were excluded and it was laid down that these countries might join later on under certain conditions. From Africa, Ethiopia and Liberia were members and China, India and Japan from Asia. But basically it was a European Organization.

6) Thus due to these various shortcomings the League on several occasions displayed its helplessness in maintaining peace and security. During 1931, the League failed to prevent Japanese aggression against China in Manchuria, the League, no doubt condemned the violation of the obligations of the Covenant and kept mum. Afterwards, Italy
invaded Abyssinia that country appealed to the League to save her from Italian aggression. No doubt the League took preventive action by restoring economic and financial sanctions against it, but the action of the League to enforce the sanctions upon the aggressor failed. Thereafter Italy left the League and it could not proceed with military sanctions. Therefore Nehru felt that military sanctions perhaps might be necessary and unavoidable on particular occasions but they involved war and remedy might be as bad as the disease. Keeping in view the disastrous consequences of military action, Nehru pleaded for economic sanctions, which were more powerful and on the whole peaceful, though their effect, might not be immediate. Similarly, Germany violated the Charter of the League in very different manner and reoccupied Rhineland in 1936 and Austria was also annexed in 1938.

Despite the Munich appeasement, the League could not oppose Czechoslovakia in 1939. This was a very big joke that the League stood helpless while Russia invaded Finland in 1939. Thus from the Polish Seizure of Vienna to the German invasion of Czechoslovakia there was an almost unbroken crescendo of lawlessness. This dismal failure of the League in securing peace to the innumerable people all over the world resulted in the reversion of nations to the old policy of pacts, alliances and blocks with a view to maintaining the balance of power, instead of placing reliance on the League. However, Nehru was shocked to see that the leaders of the member countries, who had organized the League for the peace and security, violated the Charter of this Organization on their own accord for their own selfish interest, which damaged its fundamental object, which remained unsuccessful in preventing
aggression. Thus the League inspite of its pious principles and useful purposes, failed miserably. India was under the foreign yoke and Nehru was involved in a struggle for independence at home though critically watched its activities and behaviour, but could not repose her faith and confidence in it. However, its failure and drawbacks provided sufficient material for those who were sincerely thinking in terms of establishing a more lasting world Organization. At that time there were two schools of thought, which had their own opinion. There, some of the statesmen desired to give life to the League, which had almost become a defunct body while the others wanted to give birth to a new Organization.

For carrying out this proposal the United States President, Roosevelt and the British Prime Minister Mr. Churchill held a meeting in the year 1941 to find out the possibilities of maintaining peace on stable line, which condemned the use of force and territorial aggrandizement and envisaged security from government to the people it was affirmed that after the final destruction of Navy tyranny, they hoped to established peace which provide assurances that all men in all the lands might live out their lives in freedom from any fear and want and they believed that all the nations of the world, for spiritual as well as realistic reasons whatever it may be, must come to the abandonment of the use of force which was named at Atlantic Charter. Then, later on it was followed by the United Nation Declaration signed by the representatives of 26 States on 1st January 1942 at Washington which was subscribed to the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, each nation pledging itself to employ its full resources against the enemy.
And each government promised to cooperate with the government signatory there to and not make a separate armistice with the enemies. This led to the establishment of the United Nations Organization in 1945. There was hardly a statesman in the world that displayed greater faith in and allegiance to the United Nations Charter than Nehru.

Nehru thought that this dream of one world or a federation of world nations was possible of realization in our own lifetime if we set about it in the right way. With this objective he gave his whole-hearted support to the ideals of the United Nations since its founding at San Francisco on October 24, 1945. Nehru did not forget the fact that the League of Nations and all that it stood for met with an ignominious doom of frustration and failure within two decade of its birth. But being an optimistic by nature and one who had unlimited faith in man and his destiny, he thought that the inauguration of the United Nations was a step rightly taken to join the nations of the world in their common efforts and endeavours to bring peace and happiness to all people.

India, being one of the original signatories of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco in 1945 is a firm adherent to the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Among others, the United Nations Charter emphasized in maintenance and promotion of international peace and security, preventing the occurrence of wars and aggression and threats to peace, solving international disputes by pacific means and maintenance of international peace and security, solving problems of an international character by cooperation, promoting better standards of living, and social progress. The inspiring aims and
objectives of the United Nations, as enshrined in the United Nations Charter, constitute an integral part of the Nehruvian ideology pervading his perception of the new global order.

Nehru repeatedly pointed out India's attitude towards this august body as that of whole-hearted cooperation and unreserved adherence, in both spirit and letter to the Charter governing it. To that end, India will participate fully in its various activities and endeavour to play that role in its council to which her geographical position, population and her urge for contribution towards peaceful progress entitled her.10

It was Nehru's profound sense of history and idealism, which made him a firm supporter of the United Nations. The circumstances under which the United Nations was born and the purpose for which it stood compelled Nehru more than anything else to support firmly and sincerely the United Nations and its role in the international sphere. Thus after independence, he made it one of the chief corner stones of India's foreign policy to support and work within the United Nations, and to mediate whenever possible and desirable. Nehru once said, "But looking at the broad picture, I think we can definitely say that the United Nations has amply justified its existence and repeatedly prevented the recurrent crises from developing into war. It has played a great role and it is a little difficult now to think of this troubled world without the United Nations. If it had defects they lay in the world situation itself that inevitably it mirrored".11 Thus he found in the United Nations the last hope of mankind for survival progress and onward
march. In the absence of the United Nations, Nehru found as a discerning statesman, the alternative before mankind was war.

Nevertheless his supreme faith in the United Nations and its underlying aims, objectives and purposes did not make him blind to the conspicuous defects in the United Nations Charter. However, these defects in the United Nations Charter did not prevent him from supporting the United Nations—a fragile and important instrument.

Nehru being an eyewitness to the formation of the League of Nations realized how the lack of universalism in the membership of the League of Nations was responsible for its early demise. It was natural in the light of this experience that he stood for making the United Nations a truly universal Organization by enlarging its membership. Thus when the United Nations came into being in 1945 Nehru realized that though the United Nations was in many respects a great improvement on the League of Nations, yet the United Nations lacked universalism. This was for two very strong and unassailable reasons: Firstly the United Nations as it existed in 1945 was dominated by member-countries mostly that belonged to the non-Western world. Secondly a very large part of the Afro-Asian countries were under imperial and colonial domination of Western powers as Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium and Holland. Thus, in view of the conspicuous absence of countries and territorial regions belonging to the non-Western world prompted Nehru to emphasize repeatedly on the question of making the United Nations a truly universal Organization; because Nehru was fully convinced that unless the United Nations became truly
universal in character and composition it would meet the same kind of fate as the League of Nations. Thus his profound conviction of making the United Nations a truly universal Organization prompted him to support and champion the cause of admitting as many countries as possible into the fold of the United Nations. Therefore Nehru spared no efforts in championing and supporting the freedom struggle in several parts of the Afro-Asian world as well as the applications of peace loving countries to become members of the United Nations. In emphasizing the universal character of the United Nations, Nehru was convinced that a truly international Organization like the United Nations comprising all the eligible peace loving countries of the world would go a long way in making it a powerful instrument in serving the cause of peace and security and promoting friendly relations among nations. Thus it would be no exaggeration to say that his emphasis on universalizing membership of the United Nations was in consonance with his perception of the new global order.

Thus Nehru not only supported the freedom struggle of the people concerned in several areas of these Continents, but also supported very strongly their request for membership of the United Nations as and when they became free and sought membership of the United Nations in taking up this cause. Nehru was fully convinced that as long as membership of the United Nations was confined to a small number of nations and consequently a large number of countries remaining outside its ranks would make this Organization a very ineffective instrument for attaining its lofty objectives and ideals.
Since it was Nehru's vision to transform the United Nations into World Government of some sort, he resisted all attempts to reduce the world body into a forum to serve the interest of the power blocs. In the initial stage of the United Nations, some Western powers wanted to limit the United Nations by the exclusion of some Communist nations. This had surprised Nehru greatly and he very firmly stood for bringing Communist China into the fold of the United Nations. As the United Nations stood in the immediate aftermath of its birth, Communist China was not a member of the United Nations. This was the result of the power politics that prevailed in the international sphere and also the most vehement opposition of USA to bring Communist China into the United Nations. The government represented by Chiang Kai-Shek in Formosa Island continued to be seated in the United Nations as the genuine accredited and legitimate representative of China. The new regime on the mainland of China represented a population of more than 500 millions but unfortunately it was not allowed to take its seat in the United Nations mainly because of strong opposition mustered and maintained by the United States much against the naked political realities. Recognizing the causes that influenced the policy of America which led to the continuous exclusion of the new regime of Communist China from the United Nations, Nehru took the position that it was unrealistic, unjust and illegal to keep a country like China-representing a population of more than half a billion from the United Nations. He was convinced that for very effective and purposeful functioning of the United Nations and making it really universal in character, it was
unavoidable and inevitable to bring Communist China into the fold of the United Nations. Thus he continued to champion the cause of seating Communist China in the United Nations. He even directed the then representative to the United Nations, Sir B.N. Rao, to plead for China's cause failed because of United States opposition. The USA suggested to India to accept a permanent seat in the Security Council ousting China. Nehru reacted very sharply against this offer and felt that it would do little good and it would bring a great deal of trouble in its train.  

Nehru very often asked the General Assembly to consider the question regarding proper representation of China and warned that it was improper for that 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 like disarmament, etc. and without which the United Nations is incomplete. Moreover, by keeping out some countries whether it is Ceylon or China. It is in a sense denying itself the moral right to deal with that country. For that country, it is a simple reply “since you do not recognize us for this purpose, therefore we have nothing to do with you”. The United Nations there by puts itself in a wrong position. If you cannot deal with a country within the forum of the United Nations, then the only alternative to deal with it outside, ultimately by force of arms. Nehru was fully convinced that had China been in the United Nations there would have been no Korean crises and it would have been much easier to deal with China across the Conference table than on the battlefield.  

Thus the basic principle of universality has been abandoned by the United Nations. This is a return to the attitude that caused the League of Nations to fail, which is not a healthy sign.
Though Nehru found in the United Nations a very formidable instrument for promoting peace and security in the world solving international problems by cooperation and ensuring friendly relations among nations, but he was well aware of the various formidable obstacles that stood in the way of the working of the United Nations. Among them, he rightly emphasized the impact of Cold War, Super Power rivalries, indiscriminate use of Veto powers by the permanent members of the United Nations, and lacks of cooperation between the Super Power in particular and permanent members of the Security Council in general in the Nehruvian perception, was absolutely necessary for the satisfactory working of the United Nations. Nehru was well aware of the fact that as long as these formidable obstacles stood in the way of the working of the United Nations, it would not be possible for the United Nations to function very effectively and meaningfully. Jawaharlal Nehru was also very much dissatisfied with the dubious role played by the Security Council in preventing aggression and removing the causes of aggression. According to the objectives laid down in the Charter the primary responsibility of maintaining and promoting international peace and security and preventing war and aggression was laid on the Security Council but it could not live up to this cherished objective. For this failure in Jawaharlal Nehru's opinion the United Nations was not responsible, but the behaviour and actions of the so-called five permanent members to use Roosevelt's phrase the five policemen of the United Nations were responsible for e.g. The role played by USSR and USA in Korean war, France and Britain in collision
with Israel in the case of the Suez attack, France in the case of the Vietnam war will go a long way in justifying eloquently how the behaviour and actions of the so-called permanent members of the Security Council stood in the way of the working of the Security Council.

The emergence of the USA and the USSR as the mighty world powers and their intentions to make use of the United Nations had decisive effect on the prestige of this body. These Super Power rivalries were in a sense a logical by product of a very strange situation brought by the World War II. Though in the beginning it was assumed that there would be close understanding and cooperation between the USA and USSR in tackling the problems of peace and security and creating a stable world order, this did not come about in any reasonable measure. Cold War and the Super Power rivalries caused, among others by the ideological rivalries and fear psychosis came to affect very adversely the working of the United Nations and especially the Security Council. Nehru was very much distressed by these ugly and unpleasant developments in the international sphere. He very well knew that as long as these ugly developments continued to prevail on the world scene, it would be impossible for the United Nations in general and the Security Council in particular to play their role effectively in accomplishing the avowed goals and objectives of the United Nations. Consequently, Nehru spared no words in criticizing bluntly the actions and behaviour of the Super Power whose rivalries were responsible for jeopardizing the working of the United Nations.
Nehru was fully aware of the utter failure of the United Nations in solving political disputes but on this ground he was not prepared to brand the United Nations as a failure because in the constructive, social and economic spheres the United Nations played a very impressive and positive role. India under Nehru had been a champion of disarmament and also being the member of the 18 Nation Disarmament Committee Nehru believed that just as military pacts undermine the process of peace, militarization only leads to tensions and conflicts. Therefore in order to achieve general and complete disarmament all nations must therefore follow a policy of demilitarization. Consequently, Nehru through his speeches and appeals made an important contribution to the process of demilitarization. According to him disarmament is imperative if world is to survive. Therefore one of the important tasks for the United Nations was to ensure an effective machinery to achieve disarmament, because it was absolutely necessary for maintaining and preserving lasting peace. This convinced him to support the United Nations whole-heartedly in tackling the problem relating to disarmament. But the ‘Super Power’ rivalries far reaching effect of Cold War and fear-psychosis prevented the United Nations from accomplishing what it was required to do in regard to disarmament. Inspite of this sordid failure and dismal record he continued to support the United Nations because he was quite convinced how difficult it would be to think of the world without United Nations.

Nehru was not only an admirer of the United Nations but he also put in efforts to make the United Nations system a very formidable,
positive and dynamic instrument of the modern era. As Nehru continued to believe firmly in the continuance of the United Nations and its necessity for creating a new global order of his perception, he was prompted to do so as the existing trouble torn world was in no way congenial either for accomplishing the ends of international peace and security or for reconstructing the new global order of his perception on enduring lines. So, the deteriorating international sphere and ominous developments which precipitated war and aggression forced Nehru to make sincere, sustained and selfless efforts by supporting the United Nations and its role in maintaining international peace and security. In view of the prevailing situation in the world, Nehru realized, unless the United Nations was strengthened through dedicated, coordinated and sustained efforts it would be difficult to maintain international peace and security. He knew the Charter assigned well that notwithstanding the most avowed and admirable objectives, aims and goals enshrined in the Charter, the United Nations had become a very fragile and weak instrument and unless these defects were removed it would not be possible for the United Nations to play the role assigned by the Charter.

Nehru being a very enlightened and mature statesman was well aware of the fact that as long as the forces of imperialism, colonialism and racialism continued to exist in the world it would not be possible for the United Nations to grow from strength to strength and function effectively in accomplishing its objectives and goals of getting rid of exploitation, oppression, injustice in the stricken and under developed countries of the world.
Nehru in the light of his experience realized that as long as India continued to be under British domination it would not be possible for Indian humanity to progress in the direction of liberal democracy and fulfill its cherished goals of liberty, equality, justice and development of enduring lines. However, Nehru came to the conclusion that as long as these enemies of mankind manifested in the form of imperial and colonial domination and racial hatred continued it would prove to be a hurdle for the people in colonial areas to come up and progress on enduring lines. Thus he whole-heartedly supported the cause of freedom struggle waged by the suppressed people in several colonial territories of Asia and Africa and also mobilized world opinion against the policy of racial apartheid pursued by the white minority government of South Africa. He even opposed South African refusal to place South-West Africa under the Trusteeship Council, and also insisted upon the principle of self-determination for Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia etc. Thus his own experience as a charismatic leader convinced him about the dangers inherent in these inimical forces. So he opposed tooth and nail the continuance of these forces, as they constituted the negation of the very noble causes, aims and objectives of the United Nations. Thus, with the object of strengthening the moral, social and political foundations of the United Nations and making it a very dynamic and powerful instrument of a new global order in which the forces of imperialism, colonialism and racialism would be eliminated.

Nehru equally laid great stress on the specialized agencies of the United Nations as they could provide economic and social aid to the
under developed countries. Hence Nehru played a very effective role in these agencies and raised its voice against unduly onerous charges with regard to loans advanced by the world banks. Moreover it was felt by him that to enable under-developed countries to make use of the bank loans, these charges should be reduced to a reasonable level. Nehru was of the opinion that peace in the world consisted of two dimensions socio-economic and political. One was as important as the other “And so UNESCO came into being to represent something that was vital to human existence and progress”. As, the General Assembly represented the mind of the world community and desire for peace. If the General Assembly mainly faced the political problems of the world, its specialized agencies were charged with work of equal importance in the field of economic, educational, scientific and cultural spheres.

Nehru very much appreciated and quoted the preamble of the constitution of UNESCO which stated that war begins in the mind, so the defence of peace should be built in the minds and hearts of the people and felt that it was undoubtedly a step towards changing the mind of the man by providing social, economic, educational and cultural relief. In this respect he also realized that as long as the enemies of mankind in the form of grinding and abysmal poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, backwardness and equality continued to prevail it would be impossible for the United Nations to play its role in a very effective manner for accomplishing its objectives and goals. He was of the view that the danger posed by these ugly forces was much more severe than war and aggression to the cause of peace and progress in the world. So
the need to combat these forces was as important and urgent as the imperative necessity of combating war and aggression. So, his fight against these ugly forces was very strongly motivated by his perception of peace and development and to need to remove such forces inimical to peace, progress and development etc.

The United Nations was founded on a note of high idealism embodied in the noble wording of the Charter. There was also realization of the state of the post world war and thus provision was made in the structure of the Organization to balance certain conflicting urges. There were permanent members of the Security Council and there was provision for unanimity among the great powers. All this India considered being very illogical. However in view of the emergence of many independent Afro-Asian countries, a new dimension is being added. Therefore India pleaded for their representation in the United Nations. India very often criticized the United Nations for its structure and for some of its activities. These criticisms have had some justification behind them because the structure of the United Nations, when it started was weighed in favour of Europe and Americas and did not seem fair to the Afro-Asian countries. However, with the growth of the United Nations and more countries coming in, its structure today has become still more unbalanced. Even then, Nehru took into account the broad picture and thought that the United Nations had amply justified its existence and had repeatedly prevented the recurrent crises from developing into war. Though he realized that certain structure defects exist in the Organization but he appreciated the difficulties of the
situation and warned the nations of the world to proceed slowly and with agreement and not to press for any change which would involve an immediate amendment of the Charter and the raising of heated controversies.\footnote{15}

Another biggest headache, which was a matter of heated controversy and its surest undoing, if no timely steps had been taken to remedy it, was the ‘Veto’. The provision that the Security Council cannot arrive at any binding decision unless the big five were unanimous over it has tragically undermined the strength or usefulness of the United Nations Organization. The frequented use of ‘Veto’ by the USSR compelled other members to find an alternative to the United Nations as it would lead to the most dangerous developments in the form of military pacts aggression and the threat to territorial integrity. Moreover the abuse of the right of unanimity has prevented the Security Council from fulfilling its true function. But Nehru viewed the situation from a different angle. He thought that the presence of the USA and the USSR in the United Nations was a matter of added prestige, which the League of Nations lacked. Even the “Uniting for Peace” Resolution which recognized that the failure of the Security Council to exercise its responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security did not deprive the General Assembly of its right or relive it of its responsibilities under the Charter.\footnote{16}

Nevertheless, Nehru felt that no matter how 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. Moreover, if any radical change would be made in the Charter without the prior consent of all big powers it would have only led to increase in tension and confusion and the downfall of the United Nations for which he was not ready because the United Nations inspite of its so many shortcomings had been a formidable instrument in bringing about peace and harmony in the world. Nehru however, 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. However Nehru was of the view that if the present tendency of Vetoing important matter continued, the United Nations could hardly face the realities of the world and would come closer to the fate of the League of Nations. Merely transferring the principle of unanimity from the General Assembly to the Security Council would not help solve the problems.

Thus Nehru’s faith in the United Nations was complete. He wanted India to play a role of “peace maker” in the United Nations and for this he wanted Indian delegates in the United Nations to adopt such an attitude that it did not lead to any discord and suspicion in the bipolar world. As the head of the Foreign Department in the Interim Government, Nehru in his note of September 7, 1947 to the Foreign Secretary, advised Indian diplomats abroad that their attitude in the world body should be “one of bringing together different powers and not one of adding to their ill feeling for each and not to support any action which might lead to ill feeling”. Thus as an instrument designed to promote good-will among the nations of the world; the Organization
received all the support and encouragement from India, who firmly believed that by positive contributions to the success of the Organizations ideals it should be allowed to develop into some kind of world order. It was in view of this belief that, when Russia boycotted the United Nations. Nehru termed the decision taken by Russia as "unfortunate".

To sum up Nehru's attitude regarding this august body in his own words is as follows "Apart from theory or idealism, the practical choice offered to the world is to cooperate or perish. The choice is of peaceful co-existence or non-existence at all. I would respect that the future of the world depends so much on the continuance of the United Nations. Without it perhaps the future itself would end".

Thus the need of the hour is to make the United Nations as strong as possible. Till now it has not yet provided sanctions for those who violate international rules and regulations it has been an utter failure in providing a compromise formula on the issue of disarmament, which is the major cause of all problems. However, according to Nehru "The United Nations admittedly has numerous shortcomings. The government of a country representing a larger part of a world's population is still not subject to the discipline and responsibilities that memberships in world Organization would impose. Often however, the judgment and activities of the United Nations have been swayed or inhibited by the passion and prejudices of the Cold War. Nonetheless, the United Nations is the chief repository of our hopes for closer and more effective international cooperation for security as well as welfare".

Lord Glandwyan has rightly met the criticism against the United Nations for
not bringing required peace to the world when he said, "United Nations is a mirror of the world we live in, and if the reflection is ugly, it is not the mirror which is to be blamed". 21 Beardsley Ruml rightly commented in the year 1950.

"At the end of five years you will think the United Nations is the greater vision ever realized by man? At the end of ten years you will find doubts within yourself and all through the world. At the end of fifteen years you will believe the United Nations cannot succeed. You will be certain that all the odds are against its ultimate life and success. It will only be when the United Nations is twenty years old that.... We will know that the United Nations is then only alternative to the demolition of the world". 22

Nehru believed the United Nations inspite of its many faults, and very often having deviated from its aim somewhat, is nevertheless a basic and fundamental thing in the structure of world today. Not to have it or to do away with it would be a tragedy for the world. Therefore he wanted his countrymen to extend whole-hearted support to the United Nations irrespective of difference of ideologies, and cultures because if the United Nations is denied its due place in the eyes of the world, the only alternative to co-existence is co-destruction. Moreover its work should not be hampered by the pressures and passions of the big powers. 23 It is dedicated to peace, freedom and justice-noble ideals which embody the aspiration of all mankind and it may yet lead us out of this fear and strife ridden age into a more settled future when the full potentialities of science and technology could be well applied to the well being of all people. 24 Nehru rightly said, we shall have to go through terrible experiences and face disasters again before we return to something which offers a forum for all nations, even though they differ from one another. The
whole conception of one world, however distant that one world may be, involves an Organization like the United Nations. To imagine that strict conformity to a single doctrine or approach can solve the problems of the world is to forget the lessons of history and to ignore the realities of today.\(^\text{25}\)

However, today the United Nations is at the cross road with the dramatic end of the crucial Cold War era and the disintegration of Soviet Union. Another serious development, which the world is witnessing, is the United States hegemony within and outside the United Nations. The post Cold War world is experiencing a strong unilateral unidirectional pull of the United States.\(^\text{26}\) The United States is the preeminent power and plays a decisive role in any conflict in any part of the world it chooses to involve itself.\(^\text{27}\) Thus the United States dominance of the world has resulted in the sidelining the United Nations as happened in the case of Iraq, Kuwait etc. which is a serious development. Moreover we see big powers dominance continues to enshrine in the United Nations in the form of Veto. Most of its member nations are not democracies and the United Nations is not governed by any rule of law. What Justice can we expect from the United Nations in such circumstances? Had Nehru been alive he would have been the saddest person on this earth to see such a deteriorating condition of the United Nations. Thus with the change in international scenario the United Nations and its role should be critically assessed and analyzed and it needs structural changes to get the real feel of the existing international environment.
Thus Nehru's vision of just and honourable international order is to be taken seriously and sincerely if the world is to survive and it should be the responsibility of the United Nations to make the world safe not only for the present but for the future generations too.\textsuperscript{28}
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