

## **I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture: 15**

### **PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY**

**D.N. Pathak**

**CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES, SURAT  
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS, UDHNA MAGDALLA ROAD  
SURAT - 395 007**

## PREFACE

The Centre for Social Studies has created an endowment fund to honour late Prof. I.P. Desai, the founder-Director of the Centre. As part of the programme, we have instituted the I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture series. Prof. D.N. Pathak delivered the fifteenth lecture entitled 'Peace and Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century'. It gives us great pleasure to make this lecture available to a wider academic community.

We are grateful to Prof. D.N. Pathak for having readily responded to our invitation to deliver the lecture. I must thank my colleague Dr. Babasaheb Kazi for preparing the copy for the press.

Vidyut Joshi

August 2002  
Centre for Social Studies  
Surat - 395 007

## PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

D.N. Pathak

I feel highly honoured to have been invited to deliver the 15<sup>th</sup> I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture at the Centre which aptly commemorates and embodies the rich and valuable memories of Dr. I.P. Desai. I knew I.P., he was mostly known and called by his students, friends and admirers, as a Senior Social Scientist. Though senior to me I found him very courteous and kind and very friendly. He carried his learning and scholarship in a simple and unassuming way. He did pioneering work of teaching as well as research and left a rich legacy of study and selfless service. I heartily remember him and pay my respects to him.

If I am asked why I chose Peace and Security as my topic for today's presentation I can adduce four very cogent reasons for the choice. In the first place, we have had so much of violence in our midst that it is time we thought of reducing it in a big measure, if not completely eradicating it. Let us not forget that in the course of last 53 years of our independent life, we lost Father of our Nation through violent assassination. Further, we can cite the number of wars that we fought with our neighbour in 1948, 1965, 1971 and 1999 not to mention the low intensity war that has continued to ravage Kashmir during last 12 years claiming some thousands of victims. Going down the memory lane we would find that six of Asia's most prominent Women leaders lost their father or husband through violence. Chandrika Kumartung of Sri Lanka, Shaikh Hasina and Khaleda Zia of Bangladesh, Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan, Sonia Gandhi and Aung San Suu Kyi of Burma (Myanmar). Their grievous loss affects all the countries of South Asia.

Thirdly, barring sub-saharan Africa, South Asia remains the poorest, with a high number of illiterate people and extremely low level of health. With high level of expenditure on defence South Asia spends less on health and education. Fourthly, apart from riots and violent upheavals South Asia is adversely affected by terrorist activities. The LTTE in Sri Lanka, Maoist Guerillas in Nepal, terrorism in Kashmir, periodic

upheaval in North East as well Assam, People's War group in Andhra Pradesh – are examples of violent deeds recurring and posing a grave challenge to peace and amity of South Asia. Explosion of nuclear device in India and Pakistan had produced a profound impact on the peace and security of South Asia.

To this perilous situation has been added the policy of religions extremism and fundamentalism that produced communal hatred and religious divide that threatened the very fabric of the Indian nation threatening its secular ethos and the process of nation-building. I may add that, the UN has designated the first decade of the century as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence.

Policies leading to confrontation and conflicts have taken a heavy toll in terms of economic stagnation, rising mountains of debt, unemployment, deprivation and destitution for a large number of people and poor prospects for the future of the region.

In an atmosphere that is so highly surcharged with violence, where violence begets violence, retribution and revenge rule the minds of governments, how can one talk of peace and, more so, of building a Culture of Peace? We are so much used to violence that it is difficult to disabuse our minds from its stereotyped mystique.

Notwithstanding the surrounding aura of violence, the long term interests, advantage and benefits of peace cannot be easily dismissed away. It is often said that there never was a good war or a bad peace. There are enough examples to prove and show how peace and prosperity go together. Neither Japan nor Germany has spent much on defence and they have registered a remarkable economic growth in the post-war years. The European union and along with it several European nations have successfully banished war particularly through the Helsinki Agreements signed in 1975. These wide ranging agreements clearly commit the signatory states not to change state boundaries through violence – a far-reaching step in the direction of a warless world.

Peace and security are the crying needs of the hour, not only for South Asia but for the entire world. They appear to be the best organizing principles of International Relations as also of future – a better and more livable future. As Gandhi said, life can only be understood backwards but it must be lived forwards. We need not be the prisoners of the past but think new and big for the future. We have to change our mindsets and jettison the baggage of the past.

Peace and security, both as values and concepts, belong to the discipline of International Relations that has gained its importance especially during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This is not to deny that the studies in diplomacy, foreign policies, wars, international law, treaties and alliances that continued to engage the minds of historians and social scientists all throughout modern times.

The first and the second World Wars, the rise of the League of Nations during 1919-1939 and subsequent birth and expansion of the United Nations underlined increasing inter-dependence as well as the concern for peace. Statements and public alternates like "Peace is indivisible" as also "freedom is indivisible" brought out new awakening and understanding of world affairs.

In spite of mankind's deep and lasting desire for peace, the history of the world is full of conflicts, confrontations and wars. Indeed, one could say with considerable justification that wars have played a decisive role in moulding history, changing the boundaries of states as also giving birth to new nations. Indeed, even a cursory examination of works on international law would show that the Law of Wars occupies a larger space than the Law of Peace. Short of winning a lasting peace, continuing occurrence of wars has left the only option of regulating, controlling and humanizing them, though without total success. Hence the greater attention bestowed upon the Law of War.

Study of International Relations as a discipline grew after the end of the Second World War that coincided with the emergence of the United

States as a world power. The war dealt a severe blow to Europe as well as European empires and ushered in a new era of world politics.

The new emergent reality called for an all embracing study that took into account. It was in response to this new emergent reality that International Relations as a subject of study and research began to grow, especially in the United States. This, in no small measure was due to the arrival of European Scholars like Hans. J. Morgenthau, Nicholas Spykman, Arnold Wolfers, Robert Straus – Hupe and Henry Kissinger bringing with them intellectual traditions of Europe. Thereby enriching American scholarship in the subject that had started with the Anglo-Saxon authors like E.H. Carr, Alfred Zimmern, Martin Wight and Hedley Bull.

Varieties of approaches developed in the study of International Relations but they can be categorized broadly in two respects, namely, realistic and idealistic. The realists emphasized the concept of power as the motivating factor in all international dealings. The most seminal work in this regard being that of Hans J. Morgenthau whose *Politics Among Nations* turned out to be a classic with world wide appeal among the scholars of the subject. For Morgenthau all political communities are concerned in one way or another with power – acquiring, consolidating or expanding power, projecting an image of power to preserve it, balancing power for security or accommodating to the power of another political community.

Such a power based approach *ipso facto* leads to the concept of international anarchy wherein each state is law unto itself looking after its own interest following no norms or the ones that are convenient and therefore acceptable to itself. There is no effective authority in the international realm and the system, if any, is highly decentralized.

David Easton, a well known political scientist admits, “decisions and actions performed by international systems rely for their acceptance on accord with the perceived self-interest of the participating members among whom the impact of a sense of legitimacy is still extremely low”.

There is a crucial difference between the national societies in which law and power are well centralized, established and accepted and the international system in which they are decentralized, each state, by and large, free to decide the norms it is going to follow. It has been aptly called a polyarchic system in which conflicts are prosecuted and resolved on the basis of *ad hoc* power plays.

As against the *realpolitik* of the realists the idealist school of thought, though in a minority, has been gaining ground especially in view of the destructive potential of the new weapons of mass destruction, the spread of democratic impulse and growing revulsion against violence.

Taking an overall view of the developing subject of International Relations, Quincy Wright suggests four categories of approach for the evolving study of International Relations. (1) the *actual* i.e. what was or what is through description. (2) the *possible*, what can be known through the method of theoretical speculation. (3) the *probable*, what will be known through the method of prediction. (4) the *desirable*, what ought to be known through the method of ethical, valuational or normative reflection. These four categories relate to history, art, science and philosophy. Thus international theory has descriptive, speculative, explanatory, predictive and normative components for a full and proper understanding of the subject.

In the course of last few years International Relations has undergone a profound change due to the rise of non-state actors, growth and impact of international organisations, an immense increase in trans-national transactions and a pronounced emphasis on interdependence. It has been aptly called an age of “turbulence”. There has been more than a three fold increase in the membership of the United Nations – from 51 in 1945 to 189 today, along with vast asymmetries and disparities in their political, military, technological and economic capabilities.

Those new trends necessitate a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of International Relations synthesizing insight from various disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, economics, history etc. And, yet the



sheer complexity of International relations, the speed with which multifarious events take place in the world hardly enable the student of International Relations to fully fathom the mounting array of developments. For example, no body could predict the end of the Cold War and the subsequent disintegration of the Soviet Union and other consequences that followed. No doubt, post facto analysis did provide a few insights into such momentous developments. Was it the massive expenditure on defence that brought about the collapse of the Soviet Union? Or, was it in-built in the communist structure with great emphasis on centralization of power and decision-making? Or, alternatively was it on account of the exposure of the Soviet Society to the onslaught of information waves from the West? All these may provide reasons for such a weighty development.

There is no doubt that the two world wars had a major impact on the development of international relations theory. If the period between 1919-1939 gave rise to utopian theory, the realist school arose after the Second World War. If the end of the Cold War was unexpected, how is one to characterise the post Cold War years of the 1990s?

Throughout the 1990s, the world appears very different from that of the Cold War era when the bipolarity between the two super powers – the USA and the USSR – ideologically and militarily pitted against each other with their military alliance systems, appeared somewhat simple. The end of the Cold War should have led to a world of peace. “But today the world is not at peace so much as a world in search of peace. It has been not a world of interstate war, but a world increasingly burdened with intrastate conflict and turmoil, pervasive ethnic and religious conflict and humanitarian crises, failed states torn apart by civil warfare.... the dangers of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Today on five continents, some three dozen such conflicts fester and raise difficult security problems for the international community”<sup>1</sup>..... “For a half-century of Cold War struggle the USA viewed the world

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Institute of Peace, *Passing the Baton – Challenges of Statecraft for the New Administration*, p.15-16, 2002.

largely through a zero-sum prism. We advance, they retreat. We retreat, they advance. Today zero-sum increasingly must give way to win-win.”<sup>2</sup>

- 1) USA – Pre-eminent world power or lone Super power – world’s unchallenged military economic and political power. With responsibility to serve as a “catalyst of coalitions, a broker of peace, a guarantor of global financial stability”.
- 2) Cold War is over – yet local conflicts can have global consequences.
- 3) Security – old threats plus new dangers; Proliferating weapons technologies and porous national boundaries, transnational crime and terrorism.  
Need to integrate economic and security policies
- 4) Two to three dozen intrastate conflicts involving ethnicity, religion and identity.
- 5) Concept of Sovereignty – Governments no longer have the exclusive powers they once held – many new actors and factors challenging traditional government domination.
- 6) New actors, new forces – Bottom up rather than top down – non-political strategic, non-violent means – grassroots organizations.
- 7) (a) Hard and (b) Soft power  
(a) Military and cohesive alliances  
(b) Non-government institutions – promoting American values – knowledge – public/private – partnerships – Total spectrum of policy Instruments.

Historians and Political Scientists learn a great deal from past history and divide history in terms of periods and centuries. Recently, an historian named Eric Hobsbawm has written the history of 20<sup>th</sup> century and aptly called it *The Age of the Extremes*. The interesting thing about the publication is that for him the 20<sup>th</sup> century began in 1914 when the first world war was started and ended in the year 1991 with the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War, including dissolution of the Warsaw Pact,

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p.18.

disintegration of the Soviet Union and the beginning of liberal economics in Russia and Eastern Europe.

If he were to write his history after September 11, 2001 he would perhaps have changed his mind and extended 20<sup>th</sup> century till that date. In any case, the event has been called the first war of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It was a defining moment of history for two obvious and universally acknowledged reasons. For the first time, after 1812, USA suffered an attack, and that too, on the centres of its economic power in New York and its military centre in Washington during day time, its invincible military power notwithstanding. The nature and the extent of attack unnerved the U.S. state, its military establishment as well as the economic system driving a universal sense of fear among the people.

Indeed, a new era of warfare and attack by non-state actors had started, with no place to hide. The modern nation-state had come into being with the treaty of Westphalia in 1648 after thirty years religious wars (1618-1648). From now on, the state had the monopoly of violence and the wars that took place were between nation-states. Since that time the nature of warfare has undergone different phases. For quite some time wars continued to be fought among the nation-states, the period called the classic nation state war that continued upto the end of the Napoleonic War (1815). The next phase was that of the industrial wars beginning with the American Civil War (1861-1865) till the beginning of the first World War (1914-1918). The third phase was of manoeuvre war that included infiltration tactics and blitzkrieg that emerged after the first world war.

The fourth phase marks a profound and fundamental change in the nature of warfare "It pits nations against non-national organizations and networks that include not only fundamentalist, extremists but ethnic groups, mafias and narco-traffickers as well. Its evolutionary roots may lie in guerrilla warfare... but it is rendered more pervasive and effective by the technologies, mobilities and miniaturised instrumentalities spawned by the age of computers and mass communication - It allows

the politically weak to circumvent the capacity of the state to protect itself through the use of conventional military means".

In such a warfare the enemy is elusive and without any location or address. The quality or the nature of attack, its place and timing are unpredictable and yet universal. There is no sanctuary, no safety, no durable peace. There is a fear of the unknown.

In the words of Dr. Chester Richards, a retired U.S. Air Force Colonel, "The distinction between war and peace(is) blurred to the vanishing point. No longer are there definable battlefields or fronts. Indeed, the distinction between civilian and military ceases to exist".

"The ubiquity and the ambiguity of fourth generation warfare will require dramatic changes in military capabilities as well as how states think about national security... the sanctuary of national sovereignty is no longer sacrosanct, can no longer be honoured when employed as a façade for sheltering, endorsing and provisioning non-national fourth generation warfare assets and formations."<sup>3</sup>

The events of September 11 in the USA and December 13 in India have proved that no place is beyond the reach of these fanatics. The real message of these tragedies is that we live in an interdependent world where no territory, however rich and powerful, can insulate itself from catastrophe. As Mahbub-ul-Haq mentioned at SID International Congress in Mexico in 1994: "An island of wealth and prosperity cannot survive in an ocean of poverty and deprivation."

The crisis that resulted from such attacks can best be met by justice, not revenge, by the pursuit of peace, not the waging of war in which many more innocent victims would suffer. There is, in fact, no purely military solution to the kind of acts that have rocked the world.

<sup>3</sup>Harold A. Gould and Franklin C. Spinney, "Fourth Generational Warfare", *The Hindu*, Oct.9, 2001.

Through the choice of their targets, namely, the citadels of financial and military power, the terrorists have questioned the neo-liberal, corporate globalization and the need to eliminate economic and political injustice, tribal/ethnic hatreds and fear and expose the mystique of violence... We must link our existing and common demands on new-liberal globalization to an agenda that includes a clear voice against militarization and imperialism and proclaiming peace, cultural and religious freedom and self-determination.

The new kinds of war cannot be ended through military means. There are no easy answers, but the only possible approaches are political; to counter the strategy of sowing fear and hatred with a strategy of winning hearts and minds; to reconstruct a global legitimacy as an alternative to fundamentalism and exclusivism.

The manner in which the war has been waged leave no doubt that it was not so much the question of justice for the victims of the September 11 tragedy but the reassertion and reconsolidation of U.S. hegemony and invincibility perceived to have been challenged, if not threatened, by the September 11, incident, the pursuance of interest of the global military industrial complex, and the reorientation of International politics and strategic alliances.<sup>4</sup>

The question is about the ways to meet the new challenge that the nation state is facing. Since the danger is global it requires short terms as well as long term, well-thought out strategy that would cover military as well as non-military means. In the first place there should be a thoroughly well-designed intelligence system equipped with the latest technology.

Blind, reckless force may not only fail to produce results but may generate vigorous outbursts of retaliation. It may defeat its own purpose. Along with the employment of hardware, we will have to plan software means of social development such as alleviation of poverty, safeguarding

<sup>4</sup> "Reactions from the SID Network", Bridges, Newsletter, SID, Oct., 2001.

human rights, renewal of the facing of alienation, deep sense of injustice born out of exploitation and exercise of double standards.

It is out of these downtrodden material that the recruits for terrorism are enlisted. For them life is so cheap that suicide on behalf of the cause is a triumph instead of a tragedy. Only when their conditions are more worth living than dying that the new warfare can be eradicated.

If the above analysis makes sense, pointing out the roots of terrorism, then several of the Islamic countries out of 56 (their total world population being one billion) suffer from several of the evils mentioned above. Apart from huge disparities, the majority of people are illiterate lacking exposure to modern life including its amenities. Added to them are the age old traditional education systems that are completely dysfunctional for the modern times. Added to that is the domination of outside power who, in league with the small, top elite, is exploiting the resources and deriving huge profits out of them. Whenever such powers' easy access to the raw material, such as oil or gas, is threatened they resort to war and subdue all opposition. The Gulf war is an instance that eminently illustrates the pattern of hegemonic power.

**Death Tolls of Largest Armed Conflicts Since 1945<sup>1</sup>**

<i>Conflict</i>	<i>Time Period</i>	<i>Number Killed</i>	<i>Civilian Victims (%)</i>
Chinese civil war	1946-50	1,000,000	50
Korea	1950-53	3,000,000	50
Vietnam (U.S. intervention)	1960-75	2,358,000	58
Cambodian civil war	1970-89	1,221,000	69
Bangladesh succession	1971	1,000,000	50
Afghanistan (Soviet intervention)	1978-92	1,500,000	67
Mozambican civil war	1981-94	1,050,000	95
Sudanese civil war	1984 onward	1,500,000 <sup>2</sup>	97

<sup>1</sup> Conflicts that killed 1 million persons or more

<sup>2</sup> Numbers upto 1995 only.

Source: Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditure 1996*, (Washington, DC: World Priorities, 1996).



When we talk of peace we often think of the time when there is no war. In fact, peace is an interlude when wars are not taking. But such an attitude talks of "what peace is not" (negative peace) rather than "what peace is" (positive peace).

For Johan Galtung, a renowned pioneer of peace research, peace is not the opposite of war but rather the opposite of violence. This logically leads us to a comprehensive understanding of the concept of violence. Here too, violence is often equated with physical assault and injury meaning direct violence. Such violence is actor-oriented, visible and when practised on a vast scale stands for war which is institutionalized violence. Since the states have a monopoly of violence, wars are conducted by the states as a legitimate exercise of violence. But such violence is often practised at societal level such as violence on women, on lower strata of society or, at times, on minorities. Such direct violence results in physical injury leading, at times, to death.

But violence is exercised in numerous fashions and visible only to sensitive eyes. Such a violence is rooted in the structure of society and aptly called structural violence. Its roots are to be found in the inequality, inequity, deprivation, denial of basic needs and suppression of human rights. Gandhi seemed to be aware of such violence when he said that all exploitation was violence.

Properly viewed and fully understood, structural violence is widely practised and highly ominous. Every act or policy of exploitation – in terms of inhuman treatment, oppressive policies, denial of human rights, non-payment of dues such as minimum wages, corruption and such other evil practices can be subsumed under it. It is operative from the local to the global, the North-South exploitative nexus being an obvious instance of it.

Over and above the direct and indirect types of violence, there is cultural violence that inculcates justification for the use of violence. Cultural violence provides legitimacy to the exercise of violence.

Since peace is the opposite of violence, a broad, comprehensive view of violence would ipso facto provide an equally broad-based definition of peace. Peace is an alternative vision of life where all the three types of violence are ruled out. A negative view of peace would mean absence of violence but its positive version, would entail the presence of justice, harmony, equity, human rights, including gender justice and ecological balance.

The Nairobi Forward Looking Strategies document from the Third World Conference on Women in 1985, cites, "Peace includes not only the absence of war, violence and hostilities at the national and international levels, but also the enjoyment of economic and social justice, equality and entire range of human rights and fundamental freedoms within society".

Both negative and positive peace are realized only if all the three types of violence are completely eliminated. Any external factor interfering with the normal growth, functioning and survival of a living organism can be broadly defined as violence. Violence and Peace could be juxtaposed as below.

	Violence	Peace (four basic needs)
Direct Violence	1) Violence (Holocaust) 2) Repression (Human Rights)	Survival
Structural Violence	1) Misery (Silent Death) 2) Alienation (Spiritual Death)	Welfare Identity

Peace is a situation where the four basic needs are properly met. If any one is threatened peace is destroyed. Viewed as a concept and a highly prized value, peace is full of rich meaning, many-splendoured, normative goal. Gandhi rightly suggested that unless all the prerequisites and the ingredients that make for peace are realised, there cannot be a real genuine peace. Peace stands for the fullest fulfilment of human life, a life that stands for liberation and emancipation.



This may sound as a perfectionist picture of human society, a dream, nay, a utopia. But humankind needs utopias and dreams as their goals. They provide the vision that makes human life meaningful and efforts towards their fulfilment make life worth living. A society that lacks vision is a rudderless world without a goal or a destination.

The journey or transition from violence to peace is the main core subject of peace research. The fundamental task is to find out causes of violence and suggest the conditions of peace. Full understanding of violence, in all its varied manifestations, alone can enable us to remove it and replace it with peace and usher in a peaceful society. In other words, one has to understand the present day peacelessness for bringing about a peaceful world.

Though peace, as a goal, has engaged the minds of people from time immemorial, peace as a subject of systematic study gathered weight only after the Second World War. The most pressing and obvious reason for its emergence was the advent of the weapons of mass destruction. For the first time, man's capacity for violence reached its climax. Never before in human history so few people had acquired so much destructive power, an overkill capacity, enough to destroy the globe perhaps 30 times over.

Research activity for peace presupposes sensitization of the researchers' mind. In our study for peace we cannot remain content with research. Peace research is intimately and closely connected with peace education and peace action. Here, Gandhi emerges as a great educator of peace and equally prominent activist for peace. All the three aspects of peace are vitally and indissolubly synthesized in Gandhi's personality, life and action.

Peace education may appear to resemble international relations but it differs from it in many vital respects. International relations are built around the nation-state, its external policies and its interactions with other states ranging from peace and cooperation to conflicts. Peace research may study the nation-state, but its canvas embraces the whole world. If international relations concentrate on the interest of the nation

state, peace research aims at the overall good of the world. If international relations are analytical and descriptive, peace research is diagnostic as well as prescriptive. Its objective is to explore the ways through which peace may prevail in the whole world. Like freedom, peace is indivisible and has to be realised universally. In short, peace research is value-based having a normative vision of the future of the world. If international relations deal with "what is", peace research is concerned with "what ought to be". Again, if international relations are studied chiefly as a branch of Political Science, peace research is multidisciplinary and relies on social sciences, psychology, anthropology and other subjects so as to gain insight into the working of the human mind in all its multifarious ways. Peace research is critical of the past and projects desirable future that is free from animus and wars. Since it is concerned with the entire human kind, it is global in its range, holistic in its outlook and deals with all humans and the whole of his/her personality. No doubt, this is a tall order and highly challenging in its import and significance.

Since peace research is futuristic, it has to address the major issues and questions that lie at the root of present day state of peacelessness. Its first task would be to minimise, if not completely eradicate, violence from our life. Here the first priority should be the elimination of nuclear weapons that pose a grave threat to the survival of the world. As John Kennedy observed, the world has to choose between co-extinction and co-existence.

This weapon of mass destruction poses a serious threat to our right to life, the foremost fundamental right of every living person on the earth. Equally important is the right to peace that is to be universally respected. It has been rightly said that the best use of the nuclear weapon is never to use it. A nuclear war obliterates all distinctions between the victor and the vanquished. Indeed, as Krushchev said, "In a nuclear war, the living would envy the dead". Possession and continuation of such weapons are a crime against the entire humanity. It is immoral, iniquitous, unjust and anti-people and therefore oppressive and undemocratic. The International

Court of Justice have also pronounced, in no uncertain terms, its outright opposition to the use of these weapons except in very exceptional times.

Securing peace has always remained the prime concern of the state. Maintenance of law and order, stability, peace and security are the elementary duties and tasks of all states, irrespective of the differences of ideology. The state lies at the core of all aspects of security. On the other hand, insecurity is always linked to the weaknesses, the shortcomings, even the momentary disappearance, of the state. The term security is primarily associated with the state and any threat to the state is *ipso facto* a threat to the people of the state. In short, the term security is not only state-centric but usually deemed to be militaristic in nature. The security of the state is to be defended through military preparations, including, in the last resort, through war. "Political independence" and "territorial integrity" of the state are the usual terms associated with the concept of security and that, too, with military defence.

Recent times have witnessed a wider and more comprehensive views of security. Instead of viewing it as state-centric, the new concept conceives it in terms of the security of the people and civil society. Broadly speaking, the realist school of thought views security in military terms, as a matter of defending the territory of the state. The idealists, on the other hand, subsume it under peace.

Threats to security may arise not merely through military challenge but also through various other ways such as destitution, deprivation, malnutrition and unjust social order. Structural violence often causes more deaths than direct violence caused by military attacks. 40,000 children die every day in the underdeveloped world because of lack of nutrition and poverty. That comes to 1,20,000 every three days. This is equivalent to Hiroshima that silently takes place every three days.

Military defence and deterrence may not be adequate for security in the sense that the state can prevent a war through imaginative handling of diplomacy and negotiation. An active peace policy may go a long way in ensuring security. Security is not a static concept nor can it be achieved

through more preservation of status quo. Threats to security may arise from other potential dangers to survival and well-being. The dangers we face today are of varied nature and so complex that no one discipline can adequately treat them. Equally importantly no single state, however powerful, can have the capacity to solve them. Johan Galtung aptly states that, "the dialogue over peace must remain open-ended. No culture or no discipline can have any monopoly of how to conceive of peace".

#### Selected Humanitarian, Human Rights, and Arms Control Treaties of the Twentieth Century

<i>Humanitarian/Laws of War</i>	<i>Human Rights</i>	<i>Arms Control/Disarmament</i>
1907 Hague Conventions	1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights	1959 Antarctic Treaty
1925 Protocol Prohibiting Use of Poison Gas	1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees	1967 Outer Space Treaty
1929 Geneva Conventions	1966 Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights	1969/1995 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
1948 Genocide Convention	1966 Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	1971 Seabed Treaty
1949 Geneva Convention	1984 Anti-Torture Convention	1972 Biological Weapons Convention
1976 Environmental Modification Convention		1993 Chemical Weapons Convention
1977 Protocols Additional to 1949 Geneva Convention		1996 Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty
1980/1995 Inhumane Weapons Convention		1997 Anti-personnel Landmine Convention

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection Web Page, <http://www.un.org/Depts/Treaty/Overview.htm>, viewed 19 August 1998; Ian Browline, ed., *Basic Document on Human Rights* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1992); Director Flecht, ed., *The Handbook of Humanitarian Law in Armed Conflicts*, (New York: Oxford University press, 1995); "Multilaterals Project Chronological Index", <http://tufts.edu/fletcher/multi/chrono.html>, viewed 20 July, 1998.

In fact, security understood in a broad, comprehensive manner can serve as a sound organizing principle for the study of international relations just as realist school treats power as the governing principle of international politics.

In fact, there has been a "plethora of security studies" in recent years covering subjects such as offensive and defensive advantage on strategy, arms race, military innovation, deterrence and security cooperation as well as regional security. Indeed, we encounter a bifurcated environment that contains a state-centric as well as transtate paradigm. There is a large number of sub-state, non-state and transnational actors. Taken together they may create instability, disruption, armed conflicts and ungovernability. Impact, of new technology has also to be taken into consideration.

#### **Definitions of Security:**

The International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, convened by the United Nations General Assembly in New York from August 24 to September 11, 1987, adopted a definition of security that also encompasses non-military aspects. In its final document, which was adopted by consensus by the representatives from the 150 participating states, the conference stated, among other items:

"Security is an overriding priority for all nations. It is also fundamental for both disarmament and development. Security consists of not only military, but also political, economic, social, humanitarian and human rights and ecological aspects. Enhanced security can, on the one hand, create conditions conducive to disarmament and, on the other, provide the environment and confidence for the successful pursuit of development. The development process, by overcoming non-military threats to security and contributing to a more stable and sustainable international system, can enhance security and thereby promote arms reduction and disarmament. Disarmament would enhance

security both directly and indirectly. A process of disarmament that provides for undiminished security at progressively lower levels of armaments could allow additional resources to be devoted to addressing non-military challenges to security, and thus result in enhanced overall security."

Recently, non-military threats to security have moved to the forefront of global concern. Underdevelopment and declining prospects for development, as well as mismanagement and waste of resources, constitute challenges to security. The degradation of the environment presents a threat to sustainable development. The world can hardly be regarded as secure so long as there is polarization of wealth and poverty at the national and international levels. Gross and systematic violations of human rights retard genuine socio-economic development and create tensions which contribute to instability. Mass poverty, illiteracy, disease, squalor and malnutrition afflicting a large proportion of the world's population often become the cause of social strain, tension and strife.

The meeting of a group of experts on non-military aspects of security in Tashkent in May 1990 used the following operational definition of security:

Security is a condition in which states consider that there is no danger of military attack, political pressure or economic coercion, so that they are able to pursue freely their own development and progress.

The security of individuals and communities of which states are constituted is ensured by the guarantee and effective exercise of individual freedom, political, social and economic rights, as well as by the preservation or restoration of a livable environment for present and future generations. Security also implies that essential human needs, notably in the field of nutrition, education, housing and public health are ensured on a permanent basis. An adequate protection against dangers to security should also be maintained. The ways and means to attain security may be defined in national, intergovernmental, non-governmental or global terms.



Security has two aspects: (1) the absence of objective dangers, whether or not they are recognized, and (2) the absence of subjective fears, whether or not they are justified. Which of the two is more important? Arguments for both viewpoints can be made. Ignorance or denial of dangers does not provide security. For example, if a government denies the existence of a danger like the greenhouse effect, that does not mean that the country faces no danger. Nor does a claim of a non-existent threat of aggression, sometimes deliberately invented or at least exaggerated – to justify military expenditures, expose a country to real dangers, even if they may be under- or over-estimated. Therefore, both perceived and actual dangers, as formulated by the above definition of security, need to be examined. A nation's conception of its security largely depends upon its own experience. A nation that has suffered repeated invasions may think of it in defensive terms. A country that suffered internal problems may assign priority to domestic situation. There is an evolutionary spiral to the concept of security in that it continues to grow or expand with changing times. What is proper and adequate today may not be so tomorrow.

The new concept of human security centres round the quality of life and not on the destructive power of the weapons the community possesses. According to Mahbub Ul Haq such a security requires five steps:

- 1) A mode of development which enhances human life and regards GNP growth as a means, distributes income equitably, takes care of the natural resources and ensures people's participation as well as equity in opportunities.
- 2) We have to move from Arm's Security to Human Security. There should be a social agenda for humankind. The developing countries should be asked why they (a) spend three times more for arms rather than on Health and Education (b) have 20 times more soldiers than doctors (c) airconditioned jeeps for soldiers when they lack school rooms for children. Simultaneously, the rich countries should close down military bases, convert military aid into economic aid, stop arms shipment worth \$35 billion a

year, stop subsidies to arms exporters and stop huge arms spending - \$ 130 billion a year.

- 3) There should be a new partnership between the North and the South on justice, equitable sharing of global market opportunities. Rich nations channelled 15% of their GNP to their 100 million people below poverty line i.e. \$ 5000 a year. The same nations earmarked only 0.3% of GNP for poor nations having 1.3 billion below poverty line with income level of \$ 300 per year. They should also remove trade barriers.
- 4) There should be a new human world order with global governance. The Bretton Woods institutions (IMF, World Bank etc.) have turned irrelevant. Today three-fourth of private capital goes to ten better off developing nations in East Asia and Latin America. There is a need for an Economic Security Council to deal with human security. It should represent all without veto.
- 5) There is a need to have and strengthen a global civil society. With the new millennium the future should rest not with the government alone but with people at the grassroots. In the words of Haq, "At a time of such a profound change in human affairs the North is choosing to become somewhat passive, cautious, conservative and almost reactionary."<sup>5</sup>

As the lone superpower of the world, USA has established its undisputed superiority in military might, political clout, technological know-how, cultural impact and economic preponderance. End of the Cold War and dissolution of the Soviet Union presented a rare and historic opportunity to the USA to come forward and forge a new world in cooperation with other states of the world. A multilateral approach through the United Nations and its various agencies could have paved the way for a better and more livable world. Woodrow Wilson after the first world war and

<sup>5</sup> Mahbub Ul Haq, "Toward a Better Social Order", *The Economic Times*, 27-03-1995.



Franklin Roosevelt at the end of the second world war exercised imaginative leadership in shaping the new world order.

Instead of utilizing the golden opportunity in the best interest of the world, the USA has chosen the unilateral path, sidetracking the United Nations, including non-payment of dues, and going back on the international commitments it had entered into in the past. By refusing to support Kyoto Agreement, USA has upset the international agreement on climate control, a very vital agreement in the interest of the entire world.

US decision to devise National Missile Defence (NMD) thereby carrying weapons into the space and to abrogate the Anti Ballistic Missile treaty of 1972 are a great threat to peace and likely to lead to an arms race endangering the prospects for peace. US is likely to spend \$10.5 billion for NMD. It will change the strategic stability and alter the security environment of the world and have a negative impact on the process of disarmament.

After September 11, 2001 the USA has launched a war against "global terrorism", a war that may continue for an indefinite time and may be fought in different regions and states of the world, the US arrogating to itself full freedom to strike or invade any part of the world. USA has cited article 51 of the UN Charter that enables a state to act in self defence. Since terrorism is an elusive phenomenon USA has acquired a right to defy international law and regulations that would govern use of force. Thus US armed presence turns out to be global. Behind such exercise of force may lurk designs to dominate and exploit resources in different parts of the earth.

It was Clausewitz who said that war is a continuation of politics by other means. But nuclear weapon can hardly be treated as an instrument of war to serve a political objective. "Nuclear wars are not meant to be fought, especially when both the nuclear powers are neighbours (India and Pakistan). The nukes are for negotiations, they are not weapons of war. Pakistan has a professional armed force and they realize that in case they

do resort to a strike, there will be a retaliation. It would be lunacy for them to start one. In a nuclear strike, there are no winners."<sup>6</sup>

As a nuclear state Pakistan has achieved parity, in conventional military power with India. At the same time, it has used it to escalate its low intensity conflict against India. Geographical proximity of two nuclear powers and the high tension between them have generated great amount of fear and anxiety among the international community.

Nuclear weapons are political weapons of deterrence and could be used, if at all, only in the extreme cases involving threat's to core national interests such as the territorial integrity of the state. Acquisition of nuclear weapon by India and Pakistan has generated great amount of fear and anxiety in the International World chiefly because of their long standing animus, continued bloodshed on the line of control resulting in high loss of life (20,000) and an atmosphere of tension, confrontation and sanguinary leadership on both sides. It is estimated that India has plutonium for between 55 and 110 bombs whereas Pakistan has enriched uranium that may produce 20-40 bombs.

The most forbidding aspect of the situation is that the adversaries have a common border with dense populations. Their missiles can reach the other's territory within seconds leaving little time for warning or preparation, unlike in the case of USA and the USSR whose missiles would take 30 minutes to reach their targets. Nor do they have confidence building contacts that the superpowers had built up during the Cold War.

However, there is saving grace even in the scenario of despondency. During the Lahore Summit of February 1999 both the countries signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to adopt measures for promoting a stable environment of peace, stability and security between the two countries.

<sup>6</sup> Admiral Sushil Kumar, "Interview of the Week", *Indian Express*, 6-01-2002.

Unfortunately the Kargil conflict prevented translation of it into a confidence building measure though we need not forget earlier measures that were thoughtfully taken in the past. For example, Rajiv Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto signed the Agreement on the Prohibition of Attack Against Nuclear Installations and Facilities in December 31, 1988 that came into force on January 27, 1991. Agreements have also been signed on advance notification of military exercises, prevention of airspace violations and prohibition of chemical weapons.

But what is really crucial and vital is to convert Lahore MOU into a treaty containing communication, constraint, transparency and verification measures. A treaty for nuclear and missile conflict management would be a highly significant move towards confidence building process. Such a treaty would go a long way in assuaging the feeling of fear about a nuclear holocaust. A cooperative monitoring regime would enhance stability along the border. It would go a long way in ensuring peace in South Asia.

Again, as per the agreement of 1998, the countries are required to inform each other on January 1 of every year about each others' nuclear installations and facilities. Despite the tension and troop build-up along the borders, India and Pakistan have exchanged lists of nuclear installations and facilities covered under the bilateral agreement. This was done on Tuesday, January 1, 2002 (*Times of India*, 2-1-2002). Pakistan foreign minister Abdul Sattar said that Pakistan had not made any change to previous list as it had not built any additional nuclear installations.

Among several reasons that would explain the perpetuation of armed conflicts, the one that is most crucial is the presence and prevalence of military-industrial complex. There is a lasting nexus between the arms industry, and the defence establishment, both having a vested interest in each other.

Not surprisingly, there is a "security exception" in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This allows Government to

provide subsidies to private arms manufactures and also allow collaboration with foreign weapons companies. There is a distinct bias with enabling provisions for the promotion of the arms industry and trade. Arms manufacturers are deriving special promotion and benefits from the WTO.

A highly significant provision – Article XXI of the GATT, the main treaty under which WTO states function, states that a country cannot be prevented from taking action regarding traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war thus providing a blanket exception for military spending.

The free market in arms prevent governments from taking necessary steps for the welfare of the people such as education, health and environmental measures. At the same time, it supports military spending, trade in weapons and arms race. In the views of Ninan Koshy, "Arms corporations derive a double benefit from the WTO system – profit from the elimination of environment, health and labour standards.... By providing a special place for the war industry.... (it) actually promotes government military spending and militarization of the economy. This may lead to massive shifting of priorities and development of resources at the cost of social justice and human development... subsidy for agriculture and policies of social welfare will be challenged."<sup>7</sup>

In 1997 world spent \$842 billion on defence – did it guarantee security? Between 1989-1998, 61 major armed conflicts occurred with massive devastation, one million killed, of which 50 per cent were civilians, 65 million displaced, innumerable injured, property and infrastructure worth billions of dollars destroyed. "But if combatants started negotiating with each other, arms manufacturers, dealers, and middlemen would all go out of business."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Ninan Koshy, "India and WTO's Security Exception", *The Hindu*, 17-05-2001.

<sup>8</sup> Sonia, Jabbar, Insecurity Council, "Money Makes the War Go Round", *Times of India*, May 25, 2001.

Legal trade in arms in 1997 was worth \$55 billion. Five permanent members of the Security Council are among the top eight arms exporting nations, the USA leads the pack, hogging 55 per cent market-share. The Tehelka expose provided a mere glimpse of the nexus-politician, arms manufacturer and the key military personnel. In USA during 1995-96 elections 25 leading arms exporters donated a record \$10.8 million in campaign funds mainly to the Republican party. In the 1990, USA supplied billions of dollars worth of arms to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates to deter attack from Iraq and Iran... Iran getting arms from Russia and China. Saudi Arabia spent \$9 billion between 1985 and 1989. The number one arms importing country between 1995 and 1997 buying weapons worth \$31.3 billion, mainly from the U.S. Top arms exporters... sell to traditional rivals – Greece and Turkey, Egypt and Israel, China and Taiwan. Pakistan is best customer of France buying arms worth \$390 million between 1995 and 1997 and yet the Kargil war had hardly ended before the French were flocking to Indian shores, defence contracts worth millions in hand! Huge illegal trade in weapons – most of them small arms. An estimated 500 million weapons are currently in circulation. Large number provided by USA and Soviet Union on account of Cold War. After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan the U.S. provided military assistance worth \$3 billion to the Mujahidin – Nearly the entire arsenal of the Kashmiri militants has its origins in the Afghan War.

“To resolve a conflict or at least scale down the levels of violence and civilian casualties, it is imperative that the world's largest arms producers and exporters be held accountable, forced to reduce and ultimately close down their death industries... we ought to stop and think: ultimately who is going to win: us, the enemy or the arms corporations?”

As we enter the 1990s, there is little doubt that with the profound changes in the East West relations and the breaking down of cold-war alignments, a new international security system has been emerging.

Commenting on the volatile nature of the emerging scenario, the Secretary General of the UN observed,

“The period we have entered is Janus-faced. It wears both the aspect of hope and the countenance of dangerous unrestraint. In one major segment of world affairs, we have witnessed political change of a phenomenal character. In large parts of the globe, however, the scene continues to be one of simmering resentments, violent collisions and at best a precarious peace. The question whether the more beneficial developments of 1989-90 will have a healthy impact on the totality of the world situation is still unanswered.”

Kenichi Ito, the President of the Japan Forum on International Relations, Tokyo, has characterised the post Cold War period with three logical developments.

- 1) ‘Cooperation’ would replace ‘confrontation’ as a guideline for the interaction of nations.
- 2) ‘Economic power’ would supersede ‘military power’ as a means of the power struggle among nations.
- 3) The concept of ‘peace without victory’ would prevail over that of ‘peace with victory’ as a framework for the order.

During the Cold War period of 1947 through 1989 international politics was motivated by the logic of “ideology-oriented diplomacy”. It is interesting to note that “national-interest-oriented diplomacy” had already evolved in the distant past. It was dominant in seventeenth century Europe after the religious wars of 1618 through 1648 and in 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe after the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars of 1791 through 1815.

However, the diplomacy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be different from that of 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries because of the drastic change in the international environment. The security environment has changed due to the overkill capabilities of the nuclear stockpile in the two super-powers’ arsenals



and the resultant phenomenon of nuclear stalemate. Economic interdependence is visible everywhere and business transactions are daily conducted in a borderless fashion. Physical environmental problems have also become global as indicated in the case of the global warming resulting from the so-called "greenhouse effect". As a result of all these changes, nations are already forced to cooperate with other nations to solve their mutual problems. As a matter of fact, no country in the modern world can maintain its peace, its prosperity or its environment without cooperation with other countries. Collective or common security, or both, are earnestly sought. Joint and coordinated efforts are an absolute requirement for the solution of environmental problems.

Thus, the concept of "national interest" in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is an unprecedented phenomenon. In the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, it took into consideration the narrow and direct interest of one nation alone as "classic national interest". However, we now find that we cannot solve problems of today and tomorrow; we find that we must contribute to the common interest and to the common cause of the international community as a whole. In doing so we find ourselves contributing to the solution of the problems of our own countries. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the type of "national interest" must be "enlightened national interest" which guides nations in accordance with the logic of "cooperation" and rejects that of "confrontation".

End of the Cold War could be called the Third World War. The war was fought between East and West and ended with victory for the West and defeat for the East. Old doctrines, old systems are being denounced. Democracy and freedom won. Despite the decisiveness of the result, the war was fought without a drop of bloodshed and without a bullet being shot. True, the USSR was economically weakened but it was still a formidable military power. The reason was that they understood that the days were different from earlier days when "military power" was almighty. Edward Lultwak in his article "From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics" in the Summer 1990 issue of *The National Interest* wrote, "For some decades now the dominant elites of the greatest powers have ceased to consider war as a practical solution for military confrontations

between them because non-nuclear fighting would only be inconclusively interrupted by the fear of nuclear war, while the latter is self-inhibiting". Perhaps, geo-economics is gaining ground and winning salience against geo-politics.

## Conclusion

In this brief outline I have tried to place before you the ideas of peace and security, their meaning and importance for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The 20<sup>th</sup> may stand out in terms of social progress and scientific, technological achievements. But it is marred by a harrowing record of violence and wars – killings that amounted to 75% of all such deaths in the recorded history since the days of the Roman Empire. The most gruesome part of such wars was in the percentage of civilian deaths. At the beginning of the century 90% of the deaths were confined to the soldiers. At the end of the century, 90% of the casualties were of the civilians.

With the onset of the weapon of mass destruction, the very survival of the human civilization has been at stake. The danger was not the deliberate use of such weapons but an accidental one that could not be easily ruled out. Psychologists opine that if a mistake is to take place sometime, that "sometime" may definitely occur some day. Miscalculation on the basis of wrong signal may ignite a nuclear holocaust. The end of the Cold War provided an opportunity for denuclearisation. The famous author of *The Fate of the Earth*, Jonathan Schell brought out *The Gift Time* (1998) giving an edge to this rare, historic moment.

In the first months of the new century USA took steps that encouraged an arms race. The US Senate rejected the CTBT and decided to upgrade the Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 for going ahead with the National Missile Defence i.e. carrying weapons in the space. The U.S. military expenditure increased by \$20 billion reaching new height of \$33 billion over the next six years. The U.S. military spending thus reached a level at the height of the Cold War.



The single most pressing issue before us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to move away from the "culture of violence and war" and rapidly develop a "culture of peace". The UN's International Court of Justice came out on July 8, 1996 declaring the use of nuclear weapons as illegal under International Law asking the nuclear weapons state to move towards nuclear disarmament.

It is time that we should demand that all nuclear weapons in every nuclear state be taken off alert status, thereby obviating the chance of accidental nuclear war. There should be an agreement for its proper implementation. This is the path to free the world from nuclear dangers.

As against such a discouraging picture, we have before us some shining examples of movements towards disarmament and peace. In 1986, the South Pacific including Australia, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea established a nuclear weapon-free zone with the Treaty of Rarotonga. In 1992 Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan agreed to surrender their nuclear arms to Russia for dismantling them. In 1993, South Africa dismantled the six nuclear bombs thus becoming the first state in the world to abolish a nuclear arsenal. In fact, the whole of Africa turned nuclear free when they signed the Treaty of Pelindaba in 1996. In the same fashion, the whole of South America by signing the Treaty of Tlateloleo in 1994 declared itself nuclear free.

Henry Stimson Centre in USA, the Canberra Commission (Australia) for the elimination of nuclear weapons, the Pugwash Conference and several Nobel Peace Prize winners combined to voice their anti-nuclear weapons views. In addition, some 63 active and retired military men from seventeen countries along with former President Jimmy Carter signed an appeal for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Ronald Reagan during his second term confessed that a nuclear war "cannot be won and never be fought".

If the end of the Cold War was a miracle, could we not conceive of such developments taking place? What was viewed as impossible and unachievable did happen and is now viewed as ordinary and even

mundane. The great intellectual error seems to be that we imagine the future solely in terms of the past. Perhaps the best way to support the cause of peace is to have faith that peace is possible.

Today, there are 28 countries that do not have an army, Costa Rica being the most prominent among them and having for a long time a University of Peace. Some 95% of countries do not have nuclear weapons. Are they feeling less secure than those who have such weapons? In fact, nuclear weapons hardly provide security. The question before us is: Are we feeling more secure than before? The irony is that we have purchased greater insecurity at a higher price. Justifying such weapons under the guise of the doctrine of deterrence hardly helps because it generates a competitive atmosphere of fear and counter fear, a balance of terror, leading to tension and arms race the poor countries could hardly afford.

What matters is the sense of priorities and a humane approach to governance. The central message of the 'Human Development Reports' published by the UNDP is to adopt people – centric approach to the socio-political ordering of societies, where people's aspirations are to be kept in view. The world needs welfare not warfare, less spending on defence and more expenditure towards sustainable development leading to a better quality of life. This can be assured through the proper harnessing of science and technology.

Voices in support of peace are gaining ground if we have the ears to listen. At the beginning of the last century the world had 200 NGOs; today we have 20,000 and quite a few having access to the United Nations. Quite a few nations (14 in all) have appointed Commissions on Reconciliation, South Africa having a lead over others by having one on Truth and Reconciliation with inspiration provided by Nelson Mandela. The misdeeds of the past were to be forgiven and transition to be affected from culture of violence to culture of conflict resolution. It was a "transformative peace process" unprecedented in our times. Rajmohan Gandhi has launched an NGO advocating Dialogue and Reconciliation thereby reviving the process of peace in South Asia. Instead of ruminating the past misdeeds, countries and communities are preparing

and looking forward to a better future and a peaceful life. Unfortunately in today's world, war makes news and peace goes unnoticed. Realization of its rich potential should dawn upon our minds.

Prospects of Peace have brightened on account of the awakening of women that has taken place in the course of last few years. World Conferences on women beginning with New Mexico (1975), Nairobi (1985) and Beijing (1995) have infused a new spirit that would certainly increase women's participation in public affairs including politics. Women are likely to throw their weight in favour of constructive aspects of life and support the cause of peace.

Along with the threat of war, violence and annihilation, the world is facing the environmental crisis. The world has destroyed 30% of the natural world since 1970 resulting in serious depletion of the forest, fresh water and marine system upon which human life depends.

At the same time disparities of income within and across nations have continued to increase. At present 20 per cent of the world's people living in industrialized world have 85 per cent of the world's income; the poorest 20 per cent of world's people have about 1 per cent. According to the U.N. Secretary General half of humanity i.e. three billion people live in poverty.

On the other hand, the richest 200 people of the world have income equivalent to 41 per cent of the world's people. Just 1 per cent of this income could be enough to finance universal primary education for the entire world. Corporate globalization is benefiting a few at the expense of the rest of the world. World peace needs globalization that would be beneficial to all.

It should be widely recognized that peace, in a large measure, depends upon having an inclusive vision of life that subsists and welcomes diversity and plurality of social life. As the world gets more interdependent there is a dire need for sustaining multi-cultural, multi-

ethnic and multi-religious life. Such an approach would provide equal opportunity to all and reinforce the secular foundations of our society.

We must also realize that, our lifestyle has led to consumerist ways. Our over-consumption of natural resources is robbing the earth of its none to unlimited carrying capacity. To this grim picture, we may add the burden of growing population. It has been calculated that if the world's population consume as much resources and energy as the industrialized nations, we would need resources of ten planet Earths. The future of the planet, and along with it, ours, is already poised in a delicate balance. Sustainable development has to be achieved if irreversible tendencies are to be checked. We have reached the crossroads where our choice will make or mar our future prospects.

As war begins in the mind of men, so peace also begins in our minds. The same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace. As humankind is responsible for the 20<sup>th</sup> century's culture of violence, war and environmental degradation, so we can create a culture of peace and social and economic justice based on a healthy and sustainable environment for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond. The beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century offers an opportunity for striking out new paths of peace and prosperity. We should not be found wanting in seizing such a rare moment of history.

The world is suffering from many problems. Since many of them are man made, they are avoidable and remediable. Broadly speaking, they can be categorised under four headings.

- 1) Violence, wars and holocaust
- 2) Poverty, hunger and destitution
- 3) Repression of liberties and human rights
- 4) Eco-disaster leading to environmental crisis, paucity of resources and pollution.

Peace, both as vision and as concept, embraces and covers all of them under its comprehensive range. It involves restructuring of society in terms of approach, attitude and behaviour, takes into its ambience macro,

meso and micro aspects – from general fashioning of global life to individual life style. Indeed, the potency and the potential of peace are far-reaching with revolutionary implications for our future. Gandhi's non-violence is no idle dream. It may serve as a compelling imperative for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture Series

- 1 Ramkrishna Mukherjee, *I.P. Desai and Sociology of India* (1986).
- 2 A.R. Desai, *Rural Development and Human Rights of the Agrarian Poor in Independent India* (1987).
- 3 Yogendra Singh, *Social Processes and Dimensions of Indian Nationalism* (1988).
- 4 M.S. Gore, *Social Movements and the Paradigm of Functional Analysis* (1989).
- 5 Rajni Kothari, *Social Policy, Development and Democracy* (1990).
- 6 A.M. Shah, *The Judicial and Sociological View of the Other Backward Classes* (1992).
- 7 Y.B. Damle, *Theory, Rhetoric and Social Reality* (1993).
- 8 Jan Breman, *Labour Nomads in South Gujarat* (1994).
- 9 Krishna Ahooja-Patel, *Towards a New Social Order in India* (1996).
- 10 Suma Chitnis, *The Crisis in Higher Education* (1997).
- 11 Krishna Kumar, *Education and Society in Post-Independence India - Looking Towards the Future* (1998).
- 12 D.L. Sheth, *Knowledge, Power and Action: Challenges Facing the Grassroots Movements for Alternative Development* (1999).
- 13 Victor S. D'Souza, *Indian Family at the Crossroads* (2000).
- 14 N.R. Sheth, *Reflections on Religion as Social Capital* (2001).

Published by Centre for Social Studies, South Gujarat University  
Campus, Surat - 395 007  
Price Rs.40/-

## **I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture: 15**

### **PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY**

**D.N. Pathak**

**CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES, SURAT  
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS, UDHNA MAGDALLA ROAD  
SURAT - 395 007**



## PREFACE

The Centre for Social Studies has created an endowment fund to honour late Prof. I.P. Desai, the founder-Director of the Centre. As part of the programme, we have instituted the I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture series. Prof. D.N. Pathak delivered the fifteenth lecture entitled 'Peace and Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century'. It gives us great pleasure to make this lecture available to a wider academic community.

We are grateful to Prof. D.N. Pathak for having readily responded to our invitation to deliver the lecture. I must thank my colleague Dr. Babasaheb Kazi for preparing the copy for the press.

Vidyut Joshi

August 2002  
Centre for Social Studies  
Surat - 395 007

## PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

D.N. Pathak

I feel highly honoured to have been invited to deliver the 15<sup>th</sup> I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture at the Centre which aptly commemorates and embodies the rich and valuable memories of Dr. I.P. Desai. I knew I.P., he was mostly known and called by his students, friends and admirers, as a Senior Social Scientist. Though senior to me I found him very courteous and kind and very friendly. He carried his learning and scholarship in a simple and unassuming way. He did pioneering work of teaching as well as research and left a rich legacy of study and selfless service. I heartily remember him and pay my respects to him.

If I am asked why I chose Peace and Security as my topic for today's presentation I can adduce four very cogent reasons for the choice. In the first place, we have had so much of violence in our midst that it is time we thought of reducing it in a big measure, if not completely eradicating it. Let us not forget that in the course of last 53 years of our independent life, we lost Father of our Nation through violent assassination. Further, we can cite the number of wars that we fought with our neighbour in 1948, 1965, 1971 and 1999 not to mention the low intensity war that has continued to ravage Kashmir during last 12 years claiming some thousands of victims. Going down the memory lane we would find that six of Asia's most prominent Women leaders lost their father or husband through violence. Chandrika Kumartung of Sri Lanka, Shaikh Hasina and Khaleda Zia of Bangladesh, Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan, Sonia Gandhi and Aung San Suu Kyi of Burma (Myanmar). Their grievous loss affects all the countries of South Asia.

Thirdly, barring sub-saharan Africa, South Asia remains the poorest, with a high number of illiterate people and extremely low level of health. With high level of expenditure on defence South Asia spends less on health and education. Fourthly, apart from riots and violent upheavals South Asia is adversely affected by terrorist activities. The LTTE in Sri Lanka, Maoist Guerillas in Nepal, terrorism in Kashmir, periodic

upheaval in North East as well Assam, People's War group in Andhra Pradesh – are examples of violent deeds recurring and posing a grave challenge to peace and amity of South Asia. Explosion of nuclear device in India and Pakistan had produced a profound impact on the peace and security of South Asia.

To this perilous situation has been added the policy of religions extremism and fundamentalism that produced communal hatred and religious divide that threatened the very fabric of the Indian nation threatening its secular ethos and the process of nation-building. I may add that, the UN has designated the first decade of the century as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence.

Policies leading to confrontation and conflicts have taken a heavy toll in terms of economic stagnation, rising mountains of debt, unemployment, deprivation and destitution for a large number of people and poor prospects for the future of the region.

In an atmosphere that is so highly surcharged with violence, where violence begets violence, retribution and revenge rule the minds of governments, how can one talk of peace and, more so, of building a Culture of Peace? We are so much used to violence that it is difficult to disabuse our minds from its stereotyped mystique.

Notwithstanding the surrounding aura of violence, the long term interests, advantage and benefits of peace cannot be easily dismissed away. It is often said that there never was a good war or a bad peace. There are enough examples to prove and show how peace and prosperity go together. Neither Japan nor Germany has spent much on defence and they have registered a remarkable economic growth in the post-war years. The European union and along with it several European nations have successfully banished war particularly through the Helsinki Agreements signed in 1975. These wide ranging agreements clearly commit the signatory states not to change state boundaries through violence – a far-reaching step in the direction of a warless world.

Peace and security are the crying needs of the hour, not only for South Asia but for the entire world. They appear to be the best organizing principles of International Relations as also of future – a better and more livable future. As Gandhi said, life can only be understood backwards but it must be lived forwards. We need not be the prisoners of the past but think new and big for the future. We have to change our mindsets and jettison the baggage of the past.

Peace and security, both as values and concepts, belong to the discipline of International Relations that has gained its importance especially during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This is not to deny that the studies in diplomacy, foreign policies, wars, international law, treaties and alliances that continued to engage the minds of historians and social scientists all throughout modern times.

The first and the second World Wars, the rise of the League of Nations during 1919-1939 and subsequent birth and expansion of the United Nations underlined increasing inter-dependence as well as the concern for peace. Statements and public alternates like "Peace is indivisible" as also "freedom is indivisible" brought out new awakening and understanding of world affairs.

In spite of mankind's deep and lasting desire for peace, the history of the world is full of conflicts, confrontations and wars. Indeed, one could say with considerable justification that wars have played a decisive role in moulding history, changing the boundaries of states as also giving birth to new nations. Indeed, even a cursory examination of works on international law would show that the Law of Wars occupies a larger space than the Law of Peace. Short of winning a lasting peace, continuing occurrence of wars has left the only option of regulating, controlling and humanizing them, though without total success. Hence the greater attention bestowed upon the Law of War.

Study of International Relations as a discipline grew after the end of the Second World War that coincided with the emergence of the United

States as a world power. The war dealt a severe blow to Europe as well as European empires and ushered in a new era of world politics.

The new emergent reality called for an all embracing study that took into account. It was in response to this new emergent reality that International Relations as a subject of study and research began to grow, especially in the United States. This, in no small measure was due to the arrival of European Scholars likes Hans. J. Morgenthau, Nicholas Spykman, Arnold Wolfers, Robert Straust – Hupe and Henry Kissinger bringing with them intellectual traditions of Europe. Thereby enriching American scholarship in the subject that had started with the Anglo-Saxon authors like E.H. Carr, Alfred Zimmern, Martin Wight and Hedley Bull.

Varieties of approaches developed in the study of International Relations but they can be categorized broadly in two respects, namely, realistic and idealistic. The realists emphasized the concept of power as the motivating factor in all international dealings. The most seminal work in this regard being that of Hans J. Morgenthau whose *Politics Among Nations* turned out to be a classic with world wide appeal among the scholars of the subject. For Morgenthau all political communities are concerned in one way or another with power – acquiring, consolidating or expanding power, projecting an image of power to preserve it, balancing power for security or accommodating to the power of another political community.

Such a power based approach *ipso facto* leads to the concept of international anarchy wherein each state is law unto itself looking after its own interest following no norms or the ones that are convenient and therefore acceptable to itself. There is no effective authority in the international realm and the system, if any, is highly decentralized.

David Easton, a well known political scientist admits, “decisions and actions performed by international systems rely for their acceptance on accord with the perceived self-interest of the participating members among whom the impact of a sense of legitimacy is still extremely low”.

There is a crucial difference between the national societies in which law and power are well centralized, established and accepted and the international system in which they are decentralized, each state, by and large, free to decide the norms it is going to follow. It has been aptly called a polyarchic system in which conflicts are prosecuted and resolved on the basis of *ad hoc* power plays.

As against the *realpolitik* of the realists the idealist school of thought, though in a minority, has been gaining ground especially in view of the destructive potential of the new weapons of mass destruction, the spread of democratic impulse and growing revulsion against violence.

Taking an overall view of the developing subject of International Relations, Quincy Wright suggests four categories of approach for the evolving study of International Relations. (1) the *actual* i.e. what was or what is through description. (2) the *possible*, what can be known through the method of theoretical speculation. (3) the *probable*, what will be known through the method of prediction. (4) the *desirable*, what ought to be known through the method of ethical, valuational or normative reflection. These four categories relate to history, art, science and philosophy. Thus international theory has descriptive, speculative, explanatory, predictive and normative components for a full and proper understanding of the subject.

In the course of last few years International Relations has undergone a profound change due to the rise of non-state actors, growth and impact of international organisations, an immense increase in trans-national transactions and a pronounced emphasis on interdependence. It has been aptly called an age of “turbulence”. There has been more than a three fold increase in the membership of the United Nations – from 51 in 1945 to 189 today, along with vast asymmetries and disparities in their political, military, technological and economic capabilities.

Those new trends necessitate a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of International Relations synthesizing insight from various disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, economics, history etc. And, yet the



sheer complexity of International relations, the speed with which multifarious events take place in the world hardly enable the student of International Relations to fully fathom the mounting array of developments. For example, no body could predict the end of the Cold War and the subsequent disintegration of the Soviet Union and other consequences that followed. No doubt, post facto analysis did provide a few insights into such momentous developments. Was it the massive expenditure on defence that brought about the collapse of the Soviet Union? Or, was it in-built in the communist structure with great emphasis on centralization of power and decision-making? Or, alternatively was it on account of the exposure of the Soviet Society to the onslaught of information waves from the West? All these may provide reasons for such a weighty development.

There is no doubt that the two world wars had a major impact on the development of international relations theory. If the period between 1919-1939 gave rise to utopian theory, the realist school arose after the Second World War. If the end of the Cold War was unexpected, how is one to characterise the post Cold War years of the 1990s?

Throughout the 1990s, the world appears very different from that of the Cold War era when the bipolarity between the two super powers – the USA and the USSR – ideologically and militarily pitted against each other with their military alliance systems, appeared somewhat simple. The end of the Cold War should have led to a world of peace. “But today the world is not at peace so much as a world in search of peace. It has been not a world of interstate war, but a world increasingly burdened with intrastate conflict and turmoil, pervasive ethnic and religious conflict and humanitarian crises, failed states torn apart by civil warfare.... the dangers of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Today on five continents, some three dozen such conflicts fester and raise difficult security problems for the international community”<sup>1</sup>..... “For a half-century of Cold War struggle the USA viewed the world

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Institute of Peace, *Passing the Baton – Challenges of Statecraft for the New Administration*, p.15-16, 2002.

largely through a zero-sum prism. We advance, they retreat. We retreat, they advance. Today zero-sum increasingly must give way to win-win.”<sup>2</sup>

- 1) USA – Pre-eminent world power or lone Super power – world’s unchallenged military economic and political power. With responsibility to serve as a “catalyst of coalitions, a broker of peace, a guarantor of global financial stability”.
- 2) Cold War is over – yet local conflicts can have global consequences.
- 3) Security – old threats plus new dangers; Proliferating weapons technologies and porous national boundaries, transnational crime and terrorism.  
Need to integrate economic and security policies
- 4) Two to three dozen intrastate conflicts involving ethnicity, religion and identity.
- 5) Concept of Sovereignty – Governments no longer have the exclusive powers they once held – many new actors and factors challenging traditional government domination.
- 6) New actors, new forces – Bottom up rather than top down – non-political strategic, non-violent means – grassroots organizations.
- 7) (a) Hard and (b) Soft power  
(a) Military and cohesive alliances  
(b) Non-government institutions – promoting American values – knowledge – public/private – partnerships – Total spectrum of policy Instruments.

Historians and Political Scientists learn a great deal from past history and divide history in terms of periods and centuries. Recently, an historian named Eric Hobsbawm has written the history of 20<sup>th</sup> century and aptly called it *The Age of the Extremes*. The interesting thing about the publication is that for him the 20<sup>th</sup> century began in 1914 when the first world war was started and ended in the year 1991 with the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War, including dissolution of the Warsaw Pact,

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p.18.



disintegration of the Soviet Union and the beginning of liberal economics in Russia and Eastern Europe.

If he were to write his history after September 11, 2001 he would perhaps have changed his mind and extended 20<sup>th</sup> century till that date. In any case, the event has been called the first war of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It was a defining moment of history for two obvious and universally acknowledged reasons. For the first time, after 1812, USA suffered an attack, and that too, on the centres of its economic power in New York and its military centre in Washington during day time, its invincible military power notwithstanding. The nature and the extent of attack unnerved the U.S. state, its military establishment as well as the economic system driving a universal sense of fear among the people.

Indeed, a new era of warfare and attack by non-state actors had started, with no place to hide. The modern nation-state had come into being with the treaty of Westphalia in 1648 after thirty years religious wars (1618-1648). From now on, the state had the monopoly of violence and the wars that took place were between nation-states. Since that time the nature of warfare has undergone different phases. For quite some time wars continued to be fought among the nation-states, the period called the classic nation state war that continued upto the end of the Napoleonic War (1815). The next phase was that of the industrial wars beginning with the American Civil War (1861-1865) till the beginning of the first World War (1914-1918). The third phase was of manoeuvre war that included infiltration tactics and blitzkrieg that emerged after the first world war.

The fourth phase marks a profound and fundamental change in the nature of warfare "It pits nations against non-national organizations and networks that include not only fundamentalist, extremists but ethnic groups, mafias and narco-traffickers as well. Its evolutionary roots may lie in guerrilla warfare... but it is rendered more pervasive and effective by the technologies, mobilities and miniaturised instrumentalities spawned by the age of computers and mass communication - It allows

the politically weak to circumvent the capacity of the state to protect itself through the use of conventional military means".

In such a warfare the enemy is elusive and without any location or address. The quality or the nature of attack, its place and timing are unpredictable and yet universal. There is no sanctuary, no safety, no durable peace. There is a fear of the unknown.

In the words of Dr. Chester Richards, a retired U.S. Air Force Colonel, "The distinction between war and peace(is) blurred to the vanishing point. No longer are there definable battlefields or fronts. Indeed, the distinction between civilian and military ceases to exist".

"The ubiquity and the ambiguity of fourth generation warfare will require dramatic changes in military capabilities as well as how states think about national security... the sanctuary of national sovereignty is no longer sacrosanct, can no longer be honoured when employed as a façade for sheltering, endorsing and provisioning non-national fourth generation warfare assets and formations."<sup>3</sup>

The events of September 11 in the USA and December 13 in India have proved that no place is beyond the reach of these fanatics. The real message of these tragedies is that we live in an interdependent world where no territory, however rich and powerful, can insulate itself from catastrophe. As Mahbub-ul-Haq mentioned at SID International Congress in Mexico in 1994: "An island of wealth and prosperity cannot survive in an ocean of poverty and deprivation."

The crisis that resulted from such attacks can best be met by justice, not revenge, by the pursuit of peace, not the waging of war in which many more innocent victims would suffer. There is, in fact, no purely military solution to the kind of acts that have rocked the world.

<sup>3</sup>Harold A. Gould and Franklin C. Spinney, "Fourth Generational Warfare", *The Hindu*, Oct.9, 2001.

Through the choice of their targets, namely, the citadels of financial and military power, the terrorists have questioned the neo-liberal, corporate globalization and the need to eliminate economic and political injustice, tribal/ethnic hatreds and fear and expose the mystique of violence... We must link our existing and common demands on new-liberal globalization to an agenda that includes a clear voice against militarization and imperialism and proclaiming peace, cultural and religious freedom and self-determination.

The new kinds of war cannot be ended through military means. There are no easy answers, but the only possible approaches are political; to counter the strategy of sowing fear and hatred with a strategy of winning hearts and minds; to reconstruct a global legitimacy as an alternative to fundamentalism and exclusivism.

The manner in which the war has been waged leave no doubt that it was not so much the question of justice for the victims of the September 11 tragedy but the reassertion and reconsolidation of U.S. hegemony and invincibility perceived to have been challenged, if not threatened, by the September 11, incident, the pursuance of interest of the global military industrial complex, and the reorientation of International politics and strategic alliances.<sup>4</sup>

The question is about the ways to meet the new challenge that the nation state is facing. Since the danger is global it requires short terms as well as long term, well-thought out strategy that would cover military as well as non-military means. In the first place there should be a thoroughly well-designed intelligence system equipped with the latest technology.

Blind, reckless force may not only fail to produce results but may generate vigorous outbursts of retaliation. It may defeat its own purpose. Along with the employment of hardware, we will have to plan software means of social development such as alleviation of poverty, safeguarding

<sup>4</sup> "Reactions from the SID Network", Bridges, Newsletter, SID, Oct., 2001.

human rights, renewal of the facing of alienation, deep sense of injustice born out of exploitation and exercise of double standards.

It is out of these downtrodden material that the recruits for terrorism are enlisted. For them life is so cheap that suicide on behalf of the cause is a triumph instead of a tragedy. Only when their conditions are more worth living than dying that the new warfare can be eradicated.

If the above analysis makes sense, pointing out the roots of terrorism, then several of the Islamic countries out of 56 (their total world population being one billion) suffer from several of the evils mentioned above. Apart from huge disparities, the majority of people are illiterate lacking exposure to modern life including its amenities. Added to them are the age old traditional education systems that are completely dysfunctional for the modern times. Added to that is the domination of outside power who, in league with the small, top elite, is exploiting the resources and deriving huge profits out of them. Whenever such powers' easy access to the raw material, such as oil or gas, is threatened they resort to war and subdue all opposition. The Gulf war is an instance that eminently illustrates the pattern of hegemonic power.

**Death Tolls of Largest Armed Conflicts Since 1945<sup>1</sup>**

<i>Conflict</i>	<i>Time Period</i>	<i>Number Killed</i>	<i>Civilian Victims (%)</i>
Chinese civil war	1946-50	1,000,000	50
Korea	1950-53	3,000,000	50
Vietnam (U.S. intervention)	1960-75	2,358,000	58
Cambodian civil war	1970-89	1,221,000	69
Bangladesh succession	1971	1,000,000	50
Afghanistan (Soviet intervention)	1978-92	1,500,000	67
Mozambican civil war	1981-94	1,050,000	95
Sudanese civil war	1984 onward	1,500,000 <sup>2</sup>	97

<sup>1</sup> Conflicts that killed 1 million persons or more

<sup>2</sup> Numbers upto 1995 only.

Source: Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditure 1996*, (Washington, DC: World Priorities, 1996).

When we talk of peace we often think of the time when there is no war. In fact, peace is an interlude when wars are not taking. But such an attitude talks of "what peace is not" (negative peace) rather than "what peace is" (positive peace).

For Johan Galtung, a renowned pioneer of peace research, peace is not the opposite of war but rather the opposite of violence. This logically leads us to a comprehensive understanding of the concept of violence. Here too, violence is often equated with physical assault and injury meaning direct violence. Such violence is actor-oriented, visible and when practised on a vast scale stands for war which is institutionalized violence. Since the states have a monopoly of violence, wars are conducted by the states as a legitimate exercise of violence. But such violence is often practised at societal level such as violence on women, on lower strata of society or, at times, on minorities. Such direct violence results in physical injury leading, at times, to death.

But violence is exercised in numerous fashions and visible only to sensitive eyes. Such a violence is rooted in the structure of society and aptly called structural violence. Its roots are to be found in the inequality, inequity, deprivation, denial of basic needs and suppression of human rights. Gandhi seemed to be aware of such violence when he said that all exploitation was violence.

Properly viewed and fully understood, structural violence is widely practised and highly ominous. Every act or policy of exploitation – in terms of inhuman treatment, oppressive policies, denial of human rights, non-payment of dues such as minimum wages, corruption and such other evil practices can be subsumed under it. It is operative from the local to the global, the North-South exploitative nexus being an obvious instance of it.

Over and above the direct and indirect types of violence, there is cultural violence that inculcates justification for the use of violence. Cultural violence provides legitimacy to the exercise of violence.

Since peace is the opposite of violence, a broad, comprehensive view of violence would ipso facto provide an equally broad-based definition of peace. Peace is an alternative vision of life where all the three types of violence are ruled out. A negative view of peace would mean absence of violence but its positive version, would entail the presence of justice, harmony, equity, human rights, including gender justice and ecological balance.

The Nairobi Forward Looking Strategies document from the Third World Conference on Women in 1985, cites, "Peace includes not only the absence of war, violence and hostilities at the national and international levels, but also the enjoyment of economic and social justice, equality and entire range of human rights and fundamental freedoms within society".

Both negative and positive peace are realized only if all the three types of violence are completely eliminated. Any external factor interfering with the normal growth, functioning and survival of a living organism can be broadly defined as violence. Violence and Peace could be juxtaposed as below.

	Violence	Peace (four basic needs)
Direct Violence	1) Violence (Holocaust) 2) Repression (Human Rights)	Survival
Structural Violence	1) Misery (Silent Death) 2) Alienation (Spiritual Death)	Welfare Identity

Peace is a situation where the four basic needs are properly met. If any one is threatened peace is destroyed. Viewed as a concept and a highly prized value, peace is full of rich meaning, many-splendoured, normative goal. Gandhi rightly suggested that unless all the prerequisites and the ingredients that make for peace are realised, there cannot be a real genuine peace. Peace stands for the fullest fulfilment of human life, a life that stands for liberation and emancipation.



This may sound as a perfectionist picture of human society, a dream, nay, a utopia. But humankind needs utopias and dreams as their goals. They provide the vision that makes human life meaningful and efforts towards their fulfilment make life worth living. A society that lacks vision is a rudderless world without a goal or a destination.

The journey or transition from violence to peace is the main core subject of peace research. The fundamental task is to find out causes of violence and suggest the conditions of peace. Full understanding of violence, in all its varied manifestations, alone can enable us to remove it and replace it with peace and usher in a peaceful society. In other words, one has to understand the present day peacelessness for bringing about a peaceful world.

Though peace, as a goal, has engaged the minds of people from time immemorial, peace as a subject of systematic study gathered weight only after the Second World War. The most pressing and obvious reason for its emergence was the advent of the weapons of mass destruction. For the first time, man's capacity for violence reached its climax. Never before in human history so few people had acquired so much destructive power, an overkill capacity, enough to destroy the globe perhaps 30 times over.

Research activity for peace presupposes sensitization of the researchers' mind. In our study for peace we cannot remain content with research. Peace research is intimately and closely connected with peace education and peace action. Here, Gandhi emerges as a great educator of peace and equally prominent activist for peace. All the three aspects of peace are vitally and indissolubly synthesized in Gandhi's personality, life and action.

Peace education may appear to resemble international relations but it differs from it in many vital respects. International relations are built around the nation-state, its external policies and its interactions with other states ranging from peace and cooperation to conflicts. Peace research may study the nation-state, but its canvas embraces the whole world. If international relations concentrate on the interest of the nation

state, peace research aims at the overall good of the world. If international relations are analytical and descriptive, peace research is diagnostic as well as prescriptive. Its objective is to explore the ways through which peace may prevail in the whole world. Like freedom, peace is indivisible and has to be realised universally. In short, peace research is value-based having a normative vision of the future of the world. If international relations deal with "what is", peace research is concerned with "what ought to be". Again, if international relations are studied chiefly as a branch of Political Science, peace research is multidisciplinary and relies on social sciences, psychology, anthropology and other subjects so as to gain insight into the working of the human mind in all its multifarious ways. Peace research is critical of the past and projects desirable future that is free from animus and wars. Since it is concerned with the entire human kind, it is global in its range, holistic in its outlook and deals with all humans and the whole of his/her personality. No doubt, this is a tall order and highly challenging in its import and significance.

Since peace research is futuristic, it has to address the major issues and questions that lie at the root of present day state of peacelessness. Its first task would be to minimise, if not completely eradicate, violence from our life. Here the first priority should be the elimination of nuclear weapons that pose a grave threat to the survival of the world. As John Kennedy observed, the world has to choose between co-extinction and co-existence.

This weapon of mass destruction poses a serious threat to our right to life, the foremost fundamental right of every living person on the earth. Equally important is the right to peace that is to be universally respected. It has been rightly said that the best use of the nuclear weapon is never to use it. A nuclear war obliterates all distinctions between the victor and the vanquished. Indeed, as Krushchev said, "In a nuclear war, the living would envy the dead". Possession and continuation of such weapons are a crime against the entire humanity. It is immoral, iniquitous, unjust and anti-people and therefore oppressive and undemocratic. The International



Court of Justice have also pronounced, in no uncertain terms, its outright opposition to the use of these weapons except in very exceptional times.

Securing peace has always remained the prime concern of the state. Maintenance of law and order, stability, peace and security are the elementary duties and tasks of all states, irrespective of the differences of ideology. The state lies at the core of all aspects of security. On the other hand, insecurity is always linked to the weaknesses, the shortcomings, even the momentary disappearance, of the state. The term security is primarily associated with the state and any threat to the state is *ipso facto* a threat to the people of the state. In short, the term security is not only state-centric but usually deemed to be militaristic in nature. The security of the state is to be defended through military preparations, including, in the last resort, through war. "Political independence" and "territorial integrity" of the state are the usual terms associated with the concept of security and that, too, with military defence.

Recent times have witnessed a wider and more comprehensive views of security. Instead of viewing it as state-centric, the new concept conceives it in terms of the security of the people and civil society. Broadly speaking, the realist school of thought views security in military terms, as a matter of defending the territory of the state. The idealists, on the other hand, subsume it under peace.

Threats to security may arise not merely through military challenge but also through various other ways such as destitution, deprivation, malnutrition and unjust social order. Structural violence often causes more deaths than direct violence caused by military attacks. 40,000 children die every day in the underdeveloped world because of lack of nutrition and poverty. That comes to 1,20,000 every three days. This is equivalent to Hiroshima that silently takes place every three days.

Military defence and deterrence may not be adequate for security in the sense that the state can prevent a war through imaginative handling of diplomacy and negotiation. An active peace policy may go a long way in ensuring security. Security is not a static concept nor can it be achieved

through more preservation of status quo. Threats to security may arise from other potential dangers to survival and well-being. The dangers we face today are of varied nature and so complex that no one discipline can adequately treat them. Equally importantly no single state, however powerful, can have the capacity to solve them. Johan Galtung aptly states that, "the dialogue over peace must remain open-ended. No culture or no discipline can have any monopoly of how to conceive of peace".

#### Selected Humanitarian, Human Rights, and Arms Control Treaties of the Twentieth Century

<i>Humanitarian/Laws of War</i>	<i>Human Rights</i>	<i>Arms Control/Disarmament</i>
1907 Hague Conventions	1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights	1959 Antarctic Treaty
1925 Protocol Prohibiting Use of Poison Gas	1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees	1967 Outer Space Treaty
1929 Geneva Conventions	1966 Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights	1969/1995 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
1948 Genocide Convention	1966 Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	1971 Seabed Treaty
1949 Geneva Convention	1984 Anti-Torture Convention	1972 Biological Weapons Convention
1976 Environmental Modification Convention		1993 Chemical Weapons Convention
1977 Protocols Additional to 1949 Geneva Convention		1996 Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty
1980/1995 Inhumane Weapons Convention		1997 Anti-personnel Landmine Convention

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection Web Page, <http://www.un.org/Depts/Treaty/Overview.htm>, viewed 19 August 1998; Ian Browline, ed., *Basic Document on Human Rights* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1992); Director Flect, ed., *The Handbook of Humanitarian Law in Armed Conflicts*, (New York: Oxford University press, 1995); "Multilaterals Project Chronological Index", <http://tufts.edu/fletcher/multi/chrono.html>, viewed 20 July, 1998.

In fact, security understood in a broad, comprehensive manner can serve as a sound organizing principle for the study of international relations just as realist school treats power as the governing principle of international politics.

In fact, there has been a "plethora of security studies" in recent years covering subjects such as offensive and defensive advantage on strategy, arms race, military innovation, deterrence and security cooperation as well as regional security. Indeed, we encounter a bifurcated environment that contains a state-centric as well as transtate paradigm. There is a large number of sub-state, non-state and transnational actors. Taken together they may create instability, disruption, armed conflicts and ungovernability. Impact, of new technology has also to be taken into consideration.

#### Definitions of Security:

The International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, convened by the United Nations General Assembly in New York from August 24 to September 11, 1987, adopted a definition of security that also encompasses non-military aspects. In its final document, which was adopted by consensus by the representatives from the 150 participating states, the conference stated, among other items:

"Security is an overriding priority for all nations. It is also fundamental for both disarmament and development. Security consists of not only military, but also political, economic, social, humanitarian and human rights and ecological aspects. Enhanced security can, on the one hand, create conditions conducive to disarmament and, on the other, provide the environment and confidence for the successful pursuit of development. The development process, by overcoming non-military threats to security and contributing to a more stable and sustainable international system, can enhance security and thereby promote arms reduction and disarmament. Disarmament would enhance

security both directly and indirectly. A process of disarmament that provides for undiminished security at progressively lower levels of armaments could allow additional resources to be devoted to addressing non-military challenges to security, and thus result in enhanced overall security."

Recently, non-military threats to security have moved to the forefront of global concern. Underdevelopment and declining prospects for development, as well as mismanagement and waste of resources, constitute challenges to security. The degradation of the environment presents a threat to sustainable development. The world can hardly be regarded as secure so long as there is polarization of wealth and poverty at the national and international levels. Gross and systematic violations of human rights retard genuine socio-economic development and create tensions which contribute to instability. Mass poverty, illiteracy, disease, squalor and malnutrition afflicting a large proportion of the world's population often become the cause of social strain, tension and strife.

The meeting of a group of experts on non-military aspects of security in Tashkent in May 1990 used the following operational definition of security:

Security is a condition in which states consider that there is no danger of military attack, political pressure or economic coercion, so that they are able to pursue freely their own development and progress.

The security of individuals and communities of which states are constituted is ensured by the guarantee and effective exercise of individual freedom, political, social and economic rights, as well as by the preservation or restoration of a livable environment for present and future generations. Security also implies that essential human needs, notably in the field of nutrition, education, housing and public health are ensured on a permanent basis. An adequate protection against dangers to security should also be maintained. The ways and means to attain security may be defined in national, intergovernmental, non-governmental or global terms.

Security has two aspects: (1) the absence of objective dangers, whether or not they are recognized, and (2) the absence of subjective fears, whether or not they are justified. Which of the two is more important? Arguments for both viewpoints can be made. Ignorance or denial of dangers does not provide security. For example, if a government denies the existence of a danger like the greenhouse effect, that does not mean that the country faces no danger. Nor does a claim of a non-existent threat of aggression, sometimes deliberately invented or at least exaggerated – to justify military expenditures, expose a country to real dangers, even if they may be under- or over-estimated. Therefore, both perceived and actual dangers, as formulated by the above definition of security, need to be examined. A nation's conception of its security largely depends upon its own experience. A nation that has suffered repeated invasions may think of it in defensive terms. A country that suffered internal problems may assign priority to domestic situation. There is an evolutionary spiral to the concept of security in that it continues to grow or expand with changing times. What is proper and adequate today may not be so tomorrow.

The new concept of human security centres round the quality of life and not on the destructive power of the weapons the community possesses. According to Mahbub Ul Haq such a security requires five steps:

- 1) A mode of development which enhances human life and regards GNP growth as a means, distributes income equitably, takes care of the natural resources and ensures people's participation as well as equity in opportunities.
- 2) We have to move from Arm's Security to Human Security. There should be a social agenda for humankind. The developing countries should be asked why they (a) spend three times more for arms rather than on Health and Education (b) have 20 times more soldiers than doctors (c) airconditioned jeeps for soldiers when they lack school rooms for children. Simultaneously, the rich countries should close down military bases, convert military aid into economic aid, stop arms shipment worth \$35 billion a

year, stop subsidies to arms exporters and stop huge arms spending - \$ 130 billion a year.

- 3) There should be a new partnership between the North and the South on justice, equitable sharing of global market opportunities. Rich nations channelled 15% of their GNP to their 100 million people below poverty line i.e. \$ 5000 a year. The same nations earmarked only 0.3% of GNP for poor nations having 1.3 billion below poverty line with income level of \$ 300 per year. They should also remove trade barriers.
- 4) There should be a new human world order with global governance. The Bretton Woods institutions (IMF, World Bank etc.) have turned irrelevant. Today three-fourth of private capital goes to ten better off developing nations in East Asia and Latin America. There is a need for an Economic Security Council to deal with human security. It should represent all without veto.
- 5) There is a need to have and strengthen a global civil society. With the new millennium the future should rest not with the government alone but with people at the grassroots. In the words of Haq, "At a time of such a profound change in human affairs the North is choosing to become somewhat passive, cautious, conservative and almost reactionary."<sup>5</sup>

As the lone superpower of the world, USA has established its undisputed superiority in military might, political clout, technological know-how, cultural impact and economic preponderance. End of the Cold War and dissolution of the Soviet Union presented a rare and historic opportunity to the USA to come forward and forge a new world in cooperation with other states of the world. A multilateral approach through the United Nations and its various agencies could have paved the way for a better and more livable world. Woodrow Wilson after the first world war and

<sup>5</sup> Mahbub Ul Haq, "Toward a Better Social Order", *The Economic Times*, 27-03-1995.



Franklin Roosevelt at the end of the second world war exercised imaginative leadership in shaping the new world order.

Instead of utilizing the golden opportunity in the best interest of the world, the USA has chosen the unilateral path, sidetracking the United Nations, including non-payment of dues, and going back on the international commitments it had entered into in the past. By refusing to support Kyoto Agreement, USA has upset the international agreement on climate control, a very vital agreement in the interest of the entire world.

US decision to devise National Missile Defence (NMD) thereby carrying weapons into the space and to abrogate the Anti Ballistic Missile treaty of 1972 are a great threat to peace and likely to lead to an arms race endangering the prospects for peace. US is likely to spend \$10.5 billion for NMD. It will change the strategic stability and alter the security environment of the world and have a negative impact on the process of disarmament.

After September 11, 2001 the USA has launched a war against "global terrorism", a war that may continue for an indefinite time and may be fought in different regions and states of the world, the US arrogating to itself full freedom to strike or invade any part of the world. USA has cited article 51 of the UN Charter that enables a state to act in self defence. Since terrorism is an elusive phenomenon USA has acquired a right to defy international law and regulations that would govern use of force. Thus US armed presence turns out to be global. Behind such exercise of force may lurk designs to dominate and exploit resources in different parts of the earth.

It was Clausewitz who said that war is a continuation of politics by other means. But nuclear weapon can hardly be treated as an instrument of war to serve a political objective. "Nuclear wars are not meant to be fought, especially when both the nuclear powers are neighbours (India and Pakistan). The nukes are for negotiations, they are not weapons of war. Pakistan has a professional armed force and they realize that in case they

do resort to a strike, there will be a retaliation. It would be lunacy for them to start one. In a nuclear strike, there are no winners."<sup>6</sup>

As a nuclear state Pakistan has achieved parity, in conventional military power with India. At the same time, it has used it to escalate its low intensity conflict against India. Geographical proximity of two nuclear powers and the high tension between them have generated great amount of fear and anxiety among the international community.

Nuclear weapons are political weapons of deterrence and could be used, if at all, only in the extreme cases involving threat's to core national interests such as the territorial integrity of the state. Acquisition of nuclear weapon by India and Pakistan has generated great amount of fear and anxiety in the International World chiefly because of their long standing animus, continued bloodshed on the line of control resulting in high loss of life (20,000) and an atmosphere of tension, confrontation and sanguinary leadership on both sides. It is estimated that India has plutonium for between 55 and 110 bombs whereas Pakistan has enriched uranium that may produce 20-40 bombs.

The most forbidding aspect of the situation is that the adversaries have a common border with dense populations. Their missiles can reach the other's territory within seconds leaving little time for warning or preparation, unlike in the case of USA and the USSR whose missiles would take 30 minutes to reach their targets. Nor do they have confidence building contacts that the superpowers had built up during the Cold War.

However, there is saving grace even in the scenario of despondency. During the Lahore Summit of February 1999 both the countries signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to adopt measures for promoting a stable environment of peace, stability and security between the two countries.

<sup>6</sup> Admiral Sushil Kumar, "Interview of the Week", *Indian Express*, 6-01-2002.



Unfortunately the Kargil conflict prevented translation of it into a confidence building measure though we need not forget earlier measures that were thoughtfully taken in the past. For example, Rajiv Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto signed the Agreement on the Prohibition of Attack Against Nuclear Installations and Facilities in December 31, 1988 that came into force on January 27, 1991. Agreements have also been signed on advance notification of military exercises, prevention of airspace violations and prohibition of chemical weapons.

But what is really crucial and vital is to convert Lahore MOU into a treaty containing communication, constraint, transparency and verification measures. A treaty for nuclear and missile conflict management would be a highly significant move towards confidence building process. Such a treaty would go a long way in assuaging the feeling of fear about a nuclear holocaust. A cooperative monitoring regime would enhance stability along the border. It would go a long way in ensuring peace in South Asia.

Again, as per the agreement of 1998, the countries are required to inform each other on January 1 of every year about each others' nuclear installations and facilities. Despite the tension and troop build-up along the borders, India and Pakistan have exchanged lists of nuclear installations and facilities covered under the bilateral agreement. This was done on Tuesday, January 1, 2002 (*Times of India*, 2-1-2002). Pakistan foreign minister Abdul Sattar said that Pakistan had not made any change to previous list as it had not built any additional nuclear installations.

Among several reasons that would explain the perpetuation of armed conflicts, the one that is most crucial is the presence and prevalence of military-industrial complex. There is a lasting nexus between the arms industry, and the defence establishment, both having a vested interest in each other.

Not surprisingly, there is a "security exception" in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This allows Government to

provide subsidies to private arms manufactures and also allow collaboration with foreign weapons companies. There is a distinct bias with enabling provisions for the promotion of the arms industry and trade. Arms manufacturers are deriving special promotion and benefits from the WTO.

A highly significant provision – Article XXI of the GATT, the main treaty under which WTO states function, states that a country cannot be prevented from taking action regarding traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war thus providing a blanket exception for military spending.

The free market in arms prevent governments from taking necessary steps for the welfare of the people such as education, health and environmental measures. At the same time, it supports military spending, trade in weapons and arms race. In the views of Ninan Koshy, "Arms corporations derive a double benefit from the WTO system – profit from the elimination of environment, health and labour standards.... By providing a special place for the war industry.... (it) actually promotes government military spending and militarization of the economy. This may lead to massive shifting of priorities and development of resources at the cost of social justice and human development... subsidy for agriculture and policies of social welfare will be challenged."<sup>7</sup>

In 1997 world spent \$842 billion on defence – did it guarantee security? Between 1989-1998, 61 major armed conflicts occurred with massive devastation, one million killed, of which 50 per cent were civilians, 65 million displaced, innumerable injured, property and infrastructure worth billions of dollars destroyed. "But if combatants started negotiating with each other, arms manufacturers, dealers, and middlemen would all go out of business."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Ninan Koshy, "India and WTO's Security Exception", *The Hindu*, 17-05-2001.

<sup>8</sup> Sonia, Jabbar, Insecurity Council, "Money Makes the War Go Round", *Times of India*, May 25, 2001.

Legal trade in arms in 1997 was worth \$55 billion. Five permanent members of the Security Council are among the top eight arms exporting nations, the USA leads the pack, hogging 55 per cent market-share. The Tehelka expose provided a mere glimpse of the nexus-politician, arms manufacturer and the key military personnel. In USA during 1995-96 elections 25 leading arms exporters donated a record \$10.8 million in campaign funds mainly to the Republican party. In the 1990, USA supplied billions of dollars worth of arms to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates to deter attack from Iraq and Iran... Iran getting arms from Russia and China. Saudi Arabia spent \$9 billion between 1985 and 1989. The number one arms importing country between 1995 and 1997 buying weapons worth \$31.3 billion, mainly from the U.S. Top arms exporters... sell to traditional rivals - Greece and Turkey, Egypt and Israel, China and Taiwan. Pakistan is best customer of France buying arms worth \$390 million between 1995 and 1997 and yet the Kargil war had hardly ended before the French were flocking to Indian shores, defence contracts worth millions in hand! Huge illegal trade in weapons - most of them small arms. An estimated 500 million weapons are currently in circulation. Large number provided by USA and Soviet Union on account of Cold War. After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan the U.S. provided military assistance worth \$3 billion to the Mujahidin - Nearly the entire arsenal of the Kashmiri militants has its origins in the Afghan War.

"To resolve a conflict or at least scale down the levels of violence and civilian casualties, it is imperative that the world's largest arms producers and exporters be held accountable, forced to reduce and ultimately close down their death industries... we ought to stop and think: ultimately who is going to win: us, the enemy or the arms corporations?"

As we enter the 1990s, there is little doubt that with the profound changes in the East West relations and the breaking down of cold-war alignments, a new international security system has been emerging.

Commenting on the volatile nature of the emerging scenario, the Secretary General of the UN observed,

"The period we have entered is Janus-faced. It wears both the aspect of hope and the countenance of dangerous unrestraint. In one major segment of world affairs, we have witnessed political change of a phenomenal character. In large parts of the globe, however, the scene continues to be one of simmering resentments, violent collisions and at best a precarious peace. The question whether the more beneficial developments of 1989-90 will have a healthy impact on the totality of the world situation is still unanswered."

Kenichi Ito, the President of the Japan Forum on International Relations, Tokyo, has characterised the post Cold War period with three logical developments.

- 1) 'Cooperation' would replace 'confrontation' as a guideline for the interaction of nations.
- 2) 'Economic power' would supersede 'military power' as a means of the power struggle among nations.
- 3) The concept of 'peace without victory' would prevail over that of 'peace with victory' as a framework for the order.

During the Cold War period of 1947 through 1989 international politics was motivated by the logic of "ideology-oriented diplomacy". It is interesting to note that "national-interest-oriented diplomacy" had already evolved in the distant past. It was dominant in seventeenth century Europe after the religious wars of 1618 through 1648 and in 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe after the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars of 1791 through 1815.

However, the diplomacy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be different from that of 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries because of the drastic change in the international environment. The security environment has changed due to the overkill capabilities of the nuclear stockpile in the two super-powers' arsenals

and the resultant phenomenon of nuclear stalemate. Economic interdependence is visible everywhere and business transactions are daily conducted in a borderless fashion. Physical environmental problems have also become global as indicated in the case of the global warming resulting from the so-called "greenhouse effect". As a result of all these changes, nations are already forced to cooperate with other nations to solve their mutual problems. As a matter of fact, no country in the modern world can maintain its peace, its prosperity or its environment without cooperation with other countries. Collective or common security, or both, are earnestly sought. Joint and coordinated efforts are an absolute requirement for the solution of environmental problems.

Thus, the concept of "national interest" in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is an unprecedented phenomenon. In the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, it took into consideration the narrow and direct interest of one nation alone as "classic national interest". However, we now find that we cannot solve problems of today and tomorrow; we find that we must contribute to the common interest and to the common cause of the international community as a whole. In doing so we find ourselves contributing to the solution of the problems of our own countries. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the type of "national interest" must be "enlightened national interest" which guides nations in accordance with the logic of "cooperation" and rejects that of "confrontation".

End of the Cold War could be called the Third World War. The war was fought between East and West and ended with victory for the West and defeat for the East. Old doctrines, old systems are being denounced. Democracy and freedom won. Despite the decisiveness of the result, the war was fought without a drop of bloodshed and without a bullet being shot. True, the USSR was economically weakened but it was still a formidable military power. The reason was that they understood that the days were different from earlier days when "military power" was almighty. Edward Lultwak in his article "From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics" in the Summer 1990 issue of *The National Interest* wrote, "For some decades now the dominant elites of the greatest powers have ceased to consider war as a practical solution for military confrontations

between them because non-nuclear fighting would only be inconclusively interrupted by the fear of nuclear war, while the latter is self-inhibiting". Perhaps, geo-economics is gaining ground and winning salience against geo-politics.

## Conclusion

In this brief outline I have tried to place before you the ideas of peace and security, their meaning and importance for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The 20<sup>th</sup> may stand out in terms of social progress and scientific, technological achievements. But it is marred by a harrowing record of violence and wars – killings that amounted to 75% of all such deaths in the recorded history since the days of the Roman Empire. The most gruesome part of such wars was in the percentage of civilian deaths. At the beginning of the century 90% of the deaths were confined to the soldiers. At the end of the century, 90% of the casualties were of the civilians.

With the onset of the weapon of mass destruction, the very survival of the human civilization has been at stake. The danger was not the deliberate use of such weapons but an accidental one that could not be easily ruled out. Psychologists opine that if a mistake is to take place sometime, that "sometime" may definitely occur some day. Miscalculation on the basis of wrong signal may ignite a nuclear holocaust. The end of the Cold War provided an opportunity for denuclearisation. The famous author of *The Fate of the Earth*, Jonathan Schell brought out *The Gift Time* (1998) giving an edge to this rare, historic moment.

In the first months of the new century USA took steps that encouraged an arms race. The US Senate rejected the CTBT and decided to upgrade the Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 for going ahead with the National Missile Defence i.e. carrying weapons in the space. The U.S. military expenditure increased by \$20 billion reaching new height of \$33 billion over the next six years. The U.S. military spending thus reached a level at the height of the Cold War.



The single most pressing issue before us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to move away from the "culture of violence and war" and rapidly develop a "culture of peace". The UN's International Court of Justice came out on July 8, 1996 declaring the use of nuclear weapons as illegal under International Law asking the nuclear weapons state to move towards nuclear disarmament.

It is time that we should demand that all nuclear weapons in every nuclear state be taken off alert status, thereby obviating the chance of accidental nuclear war. There should be an agreement for its proper implementation. This is the path to free the world from nuclear dangers.

As against such a discouraging picture, we have before us some shining examples of movements towards disarmament and peace. In 1986, the South Pacific including Australia, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea established a nuclear weapon-free zone with the Treaty of Rarotonga. In 1992 Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan agreed to surrender their nuclear arms to Russia for dismantling them. In 1993, South Africa dismantled the six nuclear bombs thus becoming the first state in the world to abolish a nuclear arsenal. In fact, the whole of Africa turned nuclear free when they signed the Treaty of Pelindaba in 1996. In the same fashion, the whole of South America by signing the Treaty of Tlateloleo in 1994 declared itself nuclear free.

Henry Stimson Centre in USA, the Canberra Commission (Australia) for the elimination of nuclear weapons, the Pugwash Conference and several Nobel Peace Prize winners combined to voice their anti-nuclear weapons views. In addition, some 63 active and retired military men from seventeen countries along with former President Jimmy Carter signed an appeal for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Ronald Reagan during his second term confessed that a nuclear war "cannot be won and never be fought".

If the end of the Cold War was a miracle, could we not conceive of such developments taking place? What was viewed as impossible and unachievable did happen and is now viewed as ordinary and even

mundane. The great intellectual error seems to be that we imagine the future solely in terms of the past. Perhaps the best way to support the cause of peace is to have faith that peace is possible.

Today, there are 28 countries that do not have an army, Costa Rica being the most prominent among them and having for a long time a University of Peace. Some 95% of countries do not have nuclear weapons. Are they feeling less secure than those who have such weapons? In fact, nuclear weapons hardly provide security. The question before us is: Are we feeling more secure than before? The irony is that we have purchased greater insecurity at a higher price. Justifying such weapons under the guise of the doctrine of deterrence hardly helps because it generates a competitive atmosphere of fear and counter fear, a balance of terror, leading to tension and arms race the poor countries could hardly afford.

What matters is the sense of priorities and a humane approach to governance. The central message of the 'Human Development Reports' published by the UNDP is to adopt people – centric approach to the socio-political ordering of societies, where people's aspirations are to be kept in view. The world needs welfare not warfare, less spending on defence and more expenditure towards sustainable development leading to a better quality of life. This can be assured through the proper harnessing of science and technology.

Voices in support of peace are gaining ground if we have the ears to listen. At the beginning of the last century the world had 200 NGOs; today we have 20,000 and quite a few having access to the United Nations. Quite a few nations (14 in all) have appointed Commissions on Reconciliation, South Africa having a lead over others by having one on Truth and Reconciliation with inspiration provided by Nelson Mandela. The misdeeds of the past were to be forgiven and transition to be affected from culture of violence to culture of conflict resolution. It was a "transformative peace process" unprecedented in our times. Rajmohan Gandhi has launched an NGO advocating Dialogue and Reconciliation thereby reviving the process of peace in South Asia. Instead of ruminating the past misdeeds, countries and communities are preparing



and looking forward to a better future and a peaceful life. Unfortunately in today's world, war makes news and peace goes unnoticed. Realization of its rich potential should dawn upon our minds.

Prospects of Peace have brightened on account of the awakening of women that has taken place in the course of last few years. World Conferences on women beginning with New Mexico (1975), Nairobi (1985) and Beijing (1995) have infused a new spirit that would certainly increase women's participation in public affairs including politics. Women are likely to throw their weight in favour of constructive aspects of life and support the cause of peace.

Along with the threat of war, violence and annihilation, the world is facing the environmental crisis. The world has destroyed 30% of the natural world since 1970 resulting in serious depletion of the forest, fresh water and marine system upon which human life depends.

At the same time disparities of income within and across nations have continued to increase. At present 20 per cent of the world's people living in industrialized world have 85 per cent of the world's income; the poorest 20 per cent of world's people have about 1 per cent. According to the U.N. Secretary General half of humanity i.e. three billion people live in poverty.

On the other hand, the richest 200 people of the world have income equivalent to 41 per cent of the world's people. Just 1 per cent of this income could be enough to finance universal primary education for the entire world. Corporate globalization is benefiting a few at the expense of the rest of the world. World peace needs globalization that would be beneficial to all.

It should be widely recognized that peace, in a large measure, depends upon having an inclusive vision of life that subsists and welcomes diversity and plurality of social life. As the world gets more interdependent there is a dire need for sustaining multi-cultural, multi-

ethnic and multi-religious life. Such an approach would provide equal opportunity to all and reinforce the secular foundations of our society.

We must also realize that, our lifestyle has led to consumerist ways. Our over-consumption of natural resources is robbing the earth of its none to unlimited carrying capacity. To this grim picture, we may add the burden of growing population. It has been calculated that if the world's population consume as much resources and energy as the industrialized nations, we would need resources of ten planet Earths. The future of the planet, and along with it, ours, is already poised in a delicate balance. Sustainable development has to be achieved if irreversible tendencies are to be checked. We have reached the crossroads where our choice will make or mar our future prospects.

As war begins in the mind of men, so peace also begins in our minds. The same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace. As humankind is responsible for the 20<sup>th</sup> century's culture of violence, war and environmental degradation, so we can create a culture of peace and social and economic justice based on a healthy and sustainable environment for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond. The beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century offers an opportunity for striking out new paths of peace and prosperity. We should not be found wanting in seizing such a rare moment of history.

The world is suffering from many problems. Since many of them are man made, they are avoidable and remediable. Broadly speaking, they can be categorised under four headings.

- 1) Violence, wars and holocaust
- 2) Poverty, hunger and destitution
- 3) Repression of liberties and human rights
- 4) Eco-disaster leading to environmental crisis, paucity of resources and pollution.

Peace, both as vision and as concept, embraces and covers all of them under its comprehensive range. It involves restructuring of society in terms of approach, attitude and behaviour, takes into its ambience macro,

meso and micro aspects – from general fashioning of global life to individual life style. Indeed, the potency and the potential of peace are far-reaching with revolutionary implications for our future. Gandhi's non-violence is no idle dream. It may serve as a compelling imperative for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

# I.P. Desai Memorial Lecture Series

- 1 Ramkrishna Mukherjee, *I.P. Desai and Sociology of India* (1986).
- 2 A.R. Desai, *Rural Development and Human Rights of the Agrarian Poor in Independent India* (1987).
- 3 Yogendra Singh, *Social Processes and Dimensions of Indian Nationalism* (1988).
- 4 M.S. Gore, *Social Movements and the Paradigm of Functional Analysis* (1989).
- 5 Rajni Kothari, *Social Policy, Development and Democracy* (1990).
- 6 A.M. Shah, *The Judicial and Sociological View of the Other Backward Classes* (1992).
- 7 Y.B. Damle, *Theory, Rhetoric and Social Reality* (1993).
- 8 Jan Breman, *Labour Nomads in South Gujarat* (1994).
- 9 Krishna Ahooja-Patel, *Towards a New Social Order in India* (1996).
- 10 Suma Chitnis, *The Crisis in Higher Education* (1997).
- 11 Krishna Kumar, *Education and Society in Post-Independence India - Looking Towards the Future* (1998).
- 12 D.L. Sheth, *Knowledge, Power and Action: Challenges Facing the Grassroots Movements for Alternative Development* (1999).
- 13 Victor S. D'Souza, *Indian Family at the Crossroads* (2000).
- 14 N.R. Sheth, *Reflections on Religion as Social Capital* (2001).

Published by Centre for Social Studies, South Gujarat University  
Campus, Surat - 395 007  
Price Rs.40/-