CHAPTER 5

DISARMAMENT—AN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

Being a global problem disarmament cannot be considered in isolation. While the response of a particular country to the needs of disarmament is bound to be conditioned largely by its own particular situation, the compulsions it faces, its long and short term interests, the political environment, the economic conditions and a host of other factors of direct and immediate concern to it, it would still be necessary for it to take notice of the conditions prevailing in other parts of the world, and of the overall developments which have a bearing on the problem in all its implications including the technological advances made, the security environment, the regional imbalances, the various constraints and the paramount need of a strife free world.

The basic outlook of India and the Indian people in general towards war and armaments is determined to a large extent by their social, cultural and spiritual heritage. This rich heritage and 'DHARMA' are the guiding forces providing deep understanding, an insight into the basic issues of our times apart from investing Indian consciousness with the ability to sift and perceive the real from the unreal. Other factors like internal compulsions, an obvious outcome of the peculiar circumstances India is placed in, the external limitations imposed

1. DHARMA is the basic concept of Indian political thought which is broad in its implications and open to several definitions. Gandhi understood dharma as a universal morality to which affairs of men and states should correspond.
upon it by its geographical location and the contradictory forces active on the world stage, which have if not directly, often indirectly influenced India's responses to various related issues, have played a significant role in providing wider dimensions to the peculiar Indian perception of disarmament.

The geography of India has influenced its history in a greater degree than perhaps in the case of any other country. Walled off by the impenetrable Himalayan range in the north and with the Indian peninsula washed on its three sides by the Indian ocean, separating her from Africa on the one side and Malaya and the islands of the Indonesian archipelago on the other, India was from the beginning of history isolated to a large extent in her evolution, developing in the process peculiarities and characteristics which constitute the marks of a civilization. The fact that the area so isolated was large and contained at all times a variety of racial elements, wide differences of climate, diversities of soil and different physical characteristics gave it a continental character which has been an essential factor in her history.

Himalayan ranges in the north separate the Indian land mass from the greater part of Asia comprising China and the Middle East. India's neighbouring countries in the north are Tibet which is now practically a part of China, the independent states of Nepal, Bhutan and the Sinkiang Uighar autonomous region of China. In the north west is Pakistan carved out of India itself while in the east
we have the State of Bangladesh which also was a part of India and later of Pakistan, surrounded by the states of Indian Union with an outlet in the Bay of Bengal, and Burma. The Southern tip of India, the Cape of Comorin (Kanya Kumari) is washed by the Indian Ocean. Off the cape are the Gulf of Mannar and the Palk Strait separating India from Sri Lanka. The Andaman and Nicobar islands in the Bay of Bengal and the Laccadive Minicoy and Amindivi islands in the Arabian sea are also parts of India. Despite its isolation for thousands of years, India has had intimate connections with West Asia, South East Asia and the Far East. From the geographical point of view, Nehru often said that India was a kind of bridge between the East and the West thereby getting inevitably involved in major world problems. This fact could never be ignored even if one wanted to.

Socially India presents the picture of acute diversity with its various castes, religions and languages. The diversity visibly extends to the ways of life and thought, to mannerisms, to different ways of dressing as also to disparities relating to education and illiteracy, to poverty and wealth and yet an underlying unity which stems out of its spiritual heritage has kept this nation together. It will not be wrong to say that the unity of India and the creation of one civilization and social structure, out of the vast disparities and varied
elements of India's population, is a conscious achievement of Hinduism. Buddhism and Jainism which sprouted from the same soil were inspired largely by the Hindu philosophy which they came to supplement and enrich rather than replace.

The basic tenets of Hinduism and the other faiths which have guided and in a way unified the different ethnic groups inhabiting this vast subcontinent are: (i) the unity of all living things in as much as it is the same consciousness which permeates all; (ii) the equality of all living beings irrespective of caste, colour or creed or their stage of development since 'Atman' (soul) is the same in all living beings though the physical manifestations of it are different; and (iii) the sanctity and inviolability of life, for to violate it would be violation against oneself in the final analysis. It is these basic concepts which have given us values of tolerance, compassion, charity and non-violence. India has welcomed other faiths and other religions which have not only co-existed with Hinduism in India but have actually flourished and prospered. In its long and chequered history India has fought wars and battles but by and large they have been defensive in

1. Eighty per cent of the country's population are Hindus out of which sixty per cent comprise orthodox Hindu society - The only common link between the Dravidian Hindus of Southern India and the Aryan Hindus of the North is Hinduism.


2. The caste system and the treatment meted out to the 'Shudras' and the low castes is something of an aberration in Hinduism which has no sanction in scriptures.
character and never motivated by any desire for aggrandisement or for forcing its own political, social or religious ideas or ideology on other communities or peoples. India's perspective on disarmament is conditioned by this basic outlook.

There are four distinct concepts in which disarmament is generally understood as mentioned earlier in Chapter III. Indian perception of disarmament is related to the concept of disarmament in its fourth sense which pertains to the reduction and limitation of armaments by general international agreement. India has in fact gone ahead to maintain that disarmament is an issue of global parameters and therefore needs universal attention, apart from investing it with a much wider significance by giving it spiritual connotation. Disarmament does not mean just the absence of armaments but from an Indian standpoint it means absence of violence not only in deed but also in thought and word. The Indian perspective also includes in its parameters the supremacy of human life; non-violence as the basis of community life; understanding and trust in place of fear and suspicion and respect for the political and economic independence of every state big or small. Evidently the Indian approach to the problem is global, the Indian concerns are universal, the Indian objects are just and the means advocated are fair. This has been brought out very explicitly and succinctly in the Delhi Declaration of January 28, 1985, which apart from defining the parameters of disarmament concept and advocating a global and universal approach to the entire issue lays down

1. See Chapter III-DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS: A REVIEW, p.79.
an action plan to implement the desired goals. The Delhi Declaration\textsuperscript{1} proposes agreements on (i) complete destruction of nuclear arsenals before the end of the century; (ii) barring all weapons from outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind; (iii) prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction; (iv) banning of chemical weapons and destruction of their stock piles; and (v) reducing the levels of conventional arms and armed forces.

The Delhi Declaration and the principles set out are not the first pronouncement of India's perspective on disarmament. Non-violence which is ingrained in the Indian character guided India's struggle for independence under the inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, with whom it was an article of abiding faith.

Gandhi believed in the Vedantic doctrine that the whole world is one family: 'Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam'. We are all of the family of God like the Bible says. He believed that being so we cannot injure others without injuring ourselves. For him joy came not out of infliction of pain on others but out of pain voluntarily borne by oneself for the sake of others. Non-violence for him was a positive force rooted in love and not a mechanical thing. This deep sense of spirituality forged a new and unique weapon of political warfare for him which he used successfully in South Africa and later in India and which even now at the fag end of this century remains the most relevant concept. He rightly believed that mankind's hope lay in treading the "narrow and

\textsuperscript{1} For the text of the Delhi Declaration see Appendix V A.
straight path" of non-violence. It needs to be emphasized that his non-violence is the non-violence of the strong and should never be mistaken for weakness or inability to stand up for a just cause. Indifference to wrong and to violence are the mortal enemies of non-violence. The basic tenets of non-violence as propounded by Gandhi in the line of Buddha and Ashoka as also India's stand on disarmament and conflict resolution should be seen in the light of the above statement.

1. The fundamental principle of Buddhist ethics is that all men should develop an attitude of compassion. If one allows the virtue of compassion or love to grow in him, it will not occur to him to harm any one else any more than he would willingly harm himself. By widening the boundaries of what one regards as his own, he breaks down the barriers that separate him from others.


2. Ashoka was the last major emperor in the Mauryan dynasty of India during C. 265-238 B.C. (Others give C.273-232 B.C.). The terrible suffering, caused by the war of Kalinga which he fought to conquer the Kalinga country filled him with such remorse that he renounced war for ever. Under the Buddhist influence he decided to live according to 'Dharma', which he understood as the energetic practice of the socio-moral virtues of honesty, truthfulness, compassion, mercifulness, benevolence, non-violence, considerate behaviour toward all, "little sin and many good deeds", non-extravagance, non-acquisitiveness and non-injury to animals.

The fear as also the obsolescence of war and violent methods of conflict resolution should not be considered the only reason why war and violence should be denounced. For the concept of obsolescence and the fear of nuclear holocaust enjoin on communities not to fight a war because it has became so absolutely lethal that it cannot be fought whereas the Gandhian concept of non-violence denounces violence and war on moral grounds and lays down that war should not be fought because it is violent and immoral, a choice which the nations must make on their own not because they are forced to make it under the threat of the presence of nuclear weapons.

On the basis of this, India has continued to maintain its independent stand on the questions of war and peace. Non-violence can be practised only by the strong, not by those who are weak and have no means of fighting. India voluntarily renounces war and yet retains the right to acquire means to defend itself. Renunciation otherwise has no meaning. In effect, non-violence establishes a relationship between should not and cannot by pointing out that the lesson to be learnt from the invention of nuclear weapons is not merely that the use of those weapons is not feasible because it entails the risk of total annihilation but also that it is not desirable because the preservation of life and its values is itself important.¹

¹For details see Mahendra Kumar, VIOLENCE AND NON-VIOLENCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,(Thomson Press India Ltd., 1975) pp. 112-113.
After independence when Jawaharlal Nehru came to guide the destiny of the Indian people, the same values continued to inspire India's outlook. India's adherence to the cause of peace and disarmament was declared in no uncertain terms in a speech he delivered in the Lok Sabha in which he said:

"No man can prophecy the future. But I should like to say on behalf of my Government and I think I can say with some assurance on behalf of any future Government— that whatever might happen, whatever the circumstances, we shall never use this atomic energy for evil purposes. There is no condition attached to that assurance because once a condition is attached, the value of such an assurance does not go very far".

During his stewardship India took several concrete steps towards promotion of disarmament through the aegis of the United Nations and other international fora. The concept of Panchsheel came to be formulated during this period postulating mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference, equality and peaceful co-existence and economic co-operation.

Nehru believed in a step by step approach to the question of comprehensive disarmament. He reiterated his faith in this approach time and again. At a news conference at Helsinki on June 19, 1957, he

said that if one step, namely, suspension of nuclear weapons tests was taken, then immediately there would be a better atmosphere for the consideration of the entire disarmament issue. He did not believe in the concept of a limited war with conventional weapons. "A war with conventional weapons can lead to a greater war with nuclear weapons, if the great powers are involved."¹ According to him an all round disarmament was the vital question of the day to which end India was determined to work apart from controlling the production of nuclear weapons. However, the most important aspect at the moment was the suspension of nuclear tests on which India had no reservations and no limitation of period of time.²  

On November 28, 1957, Nehru made an appeal to the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union to suspend all nuclear test explosions and bring about effective disarmament.³  

Further clarifying his stand on disarmament in October 1960 while addressing the U.N. General Assembly he said:⁴  

"Disarmament must include the prohibition, the manufacture, storage and use of weapons of mass destruction as well as the progressive limitation of conventional weapons".

2. Ibid.  
3. THE TIMES OF INDIA, New Delhi, November 28, 1957.  
He called upon the world community to accept and adhere to the principle of co-existence.

While India was trying to establish unity and harmony internally, the world was getting divided into two main camps with North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) powers clustering around the U.S.A. and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) around the U.S.S.R., feverishly involved in an arms race. The advent of India on the international scene and subsequently of other erstwhile colonies which achieved independence after India, created a balancing factor in international politics in as much as they were anxious to jealously guard their newly won freedom by not joining any bloc. A new force of the non-aligned nations appeared on the world stage under the leadership of India, Yugoslavia and Egypt and the non-aligned movement took birth.

Some of the important initiatives of this period have been listed by Rikhi Jaipal, in the "Review of International Affairs" and are briefly reproduced here along with other additions.

(i) 1949- India proposed a Declaration on the duties of States and individuals to ensure the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

(ii) 1950- India proposed a United Nations Peace Fund to be set up from disarmament savings;

(iii) 1953- A Declaration on non use of nuclear weapons was proposed;

---

(iv) 1954- India proposed a moratorium on atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons;
(v) 1955- India established a scientific committee to report to the United Nations on the effects of atomic radiation;
(vi) 1956- Comprehensive proposals were made for cessation of nuclear weapon tests for freezing the production of nuclear weapons, for substantial reduction and dismantling of existing stock piles, and for a ban on the transfer of fissile materials and of weapons technology;
(vii) 1958- On October 14, India, Burma, The United Arab Republic and nine other "non-committed" countries tabled a draft resolution in U.N. Political Committee and General Assembly calling for the immediate discontinuance of nuclear tests until agreement was reached on a control system;
(viii) 1958- On October 22, 1958 India and Yugoslavia moved two resolutions one of which sought to expand the 25-Nation Disarmament Commission to a body composed of the entire United Nations membership. Mr. Arthur Lall, the Indian delegate declared that disarmament was no longer a question which could be the sole concern of a handful of powers. Whatever might have been the justification in the past to leave the matter in the hands of small groups of countries, this had been antedated by the developments in weapons by certain countries.
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(ix) 1960- India proposed a set of principles for disarmament negotiations, many of which were subsequently incorporated in the McCloy-Zorin principles;

(x) 1960- India helped and succeeded in getting the super powers to commence bilateral negotiations;

(xi) 1961- India secured the inclusion of non-aligned states in the multilateral forum at Geneva conducting negotiations for disarmament.

The Indian proposal made in 1954 for the cessation of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere culminated in 1963 in the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) which pushed the testing of nuclear weapons underground. Although underground nuclear weapon tests have continued ever since, the world has gained to a great extent, in mitigating the radioactive fall out which was alarming the world community. Also during this period, Dr. Homi Bhabha along with a small group of scientists prepared a study on the effects of nuclear explosions and revealed to the world the health hazards of the radioactive fall out. This study, as is said, focussed the attention of scientists in other countries and inspired them to carry out further research. This study can justly be called the fore-runner of the World Health Organisation (WHO) report on the catastrophic effects of Nuclear Winter which seems to threaten mankind.
The impact of Indian initiatives and policies followed since 1947 upto the signing of the PTBT in 1963 was evidently quite limited. The Test Ban Treaty itself turned out to be partial because France and China did not sign it. However, some success was achieved in as much as India was elected to the Disarmament Commission and was able to foster a sense of unity among the Afro-Asian countries enhancing India's role as a leader of the Afro-Asian group of countries at the United Nations. The backing of the Third World countries strengthened India's disarmament initiatives. In keeping with its past heritage, India continued to advocate non-violence in the resolution of conflicts. India also evinced some interest for importing nuclear technology and harnessing it for peaceful purposes.

The year 1961 saw India in the fore-front of the non-aligned nations at Belgrade. The use of nuclear weapons in war was condemned by the summit at Belgrade as a crime against humanity. The same year India and other non-aligned countries joined together to sponsor a similar move at the United Nations which resulted in the General Assembly's adoption of Resolution No. 1953, with a large majority to the effect that threats or use of nuclear weapons would be in violation of the UN charter, international law and the humanitarian rules of war, and would constitute a crime against humanity and civilization.
Eighteen Nations Disarmament Committee was formed in 1962 with India as one of the eight non-aligned members of the Committee. India was one of the first countries to seriously demand non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, the Indian proposal for non-proliferation was entirely different from that of other countries of the world which in fact favoured and later prompted proliferation through the so-called Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). These are dealt with in some detail later in the chapter.

Jawaharlal's policies were by and large followed by his successors as is evident from the following utterances of Lal Bahadur Shastri and Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Both of them relied on the guidelines laid down by Nehru but kept the nuclear option for India open, reiterating their faith in peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In November 1964, Lal Bahadur Shastri clearly indicated his preference for disarmament by saying:

"Despite the continued threat of aggression from China which has developed nuclear weapons, government have continued to adhere to the decision not to go in for nuclear weapons but to work for their elimination instead."  

Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in keeping with India's peaceful traditions, maintained the same stance highlighting at the same time the linkage between disarmament and development. In April 1968 she made the following statement in the Indian Parliament: ¹

We think that nuclear weapons are no substitute for military preparedness, involving the conventional weapons. The choice before us involves not only the question of making few atom bombs, but of engaging in an arms race with sophisticated nuclear war heads and an effective missile delivery system. Such a course, I do not think would strengthen national security by imposing a very heavy economic burden which would be in addition to the present expenditure on defence. Nothing will better serve the interests of those who are hostile to us than for us to lose our sense of perspective and to undertake measures which would undermine the basic progress of the country. We believe that to be militarily strong it is necessary to be economically and industrially strong. Our programme of Atomic Energy development for peaceful purposes is related to the real needs of our economy and would be effectively geared to this end.

With the advent of the Janta Government there was a certain amount of uncertainty in India's policy regarding nuclear option caused by Pakistan's pursuit of an Islamic Bomb, but all misgivings on this account were set at rest when Prime Minister Morarji Desai speaking at the United Nations General Assembly in 1978, categorically stated that India would never stage a nuclear explosion in future, even for peaceful purposes.

While addressing the Special Session of United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament, Morarii urged that the ultimate solution lay in the general acceptance of the philosophy and practice of non-violence. He believed with Gandhi that one step was enough to start with but that step must mean abjuring of violence as an instrument of national policy and a substantial reduction within a prescribed time schedule in the weapons and forces of violence. That first step, he said must consist of:

(a) A declaration that utilization of nuclear technology for military purposes including research in weapon technology must be outlawed;

(b) qualitative and quantitative limitations on nuclear armament and immediate freezing of present stock pile under international inspection;

(c) formulation of a time bound programme- not exceeding a decade- for gradual reduction of the stock pile with a view to achieving total elimination of all nuclear weapons; and

(d) Comprehensive test ban treaty with provision for safe-guards to prevent breach of the treaty, which in his view could only be through independent inspection.

The ban, he said, should apply to atmospheric, underground and undersea tests and those in space. He added that the system of safeguards should be based on universality and non-discrimination.
For initiating programme of disarmament in the conventional field, we should not wait until nuclear disarmament is completed. The efforts should be made immediately to work out an agreement on disarmament and drastic reduction of armed strength in the conventional field.¹

Nuclear Free Zones (NFZ) were also much talked about in the seventies. Morarji while speaking to the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament put forth the Indian point of view regarding NFZ, in the clearest terms when he said:²

"It is idle to talk of regional nuclear free zones when there would still be zones which could continue to be endangered by nuclear weapons. Those who have such weapons lose nothing if some distant area is declared non-nuclear. The nations without nuclear capability who imagine that their inclusion in such zones affords them security are suffering from a delusion. We are convinced that there cannot be a limited approach to the question of freedom from nuclear threats and dangers but the whole world should be declared as a nuclear free zone".

In 1979 again, Morarji Desai made it clear that India would not change its peaceful nuclear policy even if Pakistan were to explode an atomic bomb. He believed that going nuclear would be suicidal not only on moral grounds but on practical grounds as well.

In pursuance of its policy of peaceful co-existence, India once again at the thirty-sixth regular session of the General Assembly in 1981 introduced a draft emphasizing that it was the collective responsibility of the States Members of the United Nations to undertake all possible measures to reduce the threat of nuclear war. Again along with Mexico, at the second special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, it sponsored a draft resolution on the prevention of nuclear war, by which, the General Assembly would inter-alia, request the Secretary General to appoint a representative group of public persons of great eminence to advise on special measures and procedures of practical, political and legal nature that could be employed for the collective control, management and resolution of critical and/or confrontational situations which might otherwise escalate into nuclear war. Subsequently two other draft resolutions on the same line were submitted by India however none of these was pressed to a vote at the special session in order to preserve the rule of consensus for decision making at the session on such important issues. The absence of a consensus was not unexpected in view of the fact that in general debate of the special session serious differences of approach to the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons had emerged.  

It will be seen that apart from steering clear of power blocs and founding the non-aligned movement and the Panchsheel, India has played no insignificant role in advocating and promoting the cause of disarmament. Nevertheless it has been criticised for its approach to the problem which it is considered is utopian and impractical. A great deal of mistrust has also arisen about India's motives in the wake of the underground explosion of a nuclear device by India in 1974 at Pokhran and on account of India's refusal to sign the Non-proliferation Treaty.

The Pokhran explosion, a fully contained explosion in the range of 10 to 15 kilo tons took place at a depth of 100 metres using an implosion device. The official announcement declared that this was only an experiment carried out as a part of the research in peaceful uses of nuclear explosives, particularly for mining and earth moving operations and that India had no intention of producing nuclear weapons and that all the plutonium used in the explosion had been produced within the country by the Indian scientists with the expenditure on nuclear explosion research amounting to less than 0.1 per cent of the national budget. It must be noted that applications of peaceful nuclear explosions have been known for quite sometime and peaceful nuclear explosions have been carried out by several countries. A Soviet paper on peaceful uses of nuclear explosions lists the following applications:

(a) Oil and gas recovery stimulation;
(b) creation of underground reservoirs for natural gas and oil products;
(c) creation of underground storage for wastes harmful to living organisms;
(d) extinction of runaway gas and oil underground methods of ore recovery;
(e) preparation of mineral deposit sites for open cast mining - that is, dead rock baring, rock crushing and construction of access tracks for taking out ore or coal;
(g) canal construction;
(h) construction of dams for hydroelectric power stations;
(i) construction of water reservoirs for water supply;
(j) excavation of cuttings and construction of embankments for railways and roads.

The Indian representative to the International Atomic Energy Panel on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Explosions has stressed that the possibility of application of (f) above is very attractive for the recovery of metal values from oxidised copper bodies which are considered to be of too low a grade for economic mining by conventional methods. According to information drawn from Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Year Book of World Armaments and Disarmament and other Studies, upto February 1975,
in U.S.A. alone 53 out of the 366 underground nuclear explosions were reported to be peaceful nuclear explosions carried out specifically for (i) oil and gas stimulation (3); (ii) studying phenomenology (22); (iii) developing special P.N.E explosives (10); (iv) scientific experiments (18). In the U.S.S.R. the number of peaceful nuclear explosions during the same period was reported to be 14, out of the total of 129 explosions, carried out to (i) study phenomenology (4); (ii) water reservoirs (1); (iii) canal excavation design (1); (iv) control of runaway gas wells (2); (v) oil and gas stimulation (3); and (vi) underground gas storage (3). The U.K., France and China had also carried out peaceful nuclear explosions reportedly for studying phenomenology. More than fifteen years have passed since then and one can safely assume that experimental explosions have continued. India alone has not resorted to another explosion even for peaceful purposes and yet despite the solemn pronouncements made from time to time by Indian leaders including Prime Minister Desai's declaration that India will not stage a nuclear explosion even for peaceful purposes, India continues to be suspect and is even accused of having already become a nuclear power with a few bombs in its arsenal.
Mr. Z.A. Bhutto, the Prime Minister of Pakistan described India's nuclear explosion as a "fateful development" and a "threat" which had put an end to the possibility of a no-war pact between India and Pakistan. He even went to the extent of approaching the U.N. Secretary General for "securing a political assurance" against India's nuclear threat. He also decided to despatch his Foreign Secretary Mr. Agha Shahi to China, France and Britain to explain Pakistan's position and took up the issue with the Soviet leaders himself. The issue was raised at the CENTO by his Minister of State for Defence and Foreign Affairs. His reactions were indeed vehement even though Bhutto was personally assured by the Prime Minister of India on several occasions.¹

No serious weapons programme can be undertaken without carrying out tests and since it is an undeniable fact that no further explosions have been carried out by India, the accusation that India is already a nuclear power is clearly unfounded and motivated. India may have the nuclear capability and it may also be true that the nuclear technology needed for peaceful purposes is also suitable for rapid conversion to military uses, but to call India a nuclear weapon state appears to be nothing but a

¹See ASIAN RECORDER, Vol. 22, No. 23, June 4-10, 1974, p. 12034.
travesty of truth.

It does not need to be stressed that the economic development of a country is dependent largely on the availability of a reliable and relatively cheap form of energy. This is clearly demonstrated by the relationship between energy consumption and economic growth in different countries. In 1987 for example, developing countries which have 75 per cent of the world's population accounted for only about one-third of the world's total energy consumption.

With the discovery of atomic fission in 1939 and the setting up of the chain reaction in 1942, it was clear to the scientific community all the world over that the economic exploitation of atomic energy was just a matter of time. Research in nuclear science was undertaken in several countries including India where plans were made as early as 1944 to exploit this possible source of energy, naturally enough, for peaceful purposes.\(^1\) The overall aim was to produce electrical energy to meet the requirements of a developing economy which stood on the threshold of independence and industrial expansion and which did not have adequate alternative sources of power. India's oil resources despite some recent successes in off shore drilling operations and discovery of

---

some wells do not count for much and, therefore, sources of power available in India are limited to thermal and hydro which have continued, even to this day, to be either inadequate or uncertain and therefore unreliable. While coal supplies in India are considered to be plentiful (even at 1 per cent of the world's proven reserves while India accounts for more than 15 per cent of the world's population) over all coal production continues to be short of the requirements, apart from the fact that the coal available is not of a high quality and being a non-renewable source needs to be conserved as much as possible. Hydel power has steadily increased though not in the same proportion as thermal but this source is subject to serious short falls particularly in years of scanty rainfall or drought. Tables 5.1-5.3 in Appendix V B show levels of coal production since 1970-71, generation of energy and pattern of electricity consumption during the same period.

It will be seen that the share of industrial power in over all consumption of electricity has declined from 67.6 per cent in 1970-71 to 52.8 per cent in 1986-87. The Economic Survey reveals that the estimated deficit in power availability rose from 6.7 per cent in 1984-85 to 11 per cent in 1987-88 and because of the severe shortages in power
availability, a number of states continued to enforce power cuts and restrictions to bridge the gap between demand and availability and that this has had an adverse impact on industry. Load shedding is a common phenomenon in India.

The view that renewable energy from the sun, or wind or the sea waves or tides should be used to produce electricity though largely supported has still to gather momentum, with many problems connected with the exploitation of these sources still to be overcome including that of making output comparable with those of coal fired and nuclear stations. In the background of these facts India had really no alternative to exploiting nuclear energy. In this field there had already developed world wide activity and with certain advantages which nuclear power has over coal or other fossil fuels, in as much as nuclear power contributes nothing to air pollution or acid rain and is less expensive, India naturally considered nuclear energy to be a promising source particularly, when it was found that it had high quality thorium ores located in easily accessible areas.

India acquired its first nuclear reactor in 1957. It happened to be Asia's first too. While formally opening it at Trombay, near Bombay on January 20, 1957, in the presence of distinguished atomic scientists from 30 countries, Jawaharal Nehru gave a categorical assurance that India would never
use atomic energy for evil purposes and added that no condition was attached to this assurance.

By the end of 1984, based on International Atomic Energy Agency figures, there were 345 nuclear power stations in the world with a total capacity of 2,20,407 MW generating 13 per cent of the total world electricity. In a review of energy development to the year 2000, the International Atomic Energy Agency forecast a massive expansion of nuclear power in each of the 21 member countries with nuclear power generation expected to grow from the thermal equivalent of 156.8 million tons oil equivalent (mtoe) in 1983 to 460 mtoe by 2000, representing 25 per cent of all fuels used for electricity generation.¹ It is evident that there is growing reliance the world over, on nuclear power for electricity and that this reliance is in a sense irreversible.²

In recent years however there has been a perceptible decline in the establishment of new reactors which is traced to the series of nuclear power plant accidents in which some of the advanced countries have been involved. The accident at Chernobyl in particular has provoked lot of serious rethinking about the continued desirability of

¹ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, 1986 Book of the Year, pp. 277-278.
²France is producing 70 per cent of all its electricity by nuclear power. Presently India has 6 reactors in operation and 4 under construction with plans to add 22 more in the next 16 years.
harnessing and using nuclear power. It is claimed by antagonists of nuclear energy that science has not yet shown how to render a radio-active substance harmless; that nuclear power plants cannot be demolished and remain health hazards for ever and that the cumulative burden of storing nuclear waste generated in perpetuity both on ecology and exchequer have not been realistically assessed. These are weighty arguments and the debate will doubtlessly continue but there is little prospect of a reversal of the policies followed. If anything the accidents should induce the intensification of safety standards and coming to grips with the risks involved rather than forbid nuclear power generation. As Nani Palkhiwala says what has been thought cannot be unthought and what has been learnt cannot be unlearnt, and that we must accept the fact that we live in the atomic age and put the available technology to the most efficient and rational use.¹

On the question of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty India has had to face a lot of criticism which is quite misplaced. Although the Preamble to the treaty recognises the dangers of a nuclear war and solemnly declares the need to make every effort to avert that danger the efforts made in that direction are far from satisfactory. It also

affirms its desire to strengthen trust among nations in order to facilitate the cessation of manufacture of nuclear weapons, liquidation of all stockpiles and the elimination from national arsenals of all nuclear weapons. Article VI of the treaty specifically enjoins that "Each of the parties to the treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control". In practice, however, effective measures have only pertained to horizontal proliferation while the question of vertical proliferation has been touched only in words. The treaty attempts to persuade states with nuclear weapons not to disseminate them or the technology for their manufacture, while the non-nuclear states are required not to seek nuclear weapons or the capability for making them. Of the nuclear powers, the U.S., the U.K., and the U.S.S.R. signed the treaty while France and China did not. Of the non-nuclear powers with a significant capability for manufacturing nuclear weapons, India, Argentina, Brazil and South Africa refused to sign while Japan signed but did not ratify the treaty. There has been unanimity among all non-nuclear states that they must
have the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, chiefly for generation of electricity and to resort to peaceful nuclear explosions for releasing oil and natural gas and for large scale excavations. India voiced its reservations in 1968 itself when the treaty was opened for signatures, at the 57th meeting of the First Committee of the United Nations, when it declared, inter-alia, that the treaty did not ensure non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but only stopped their dissemination to non-nuclear weapon states without imposing any curbs on the continued manufacture, stock-piling, and sophistication of nuclear weapons by the existing nuclear weapon states.

On the issue of non-proliferation, in principle, India is as concerned as any other country in the world that mankind must be saved from the threat of a nuclear holocaust, and therefore does not question the motives which seek to contain proliferation. But as is well known as mentioned earlier also there are two dimensions to nuclear proliferation - vertical and horizontal. Vertical proliferation consists in the nuclear weapon states increasing or being free to increase their piles of nuclear arsenals. In 1970 the United States and the Soviet Union had 6,000 deliverable nuclear war heads: their number increased in eight years, i.e., by 1978 to 14,000. Now each of the powers has over 10,000 war...
heads on its strategic weapons and thousands more on its intermediate range and its tactical nuclear weapons. Horizontal proliferation involves the spread of nuclear technology to new areas. While nuclear states have the means to check vertical proliferation they have shown a singular lack of will to do so, their non-proliferation effort being almost wholly pre-occupied with horizontal proliferation. They are anxious that nuclear technology should continue solely and in perpetuity to be their asset and kept away from the 'lesser breed'. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, 1978 promulgated by the United States provides a good insight into the general policy of the nuclear weapon states to concentrate on horizontal non-proliferation. This Act grants to the U.S. Government long term and wide ranging veto rights over the purchasing countries' nuclear programme at crucial stages and over the key elements in their fuel cycle. It provides a universal U.S. veto over disposal of spent fuel, not only of U.S. origin but of any origin, if the fuel is used in a plant supplied by the United States. It further provides that the U.S. Government can decide unilaterally not only whether a customer company may be allowed to reprocess its spent fuel but also whether it may export reprocessing plants and technology, even the technology developed by the customer company to another company of its choice.
the risk of catastrophe by error or design are obscured. He asked how could one nation or five nations be considered more responsible than the rest?1

Despite India's clear cut perceptions on disarmament generally and on development and use of nuclear energy in particular the perceptions which are born out of India's heritage and genius as also the other factors briefly alluded to, there have been marked changes in India's security environment during the four decades since independence. The fifties were a decade of peace with no serious threat to the security of India while its stock in the world stood high. It was for the first time in 1962, that India's confidence was shaken as a result of the Chinese onslaught and it dawned on the country that moral strength alone did not guarantee national security. India's apprehensions were aggravated as a result of the Chinese Nuclear Test of 19642: even so in the early seventies India seems to have regained some of its lost confidence notwithstanding the fact that there were during this period several internal dissensions which had surfaced and certain events with far reaching implications were taking place on


U.S. proposal in the form of a 'Plan for General and Comprehensive Disarmament in a Free and Peaceful World' (March 1960) is self explanatory. On the same lines are the concepts of 'Peaceful co-existence', 'Panchsheel' and the Delhi Declaration (January 28, 1985) advocated by India among a host of other concepts, declarations and proclamations, issued from time to time all the world over. The Delhi Declaration particularly sets out clearly the basic principles and values on which a new just world order can be based. It lays down that -

(i) Peaceful co-existence must become the universal norm of international relations;

(ii) human life must be recognised as supreme;

(iii) non-violence should be the basis of community life;

(iv) understanding and trust must replace fear and suspicion;

(v) the right of every state to political and economic independence must be recognised and respected;

(vi) resources being spent on armament must be channelled towards social and economic development, because it is only disarmament which can release the enormous additional resources needed for combating backwardness and poverty;

(vii) conditions must be guaranteed for the individual's harmonious development;

(viii) mankind's material and intellectual potential must be used to solve global problems;

(ix) the 'balance of terror' must give way to comprehensive international security; and
a nuclear weapon free and non-violent world requires specific and immediate action for disarmament.

It would be seen that in more ways than one, a just world order is an extension of the Indian perception of disarmament in its wide comprehensive connotation. Indian concept as mentioned earlier derives strength and substance from the basic tenets of Hindu philosophy pertaining to non-violence, universal brotherhood, compassion and tolerance.

The just world order model as advocated by the Indian author Rajni Kothari discussed later in the Chapter derives strength from the same basic values and aims at realising these values and not on just eliminating armaments from the world. It strikes at the root causes of conflict and sets about devising means and institutions which would create conditions for the establishment of a peaceful and a just world. His structural model also takes into account the values to be realised which have been advocated many a time before by Indian leaders and have come to occupy an unprecedented relevance in the present times in the conduct of international relations. In accordance with the emphasis on values to be realised the model advocated by Rajni Kothari is different from those of other writers specially the Western who still continue to harbour a superiority complex and want to achieve the goal of a just world order by way of global management.
However, the fact that the views expressed by various writers are varied and perceptions widely divergent should be accepted as natural keeping in view the different backgrounds they have originated from and should be taken for what they are worth in terms of a universal approach to the subject and in relation to the present day global environment. Notable contributions have been made by thinkers and intellectuals from all parts of the world.\textsuperscript{1} It goes to show that changes are eagerly sought and are inevitable though the responses to the oncoming changes are quite varied and so are the means and prescriptions offered for the achievement of a peaceful and just world order.

The Western response while recognizing the changing reality still aims at maintaining somehow its superiority and the status quo. The language used is different though, in as much as it recognises the importance of the Third World by offering to allow the more powerful of the third world countries to participate in a system of global management and sharing of power and prosperity to some extent. The underlying idea behind it, however, remains the national self interest in the sense that any such participation in global management is likely to undercut the Soviet influence in the Third

\textsuperscript{1}Authors like KAHN & WEINER, SPENGLER, EHRLIC FORRESTER, MEADOWS et al, HEILBRONER from the U.S.A., DUMONT from France, SCHUMACHER from the U.K., GALTUNG from Norway, TINBERGEN from Netherlands, HERRERA et al (BARILOCHE FOUNDATION) from Argentina, MODRZHINSKAYA & STEPHANYAN and KOSOLAPOV from the U.S.S.R., KAYA et al from Japan and RAJNI KOTHARI from India, have dealt with and delineated, naturally the stand points peculiar to their perceptions of the present world scenario.
World regions. The Western response has found expression in the writings of Kahn and Weiner who visualise the future world as essentially one in which Western technology and Western social forms shall be adopted by the developing nations, disparities would exist and low level of violence and small wars would be accepted in order to deal better with high levels of violence. Theirs is essentially a picture of a world in which the existing status quo is maintained with economic and technological advancement bringing in some prosperity to the poor. The developing nations will have to go through the stages of development already gone through by the developed nations.¹

Other Western writers have dealt with the problems posed by population explosion and ecological imbalances created thereby.² They have also advocated, although with

2. Writers like Joseph Spengler have advocated the neo-Malthusian approach and have directed their recommendations particularly to developing countries. According to him if only population growth can be brought under control, other problems would be solved automatically and economic measures in the form of carefully designed taxes on population and consumption would correct the Malthusian trends. It is better to spend money on population control than to give aid to the poor countries.

ANNE and PAUL EHERLICH gave birth to the idea of eco catastrophe. They advocate that for ecological reasons redevelopment of individual regions should take place instead of further growth. According to Eherlichs "the capacity of the planet to support human life has already been permanently impaired".
...strings attached, the redistribution of the wealth of the world while advocating a policy of 'Triage' against the poor countries.¹

Computerised models followed soon along with the studies initiated by the Club of Rome which further reinforced these ideas. RENE DUMONT, for example, concluded that poor nations stood no chance of reaching the standards of living realised in the United States and that the rich countries' hopes of survival rested solely on the continued poverty of the rest of mankind. He, however, condemns the high levels of consumption of the rich countries and advocates a diet of austerity for rich nations calling for the abolition of armaments and private motor cars. He accepts the importance of aid from the rich to the poor while insisting that poor countries must achieve independence, as a first stage agricultural independence. His view of the world is fraught with

¹Eberlighs also advocate redistribution of the wealth of the world favouring almost 20 per cent of the rich nations' GNP as aid to the poor countries. However, they caution that keeping the ecological limitations in view the economies of the poor nations should not be developed on the same lines as those of the developed countries. "They must design a low consumption economy of stability and in which there is a much more equitable distribution of wealth than in the present one". However, their stand looks somewhat paradoxical and ambiguous in that they advocate despite their prescription of a massive redistribution of wealth and resources and aid to the poor, a policy of 'Triage' against the poor countries. 'Triage' is the policy of allowing such poor countries as are unable to cope up with demands of their populations, to sink instead of helping them out.
conflict and violence. And he sounds a note of despair:

This new world is not and never will be a rational structure; it will be an arena of confrontation and struggle".

The Soviets and the other communist countries have hitherto viewed the world problems as an essential outcome of imperialism. The poverty of the major part of humanity, according to the communist doctrine, is the result of the capitalist system which needs to be demolished. The Soviet authors\(^1\) in keeping with the Leninist thought have consistently advocated a mass revolutionary movement. In V.Kosolapov's vision of the future there will be detente in international relations, global measures will be implemented to control the arms race, the production of nuclear weapons would be stopped and trade would be internationalised.

For the achievement of a just world order, a number of demands for institutional changes in the present world order have also surfaced, naturally to meet the requirements of a new emerging society, in the writings of various thinkers and writers. A number of authors have found the 'Nation State' an institution on which our present world political structure is based as a thing of the past and completely out of pace with the realities

---


of the fast moving world. Similarly, the economic systems and institutions have long since become obsolete as has the institution of war for resolving conflicts.

Handing over the time honoured functions of the Sovereign States to appropriate agencies clothed with enough power to administer on behalf of mankind;\(^1\) the establishment of a new international economic and political order\(^2\) for which an emergency action plan spanning a period of 5 to 10 years was advocated, to incorporate a large scale transfer of resources to developing countries; an international energy strategy, a global food programme and various other proposals which have been sought to be implemented at various levels are results of changing patterns of political thought. On the same line proposals have come for a linkage between disarmament and development by Al Cock Norman in an article on "Peace Justice and Prosperity"\(^3\) making the following concrete recommendations-

(i) Over the next 25 years (1977-2001) economic growth (energy consumption per capita) for the rich nations of the world to be held to be under 1%.

(ii) Over the next 25 years economic growth (energy consumption per capita) for the poor nations of the world be increased steadily, on a sliding scale as individually they attain greater wealth.

1. See Stuart Chase, "One World or None", BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, December, 1975, p.5.


(iii) Funding for the distribution of wealth between nations be obtained over a 20 years period from 1982-2001 on a gradual basis from the $300 billion presently being spent on armaments world wide. A portion of this fund should be allocated to other nations but a portion should be retained for domestic economic adjustments. By the year 2001 World armament will be down to perhaps 10% of present levels, or an amount deemed necessary for United Nations duty and domestic policing.

(iv) Defensive alliances be systematically dismantled in a balanced fashion between antagonistic blocs around the World;

(v) Systematically domestic governments move in the direction of greater equality and freedom for their people. For poor nations this emancipation should be in the economic dimension, for rich countries the emancipation should be political.

Similarly MEHBUBUL HAQ in his summary of the proceedings of the Conference of the Programme Committee for SID 15th World Conference has highlighted the areas of consensus—like the equality of opportunity at national and international levels embracing not only economic opportunities but also political participation, equality under law and basic human rights including an end to all forms of discrimination. At the same time the importance of making a beginning at the local level has been recognised. Charity must begin at home with an effort directed at achieving self reliance. New development strategies should be aimed at the needs of people and not market oriented. Great deal of reforms viz. land reforms in the ownership of assets and

reforms in the distribution of public services are called for. Similarly on the international level existing great disparities must be removed which could be done by the Third World countries themselves by seeking structural changes in prevailing market mechanisms and power structures and not by seeking concessions, trade preferences, aid and assistance from the rich. Structural changes would be required in international institutions; a system of International Taxation, an International Central Bank, an International Currency, world planning mechanisms or a new division of labour based on greater equality and self reliance of nations are called for.¹

In short the demand for a new world order is evident. The basic requirement that presents itself as a result is that of providing new world institutions, political, economic, social, judicial and related to defence. This can be done by either beginning at the very beginning or by accepting the world institutions already in existence as a starting point and subsequently adding to their authority and enlarging their scope of activity. A number of studies have been made on this aspect. Worth mentioning is a study of GRENVILLE CLARKE and LOUIS SOHN B.D. The book gives a detailed plan for the maintenance of world peace by revising the U.N. charter to strengthen the world institutions to maintain effectively law and order and establish peace on a strong and sound footing.

The authors have been guided by certain basic principles which, in brief, are:-

(i) In order to establish genuine peace and outlaw war, an enforceable system of world law must be established.

(ii) The world law against violence must be explicitly stated in a constitutional and statutory form. It must, under appropriate penal ties, be able to forbid the use of force.

(iii) There should be World Judicial Tribunals to interpret and apply the world law along with organs specially designed for mediation and conciliation.

(iv) A world police force should be created to forestall and suppress any violation of the world law.

(v) Nations- all the world over should be completely disarmed which should be accomplished in a simultaneous and proportionate manner by carefully verified stages.

(vi) Effective world machinery should be created to remove the economic disparities from various regions of the world which otherwise tend to cause conflict and instability.

To achieve all this, active participation on a universal level is sought which would mean representation of all the countries of the world in the institutions thus created. The details of how and on what basis countries would be represented have been comprehensively dealt with in the study. While the nation State has not been done away with and continues to maintain its identity on the national level, without of course the
heavy arsenals, the task of maintaining peace and resolution of conflicts has been given to the international agencies of which a number of them are the continuation of the present U.N.O.¹

The whole plan seems on paper, at any rate, to be sound and feasible to a great extent, but would the major powers which would stand divested of their veto in the Security Council, and the armed nations of the World with their enormous stakes bite it? While the plan talks of disarming all the nations of the world it does not refer to establishing conditions of co-operation and peaceful co-existence. It does not even consider voluntary acceptance of non-violence as is desirable but tries to enforce it through an enforceable system of world law also with the help of a world police force.

¹ Like the General Assembly, the Security Council in the form of Executive Council, the Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, the Secretariat and various other specialised agencies etc. with of course added powers and expanded scope of activity to make them effective tools for the preservation of a just and peaceful world. To these have been added a number of other institutions like the International Peace Force, World Equity Tribunal(to deal with non-legal disputes) Regional United Nations Courts, a World Conciliation Board, World Development Commission and a Nuclear Energy Authority.

In so far as the new institutions at national, international, regional and global levels are concerned, Richard Falk's study makes an interesting and useful contribution. According to him 'conventional world order thinking has tended to proceed on the basis of a stark alternative between virtual anarchy and virtual world government'. He seeks to explore the intermediate options. His visual expositions of the various models depict the gradual decrease in the authority of the nation states and the gradual increase in the world order values which pertain to ethically beneficial goals for the humanity as a whole, viz., peace, economic well being, human solidarity etc. with diffusion of power at various levels viz. national, international, regional and global. His preferred models as an alternative to existing world order provide a structural image of preferred world order system that could be brought into being by a planned transition process sometime around the year 2000. The visuals of the existing world order and those of the preferred models dominated by WOMP values are reproduced hereafter. It will be seen that in the existing world order system as presented in the visual in Figure I the predominance of state actors is apparent as is the emergent role of regional and universal functional actors. The predominance of the super powers and the inequality of states are clearly brought out.

2. WORLD ORDER MODEL PROJECT.
Existing World Order System

Figure I

Figure I. Existing world-order system, early 1970s
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Figure 2 depicts the internal dimensions of the system. The inner black circle depicts the extent to which a particular government is committed to WOMP values. The size of the inner black circle expresses the degree of militarization, the extent of social privation, the extent of political privation and the extent of ecological privation.
In the preference model depicted above, centralized administration of many realms of human activity is expected. These include health, environmental protection, money, business operations, ocean and space use, disarmament, disaster relief, peace keeping and peaceful settlement, and resource conservation.
The diminished inner circles in the above visual reflect the increasing influence of WOMP values on the internal organisation of states.

The preferred models are not to be considered as terminal, pleads Falk. "They will if achieved stimulate twenty first century world order reformers to express new preference models and transition strategies".  

1. For details and other intermediate models see Richard Falk, op. cit., pp. 537-557.
Rajni Kothari from India has made a study emulating the traditional Indian values of non-violence, justice, participation and autonomy. According to him a time in history has arrived when a determined intervention in the ongoing process, based on widely shared values that are capable of reversing the prevailing patterns of dominance and exploitation, is called for. "There are moments in history" he says, "when long needed changes which were only dimly felt for decades are vividly felt and offer a chance of being carried out. The present is such a moment. It provides a peculiar combination of necessity born out of a sense of crisis (that the human species may become extinct) and hope born out of accumulating evidence that if only men would be prepared to act, it is possible to move towards a better human order."¹

His world order model does not do away with the nation state and yet does not accept a world state which is an extension of nation state with all its deficiencies, unmanageable and grotesque. His preferred model takes into account the ancient Indian background which seeks to realise preferred values through active intervention in the process of time without rejecting what is good and enduring in its tradition.

The values he seeks to realise in the new world order are non-violence, autonomy, justice and participation—all four increasingly absent in the present world order. According to him the greatest

obstacle to achieving these values is the presence of structures of dominance and inequality and the absence of real autonomy in greater parts of the world and not, as many Western thinkers would have us believe, in the absence of some centralised and benign world authority. In order to achieve the value objectives, he proposes action on two separate grounds— one of restructuring world politics to remove conditions that perpetuate inequality and dependence and two— of devising institutions at three different levels— the individual level, the national level and the world level. It would also have to evolve a system of ethics so that the society is not a consumption society with ever increasing wants ready to destroy natural resources but a society exercising self control. While there shall be a minimum standard of material living, there shall also be a maximum standard beyond which the resources would be transferred to those who have not yet achieved the minimum standard.

In his design for future, he advocates unity among the poor and the backward nations, based on a sense of common stake so that they are able to resist the manipulation of the big powers. He suggests twenty to twenty five political units of the world community.

Institutional structures in the new world order should be geared to promote autonomy and equality on all the three levels mentioned before. These institutions, however, are to be considered separate from a world authority but would cater to diverse functional needs transcending national boundaries. The world political
structure that he envisages would function at both global and national levels with appropriate intermediate levels built into the system. In his words "the system will be an operating world federation without centralising power in the hands of one apex unit."¹ A reversal of the existing order would be the outcome. Autonomous individual would be at the centre and the world institutions would form the periphery and nation and intermediate structures would occupy the mediating positions. In many ways his model resembles what Richard Falk has advocated but more than that it draws strength from what Gandhi preached when he said:²

"Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance, but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units. Therefore, the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle, but will give strength to all within and will derive its own strength from it".

As far as the concrete institutional structure is concerned it is indeed not possible to impose a prefabricated world order model on the fast changing world scenario. One thing is clear however, and that is, that the values of non-violence, autonomy, participation and justice have to take precedence over violence, injustice and centralisation of authority in the hands of a few. In a new world order model enough freedom would have to be left for the institutions to grow according to the changing demands of human society adhering strictly though to the realisation of the world order values.

¹For details see Rajni Kothari, op. cit., pp. 149-162.
²HARIJAN, July 28, 1946.
The means to achieve them will have to be in consonance with the values to be achieved. Any means, just or unjust as advocated by some of the authors mentioned earlier in the Chapter, to achieve a new world order peaceful and just would be a contradiction and would not lead to the achievement of the goal. It was Albert Einstein who had said that:¹

> It is my belief that the problem of bringing peace to the world on a supranational basis will be solved only by employing Gandhi's method on a large scale".

Numerous efforts made by the world community in the past it would be seen were aimed at denouncing war as an instrument of national policy(Kellogg Briand Pact, 1928) making the world safe for democracy,after the first world war and later to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In practice however as is evident from past records, peace remained a far cry because war was equated with only military violence causing physically visible damages and to achieve these high sounding goals disarmament was sought to be imposed primarily by victors on the vanquished by way of limiting, controlling, and banning armaments with national self interest as the basis of all overtures for peace. The value and relevance of non-violence and peaceful persuasion has come to be realised only recently.

There have been endless discussions on the form and content, nature and scope and the wide ranging

implications of a World Order for nations great and small, in the present and in the future. The discussions will continue over time. Progress and improvement are a continuous process and any efforts aimed at limiting, obstructing or stopping this process can be disastrous. No World Order Model can be a fixture, a final product or a perfect specimen to be followed or acted upon for all times. It is futile therefore to think of imposing a pre-fabricated World Order Model on the fast changing world comprising of 165 odd countries with different historical, political and cultural backgrounds, following diverse ideologies, practising different methods and means to solve their problems and having widely different preceptions of world issues and realities. However, with all the differences and diversities there should still be no room for despair. For one the world today is composed of human beings who are facing the same predicament of survival and are anxious to evolve an order which would enable them to live in peace and dignity on this planet. Another common factor is the undercurrent of religious beliefs prevalent in all societies and universally accepted the world over; beliefs which recognise the sanctity of human life and the brotherhood of man, and which preach such values as justice, tolerance, forgiveness, charity, truthfulness and non-violence. Properly propagated and applied such beliefs can provide the much needed fillip which can bring people closer to each other and help in bridging the chasm which divides
them. Evolving the model of a New World Order must, therefore, take note of the prevailing diversities and at the same time utilize the widely held values on which the foundation of the new World Order can be based. And as already stated it should not be rigid but pliable in its superstructure which can be modified and adjusted to suit the changing requirements. The importance of this was realised by Jawahar Lal Nehru in as early as 1939 when he said:

"One of the tragedies of history is slowness with which people's minds adapt themselves to a changing environment. The world changes from day to day, not so our minds which are peculiarly static and insist on imagining that today is the same as yesterday and tomorrow will not differ greatly. This lag between our minds and reality prevents us from solving the problems of the day and produces war and revolution and much else that afflicts the world...

The old political and economic structure is rotten and moth-eaten and all the kings horses and all the kings men cannot hold it together for long...

Systems, like individuals, have their span of life and they cannot go beyond it."

What are the prospects of disarmament and the emergence of a peaceful and just world order forms the theme of the next Chapter.