CHAPTER - 1

CONCEPT OF PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Peace

Unto the heaven be peace,
   Unto the sky and the earth be peace;
Peace be unto the waters,
   Unto the herbs and the trees be peace;
Unto all the Gods be peace,
   Unto Barhman and unto all be peace,
Peace, yea, verily peace!
   May that peace be unto me.

-- Shukta Yajurveda

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.1

These ancient and deep-seated longings for peace have been poignantly reaffirmed after every war, as the evolution of man progressed through wars of every 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\(^2\).

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\(^3\).

1. **Definition of Peace**:

How then are we to introduce the idea of peace? Peace of course is a state without war. Hence, it may be argued that war must be unconditionally rejected, irrespective of reasons, if we are to sustain peace. This is the negative concept of peace, a concept also known as blind antiwarism or sentimental pacifism\(^4\).

None will object against the people with the trend of thought when they say that the inhuman misery of war must be prevented by all means. Nothing is wrong, for
sure, with what they are saying. The trouble, however, is that, just as typhoons cannot be prevented by means of legislation, war cannot be stopped by a mere antiwar argument or sentimental desire. In other words, war is a supra-theoretical matter.

Now, peace is a term that is used in referring to a state of concert secured through the mutual assurance of basic conditions necessary for independence and autonomy. Peace, therefore, has to be a joint effort, that is, bilateral rather than unilateral. If the idea of antiwar or peace is injudiciously advocated to exact from a people a one-sided renunciation of war, it will virtually come to no more than surrendering to the enemy.

Another kind of peace I have in mind at this point is a peace that stands on practical preventive measures against war, possibly through a series of mutual cooperative steps. This is the positive concept of peace.

In essence, it promotes, instead of the reckless idea of antiwar, a forum of international dialogue of nonviolence based on mutual trust and collaboration. This will bring us the relaxation of international tensions to start with, then the reduction of armaments, and finally a permanent peace on earth through the removal of utilitarianistic or idealistic absurdity and injustice that give rise to war.
If peace is to be based on the mutual concord aim at a liable society, first, we must bring about co-existence and prosperity through mutual understanding and friendship, and second, we must arouse, through the promotion of peace-oriented ideas, public hatred and indignation at aggressor by refusing to accept any provocation of war.

For example, when a nation attacks another, the entire world may rise up to stage protest rallies in denouncing the inhuman act of mass murder and destruction. By inspiring a peace-loving spirit in the minds of people in this way, we can rightly safeguard our peace.

It is true that by promoting the spirit of love for peace as well as the spirit of hatred against aggression throughout the world, we can create the circumstances under which not only local skirmishes are stopped from spreading but also big powers dare not conceive the idea of campaigning for a global war.

Just as a big fire is started by a small spark, big wars are always set off by small incidents. The First and Second World Wars were not any exceptions. Even a trivial dispute should be quenched lest it escalates into a world war.

Truly a constructive way of establishing world peace must commence with uniting our minds into one rather
than instituting systems or concluding treaties for surveillance purpose. In other words, the work must begin with erasing alien feeling and, at the same time advocating peace-loving ideas. Inasmuch as the motive of all warfare originate from the human mind, war can not be prevented without changing the mind itself. We should hurry on with the diffusion of the right knowledge of peace in its concept and principle. Only through the implantation of the correct idea of peace, will be able to acquire the strength to stop war.

Social science has uncovered more knowledge about war than about peace, just as psychology probably has yielded more insights into negative deviance (such as mental illness) than into positive deviance (such as creativity). Unfortunately, studies tend to be focused on war as units of analysis rather than on periods of peace, and there is a tendency to define peace simply as "nonwar". Thus, peace thinking has had a tendency to become utopian and to be oriented towards the future. It has been speculative and value contaminated rather than analytical and empirical. It is conceivable that this might change if research were to be focused more on peace than on war.

The conception of peace as "nonwar" is neither theoretically nor practically interesting: as used for instance, in describing the relationship that obtains
between Norway and Nepal, it can often be explained in terms of a low level of interaction resulting from geographical distance and thus will hardly be identified by many as an ideal relation worth striving for. For peace, like health, has both cognitive and evaluative components: it designates a state of a system of nations, but this state is so highly valued that institutions are built around it to protect and promote it. It is the concept of positive peace that is worth exploring especially since negative peace is a condition sine qua non and the two concepts of peace may be empirically related even though they are logically independent. 9

2. What Must Stable Peace Involve?

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. 10
In the second half of the 20th century, the achievement of stable peace must mean a major effort by the advancement 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.\textsuperscript{11}

Today almost everyone in every country would say that he is in favour of peace. Western democracies would add: that "if only the communists would give up their plot for world conquest, all nations could without arm and live in prosperity togerther". In the communist countries many would say almost the same, only substituting the word "imperialists" with "communists".

But before World War I the response to a question about peace would have been very different. Many people, including government leaders would have agreed with German Field Marshal Helmut Von Moltake's words "Perpetual peace is a dream". Or they might have repeated the words of British essayist John Ruskin "War is the foundation of all high virtues and faculties of men".\textsuperscript{12}
Such people pointed out that throughout recorded history, war organized armed conflict between groups, tribes, cities and nations had been a constant feature of human society. They believed that military success was the height of human achievement and that armed might was the measure of national greatness and prestige. In support of their belief they argued and a handful of militarists still argue along the following line of reasoning: (i) that man is by nature a fighting animal; (ii) that his progress has been achieved by the survival of the fittest in the unending struggle for wealth and power; (iii) that stable peace is therefore contrary to the decisive forces in human evolution, and (i v) that if stable peace could be achieved, man's worth and achievements would decline. As things have been in the past, the militarists say, so they must be in the future. They concluded that because there always have been wars, there always will be wars. 13

The fact that disarmament is not an effective and reliable method of preserving peace is too obvious to pass unnoticed. So an alternate idea was suggested: to use armaments in order to oppose and punish the aggressor, or to put it differently, in the absence of cooperative means of preventive war, to enforce peace through military methods. This idea is by no means so new as its protagonists believe. Nor is the record of its application very encouraging. 14
3. Obstacles to Achieving Peace:

The experience of international institutions since World War I has shown that there are formidable obstacles to the achievement of stable peace. These obstacles may broadly be classified as: Economic, Cultural, Ideological, and Psychological.

(a) Economic Obstacles:

The struggle for colonies was a potent source of international misunderstanding before World War I. It was believed that colonies were a great source of national wealth. This was an illusion. But the personal economic interest of individual settlers, who frequently made large fortunes in a few years, helped to give momentum to the foreign policy of colonial expansion. It also diverted colonial governments from true purpose of trusteeship.

Before each of the two world wars the private economic interest of arms manufacturers likewise worked against the maintenance of peace. Some of the armament makers were extremely unscrupulous in their propaganda for weapons expansion for example, Krupp's in Germany and the Comites des Forges in France. It is more than probable that Hitler could not have come to power without the massive financial subsidies given him by the German arm firms, and without the support of the communications media that these firms purchased newspapers, journals, broadcasting stations and film companies.
High national tariff helped to cause the Great Depression of 1929-33, which destroyed many democratic governments and helped to restart a frenzied arms race. It is of great importance that governments have now begun to understand that the free exchange of goods and services promotes the prosperity of all, and that International trade can be a powerful agency for promoting understanding among nations.  

(b) Cultural and Ideological Obstacles

For thousands of years great civilizations grew up on opposite sides of the globe in Asia and Europe without any contact with each other. But in the past several hundred years knowledge, art, literature, drama, music and sport have become a common heritage. The contributions of individual nations to this common heritage have enriched mankind as a whole.

Yet even in the last hundred years some cultural and ideological forces have been obstacles to peace. The long-nurtured tradition of Prussian militarism, with its deliberate perversion of school and university teaching, made possible the war hysteria and atrocities of Hitler's regime. The most serious obstacles to international progress since 1945 have been: (i) the deeply rooted communist suspicion of capitalists, reinforced by Russian experience of Western hostility between the world wars, and (ii) the Western distrust of communists, fed by
Stalin's "sponsored" agressions. Premier Khruschev's adoption of the "peaceful coexistence" and President Johnson's declaration that his government wants "to end the Cold War for good" have been encouraging but there is still far to go before the cultural and ideological barriers between East and West can be removed. And in various countries the spirit of militarism, a belief that armed power means greatness, is by no means dead.

(c) Psychological Obstacles

Experience in every field has shown that when men and women of different nationality, language, race, and religion are brought together to cooperate for a common purpose on which they agreed that they can succeed to a remarkable degree. The members of the League of Nations and United Nations have come from more than a hundred countries. They owed allegiance both to their nations and the international institutions they served. Yet they have constituted an international civil service that has been in no way inferior to national administrations in industriousness, cohesion, and devotion.¹⁶

But there is one psychological factor that is still a major obstacle to the achievement of organized stable peace. It is the unquestioning, often subconscious, acceptance of the view that armaments and war are part of the natural order of the world and that there is no real
hope that this order can ever be changed. In many countries, for a century or more, compulsory military service has conditioned the average man to the acceptance of this view. The resulting widespread popular defeatism about peace has given the military advisers of national governments great influence in every department of domestic and foreign policy. It has obscured, even from thinking people, the mortal danger of the nuclear weapons that the arms race has produced.  

(4) **Realization of World Peace through Education:**

The question of war and peace is both an old and new problem, perhaps the greatest euphoria of human history. Mankind today is standing at crossroads. Peace or War? The choice is ours; should we choose war and destroy ourselves? John F Kennedy once said that unless mankind puts a "full stop" to war, war will put a full stop to human history. But peace is not something given. It is not something we merely wish for. It is something we have to achieve through our cooperative efforts.

It is true that the smallest unit of conflict is a struggle between individuals. Conversely, if an individual conflict between two persons is maximized, it will become a war between groups of people or nations. Therefore a war is the maximized form of individual conflict.
Man is a builder of history. As a free agent he is responsible for his own happiness and misery. Kant said that man is a free agent endowed with the ability to create a new chain of cause and effect. Accordingly the responsibility for failing to solve the question of peace must be borne by man himself. He is to be blamed for not resolving the question of war and peace.\textsuperscript{19}

When we understand that the cause of war has been in the human mind we know how important the role of education is as a means not only to transmit knowledge and technology but also to purify the mind. The preface of the UNESCO charter states: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defence of peace must be constructed".

Man is an educational animal. The power of education purifies human nature, elevates personality, and creates "cultured intellectuals". To put it more clearly, education moulds personality. Personality is the product of a posterior experience, certainly not something innate. Here, we see the difference between the primitive man and the cultured man, between an ignorant man and an intellectual.

Almost a thousand years ago, Bishop Gui d' Anjou initiated one of history's great attempts to secure peace. He proclaimed a Truce of God and issued instructions limiting the use of arms. To the surprise of many, the
Bishop succeeded in curbing violence in his diocese; so impressive was his success that other French bishops emulated his example. In the year 1000 A.D. a Council at Poitiers adopted the motto, Guerre a la guerre, and passed a resolution which obligated the princes of the church to oppose war by forceful means, that is, by the intervention of troops under religious leadership. At a synod in Limoges in 1031, it was resolved to excommunicate violators of the peace. It was also decided that, should moral coercion prove insufficient, military force was to be used against any breakers of God's Truce. Under the energetic leadership of Archbishop Aimon of Bourges several punitive expeditions were carried out against rebellious knights; the Archbishop may, in fact, be considered as the earliest predecessor of the commander of a modern international armed force. Unfortunately, Aimon's peace force was soon annihilated by a group of knights who were more expert in the art of war than the 700 priests whom they killed.\textsuperscript{20}

The principle of active maintenance of God's truce was proclaimed time and again. Pope Urban II, in preparation of the Crusade, decreed a general pacification of the Occident to be imposed by associations of nobles. Pope Alexander III (1159-1181) decreed that "peace and concord... must be proclaimed and begotten", the word "begotten" being an euphemism for "coerce". The Council of
Toulouse perfected the legal framework for the maintenance of the Truce of God; it was ordered that:

(i) Every person over fourteen years of age was to pledge himself with a solemn oath not to violate the Truce of God and not to assist any violator of the peace;

(ii) This oath was to be repeated every three years, and a person refusing to renew the pledge was to be treated as a breaker of the law;

(iii) Alliances between nobles were forbidden;

(iv) Any violator of the peace was to be attached forthwith by all the others who had pledged themselves to maintain peace; his territory was to be cut off from communications and traffic; his stronghold was to be besieged and stormed; the aggressor and his men were to be punished severely and their property confiscated;

(v) The violator of the peace was to be excommunicated (a sanction which frequently entailed economic ruin and even physical destruction).

(vi) The subjects of the aggressor were formally ordered to revolt against their master and to obstruct his aggression.21

In the beginning of the 14th century, one of the most important questions arose, that how international war should be stopped and peace promoted. It is true that the
ideal of peace was not a new ideal but was prevalent in the previous centuries. It is nevertheless correct to say that the roots of modern pacifism go back to that period. Scholastic philosophy, under the leadership of Thomas Aquinas, had insisted on the difference between Just and Unjust war. But now the idea was pronounced that war is always an evil and that society thrives best in the tranquility of universal peace.

Yet how should peace be preserved? Italian philosopher Dante wanted to gain universal peace through the establishment of a universal monarchy, but on the other hand Pierre Dubois rejected this idea, but he proposed instead Congress of Princes to rule the affairs of Europe.

During the 17th century a large number of peace projects were published for the establishment of peace and it is true that these peace projects helped in the establishment of peace. Campanella's De Monarchia Hispanica Discursus was one of them which placed the burden for the enforcement of universal peace of Spain, because it was then the most powerful country.

In the period of the Thirty Years' War, the organization of peace was a widely discussed subject and since then each major conflagration has been accompanied by a flood of ideas about the art of "peacefare". The
treaties of Osnabruck and Munster reflected this tendency and contained provisions to assure the stability and permanence of peace. Paragraphs 114 to 116 of the Treaty of Munster determined that any person breaking the convention or public peace, either intentionally or otherwise, would incur the punishment prescribed for such violations. Despite violations, peace would remain in force, all signatories to the treaties were obligated to defend and protect each other as well as the laws or conditions of peace against whomever it might be, without distinction of religion. If violations occurred, an attempt was to be made to settle the dispute by friendly means or legal procedures; if, however, after three years the dispute could not be settled by peaceful means, all the interested parties were bound to help the victim.22
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