

10 COMMENT & ANALYSIS

THE DAILY GUARDIAN REVIEW MONDAY | 16 FEBRUARY 2026 CHANDIGARH WWW.THEDAILYGUARDIAN.COM

REIMAGINING PEACE FOR GAZA: A BOARD OF PEACE IN LIGHT OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION LAW



OPINION
PROF. ABHINAV MEHROTRA & DR. BISWANATH GUPTA
The prolonged conflict in Gaza has exposed the deep limitations of existing international mechanisms for conflict prevention, civilian protection, and post-conflict governance. Despite the presence of established international organizations such as the United Nations, the Security Council, and the International Criminal Court, the various humanitarian agencies, peace has remained elusive. In this context, the idea of a Board of Peace for Gaza, a specialized conflict-specific body dedicated to coordinate enforcement, civilian protection, and reconstruction, deserves serious consideration. When examined through the lens of international organization law, such a Board poses both challenges to traditional institutional models and highlights their failures.

...the use of force. Yet, in practice, its effectiveness in the Gaza context has been severely undermined by the veto power of permanent members. International organization law permits this arrangement as a political compromise, but legally does not equate to legitimacy. The repeated failure to halt violence or ensure accountability has eroded confidence in the Security Council as a credible peace guarantor. A Board of Peace for Gaza, by contrast, would be issue-specific, regionally focused, and time-bound. Unlike universal organizations, it would not be hindered by unrelated geopolitical disputes. From an international organization law perspective, this resembles specialized or hybrid bodies, such as international commissions, trusteeship arrangements, or ad hoc peace implementation councils. These entities often operate with narrower mandates but greater operational clarity, allowing them to act decisively where larger organizations cannot. Critics might argue that such a board would lack legal authority without formal state consent. Indeed, consent remains a cornerstone of international organization law. However, this principle has already been stretched in practice. International administration in Kosovo and East Timor, for example, exercised governing authority justified by humanitarian necessity and Security Council endorsement. A Board of Peace for Gaza could similarly derive legitimacy from a combination of General Assembly support, regional backing, and international humanitarian law obligations, particularly the duty to protect civilians. Another key distinction lies in decision-making structures. International organizations typically rely on consensus or weighted voting among states, often leading to watered-down resolutions. A Gaza Board of Peace could instead adopt a technocratic and expert-driven model, incorporating international law, humanitarian experts, regional representatives, and civil society voices. While this would challenge the state-centric bias of international organization law, it would align with its evolving precedents, which increasingly recognize the role of non-state actors. Enforcement remains the most difficult issue. Traditional international organizations suffer from a chronic enforcement deficit; they can recommend, condemn,



From an international organization law perspective, this resembles specialized or hybrid bodies, such as international commissions, trusteeship arrangements, or ad hoc peace implementation councils. These entities often operate with narrower mandates but greater operational clarity, allowing them to act decisively where larger organizations cannot.
U.S. President Donald Trump speaks during a charter announcement for his Board of Peace initiative aimed at resolving global conflicts, alongside the 5th annual World Economic Forum (WEF), in Davos, Switzerland, January 22, 2024.
reconstruction without a unified strategy. A Gaza-specific Board could integrate ceasefire supervision, humanitarian access, reconstruction planning, and transitional justice under one institutional umbrella. This holistic approach is largely absent from existing international legal structures. The creation of the United Nations after World War II, international criminal tribunals in the 1990s, and hybrid peace missions all emerged from institutional failure. Gaza represents such a failure. Clinging to existing institutions simply because they are legally established risks confounding institutional continuity with more responsibility. In conclusion, a Board of Peace for Gaza would not replace international organizations but expose their limitations. It would challenge the traditional state-centric and consent-driven assumptions of international organization law while remaining grounded in its functional purpose. Legal and political pathways to international law, and legal and political pathways to international law, are highly controversial, such mechanisms would be consistent with the functional legal underpinning of international organization law, institutions exist to solve problems states cannot solve alone. Importantly, a Board of Peace would also address a blind spot in current international governance which is post-conflict continuity. International organizations often operate in silos. Humanitarian relief, human rights monitoring,

Prof. Abhinav Mehrotra is an Associate Professor and Faculty Director at IIT Jalandhar Global University. Dr. Biswanath Gupta is an Associate Professor at IIT Jalandhar Global University.

When India courts both parents of global trade

OPINION
SAURABH BANDYOPADHYAY
India today finds itself at an unusual and potentially transformative juncture in the global economic order. On one side lies the long-negotiated India-EU agreement - often described as the mother of all deals - impenetrable with market access, regulatory standards, and long-term disciplines. On the other is the rapidly deepening India-US economic engagement - increasingly resembling the father of all deals - driven by technology capital, and strategic convergence. Considered separately, each is consequential. Taken together, they could quietly but decisively reshape India's growth trajectory. The deal with the European Union is, at its core, about acceptance into the rules-intimate market in the world. The attraction is not merely access to nearly 450 million consumers. What truly matters is alignment with European standards - on product quality, labor norms, environmental safeguards, data protection, and now carbon emissions. In effect, trade with Europe is inseparable from regulatory convergence.

For Indian firms, particularly in manufacturing, this represents both an opportunity and a stress test. Firms that meet European standards acquire a form of global certification, easing access to other developed markets. Over time, this can lift India's export basket away from low-margin, price-driven goods towards higher-value, contract-based manufacturing. The macroeconomic payoff is gradual but deep: higher productivity, greater formalization, and improved institutional quality. But these gains are not costless. Compliance burdens fall disproportionately on MSMEs, adjustment costs are front-loaded, and domestic policy flexibility narrows. In the short run, some firms will exit rather than upgrade. The India-EU deal, therefore, is not about speed or headlines. It is about embedding Indian industry within a stable, predictable, and rules-based global trading system - a slow but durable source of growth. The emerging economic compact with the United States operates through



Prime Minister Narendra Modi, with President of the European Council Antonio Luis Santos Costa, and President of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen.
The India-EU deal, therefore, is not about speed or headlines. It is about embedding Indian industry within a stable, predictable, and rules-based global trading system - a slow but durable source of growth.
This dual engagement has an important macroeconomic consequence: risk diversification. In a world where globalisation is fragmenting - trade blocs are hardening, technology is increasingly weaponised, and climate policies are morphing into trade barriers - India reduces its dependence on any single market or growth model. The EU provides stability and predictability; the US provides speed and dynamism. Together, they help India hedge against shocks emanating from either system. There is also a deeper strategic shift underway. India is moving away from a growth model anchored primarily in domestic demand and services exports. In its place is a hybrid model: export-disciplined manufacturing, technology-led services, and strategic participation in global supply chains. If managed well, this shift can sustain growth rates of 7 per cent or more without the macroeconomic volatility that has historically accompanied India's expansionary work-force at scale. Yet the benefits will not be automatic. Trade agreements amplify domestic strengths; they do not create them. Without parallel reforms in skills, logistics, and MSME financing, the gains from both deals will remain uneven. High-skill sectors will surge ahead, while low-labor-intensive manufacturing may struggle to absorb India's expanding workforce at scale. There is also the risk of regulatory overload - EU-style compliance layered atop US-style IP and data regimes could squeeze smaller firms unless domestic support systems improve. Policy autonomy is another concern. Deeper integration inevitably brings greater scrutiny - over subsidies, public policy, and

Editorial Director: Prof. M.D. Nayak; Managing Editor: Parul Vohra; Editor: Jyotsna Bana; Printed and Published by Bakesh Sharma for and on behalf of Good Morning India Media Pvt. Ltd., Printed At: Good Morning India Media Pvt. Ltd. Village Sadhaura, Opp. Spring Field Public School, Anand Chandigarh Road, Sector-25B, Chandigarh. The Editorial Offices: 275 Captain Saur Marg, Sector-25B, Chandigarh. The Editorial Offices: 275 Captain Saur Marg, Sector-25B, Chandigarh. The Daily Guardian No. CH426252A/2026. The Code No: CH426261/15. For Subscriptions and Circulation/Complaints Contact: Kiran Pabla, Mobile No - 91 9646018923.