ABSTRACT

Since the beginning of history the goal of an enduring state of peace has been the foremost objective of human societies. The Upanishads positively reverberate with the most earnest prayers of peace. The Bible speaks of the vision of Isaiah in which swords were turned into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, and man gave up the art of making war.

These ancient and deep-seated longings for peace have been poignantly reaffirmed after every war, as the evolution of man progressed through wars of ever growing ferocity. It would seem that man has indeed made a fine art of destroying his own species with increasing efficacy and diminishing cost. And now in the age of thermonuclear weapons, computers and micro-electronics, the cult of war has reached its ultimate climax. We are closer today than ever before to an entirely unprecedented type of universal disaster that could lead to the disappearance of the human species.

The question of peace in international relations has been endlessly discussed by statesmen, thinkers and ordinary citizens. They have struggled to find ways to end forever the wars between nations that have been moved by memories of bloody wars in the past, and by fear of more terrible conflicts that could come.
War has become a historical anachronism that should have been abolished a long time ago. Not only it is now rational to hope for the establishment of an enduring peace for the entire world, but the only wisdom in the nuclear age is to work, as well as hope, for such a peace.

Stable international peace—peace that brings security and happiness to the citizens of all countries must mean much more than simple absence of war. It must eliminate violence and abuse of wealth and power. It must constantly expand the body of accepted international law. It can not eliminate all conflicts of personal or national interest, but it must provide means of settling those conflicts on the basis of the law. And it must be founded on the truth that the major interest of all nations, the really vital "national interests" are not in conflict, but are common interests that the nations share and that they can only be promoted by common action.

In the second half of the 20th century, the achievement of stable peace must mean a major effort by the advanced countries to eliminate the grinding poverty and ignorance in which nearly two-thirds of humanity now live. This can best be done through international institutions of the United Nations. It can only be done if the arms race is ended. It can only be accomplished if the resources and genius now devoted to weapons are diverted to science and engineering for the
betterment of all mankind, rather than for mankind's destruction. The alternative to war lies in the constant constitutional growth of the parliamentary, executive and legal institutions of the United Nations.

There are two widely accepted and appreciated approaches to solve the problem of war pacifism and universalism. The pacifists are pragmatists, who through the world public opinion and United Nations organisation, seek detente and disarmament. The universalists are progressive who thought the world community and a world state, seek peace and progress, while the pacifists wanted to save the world as well as the existing world order, the universalists wanted to save as well as change the world.

War is older than history but search for peace has also been pursued for centuries. Men have tried to devise institutions to provide for the settlement of international disputes, efforts have been made to reduce the scope of war and lessen its horrors. In 1919, a great document of international law, the Covenant of League of Nations, came into being. Now we have the United Nations with its Charter which "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small" and which promises "to promote social progress and better standards of life and enlarge freedom". Through its various agencies, assistance of many
kinds has reached the far corners of the earth and created new hope in people's minds, but the shadow of war continues to darken our lives. During the relatively short period of its existence, the United Nations has been the instrument by which, on several occasions, conflicts have been localized and ended but no formula for peace has yet been devised.

In this context, the first chapter of this thesis deals with the meaning, definition of peace, and obstacles to achieving peace. Stable international peace that brings security and happiness to the citizens of all the countries must mean much more than simple absence of war. Then I would like to mention the obstacles to achieving peace. The experience of international institutions since world war I has shown that the formidable obstacles may broadly be classified as economic, cultural ideological and psychological obstacles.

In the second chapter I have dealt with the historical aspects of peace efforts in world politics. Peace is essential for progress; without peace nothing is possible except destruction and starvation of human-beings. Since the beginning of the history the goal of an enduring state of peace has been the foremost objective of human society. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries large number of conferences were called for the establishment of peace. Peace of
Westphalia (1648) was one of them. Like the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in the nineteenth century also a large number of peace conferences were held for restoring peace. The two Hague Conferences (1899 and 1907) were milestones in world history. But these conferences failed to prevent the outbreak of the First World War. After the end of the war the League of Nations came into existence but it also failed to prevent the Second World War.

In the third chapter of this thesis an attempt has been made to analyse the concept of peace in the United Nations Charter. The fourth chapter focuses on the UN Peace Keeping Mission. The fifth and final chapter of this thesis deal with the role of other organisations and institutions besides the United Nations which are working for the maintenance of peace, security and disarmament.

Whether peace is to be reached only after unimaginable horrors precipitated by humanity's stubborn clinging to old patterns of behaviour, or is to be embraced now by an act of consultative will, is the choice before all who inhabit the earth. At this critical juncture when the intractable problems confronting nations have been fused into one common concern for the whole world, failure to stem the tide of conflict and disorder would be unconsciously irresponsible.

Among the favourable signs are: (i) the steadily growing strength of the steps towards world order taken
initially near the beginning of this century in the creation of the League of Nations, succeeded by the more broadly based UN; (ii) the achievement since the second world war of independence by the majority of all the nations on earth, indicating the completion of the process of nation building, and the involvement of these fledgling nations with older ones in matters of mutual concern; (iii) the consequent vast increase in cooperation among hitherto isolated and antagonistic peoples and groups in international undertakings in the scientific, educational, legal, economic and cultural fields; (iv) the rise in recent decades of an unprecedented number of international humanitarian organizations; (v) the spread of women's and youth movements calling for an end to war; and (vi) the spontaneous spawning of widening networks of ordinary people seeking understanding through personal communication.

The scientific and technological advances occurring in this unusually blessed century portend a great surge forward in the social evolution of the planet, and indicate the means by which the practical problems of humanity may be solved. They provide, indeed, the very means for the administration of the complex life of a united world. Yet barriers persist. Doubts, misconceptions, prejudices, suspicions and narrow self-interest beset nations and peoples in their relations
with each other.

Flaws in the prevailing order are conspicuous in the inability of sovereign states organised as United Nations to exorcise the spectre of war, the threatened collapse of the international economic order, the spread of anarchy and terrorism and the intense suffering which these and other afflictions are causing to increasing millions. Indeed, so much have aggression and conflict come to characterize our social, economic and religious systems, that many have succumbed to the view that such behaviour is intrinsic to human nature and therefore ineradicable.
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