CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION
Humanity has created great civilizations. It has also created weapons and war to completely destroy it. Civilizations, empires and wars tend to go and grow together, war serving as both mid-wives and undertakers in the rise and fall of civilization in the course of history. War has proved to be the proximate cause of the break-down of every civilization and, indeed, war may actually have been a child of civilization. It is an unacceptable, yet unavoidable, fact that the whole tragedy of militarism has been acted over and over again. It has always been the case that development outpaced political thinking. Such a lag is extremely dangerous and utterly unacceptable in matters of war and peace. International peace is more than temporary absence of war. Peace must be secure. An acceptable security system will have to provide methods to settle controversy peacefully, secure nations against external threats, discourage use of armed forces and intervention and deal with the occasional would-be aggressor.

Security is, something we try to achieve without real confidence that we can really do so. It remains a universal experience and constant preoccupation of mankind in its individual, social and corporate experience. Thus the security of the individual is inseparably intertwined with that of the state. There is controversy whether state action should have minimum impact on the individual - the
minimalist view, or the state as a collective entity, acquires an independent status which stands above the individual - the maximalists' view. To the individual, state may be unacceptable yet necessary evil to avoid confusion that might result in an anarchy of its absence. In fact, the question of security is a multilateral problem and includes the international system, the regional organizations, states, national governments, peoples, nationalities and individuals.

Each state exists in its own web of threats and problems which defines its insecurity and agenda of national security. No general definition can be assigned to the concept of national security, except that power and national interests override any other factor in its analysis. Security, as a fragmented idea, cannot be pegged down to simple military indicators. The question of security has other wide range of dimensions - economic, domestic, developmental, and environmental - which to a large extent cannot be pursued independently. The fact is that security means different things to different people and little agreement exists on the nature and role of security. History reveals that nations acting individually or through alliances have been unable to maintain peace and security. Under changing international conditions, basic assumptions - war is inevitable and that humans, individually or
collectively, are belligerent—might come under severe review. Wars have occurred because world community failed to provide suitable mechanism to resolve controversy. Causes of war lie in the struggle for power and eternal security dilemma. All round peace is unachievable without genuine sense of community, where global economic, social and human rights problems deserve high priority and action.

In the post-war period, the bipolar rivalry and ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism grew to form the core of world politics. The emerging trends supported the power concept of security. They considered war as an instrument of policy and its aim was victory and peace. There was, however, a serious lacuna in the conceptualization of contemporary security debate. It has an overwhelming systemic bias and an inadequate comprehension component-whole relationship. It assumed that the security among superpowers would ensure security of the system and its components. This, however, was not possible. Only the protagonists for 'Global society' articulated that world peace and security was inseparable from problems like human rights, ecological balance, income inequality, food, population and energy crises in the developing countries. A comprehensive international security system was not to be based on the premise of military and technology but on more humanitarian, developmental and environmental issues.
By the end of Second World War, man stood on the precipice of self-destruction with nuclear warheads. Therefore, today world security building is more important than ever before. It is directly connected with essential problems of our time—a choice between survival of human race or universal destruction. We are increasingly aware that nuclear war is unacceptable as a political instrument. New realities require new approaches, specifically with regard to the nuclear potentials. Winning wars—a former principal of military strength can no longer be fulfilled. Instead, they should design themselves to prevent war with other systems for the sake of security and stability. Priorities are changing as the formerly insignificant functions now become key ones. General trend is towards diversification of the political, social and psychological and other functions of military strength. The developing mismatch between man and nature, threatens security. It would be a more sensible choice to tackle the problem in a coordinated fashion by increasing economic efficiency and adjusting economic and social consumption patterns with ecological limitations and resource scarcity. This confers a heavy responsibility on the present and future generations. The wheels of progress have put enormous strain on nature's support system. Environmental hazards augur disruptions on enormous scale, and threaten global
security and global economy and development.

In the last decade of the twentieth century, history has accelerated, the international political map has undergone transformation beyond anyone's imagination as the Soviet and its East European empire broke down, the bipolar division collapsed and the structures considered unchangeable, disappeared. Cold war came to an end in 1991 and an entire era of international relations came to a close, as 'contours of a new zone of security are being drawn from Vancouver to Vladivostok'. The security systems now sought are intended to organize states not against any potential adversary but in defence of common values. The new system cannot be based in balance of power and fear but must be based on prevention of conflicts. A significantly emerging phenomenon is that the division between domestic and international security factors is blurred. Threats have changed as the basic line of division in the world today is determined by the economic gap between the rich and the poor - the North and the South.

The security of the big powers no longer rests in military advantage, one has over another and nor in distribution of arms, but in needs shared equally by big and small. Economic prosperity of the industrialized countries is inexorably linked to the development of the poorest. There are three major international economic issues, which
need attention, namely economic stagnation, chronic imbalances in international trade and foreign exchange and the need to ensure continued economic growth. Militarization has led to massive resource transfers within the third world and thus led to underdevelopment and exploitation. This has been the cause of most intra-third world conflicts, where the realization of collective economic security would pave way for world peace. Such underdevelopment may result in instability of nation state, thus jeopardizing a comprehensive plan for international security. Such common dangers can be encountered only mutually, through universal international cooperation by diffusion of power to the bottom of power hierarchy for proper functioning of the system as a whole.

Developing a strategic overview of the nature of security is a major task with us. Stability is a value, and perhaps a condition for security - a prime motive for behaviour of states at all levels and in context of all dimensions and variables. In respect of realism, security is companion of power, rather than a derivative of power. But in context of idealism, security is a prior condition for peace and one of its consequences. The concept of security binds together the normative and empirical aspects of international relations subject matter. Security can provide a common framework for understanding it at various
levels, as it avoids inherent polarization of realist theory that over-emphasizes the divisibility and indivisibility of security. What really matters is the universality, equality and indivisibility of security. The concept itself is multidimensional and interdependent. Hence security cannot be approached unilaterally. A clear distinction is necessary between 'national security' and 'regime security' because external linkages are sought often for regime security. As the state and the international system cannot be disconnected from one another precisely for the purpose of security, it is better to refer to them as 'security complex' to highlight the level of analysis.

In the 1980s and 1990s, humanity is still pursuing obsolete security building policies and facing the same problems as in the 1950s. Security was traditionally treated as a side-effect of the possession of power or peace. The stubborn efforts of the past forty-five years to keep the world locked into a pre-nuclear way of thinking have been exposed and undermined. An excessive attention on national security leads to dynamic struggle for power and realism, while too much emphasis on international security may lead to unrealistic idealism and peace. In fact, security itself is a more comprehensive concept than either power or peace for understanding the basic problem of international relations. Genuine global security can only
be ensured by putting an end to political manipulations involving military strength, to attempts to gain political advantages through the improvements of weapons. In fact, it is high time when all this should be eliminated, for it serves to worsen the atmosphere of international affairs. Complete security is unattainable in the anarchy of state systems. It, being a relative term, will only lead to security dilemma.

Despite the modern concept of security that war is inadmissible and a nuclear war would be disastrous, no unanimity exists regarding wars and arms. Nevertheless it is still pointed out that force has an important role to play in preserving security in an anarchical society. The unfolding of some present events are mute witnesses to this. World over, there are integrative and disintegrative tendencies, power today is more defined in economic and technological terms than in militaristic terms, ideology is loosing ground while new threats emerge such as communalism, religious fundamentalism and ethnicity; while even the superpowers get in line with the international organization as the UN, there are cases of blatant violation of international law by Third World nations. It would be treacherous to set foot on future and predict under such circumstances when there is shift in economy, new centres of power are emerging, power-equations are changing world over.
and the world faces 'common crises' and a 'common future' in world development, sustainable environment and nuclear/conventional disarmament. Hence, security is a collective preoccupation, an urgent priority for all. It has to be unequivocally emphasized that today even a potential adversary has to be considered a necessary partner in building global security.

The security dilemma has prompted nations to put forth several propositions according to their circumstances and national interests. These were based on the traditional international relations paradigm and international anarchy. This realist dilemma forced them to live in a condition of mutual competition and conflict - a la 'Machiavellian' paradigm. The search for security has been an unending process and no single system proposed has so far been able to meet the challenges thrown over by it. The Balance of Power theory has been an important and influential concept of international security. It achieved the highest level of theoretical development by the efforts of classical as well as post-war realists. Characterized by competition and intense form of decentralization, it tries to explain why state of nature does not necessarily mean a state of war. In the laissez-faire theory of international relations, it holds that although anarchy entails the absence of sovereign rule, it does not necessarily mean the absence of large...
measures of international order. It presupposes equilibrium and static conditions. Balance of power aims primarily at preserving peace and status quo, which is certainly not possible in international relations. The advent of nuclear power and bipolarity had converted it into balance of terror. It may take a still different course under the emerging new world order and a shift towards multipolarism.

The collective security concept is itself rooted in the traditional paradigm and concerns itself with the problem of peace and order in the anarchic international system. It is managing the equations among states through a partially centralized system as the United Nations, while the actual power remains diffused among sovereign states. Universalization and equality of all member nations provide equal status to all: big-small, developed-developing, the powerful or the weak, in the present community of nations. It involves a complex scheme of national commitments and argue that state the should reach formal agreement to take collective action against any aggressor. The collective security may be regarded as a partial acceptance of the Lockenian concept of social contract, where international anarchy, although not abolished, is minimized and separate state sovereignties are left intact.

Disarmament and arms control, as concepts of security, have emerged late predominantly in the twentieth century and
precisely after the advent of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Mutual distrust and fear, particularly the relations among superpowers, patterned by the 'worst-case syndrome' had brought us to the brink of self-destruction. As an old African proverb states 'when elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers'; the developing countries suffered from the eccentricities of the developed nations. While more and more people today understand the close relationship between disarmament, peace and security; while more people concede the direct linkage between disarmament and development and need to rechannelize the funds from arms race to more productive purposes, why is that the thesis that wars and arms are inadmissible was never before adopted as a fundamental principle of security. From the point of view of international peace, arms control is complimentary to disarmament. It is a logical extension of disarmament by mutual restraint. While it is argued that weapons are most dependable guarantor of peace, disarmament and arms control stand on politically, socially, economically and ethically on a firmer ground. Lately concluded INF Treaty and START Treaty stand in testimony to it. But still when 'the elephants make love it is the grass again that suffers'. The inherent logic is that the international security defined in terms of big powers will hardly make any contribution towards the common goal of survival and peace.
Can 'deterrence' be regarded as a rational instrument for building international security? Can we attribute forty years of peace and absence of war between the superpowers, is due to deterrence? Sis vis pacem para bellum is an over-simplified version to be the foundation of peace and security. The memory of the two world wars still live with us. The nightmare of senseless slaughter of millions of people and the massive destruction has left an almost genetic imprint on the psychology of all people. Therefore the resistance to the prospects of third world war is really universal. War can only be prevented by sensible policies and not by arms race. Although local wars occur, epochs of wars is receding into past as the common majority gets sick of militarism. The deterrence theory is not an end in itself. It is certainly a positive method of ensuring stability at a certain stage for a limited period of time, it is a way to consolidate detente, limit arms race and proceed to disarmament.

The realist interpretation of security might have held undisputed sway had it not been the complexity of interdependence among nations that robbed nations of their individuality. For a better cause of survival, common security gains priority over others. While these theories meet the external and militaristic exigencies of nations, they fail to properly assess the complexity of internal-
developmental problems of the two-third of the nations, who form part of the comity of nations. Their challenges pose an indirect but subtle threat to global security. The non-aligned movement has been making efforts in the direction of 'one world'. Graduating from the 'Third World' and 'developing countries' the NAM has been fighting for common cause of humanity.

The early fifties witnessed the breakdown of the traditional model of international relations. As the colonial powers stood shattered, decolonization witnessed the rise of bipolarity, ideological rivalry, and bloc-alliance formation. Power politics dominated the bipolar relations too. It was NAM that aided the emergence of new ideas, principles, norms and structural patterns of international relations. It offered the only realistic platform on which it is possible to reach a broad international consensus for concerted efforts to guide the world on the path of peace, cooperation and universal detente. As a dynamic independent foreign policy, non-alignment offered a readiness to cooperate on equitable basis with all countries on specific issues coinciding with national interests. It is the best guarantee for safeguarding the national and international position of the non-aligned countries. Non-alignment is a logical historical development arising out of structural
contradiction in the past and of the crisis in contemporary international relations.

The core of non-aligned policy is the drive to safeguard independence, national integrity and national interest, with a freedom in internal development. But it is different from the other concepts, for NAM is fighting for the broadest range of interests of mankind as a whole and not for some narrow goals of their own. It stands for a new international economic order instead of a biased Brettonwood system of discrimination, exploitation and inequality. The source of the movement's struggle lies in consistent and committed struggle for peace, independence and security for all through disarmament, development and democratization of international relations. In these efforts, the NAM has been consistently aligning itself with the United Nations because here they have a unique chance of directly sharing in the management of world affairs as equal partners. Its activities run in line, and not parallel to the UN principles. The fundamental values of activism, and universalism have accorded NAM a special place in the struggle against power politics and cold war.

Through its activities, the non-aligned movement has established itself as the only international force capable of offering comprehensive long term solutions that could lead to world free of present political and economic crisis.
However it must be admitted that non-alignment alone cannot eliminate the international conflicts, universalize detente, stop arms race or establish an equitable economic order. It does not have any illusions either, but want to work concretely on laying the ground for their solution. The non-aligned countries are a living independent force, a catalyst for positive process in the world and a vehicle of universally acceptable solution to world problems.

As the documents of the various NAM summits suggest, the goals of the movement can be summarized as strengthening world peace and security, and in this context the reduction of international tensions, disarmament, transcendence of bloc alignments, peaceful settlements of disputes and strengthening the UN; the struggle against all forms of dependence, political, economic and social, from spheres of influence, securing adequate economic and social development in the world as a whole and finally the democratization of international relations. These efforts by NAM sum up the basic requirements of global security and meet the security demands of all nations without detriment to interests of any nation. But what concerns them basically is that the majority of developing states and the small states, those who are either economically, politically and demographically not viable or are too strategically located to be of utmost interest to all concerned.
The bottom-line for security is survival, but this includes a substantial range of concerns about the conditions of existence. For most of the nations, security concerns may range from stability of the system, government and ideology, from access to resources, finance and market to acceptable level and state power, from the ability of the society to reproduce itself on traditional patterns of customs, culture, religious and national identity, to a concern for planetary biosphere as essential for all human enterprise in a broader perspective. A majority of the third world nations perceive security threats from all sides. Intervention and economic dependence have been the inevitable results in such nations, who in most cases, suffered from a colonial dominance. Political modernization and socialization process is usually in its embryonic stage. The unequal exchange between the centre and the periphery further inhibits the process of independent initiative. The nations in the periphery suffer from maladies typical of themselves which have affected the thrust of international process towards more basic needs like food, literacy, water, shelter and medical facilities. These can be successfully tackled by a concerted effort by world community as a whole. More precisely, population control may answer most of the developmental problems of the world.
These are just the tip of the iceberg. It is time they should be dealt with on an international scale or else the result will bestow more hardships on future generations. Even as we witness resolution of some difficult situations in the world, we stand in face of new ones such as religious fundamentalism, communalism, mass migration and ethnic problems. Some of them owe their originate in deprivation and underdevelopment while others result from revisionist pressures to redraw or redefine international boundaries. They may, for the time being, seem to be in local and regional context, but in all eventualities, have global ramifications. It is therefore necessary to check such tendencies, as in most cases they result in cessation and terrorism. The domestic politics of the Third World find it very hard to meet the challenge wrought by such fixtures.

The small states, apart from being socially and economically vulnerable, face threats from international tensions and increasing use of force. Today, their existence is acknowledged, though not guaranteed by the UN, which accepts the inherent right of sovereign states, irrespective of their ability to defend itself or not. What has been the advantage of the developmental approach to security is that it has minimized the age-old and intractable problem of defence developmental dilemma as faced by the developed country. No nation has an unbridled...
right to security. A new notion 'common security' is essential, as it corresponds not to security of a particular nation or group of nations but ensures security in general.

Arms-race is basically an expression of deeper political difference between states, which are magnified by armaments. Global threats through weapons are paralleled by the global challenge of pressing problem in the south. Shorn of all rhetoric and hypocrisy, interdependence today is based on a sense of insecurity. Development in dynamic transformative terms should mean survival for all. A general feeling of danger and uncertainty regarding future in wake of common evil had led to Non-aligned solidarity in a bipolar world; the cold war not only distorted some of the priorities of the 'periphery' but also reinforced historically inherited tensions based on primordial loyalties. The system itself is now manifesting signs of atrophy.

Security and peace are basically the fulcrum of international relations. Today they have origin in development and disarmament as these only can ensure permanence. The ensurance of peace and security for all countries has been the top priority of the non-aligned movement since its inception. The non-aligned policy has extricated the problem of peace and security from the exclusive competence of great powers without linking them
with the maintenance of status quo through balance of power. The responsibility of future of mankind cannot be borne by a few states, irrespective of the fact how big and powerful they may be. The greatness of NAM is that it recognizes ideological pluralism and right to decide their own socio-economic and political system best suited to their needs and realities. It is characterized by diversity and complexity, and not monolithic unity or homogeneity. But what unites them most is their under-developed status. They aim at world peace and peaceful coexistence, struggle against imperialism and colonialism, end of all arms race, an opposition to big power-alliances, and economic independence and cooperation. In all, this sums up the people's desire for international cooperation and represents the core of the problem. In order to preserve peace, thus, it is essential to remove the root cause of crises and tensions.

Today, when a new order is struggling to be born, a world quite different from the one we have known is emerging. When we talk of 'open borders', 'open trade' and of course 'open minds', when the Pope's power is assessed not by the number of his legions but by his gross national product (GNP), we know priorities have changed, the demands and challenges of present world are here to stay. The 'core' is heading towards 'multilateralism' where there would be shift in intensity of global political concerns.
while there might be rise in regional and local rivalries. Yet, as states will recognize the importance and permanence of their interdependence, unwanted conflicts might be avoided and more acceptance of mutual recognition of sovereignty will result. Hence, world is at cross roads: where either it will devise solutions to the common crises - development, disarmament and environmental/ecological security - by common efforts in common interest; or move along the precipice of tension towards unforseen consequences. The non-aligned countries have been sufficiently strong to raise these problems. Although, they know they cannot resolve them on their own, they have helped to make sure that none remains comfortably entrenched in their privileges. Thus it is fully acceptable that national and global security are largely interdependent and that security has a multidisciplinary character where it should maintain full respect for personal, political, military, economic and ecological constituents. In fact, what is necessary is an alternative form of security and that alternative is 'common security'.

The basic idea of common security is not a complex one. It is that no country can obtain security unilaterally, in the long run. Security has to be found in common with adversaries and friends alike. For long military forces, military expenditure, rapid technology change and fear of
war have dominated our way of thinking and proved empty hopes. It is now necessary to begin thinking of security in new ways. It starts with perhaps the most serious dimension of world crisis, namely the prospect of total destruction. Arms race will not only have serious consequences for peace and security but also other facets of survival. It adds in a reformist quest that nations should come to understand that maintenance of world peace must be given a higher priority than the assertion of their ideological and political positions. Weapon based thinking on security is seriously flawed. Other Common security seems to be looking for a common ground between political realism and political idealism. It seems to stress the need to eliminate the use of power as means to settle disputes and hence stop competitive arms race. In its advocacy of internationalism, common security fails to recognize that nation state is unlikely to disappear. There are international forces at work which are producing a sense of uncertainty and insecurity about political future of nations, caused partly by vulnerability of major economies and partly by continued use of military means in dealing essentially with political issues. Such structural transformations may give rise to immense power vacuum, legitimacy crises and confrontations. Increasing divergence in economic interests are drawing up new alignment possibilities. Today, interdependence is
based on a higher degree of insecurity, about access to and control over resources, as it is based on structural inequality. Without a basic transformation of the world polity and its socio-economic and cultural foundations, millions of people will find it difficult to survive in a meaningful sense. Hence, for survival even we have to start thinking beyond ourselves.

Common security promises the most realistic and promising proposition. It gives priority to political, economic and social issues over military and strategic ones in order to achieve common security. What is necessary, as regards common security, is that it should be acceptable to all and everyone should be part of it. For it, force is no legitimate instrument of national policy. Although, it recognizes security as basically inherent in any nation, it does not accept the logic of war. Armaments are the only symptoms of such maladies; they provide no permanent cure. Yet there is a basic difference in the way the Palme commission viewed common security and proposed recommendation. It went into the problem, dealing mostly with the single dimension of military and only thereafter dealing with resultant economic factors. Whereas what is necessary in a more comprehensive study is to analyze it as a whole. The developmental problematic has to be studied both in its entirety and as a resultant fallout of armament-
disarmament process both in the developed and developing countries.

Much of the problems that we face today can be categorized as disarmament, development and security of environment, ecological system and the biosphere. Linkage thesis seeks to establish a good relationship between arms-disarmament nexus and development. Limitation of resources thus helps the process only either way, it cannot be a two-way process for most of the countries who usually divert funds from productive developmental process to unproductive ones. Both development and armaments, in due course, will spell a disaster to the environmental system. Yet it is not our purpose to ignore the current realities in the world and look for a utopian-idealistic alternative. Nonetheless, a common destiny binds all the nations together, and once again we find the individual stands above our structural arrangements.

It was for the sake of the individual and his security that state came into existence. Now again it is in the larger interests of humanity, that we want to transcend national frontiers and national interests. The approach is at once individualistic and wholistic. State seems to be only a means towards the end of common security.

It appears, in large parts of the world, state is weakening and collapsing as a framework within which to
carry out the human affairs, especially their survival, development and future. While survival of life and civilization remains the focal point of all endeavour, peace and development form the crux of the problem in conventional language. Most of this work can be more effectively done by strengthening and reactivating the international organizations and the UN Security system where there can be unanimity of purpose and coherence of policy. Deterrence or concept of limited war is a dangerous piece of self deception and wishful thinking. Hence, the distinction between core and periphery has only limited applicability.

The awareness that not even some of the countries of the core are not free from underdevelopment and a low quality of life, made NAM to establish a dialogue with the developed world. It is the disparities among nations that have resulted in difference in attitude of most of the nations. While, the approach of most of the industrialized countries may vary or be conflictual, the non-aligned have always been urging a cooperative approach in international system. They aimed at dissolution of a rigid adversarial perspective. In a world that is already divided, it would be still dangerous to widen the division by restricting peace to the prosperous areas and condemning the rest of mankind to unsecurity and domination. This will be a highly unacceptable proposition as any hope of victory or
isolationism is no longer valid.

Common security does not simply mean the coexistence of present social order, nor is it a vision of 'new emergence' of the social system of today. In essence, common security goes beyond detente and permits diversity and social evolution. It is a vision of global situation where greater political, social, economic and cultural diversity is permitted at regional or national levels. Emergence of the welfare state identifies new social needs and how existing resources might satisfy emergence of new regime. Ideological and political rivals may share interest in survival - a partnership in struggle against common crises. The non-aligned movement seems to have imbibed the essence of common security. The creation of positive and irreversible process of cooperation for common survival, at the regional and the global level remain the basis of non-aligned security perspective. Whether it can be put to test as practical fundamental guideline for international relations, to a large extent, depends on us.