Chapter – I

Violence and Non-violence: The Past and the Present Scenario

The present scenario presents the whole human life in a state of turmoil as political, social, economic, and even cultural human life seems to be going through a grave crisis in the present context. The present world is full of fatal explosive spots, scattered on the various parts of the globe. Accordingly, man has dehumanized himself and has become indescribably cruel to his own beings. One can experience utter chaos, disorder, violence and riots ending up in war. The values of life are getting unrelated to the day-to-day aspects of life and we are living in a world where on the one hand, there is accelerative progress in the fields of science and technology as is evident from space travel, nuclear energy, communications and so on, and on the other hand, there is the singular failure of human mind-brain equipment to psychologically grow, to blossom, to free itself from the exiting patterns of thinking, feeling and unassuming behaviour with our fellow beings.

Until the early phase of the 20th Century, a handful of colonial powers called the shots, lording it over millions in Asia, Africa and West Asia. However, the stability of the colonial order was shattered with the outbreak of World War-I. What followed was violence on an unprecedented scale; the Russian Revolution, World War-II, the Partition of India, the Chinese Revolution, the Korean War, the Vietnam War and the ongoing Israel-Palestine Conflict. The results of all wars so far have been only destruction of mankind, humanity, property, civilization, resources and so many species of other animal kingdom. What gave people hope in the tumultuous 20th Century was Gandhi’s simple and logical and convincing message: ‘it is possible to live in amity and peace’. Despite the large-scale violence, the active pursuit of
peace in that time made possible the marvels of technology and the comforts of civil society.¹

Violence, revolt, discontentment and dissatisfaction – both in the East and the West, are basically due to the deep-rooted cause in the total way of life which man has been pursuing for several centuries. However, it is more important to investigate where the malady lies, where man has taken a wrong turn, and how is it related to the total way of life, and ask ourselves how it can be eliminated and uprooted from our psyche? A person who feels concerned about life, both individual and collective, feels the urgency of exploring the basic causes of conditioning the human psyche. The answer to a problem is embedded in the problem itself, so we have to understand the deep causes of the problem. When one can find the cause, one can end it too. A cause has an end. The causation of the problem can be ended, not through a readymade solution, but through understanding the problem itself. If we all seek together the causation, then the problem is solved.

As far the source of all things Indian, namely the Vedas, it is true, that the existence of the concept of ahimsa (Non-violence) has to be drawn from the places it prohibits its opposite, that is, himsa (Violence), destruction, injury, harm, intended in certain acts, called Annaya (injustice). The most explicit enunciation of ahimsa, no doubt, is to be found in the Jaina and Buddhist literatures, especially much more in the former. M. Hiriyanna observes correctly: “The doctrine of ahimsa, is no doubt very old in India, but the way in which it is made to pervade the whole conduct is peculiarly Jain”²

¹ The Times of India, New Delhi/Chandigarh, Wednesday, April 30, 2003, p. 8.
**Violence:**

The twentieth century experienced its testing time in a moment of great crisis. We lived and breathed and had our being in an age of apocalyptic uncertainty. Accordingly, our generation bears witness to the desperate plight of men who have grown powerful beyond their dreams but who yet suffer a poverty of spirit for which there appears to be no discernible remedy. We have shared the pain of Wat Ching generation after generation led to the slaughter bench of history. We have borne witness to and have learned to suffer the scandal of, what can only be described as an assassination of innocence. In the last fifty years, we human beings have very brutally slaughtered our own species. We all live under constant threat of our total annihilation. We seem to seek death and destruction as much as life and happiness. We are as driven, it seems, to kill and be killed as we are to live and let others live. Only by the most outrageous violation of ourselves have we achieved our capacity to live in relative adjustment to a civilization apparently driven to its own destruction?

The root meaning of violence comes from the Latin word ‘violentia’, meaning vehemence, a passionate and uncontrolled force, the opposite of a calculated exercise of power.³ Traditionally, the word meant “to prevent some object, natural or human, from its ‘natural’ course of development” and “to exceed some limit or norm”.⁴ Political theorists of the eighteenth century – Locke, Rousseau, and Montesquieu – agreed that violence could not regenerate
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people or society, and, unlike later political philosophers, set limits to the justifiable province of violence.\textsuperscript{5}

If we see the definition of Violence, we will find that violence is a combination of many aspects like:\textsuperscript{6}
1. The use of physical force to injure somebody or damage something
2. The illegal use of unjustified force, or the effect created by the threat
3. Extreme, destructive, or uncontrollable force, especially of natural events
4. Intensity of feeling or expression

Similarly, Webster recognises the different shades of the meaning of “violence” as follows:\textsuperscript{7}
1) Physical force used so as to injure or damage,
2) Intense, powerful force, as of a hurricane, etc.
3) (a) Unjust or callous use of force or power, as in violating another’s rights, privacy, etc.
(b) The harm done by this
4) Vehemence; fury
5) A twisting of sense, phrase, etc. so as to distort meaning
6) A violent deed or act.

Violence in the sense of ‘intensity of action or motion’ as a force by itself does not necessarily imply violence as understood in law – the unlawful use of ‘physical force’ or ‘intimidation’, violence par excellence. Violence in the sense of ‘violation’ may be part of non-violent resistance. Even ‘injury’ in the sense of injury to what is entitled to respect, reverence or observance, as part

\textsuperscript{6} Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia Deluxe 2000 Compact Disc.
\textsuperscript{7} David B. Guralnik (General Editor), Webster’s New World Dictionary (New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co.), 1975, p. 836.

There are few phenomena more widespread today than violent acts and violent events, and few occurrences within the total span of recorded history so seldom understood or explained. In fact, the human condition is perhaps most tellingly manifested in persons' violations of themselves, their neighbours, and their environments. Whether or not we all agree with the judgment that violence is omnipresent depends upon our perceptions of certain acts and events. Surely in our lives we have all, in one form or the other, experienced a good deal of what we call violence; some have experienced this much more fundamentally and encompassingly than others. But judgments about which acts and which events are the violent ones are judgments based upon the widest latitude of interpretation and misinterpretation - of what constitutes violence.

Now, the question arises is, what is Violence? When does Violence occur? Who are the victims of violent acts and events? Who are the agents of violent acts? And, who can remain the silent spectators of violence today?

Violence can be of many types such as: technological, economic, business, political, radical and police violence. Sexist, racial, ethnic, personal, anomic, psychogenic, assassination, terrorism and political murder are some of the different kinds of violence.\footnote{Stanage, Sherman M. (ed.), Reason And Violence: Philosophical Investigations (Oxford: Basil Blackwell), 1974, p. XIII.}

Modern techniques of violence have such an enormous scope and impersonality that it strains every metaphor of language by which we might tie events to their creators and victims. The scene of violence - the camp, the
bombed area, the riot-overwhelm the categories of character, intentionality, and action so that not even the writer can situate himself, far less construct a conventional story. Modern armies obliterate a village or town before they can enter it, and when they do, the village is empty or littered with dead and maimed bodies with no other story to tell than the ravages of overkill and napalm (a jellied petrol made from this, used in incendiary bombs) whose meaning is reduced to the scene itself. As Frederick J. Hoffman puts it in his “The Mortal No”.10

The final stage in the literature of violence describes the assailant as landscape; it is not only dehumanized, but chaotic. As in the Guernica painting of Picasso, the bodies and sensibilities are twisted, misshapen, and fragmented, and they blend with the contours of the blasted landscape. In such a setting man relies on neither courage nor a sense of the right, but upon a busy (even at times, a frenetic) earnestness to define himself. In his soul are contained both the energy of the assailant and the masochistic receptivity of the victim.11

As a matter of fact, modern equipments of violence destroy both human time and human space; their aim is sheer obliteration, whether through genocide, overkilling, or defoliation. The modern literature of violence is forced to dwell upon the bits and pieces of the world that are all that remains of man himself. We can’t expect to endure the burning of our cities and the destruction of minds and bodies and still expect our language to escape these ravages. Language is the soul of our lives together. Today we must work to restore language, to speak where violence puts an end to speech. Miss Arendt’s essay ‘On Violence’ begins the work of renewing political speech, of defining

its basic words and the contexts of public and private usage which generate their meaning.

Violence is one of the most commonly deplored phenomena of modern life. Nearly everyone would like to reduce or eliminate it. But there is very little consensus on just what constitutes violence. People differ widely in the examples of violence they single out for attention, and there is bitter controversy over what should be done to reduce violence, whether in the streets of our cities or in foreign countries in which we have diplomatic commitments or financial interests. It has been rightly observed:

“Violence at its root definition is any violation of the basic human rights of a person. These violations can be social, economic, moral and political.”\(^{12}\)

A similar notion is proposed by Newton Garver, who holds that “What is fundamental about violence is that a person is violated”, and that “Violence in human affairs amount to violating persons”, where the violation may be “personal or institutionalized”, “overt or covert”.\(^{13}\) However, violence arises from ignorance or untruth, truth conversely arises out of nonviolence.

According to Gandhi, “without ahimsa (nonviolence) it is not possible to seek and find truth. Ahimsa and truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to distangle and separate them. They are like two sides of a coin or rather a smooth unstamped metallic disc. Who can say which the obverse is, and which is reverse?”\(^{14}\) The discovery of truth is not dependent upon violence; it is in fact obscured by violence. Iyer, for example, notes that the


need for violence is often a sign of insecurity and incomplete conviction and that through it victory becomes more important than truth. If violence is used in a conflict situation the sin and the sinner can no longer be separated.

The influence of the New Testament, particularly the Beatitudes, and of Tolstoy’s work upon Gandhi’s concept of nonviolence is well known. The importance of ahimsa for Gandhi echoes Tolstoy when the latter asks:

“...how are we to harmonize the conflicts of men, when some consider an evil that others consider to be good and vice-versa? And so, to consider that an evil which I consider an evil, although my adversary may consider it good, is no answer. There can be but two answers: either we have to find a true and indisputable criterion of what an evil is, or we must not resist evil with violence.”

The arguments against violence often revolve around the assumption that it does not work, that are inherent laws governing violence that prevent it from producing positive results. These may be summarized as follows:

1. Continuity, i.e., once you start using violence you can’t escape it,
2. Reciprocity, i.e., violence creates, begets and procreates further violence. On this point Gandhi warned that “To answer brutality with brutality is to admit one’s moral and intellectual bankruptcy and it can only start a vicious circle...”
3. Sameness, i.e., it is impossible to distinguish between justified and unjustified violence, between violence that liberates and violence that
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enslaves. No matter how high the goal, violence reduces all practitioners to
the same level. Or again, in Gandhi’s words “counter-violence can only
result in further brutalization of human nature”.

4. Violence begets only further violence, i.e., the ends grow out of the means
used; and

5. Violence needs to be justified, but such justification is hypocritical; there is
no “pure” violence – violence and hatred are always linked.

Sartre in his preface to Fanon’s The Wretched of The Earth, states,

“no gentleness can efface the marks of violence; only violence itself can
destroy them. The native cures himself of colonial neurosis by thrusting out
the settlers through force of arms. When his rage boils over, he rediscovers his
lost innocence and he comes to know himself in that he creates himself.”

Fanon himself maintains:

“At the level of individuals, violence is a cleansing force; it forces the
native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes
him fearless and restores his self-respect.”

Our definition must also take account of something we have not so far
mentioned: psychological violence. Clearly a person can do violence to
someone (or even to an animal) by sufficiently vigorous and highly caustic
verbal abuse. Psychological violence may also take the form of piercing verbal
attack on someone’s sensitive spots. It may take the form of a loud, vehement,
nerve-shattering recitation of a person’s failures. And there are other forms.
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21. Weber, Thomas, Conflict Resolution And Gandhian Ethics (New Delhi: Gandhi Peace
22. Fanon, F., The Wretched of The Earth (Harmondsworth: Penguin), 1967, pp. 18, 94.
The following definition of doing violence is meant to capture both psychological and physical violence:

Violence is the physical attack upon, or the vigorous physical abuse of, or vigorous physical struggle against, a person or animal; or the highly vigorous psychological abuse of, or the sharp, caustic psychological attack upon, a person or animal; or the highly vigorous, or incendiary, or malicious and vigorous, destruction or damaging of property or potential property.24

The key to the mutation of brain is to be aware that one is inattentive and this awareness bestows attentivity. It is to grasp the whole movement of life. It requires the intelligence of love and compassion, with its perceptive sensitivity. One has to live every moment with tremendous awareness—which implies alertness and sensitivity and this results in abeyance of thought, which is ending of violence, fear, anger, pain and misery, and to revel in peace, freedom and bliss. The survival of mankind is embedded in ending violence, which includes all psychological imbalances.25

Further, the mind has a wide spectrum and it is oscillating between different frames very rapidly. One end of the spectrum has the lowest quantum energy potential and the other end has the highest quantum energy potential. So the mind expresses itself in hierarchical levels in different frames of reference in the mind spectrum. Whatever action is born of limited knowledge and limited thought, it inevitably breeds conflict, and the results have created havoc in the world. Many eminent physicists have stumbled upon another mode of knowing which has been called intimate, or direct, or intuitive, or insight, and this arises from the non-dual frame of reference of mind. It has the capacity to understand life directly and this gives non-symbolic and non-

24. Ibid., pp. 59-60.
dualistic knowledge. The non-dual mind is aware of the implicate order (values) and the explicate order, therefore, it understands its entire philosophy. It gives non-dualistic and non-symbolic thought which is a quantum of “Fundamental Vibration”, which implies ending of measurement, ending of comparison, and ending of all actions of will. The non-dual thought is at higher quantum energy potential than the dualistic thought. The mind has the capacity to make a quantum jump from dualistic frame to non-dual frame of reference, and this as stated earlier also implies ending of violence, fear, greed and all psychological imbalances, and to revel in peace, freedom and bliss.26

The above discussion indicates to understand that these five problems are both interrelated as well as derivated from the cultural acceptance of violence. Militarization, for example, increase in security, exacerbates poverty suppresses human rights, harms the environment, and divides humankind. Fearfully selfish divisiveness in turn leads to economic deprivation, lack of respect for human rights, inability to cooperate for environmental protection, and to militarization. Economic injustice in cities, violates human rights, despoils the environment and divides communities in such a way that they become the enemies of each other.

If we see the picture of Iraq-US war, for five minutes or 20 depending on whether you’ve been convinced or not by the arguments cited by the Bush administration for invading Iraq – try and forget why do you oppose or support the war. Much will continue to be written along that frontline, despite that fact that no matter what you read or hear, you are very unlikely to change your position on the matter now.

Instead, let us move on to the subject of the unprecedented images of violence that television viewers are now spectators too. A slew of disturbing

26. Ibid.
visuals has led some to coin the term ‘war porno’ – more of a moral tag than a real description. But it can’t be denied that as the war is piped live into households. TV viewers have been left shocked and awestruck (dictionary meaning: filled by an emotion compounded of dread and wonder) at being transported up-close and personal to the theatre of war. In other words, TV audiences sitting thousands of miles away from the war zone are left unprotected from a new kind of war-fog. So it’s no surprise that war-visuals fatigue is creeping in.

The human tragedy and the legal, political and diplomatic questions raised by the invasion of Iraq have generated heated debate on both sides – the so-called coalition and those in opposition. Mr. Bush evokes the idiom of gang warfare – ‘you are with us or against us’. On the other hand, his more polite opponents speak with disdain of US unilateralist behaviour while the more visceral ones refer darkly to imperialism and barbarism.

**Events of Violence: Some Illustrations**

Now it has been estimated that more than fourteen thousands and five hundred wars, which claimed the lives of about four billion people, have been fought on earth in five thousand years since the dawn of civilization. Armed conflicts have taken up to 21 million lives since World War – II. War appears to be natural to man and the aggressors justify war as a means of ending of wars; “peace through war” is what they talk about. Wars continue in spite of the efforts of League of Nations and the United Nations. And, man has the dubious credit of being the biggest killer of his species even his own kith and kins. World War – II as any other major war, left its heart rendering impact on
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the society. It was fought on a colossal scale. The enormity of losses can be judged from the fact that the Soviet Union alone had lost about 20 million lives in the War while six million Jews were killed in Hitler's gas chambers alone. In July 1945, America exploded the first nuclear weapon in the history of mankind and in August it dropped two bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Japanese cities). Disappointed Japan surrendered forthwith and that gave America an imminent edge and deprived the Russians of all but a token share in the post-war settlement in the Far East. The war ended with an act, which contained the two central elements in the cold war: the advent of nuclear weapons and beginning of Soviet-American rivalry. And this created terror and fear in the minds of the people all over the world. The net result was the panic and constant fear in the whole atmosphere.

**Era of Cold War:** In 1947 an American statesman Baruched declared “Let us not be deceived today that we are in the midst of Cold War”. 31 According to the Webster’s dictionary Cold War is a:

“Conflict between two nations and groups of nations by means of power politics, economic pressures, spy activities, or hostile propaganda and often sabotage and exclusion of opposing nationals but without engagement by arms” 32

Generally, Cold War is described as a state of extreme hostility between the superpowers, associated with arms race, ideological supremacy, diplomatic conflict and hostile measures of every kind, short of overt military action. To Fred Halliday, the term ‘cold’ is used in a double and contradictory sense:

(a) To mean that relations between East and West are cold, frozen, paralysed, frosted and so forth, i.e., not warm; and
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To mean that although relations are bad and war like, they are to some extent restrained and have not reached the point of ‘hot’ war. “Cold War has historically been evoked… to denote a coldness bordering on war and to mark deterioration from periods of greater warmth”.

After the German division into four parts, which led to deep clashes between USA and USSR, Korean War was another major cause for tension between the two blocs. The formal declaration of Cold War was made by Churchill, the then British Prime Minister. He said on 5th March 1946, “A Shadow has fallen upon the scene so lately lighted by the Allied Victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its communist international organization intend to do in the immediate future… From Stetlin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an ‘iron curtain’ has descended across the continent”. He also feared, “the Soviet menace to my mind has already replaced the Nazi, foe…” So this was a unique example we find in history.

**Period of Detente:** A simple meaning of detente is any policy, which involves self-interested economic cooperation or steps towards reduction in the level of armaments. For the first time detente was proposed during Khrushchev’s (USSR) visit of USA in 1959 by both the super powers. They presented a plan for general and complete disarmament in four years. But all these efforts faced a major jolt due to shooting down of an American reconnaissance aircraft over Russian territory in 1960 (U-2- incident).

**End of the Cold War:** International relations are not simply about inter-state relations but are also about the internationalization of domestic conflicts and domesticization of international relations. The international system is not simply the passive results of dynamic forces but is constantly engaged in a

dynamic relationship with different forces and factors. Stalin even could not have ever imagined that his giant USSR could pact into 15 states on one day. He consolidated communism by giving preference to dictatorship of Communist Party. The centralized economy of USSR and of other communist countries could not compete the Western capitalism for a long time while there was nearby equilibrium in militarization. Therefore, the result was collapse of communism.

USSR and moreover even the whole world, since Gorbachev’s (Last premier of USSR) ascent to Soviet power in 1985, has been a different one. He virtually started dialogue on all major global issues. Gorbachev dramatically changed the world focus from confrontation to cooperation, from arms race to non-violent nuclear weapon-free world. In the light of his new thinking, he renounced the ideology of cold war, by taking an unprecedented lead in matters of arms control and unilateral initiative in withdrawing from global engagements. His initiatives compelled the other super power (USA) to reciprocate it with appropriate response. Rashiduddin Khan has identified six perspectives, which have qualitatively changed international relations after Gorbachev’s ascent to power:

1. Rejection of confrontation and affirmation of cooperation as the ground rule of international co-existence.
2. Discarding the strategic concept of mutually assured destruction as the king-pin of the dominant doctrine of deterrence between the two super-powers, which was presumed to maintain peace through ‘Balance of Terror’ and its substitution by the concept of mutually assured survival through phased disarmament.
3. Replacement of narrow concept of collective security focused only on military – defence dimension, by the defence economy, polity and environment.
4. Negotiated joint ventures by US and former USSR, for solving regional tensions and conflicts – as in Afghanistan, Cambodia and Africa – by working out mutually agreed and balanced formats of political solutions by rejecting responsibility for regional peace.

5. Emphasis on global economic development to facilitate the emergence of unified, integral, organic, independent world of common peace and prosperity and

6. ‘Perestroika’ and ‘Glasnost’ are axial principles of national and international life involving non-interference and non-intervention, even in affairs of other socialist countries.35

The word Perestroika’s literal meaning is restructuring, which included the entire political, economic and administrative structure of Soviet Union. The term ‘Glasnost’ means openness and rejects Stalin, closed political system and emphasises open society based on freedom of speech and expression, and civil liberties. When some liberal democratic elements were introduced in dictatorial communist politics, several soviet states started withering away from the Soviet Union. Ultimately, the result was collapse of Soviet Union and the end of one superpower. Consequently, it was the end of cold war also. The credit to close this confrontational war goes to USSR under the leadership of Gorbachev. Soviet Union gracefully admitted its ideological defeat against the West after nearly four decades of cold war.

**Recent Events of Violence:** Now it has been observed that

“War has never threatened mankind with grave consequences than today. On the other hand, never before has mankind
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had its disposal stronger forces for eliminating war as an instrument of policy in international relations."36

The following event which had given a shivering to many is the ‘Number Game of September 11, 2001’37 which is an explanation in itself.

- 3,056 Official count of victims in 9/11 attacks
- 2,823 People killed in attack on World Trade Centre
- 291 Number of bodies discovered intact
- 1,102 Number of victims identified
- 105 Number of people classified missing
- 125 people killed in the attack on Pentagon
- 0% Survivors rescued from Ground Zero
- 108,444 truckloads of debris removed
- 190,568 Tons of steel recovered, some shipped to India as scrap
- 3.1 Million hours of labour to clear ground zero
- 69 Days underground fires continued to burn
- 1,300 Number of orphans left by the attacks
- 19 Number of Al-Qaeda members believed to have hijacked the four planes
- 600 Incidents of violence or discrimination against Muslims in the United States
- 21 Billion dollars worth of US property lost due to the attacks
- 1.8 Million jobs estimated to be lost in the US by 2002-end
- 100,000 Estimated Number of jobs lost in lower Manhattan area
- 422,000 Estimated minimum number of New Yorkers suffering from Post trauma Stress Disorder
- 26 days after 9/11 that US began bombing Afghanistan
- 3,620 Estimated Afghan civilian death toll from US bombing campaign so far
- 22,000 Number of US bombs dropped on Afghanistan in six months
- More than 48 Billion dollar increase in US defence budget
- 03 Number of times Colin Powell, US Secretary of State visited the sub-continent
- 02 Number of times Tony Blair visited India and Pakistan to ease tensions

54 Percentage of Americans who feel FBI/CIA should have been able to prevent attacks.
Accordingly, the above facts are the eye-opener for both who are perpetuating and favouring violence.

Similarly, if we go through the events of a few past years, we would find a lot of examples of violence and terrorism all over the world. For instance, we may quote the incident of attack on American Centre at Kolkata on 22nd January, 2002 in which four Indian soldiers were killed, thousands of innocent persons were killed at World Trade Centre and Pentagon in America when Al – Qaida terrorists after high jacking the aero-planes and colliding them with the great towers on 11th September, 2001, (now the day is known as ‘Black Tuesday’ in the Human History). Besides, on August 7, 1998, 224 persons were killed and thousands were wounded in Africa when American Embassy was attacked through Car Bomb Blasts. On June 25, 1996, 19 American army men were killed and thousands of citizens of other countries were wounded at Khobar Tower, Dhahran (Saudi Arabia) through Truck bomb blast. Further, Hijbullah Dosi, a small terrorist group of Saudi Arabia planted car bomb blast at American Army Headquarter in Riyadh on 13th Nov., 1995 in which 5 American Army personnel were killed. Besides, on 13th September, 1995, in Moscow, the building of American Embassy was blown through a grenade launched through a racket and on 19th April, 1995, 168 were killed and more than 500 were wounded in the Alfred P. Mora Federal building of Ohakalahome city. All these events show that violence prevails not only in one state or in any particular country, but we can find it throughout the entire world. There are so many other events to come again and again, which depict the state of violence all around the world.

24 killed in terrorist strike in Jammu (July 14, 2002): At least 24 people were killed and 31 injured in the first major terrorist strike since May 14, 2002,
when militants lobbed grenades and opened fire at random on civilians in an area inhabited by slum dwellers, here on Saturday evening, police sources said. Those killed included 12 women, 11 men and a three-year-old child. Some of them were killed on the spot, a temple was also in the vicinity of the militant strike.

The toll further increased because of the critical nature of the injuries. The Sunday Times reported: “There were at least three militants who were armed with automatic weapons. They fired towards a thickly populated labour colony.” After that several incidents of militant attacks have occurred in the State of Jammu & Kashmir.

**Ahmedabad (March 1, 2002):** Riots, arson, mob rule and mass murders, all targeted against the minority community, continued well into the day on Friday all over Gujarat. The toll, after two days of lumpenism and governmental inaction—both Central and State—shot up to a nerve-numbering 250. Shamefully, Ahmedabad, the financial and political heart of the state, accounted for most of the dead as rioters, unchallenged by the police, continued their rampage into Friday afternoon. At another place, crowds burnt alive six persons near Dehrol railway station, about 50 km from Godhra, on Friday morning. The victims were walking on the highway when a mob of more than 200 doused them in kerosene and burnt them alive, of the victims, four were women.

“A mob stormed our house and pulled me and my parents out. They doused us with petrol and set us ablaze… My parents are dead and see what they have done to me,” sobbed 15-year-old Shah Jahan, a resident of Noorani
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Masjid in Naroda-Patia, her face dripping with blood. Similarly, in another case, Mohammad Farooq, a painter, lost his three children and wife. He was left with three children, all hospitalized with serious burns. “They burnt down everything. My wife is gone... I do not know whether these children will live... In one stroke, they have wiped out all that I had,” sobbed Farooq. His remaining children – Hamid (10), Ayesh (11) and Qamar (12) – all have between 50 to 70 per cent burns. Thus, violence spreads its volumes but does not bother about the enormity of pain, agony, and helplessness of the people.

Furthermore, in Panwad village in Vadodara district, about 150 km from Pandori, the message to the 200 Muslims who fled to stay in a relief camp 15 km away couldn’t be clearer: Don’t come back. It’s more chilling than that. Attackers have used the walls of the deserted and damaged houses to scrawl messages in charcoal, many of them unprintable in literal translation. Most of the messages urged people to rape women, a few talk of “cutting them into pieces,” also. This was the height of the volume of and kind of violence.

**Ahmedabad (09-05-2002):** It could be dubbed a “Catch-72” situation for the Gujarat Government which claimed to had controlled the riots within 72 hours of their outbreak. Thursday, when the riots completed 72 days, was a moment of reckoning for an administration which neither wanted to remember its 72-hour claim, nor accept that 72 days latter, there was no semblance of control. If we could see the figures so far, then Ahmedabad accounted for more than half the 945 deaths reported officially since the Godhra Carnage, Home Department put the number of injured at 1,420 and 22,560 cases of arson.

---
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caused the loss of Rs 705 crore and even as the deaths toll kept mounting each day, police claimed they too were doing their bit. On riot control efforts, the figures spoke for themselves. Only 192 rioters were killed during that period as reported.\textsuperscript{43} When these cases were brought to the kind notice of the Supreme Court of India, the Apex Court reprimanded the Gujarat Government for the so-called action taken by the Government.

The present scenario of violence does not stop here as it is evident that it is a continuous process and creating more and more problems.

**Bali Nightclub Blasted (187, mostly foreigners were killed):** Bombs ripped through a packed nightspot on Indonesia's traditionally tranquil tourist island of Bali overnight, killing at least 187 people, most of them were foreigners.

The Saturday night blasts, which the United States denounced as a “despicable act of terror”, Police said the dead included nationals from Australia, Britain, France, Germany and Sweden. It was one of the world's most devastating attacks against tourists. There were bodies everywhere, burnt people were walking around in shock, Amos Libby, a 25 year old American said on Sunday at the airport, where he was looking for a flight out. Hospital staff told that many dead were charred beyond recognition. It was nothing quite like anything he had ever seen. “The smell of burnt skin and the pain that they were in, you can’t really put that into words,”\textsuperscript{44} Melbourne tourist Martin Lyons told Australia’s Nine Network Sunday programme.

Richard Poore, 37, a television presentation director from New Zealand, said that hundreds of revelers were inside the Sari. Poore, who filmed the aftermath, had tried to get into the club 20 minutes before the blast – but it was too full.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., Monday, October 14, 2002, p. 1.
“I saw limbs around ... I got to the stage where I couldn’t film any more because it made me fell physically ill,”45 he said. This was the net result of violence which created havoc.

**The Clouds of War Looming Over The World & Its Effects on Humanity:**
The very important commodity of the present world is ‘Petroleum Products’. The ongoing tussle between America and Iraq, resulted in a war and the biggest impact of this tussle could be seen in the rise of oil prices. World oil prices hit fresh two-year highs as the U. S. Secretary of State Colin Powell forecast that within two weeks it could be proved that Iraq was not cooperating with U. N. weapons inspectors. Crude oil futures in New York rose 34 cents to $ 34, just above two-year highs struck on Thursday. The prices jumped nearly $ 3, or 9 per cent, that week as a 47-day oil workers strike in a big exporter Venezuela ran down U. S. crude inventories, learning world markets more vulnerable to a halt to Iraqi supply. The prices could go above $ 40 a barrel, a level economist warned that if sustained could cause severe damage to world economic recovery.46 America was against Iraq, destroyed not only human beings but also the old architecture, oldest monuments, museums, property and many valuable things which may not be replaced at any cost in future. The loss, in fact, is irreplaceable. The violence is the cause of this loss.

**Suicide Blasts Kill 91 in Saudi Capital, Foreigners Among the Dead:** More than 91 people, including 10 to 12 US citizens, were killed in suicide bombings that rocked three expatriate housing compounds in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, US State Department officials said. “We have counted more than 91 dead”;47 he further said that the final figure could rise because of large number of casualties. Another official too counted the toll from the triple blasts upto 91
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and was expected to rise. At least 30 and possibly as many as 44 US citizens were wounded, the official said. Another official counted a list of 9 other persons plus the 91, who believed to be the suspects as bombers and 194 as injured in the blasts. Earlier attackers shot their way into three housing compounds in the Saudi Capital and then set off suicide car bombs, a Saudi Interior Ministry official said. An US official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said the overall casualties appeared to be in the hundreds and that several members of the Saudi National Guard died in the attacks. He also said British, German, French, Australian and other Arab citizens were among the dead and wounded. The attacks on late Monday were followed by a smaller bombing and Tuesday near the headquarters of a Saudi-US company. However, by chance, no casualties were reported in that bombing.

While counting, British officials said five of their citizens were wounded, Dutch reported three. At the housing complexes, five floors of buildings were blown out, their outer walls sheared off. Heaps of rubbles and blocks of upended concrete, spikes of twisted steel were lying everywhere in disorder. Burned cars were still in their parking spots. Thus, there was destruction of property and life everywhere. And, this was all because of use of violence which kills and destroys.

**Terror Hits Casablanca:** Terrorists set off a string of deadly blasts in the heart of Casablanca, killing at least 40 people and injuring 60. The blasts damaged a Jewish community centre, apart from two Western targets. The attack which apparently killed the most people took place at Casa Espana, a Spanish Cultural Centre and nearby Spanish restaurant. At least 18 people were believed to be killed in either one or two bomb blasts there, although little debris were visible from outside. Casablanca, Morocco’s economic centre
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was thrown completely out of gear. Police and rescue workers rushed to the aid of dazed, blood-splattered survivors. Bodies were seen scattered on the wreckage-strewn streets. Ambulances were called in from surrounding areas to aid the injured, police sources said. The violence does not save but only destroys.

The Moroccan Government did not directly implicate Osama Bin Laden’s Al-Qaida in the nearly simultaneous explosions, but the attack confirmed fears that terrorists had plans to strike less defended sites. However, no group claimed responsibility for the attacks. According to investigations, all the attacks were suicide bombings but car bombs were not used. Government officials had originally reported that at least three of the explosions were from car bombs, and a fourth was detonated by a suicide bomber wearing an explosive belt in a Spanish restaurant. Residents had reported hearing a fifth explosion. While the targets were places frequented by foreigners, most of the casualties were local inhabitants, officials said.

In this case, ten of the dead were described as suicide bombers who, at least in part, had carried out the attacks. “They were terrorists, suicide bombers”, interior minister Mustapha Sahel told reporters. “These are the well-known signatures of international terrorists.” He further added that there were similarities between the attacks in Casablanca and those in Saudi Arabia on Monday 12-05-2003, in which many people were killed.

**Bloody Muharram in Iraq, 143 Killed: Baghdad/Karbala:** Simultaneous explosions ripped through worshippers on Tuesday at Shia Mosques in Baghdad and Karbala on the holiest day of the Shia calendar. An US official
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said at least 143 people were killed. It was the bloodiest day since Saddam Hussein’s fall.

Likewise, three suicide bombers set off explosives in and around Baghdad’s Kazimiya shrine, killing 58 and wounding 200. At least five explosions shook Karbala, a holy city where more than two million Shias from Iraq, Iran and from nearby areas had gathered, where 85 were killed and over a 100 wounded. Further, the incidents of violence now has become the order of the day in Iraq.

Spain Reels on 11-03-2004, Train Blasts Kill 190: As four powerful bombs killed the Spanish capital Madrid killing 186 (190 according to AFP) and injuring over a 1000 in Europe’s deadliest act of terror after the Lockerbie bombings, major European capitals have begun to wonder if March 11, 2004 – the 11th day of the third month is meant to be the old World’s 9/11 (September 11, 2001)?

According to an AFP report, an audio tape with Koranic verses in Arabic and seven detonators were found in a van suspected of being linked to the deadly series of bomb attacks in Madrid on Thursday, Interior Minister Angel Acebes said. While some of Europe’s leading terrorism experts agreed

the bombs ahead of Ballots (as Spain went to polls on Sunday) could be as significant an assault on Western democracy as 9/11’s crumbling Twin Towers

attacked the symbol of Western Capitalism.

Dismembered bodies entangled in the metal wreckage of train carriages. Thousands of people, many of them school-children fleeing in panic and fear.

“It was butchery on a brutal scale”, Juan Redondo, an inspector for the Firefighting Department said. “This catastrophe goes beyond the imaginable.”

At least 173 people were killed and some 600 injured in ten explosions on or

near four commuter trains in Madrid. The dead and severely injured were taken away on stretchers. The wounded with cuts and bruises sat and wept helplessly on sidewalk curbs.

Further, Redondo said that at El Pogo Station just east of downtown Madrid, where two bombs tore through a double-decker commuter train, he saw at least 70 bodies on the platform. “It looked like a platform of death,” he said, adding that one body had to be picked off the train station’s roof.” Further, he laments: “I’ve never seen anything like it before. The recovery of the bodies was very difficult. We didn’t know what to pick up?”

A Red Holi: Was it a coincidence that George Bush issued an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein to get out of Iraq within 48 hours on Chhotee Holi and declared War the day after Holi? Instead of coloured water, we got a demonstration of blood being spilled – *Khoon Kee Holi*. This bloodletting took place thousands of miles away from our country. Though we will feel its impact in the way of a rise in the price of oil, the collapse of our trade with Iraq and the influx of Indians working there.

The outcome of war was never in doubt; the morality of engaging in it will be disputed for times to come. Was it a *dharanyuddh* (war for righteousness)? Or was it wages for motives like grabbing Iraq’s oil resources? Before we deal with that question, let’s see the people’s reaction. Without exception, people round the globe were against the war. Of the nearly 200 Nations, Governments of 150 were against the war, 35 (including some Muslim and Arab) for it, and the remaining unconcerned.

However, not one of the 150 countries against the war showed the slightest inclination to help Saddam Hussein. They all condemned only his
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regime as tyrannical. The strongest criticism came from Muslim rulers of Iraq’s neighbours as well as Pakistan. But they questioned the right of the US, England and their allies to undertake a task that should clearly have been that of the UN. However, the UN is not constituted to declare wars or engage in hostilities as it has no army under its command. The best it could do is to appeal to member states to act with restraint, which it did. However, this also shows the helplessness of the UN and it needs to be stronger for its interference and intervention in such cases.

Accordingly, under the present situation the major casualty of the war will be the UN. The war was in clear defiance of most of its members. What will also need to be re-examined is the concept of the sovereignty of its member states. It is no longer true that what a nation does is within its own business. No nation has the right to engage in activities like manufacturing WMDs which imperil the safety of others; nor the ruler of a country the right to deprive its citizens of freedom to speak their minds and change their rulers through democratic processes.56 This issue needs much more thinking for the better results.

**The Terrorism of Names:** What is in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, wrote William Shakespeare in the late 16th Century. In the age of global terrorism, it seems, Shakespeare is hardly applicable. Now, the politics of names assumes far greater importance than in love-struck Romeo’s speeches.

Reporting the latest assault on Jammu’s Raghunath temple, Pakistan’s leading national daily, *Dawn*, termed it an attack by “activists fighting for freedom.”57 Pakistan-based Lashkar-e-Toiba which was reportedly responsible for the attack is the largest terrorist outfit in South Asia and yet, Pakistan’s

---
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chief newspaper referred to its cadres as "activists fighting for freedom." In fact, this is a climb-down from the more regularly used line that "freedom fighters" are waging a "struggle" to free Muslim Kashmir from "Hindu India."

However, a few sane voices have risen. In *Pakistan Today* last year, Tashbih Sayyed, commented bitterly: "Now that we have learnt our lessons in Afghanistan, albeit so tragically, we will have to be extra careful before we extend our hand of cooperation to any such 'freedom movement.'"\(^{58}\)

**Al-Qaida Hits Riyadh, 11 killed:** Time and again the same story has been repeated as suspected Al-Qaida suicide bombers posing as Saudi police blew up their explosive-laden car in a Riyadh compound housing mostly Arab foreigners on Sunday, killing 11 people and wounding 122, including 36 children. The Saudi interior ministry, quoted by the Kingdom’s official news agency SPA, said the dead included Saudis, Lebanese, Sudanese and Egyptians, among them four children, but did not have a more specific breakdown. The powerful blast ripped an avenue of destruction between 200 villas in the compound in the capital just days after Western nations issued fresh terror alerts and Washington shut its missions in the kingdom, the world’s biggest oil exporter.

Further, in May a triple suicide bombing at Riyadh housing compounds killed 35, including nine Americans and Al-Qaida was blamed\(^{59}\) for this crime.

According to William Lucy, if Americans are mentally able to tune out savageries in Belfast, or a Bosnian village it is almost impossible to ignore the blood that washes through the streets of our own neighbourhoods. The cruel fact is that on the brink of the 21st century, America is drenched with violence, and a typical school kid these days is as familiar with its vocabulary – of

\(^{58}\) Ibid.

47s, drive-bys, crack, skyjackings, hacking, Saturday night specials, knee-capping – as any Libyan terrorist.

It may also be mentioned that by the end of 1993, homicide had become the leading cause of death on the job in six of the 50 states and in Washington, D. C., the nation’s capital. Within borders about some 20,000 men, women and children are slain each year. All too often, adolescents are the perpetrators and the victims; in 1991 teen-agers were being murdered at the rate of 15 a day. What is most troubling is that much of the violence is random, with no purpose other than a momentary thrill or of acquiring status in a street gang. It is currently popular to assign part of the blame for this malign epidemic to the mass media, and particularly to television; critics say that vivid and unending portrayals of mayhem encourage violence, and that may be so. But I’m struck by a possibility that is infinitely more depressing – that television’s gore-soaked “entertainments’ only mirror an American society that has lost its way.

Then President Clinton had already proposed such counter-measures as more police and harsher penalties, and we would probably be spend more billions of dollars trying them again although neither approach did work in the past. Those who ask why there is so much violence in America or anywhere else immediately arm an endless debate over nature vs. nature. The naturists hold that violence is rooted in poor education, or unemployment, or the loss of family values. The naturists argue that violence has genetic roots and may be a testosterone flavour.60 There are so many (countless) such events which have happened and happening every day compelling the right thinking minds to think, discuss and analyse the outcome and its prevention.

---

The End-Result of Violence: So far, as we have seen in the above mentioned incidents that the end-result of violence is only injury, death and destruction. No one so far had been able to claim that he had got anything out of violence, or any profit from violence. His only answer would be that violence leads only towards destruction, death-bed, separation from his near and dear ones, and separation from life’s comforts. There is no end in terms of violence, because violence is always counter productive, it is an endless game and it is not a friend of any one. It is just like a blood-sucker spider, which after sucking the blood of its pray, kills them without any reason. So how can we expect that violence is a good thing for humanity and for this beautiful Earth? Now the message is clear: do we want injury, death and destruction or development, construction and peace? The only answer to have peace is the practice of non-violence and non-violence only because violence is negative in all respects.

Nonviolence:

Non-violence can be defined as the principle of refraining from using violence, especially as a means of protest, the absence of or freedom from violence. However, Nonviolence is not easy to define as several questions may arise. Is it only a new term, which includes very old-established positions and practices? Is being a nonviolent person the same as to be nonviolent? Does nonviolence consist of a force, a different way of achieving power, as some people consider, or is it weakness, a tame acceptance of the established order? What is the limit, if there is one, in giving up the use of physical force? What are the methods of nonviolence? Are they effective? Is it possible to be nonviolent when supporting non-confessional, agnostic attitudes? As these questions show, it is not easy to speak generically about the philosophy of nonviolence.

nonviolence and related subjects, such as civil – disobedience, pacifism, nonviolent direct action, nonviolent popular defense, and so on.62

Peace research today has reached a consensus that the opposite of peace is not war, but violence. It would follow that the opposite of violence, namely nonviolence, would in some way be identical to peace. More than a subtopic, it may prove to be a different way of looking at the same phenomenon. This conclusion seems intuitively satisfactory and would suggest that the study of nonviolence should have a very great deal to do with the study of peace.

Unfortunately, the systematic study of nonviolence and its conscious development as a social mechanism are recent enough for the word to be used (and the phenomenon behind it understood) contradictorily. On a descriptive level, the distinction between nonviolence and violence is unproblematic and unilluminating: nonviolence is the absence of violence. However, just as with the concept of “negative peace”, that is, the absence of war, problems arise, in the first place because not all violence is physical. Most (but not all) theorists today would consider an abusive word or gesture as not what they want to mean by nonviolence, even if that word or gesture is not accompanied by blows; on the other hand, actual blows delivered to a bully not out of hatred or fear might well be considered nonviolence by some.63

Non-violence is, in fact, very different from what public imagines it to be. To be sure, it makes itself known first in negative guise as the refusal to violence. But this refusal suggests neither weakness nor passivity. Nor should non-violence be identified with an absolute pacifism or with non-resistance. At one place when India was attacked by some armed force under some greedy terms at that time Gandhi put it like this way, “I would prefer to see India

defend her honour by armed force than to see her stand like a coward, watching her defeat without an attempt to defend itself. But I still believe just as strongly that nonviolence is infinitely superior to violence."64 On the contrary, as Eustave Thibon wrote, “The violent person is simply a coward who pretends to be bold.” Non-violence is, above all, a critique of violence. It denounces its misdeeds and contradictions. Far from redressing injustice, violence adds further injustice. Even when it does not kill people, it shows scant respect for their integrity or dignity. Violence is a force which escapes the control of reason. Put positively, non-violence is the affirmation of an alternative view of force. It is clear-sighted power which uses means proportionate to the goal it sets itself. For Gandhi, the end is in the means as the tree is in the seed. It is the power of reason and truth, the power of morality and the human spirit. It is what in Brazil is called principled firmness and in the Philippines the power of the weak, the power of the soul. And it is in this way that Pope John Paul II defined nonviolence in 1985 in Guatemala, “an active commitment to achieve justice.”65

Some define non-violence as not mere passivity or an internal disposition, but a constant way of acting which names acts of violence for what they are as Pope John Paul II consistently did before, during and after the Gulf War. Non-violence refuses to cooperate with evil and injustice. Nonviolent reaction to acts of violence is reaching out in goodwill towards the perpetrators of violence together with a willingness to suffer ourselves rather than make others the victim of violence in retaliation. Thus, nonviolence is a series of acts of choosing life rather than injury or death – whether physical,
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psychological, social or cultural. Habitual nonviolence results in deep peace of heart based upon an integrated love of ourselves, of God’s gratuitous nature, of our neighbours in our one world and of God the creator, redeemer and sanctifier. The recent event defines the success of this definition. In the Third World we saw it in the overthrow of President Marcos in the Philippines in 1986. In 1989, we saw it in Central and Eastern Europe with the “velvet revolution” in Czechoslovakia and the destruction of the Berlin wall. In his *Encyclical Solicitude rei socialis*, John Paul II puts it this way, “the events of 1989 in Eastern and Central Europe give an example of success achieved by the will to negotiate and gospel values in the face of the enemy who has opted to remain unhindered by moral principles... Many people learn to strive without violence for justice, having recourse to the class struggle in national conflict and no recourse to war in international conflicts!”

However, the term “nonviolence” in general use today seems to inherit the meanings of earlier terms like (Christian) non resistance as understood by writers such as Adin Ballou, under the influence of Sanskrit ahimsa, “nonviolence, non-injury” made current by Gandhi (Ballou 1972; nonresistance is listed in the Oxford English Dictionary as meaning only passive obedience). The terms in use in other European languages show the same negative scope as the common acceptance of “nonviolence”: for example French nonviolence; German Gewaltlosigkeit, the latter of which can literally mean “absence of power or authority”. With the introduction of nonviolent principles and methods into the central political arena by the Green parties, particularly in the Federal republic of Germany in the present decade, however, a new and more accurate connotation has been popularized, that is, German Gewaltlosigkeit a “freedom from violence”.
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Just as in common parlance “peace” nearly always means the mere absence of war, so the term “nonviolence” usually, and somewhat erroneously, suggests the mere absence of injurious force or since most people now carelessly equate injurious force with force purely and simply, the absence of any force whatsoever.

Historically, non-violence can generate what might be called a “weak force” in the social field. It is much less likely to produce counter-productive side-effects or compromise the long-term development of a relationship than violence, but it is nothing like as predictable or efficacious as the deployment of full “dehyphenated” nonviolence, which, as in Gandhi's case, not only rectified a major situational injustice but changed world history. This is the “strong force”, or in Gandhi's terms “the greatest power mankind has been endowed with.”

A related, if not as fundamental myth, is that physical violence is absolutely ruled out for the nonviolent person under any circumstances. Nonviolence is not, like Pacifism, a moral prohibitory norm. In an emergency (Gandhi used the example of a madman with a naked sword) even lethal and physical violence can be allowed, indeed demanded - that is, for the protection of others.

Yet in such an emergency three things which lie mainly outside the domain of physical behaviour would be required of a positively nonviolent person:
a. to accept any consequences of his or her physically violent action;
b. to ask why the situation arose in the first place and what he or she - or society in general - could do to prevent such things (in technical terms, is “structural violence” lurking in the social situation, for example in mass media programes which criminalize viewers); and
c. not to entertain the slightest ill-will towards the assailant, even if physical violence must be applied against him or her.68

According to Gandhi, “The world rests upon the bedrock of satya or truth. Asatya meaning untruth also means non-existent, and satya or truth also means that which is. If untruth does not so much as exist, its victory is out of the question. And truth being that which can never be destroyed. This is the doctrine of Satyagraha in a nutshell.”69

The apparent moral contradictions of nonviolence are often susceptible of logical explanation within its own frame of reference; for example, while accepting physical violence for the protection of others (and possibly of oneself) in an emergency, Gandhi came to oppose preparations and organization for violence, which precludes war.

As we have already seen, whether or to what degree nonviolence was actually present in a given act, word, or thought is more complex than is usually recognized, this being a matter in which, for one thing, intentions are primary.70

Besides, it must be remembered that nonviolent actors view their efforts as part of a long-term process. While military strategists look to the Cuban Missile Crisis as an exemplary success of violent threat and coercion, advocates of nonviolence would look before the events to ask what dynamics had brought the United States and Soviet Union to that pass, and after it to point out that the defeat stiffened Soviet resistance and increased their determination never to be humiliated again by American power.
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Finally, it must always be borne in mind that the total dynamic of an interaction has unseen dimensions. If an individual is injured or even killed during an apparently unsuccessful attempt to offer nonviolent resistance he or she may nonetheless have avoided the psychic injury of hating (as Augustine says, imagine thinking our enemy could hurt us more than our enmity) - the opponent may have been touched more than superficially appears, readier to be persuaded at a subsequent interaction.

A long-term nonviolent actor is often referred to, particularly by Gandhi, as a “soldier” and the struggle to found society on nonviolent principles as a “war”. It also serves to remind us that nonviolence requires more discipline, training, and preparation than soldiering, and that we must expect it to require sacrifice, though of a different kind. In a sense, of course, all conflict-limiting mechanisms such as international law, formal and informal diplomacy, transnational solidarity, and the United Nations are based on at least nonviolent principles and to that extent draw upon nonviolent power.

Though the practice and theory that one should not return evil for evil is old, it was not always named nonviolent behaviour. Tolstoy may be the first to use the phrase when he spoke of “nonviolent resistance to evil”. Gandhi, influenced by Tolstoy, used “non-violence” to translate the Sanskrit term ahimsa; it soon became customary to write nonviolence as one word in English. The translation of ahimsa is not perfect. However, ahimsa means in fact “no harm”. The terminological explanation allows us to avoid a common error; nonviolence does not aim to stop the use of physical force, or any form of moral coercion or aggression. If so, nonviolent direct action would be incomprehensible. Believers in nonviolence try at any price not to damage their adversaries. They consider that the absolute limit of their action is their respect for life.
We have seen the negative aspect of nonviolence; the non return of evil for evil. We can find precedents for this attitude in Confucius, in Buddha (“If a man hurts me, I will return him my affection and good will; the more he hurts me the kinder I must be; the perfume of goodness reaches me, and the sad air of evil blows towards him”), in the Laotian tradition, and even in Socratic-Platonic thought, when Plato says through Socrates’ words in Crito: ‘It is never licit to commit an injustice nor to return injustice for injustice, nor to take revenge on someone who suffers, returning him evil for evil’. The Christian tradition includes this element, too as some of the New Testament writings, especially those of John, James, and Paul, abundantly show.

As a matter of fact, nonviolence has a positive aspect, frequently emphasized with adjectives such as “active nonviolence”, “nonviolent direct action”, or “nonviolent resistance”. In plain words, nonviolence has always implied a struggle, admittedly in the field of conscience or will, but a struggle nevertheless. Nonviolence presupposes action and initiative, which implies the use of “weapons”, tactics, and strategies based on the principle of overcoming evil through good. Without any obligation, nonviolence would not exist. Gandhi was explicit in the matter: “Ahimsa is not the way of the timid or the cowardly. It is the way of the brave ready to face death. He who perishes sword in hand is no doubt brave, but he who faces death without raising his little finger and without flinching is braver. But he who surrenders his rice bags for fear of being beaten is a coward and no votary of ahimsa.”

It is a question of turning nonviolence into a rule of life, of getting involved in it totally. It is not possible to act nonviolently, according to this theory, in one activity and violently in others; if so, we would convert nonviolence into a policy and not a way of life. However, the obligation must be total.

Now the question is that what happens when the nonviolent person faces a conflict in which agreements or obligations are not possible, a situation that must be solved by means of struggle? Those who do not trust nonviolence as a method for solving conflicts efficiently, usually think that this kind of conflict can only be settled by choosing between surrender or passive submission and violence, and since victory requires violence, they consider there is no other remedy left but to direct oneself towards a threat and the use of violence, without keeping in view its forms and its implications. The truth is that violence is not the only efficient action in such conflicts. Throughout the human history, various people and groups, in several places all over the world and under a variety of political regimes, have supported nonviolent resistance. Martin Luther King (jr.) and the buses boycott in Montgomery, Gandhi and the Salt March, Cesar Chaves and the fight on behalf of the “Chicanos” are well-known examples. There are, however, many other examples: the Hungarian resistance against Austria from 1850-67, the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods in the early twentieth century, the fights in the Russian Empire in 1905-06, the action launched in support of the legitimate government of the Weimar Republic of Germany and against the rightish Kapp Putsch, the German resistance (in 1923) to the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, the struggles against the Nazis in Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands, using nonviolent methods.

The above examples clearly show that nonviolent strategy is a strategy of peaceful resistance, of non-submission to the enemy's will. Those who decide on this strategy refuse to accept passively the sufferings their adversaries impose on them. They defy their authority and oppose their power until they defeat them. According to Richard B. Gregg, when people attack with physical violence they expect one of two responses: fear, which will lead to submission or escape; or a violent response. Attackers gain some moral
security of they face the response they expect, it allows them to take the 
initiative and reaffirms that they did well when deciding on that kind of 
behaviour. Nonviolence, in Gregg's words, is a “moral jiujitsu”. As the 
nonviolent person does not resist as the aggressor expects, the force of the 
aggression confronts a gap and the aggressor's moral balance is lost.

**History of Non-violence:**

There are several classic works of Indian philosophy, having their own 
views about war, peace and morality. ‘Mahabharata’ made it clear that just war 
is a duty but it did not permit unethical tactics to win it and return to political 
power, which is treated to be sin. Manu, another great ancient Indian 
philosopher elaborated the theory of territorial expedience by war or peace. 
Echoing the Mahabharata, Manu expressed the view that an appeal to arms 
should be avoided as far as possible.

Buddhism and Jainism the great advocates of Ahimsa (non-violence) 
also have deep roots in Indian background. Their crusades were against evils 
of tremendous sacrifices of animals prevalent and against the increasing 
differences of caste system within the Hindu religion.

In this respect, the Jains insist on the primacy of non-violence and make 
it a corner-stone of their ethics. Their interpretation of the doctrine of non-
violence is more rigorous than that of the Buddhists. The Buddhists had begun 
to think seriously of the political implications of the concept of non-violence 
and had put forward a theory of kingship based on this concept. Buddhism 
preached complete renunciation of war. The maxim that the slayer gets a 
slayer in his turn – a man who spoils is spoiled in his turn, is well known. The 
bidding of Buddha is to meet anger with love, evil with good. He says:

“Abalam Tam Balam Ahu Yassa Balabalam Balam Balassa 
Dhammaguttiassa Pativatta Na Vijjati” (Samyutta
Nikaya\textsuperscript{72}:[That Strength is really weakness which is the strength of fools. There is none to counter the power of one protected by righteousness.]

In one of the Buddhist books ‘Manjusrimula-Kalpa’ the king was forbidden from waging war at the cost of destruction of people. Because it is deliberate destruction of life of a creature: “Sancicca panam Jivita Voropetum,”\textsuperscript{73} Non-violence was understood more as an ethical than a social concept, in that it referred primarily to individual rather than collective action.

The war like temper finally saw its culmination in the ideas of the ‘Arthashastra’ a handiwork of Kautilya. He held power as the basis of the state. According to him, there was no other better instrument for bringing people under control than punishment (danda). An ideal king, he said, was possessed of valour, powerful resolute mind, quick in his decisions and actions and intelligent enough to take advantage of the weakness of his enemies for the enlargement of his kingdom. For him, territory was more valuable than men and material and the men could be sacrificed for the cause of occupation of any territory.

Before Ashoka, non-violence was practised merely on individual level not as a collective action in politics, nor in external affairs of Indian kingdoms. It has been observed that it was Ashoka, who practised it (non-violence) widely. It didn’t mean that he had not occupied any territory after the Kalinga War, still he submerged other territories into his own reign by peaceful means, whenever necessitated.

Similarly, never before, nor even afterwards, was there a king who felt regret for doing something which is always regarded as a legitimate business

\textsuperscript{72} Upadhyaya, Kashi Nath, Early Buddhism And The Bhagavad-Gita (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas), 1971, p. 532.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., p. 529.
of kings. For the first time he had the courage to renounce war as a form of state policy and declared non-violence as the basis of international relations. He admired dharmavijaya (conquest through war), which masked a distinct milestone in the history of Indian ideology and in the world.

The Ashokan inscription (XIII Rock Adic Kalinga) which described the changed heart of the emperor Ashoka says:

"Verily the Beloved of the Gods wishes all living beings non injury, self control, practice of serenity and mildness..."  

Is Non-violence Successful?

The most widespread criticism of philosophy of non-violence (in its field of individual action as well as when it prepares defense alternatives) is that it has hardly any success, that is to say, it is ineffective and utopian. However, the advocates of nonviolence, usually counter argue by citing numerous historical examples and, much more importantly, pointing out many success stories that there are several ways of exercising nonviolent strategy with possibilities of success. The first is conversion: the opponent, as a result of the action of a nonviolent person or group, comes around to a new point of view, which embraces the ends of the nonviolent actor. Conversion is based on Gandhi’s strong belief in the idea of not humiliating the opponent and of avoiding hostility towards the opponent. We fight and practice non-cooperation against systems or methods and not against people; with the result that through actions we look for the heart as well as mind for feelings, not only for repression (which is not often searched or wished for). Gandhi, however, enumerated a series of requirements or controls which nonviolent people should apply themselves to favour conversion. The inherent instructions are:

a. abstain from violence and hostility;

---

b. gain the confidence of the adversary, telling the truth, mentioning one's own plans, behaving with a degree of fair play (postpone an action in the face of a natural catastrophe, for example);
c. avoid the adversaries' humiliation;
d. make the sacrifices for one's cause visible;
e. carry out constructive tasks;
f. keep up a personal contact with the opponent;
g. show one's confidence in the opponent;
h. develop an attitude of good will and patience towards the antagonist.75

And according to Gene Sharp, “In the mechanism of accommodation the opponent resolves to grant the demands of the nonviolent actionists without having changed his mind fundamentally about the issues involved.”76

As a result, nonviolence is much more than a philosophy, in spite of its vast history in philosophical or religious thought; it is also a method of action, a way of life, and a political theory which dares even to discuss radical social change. Its peculiarity rests on emphasizing that aims and means must coincide: for the adherents of nonviolence a just and egalitarian society is impossible if we use violent means to bring it about. The changing of the structures is not enough, people have to change themselves too. We must learn to think and act differently, we must dare to disobey, to deny our consent to those who misuse it. As Gandhi had clarified that the law of the majority had nothing to say where conscience was in turn to speak. Therefore, it was not the law which should suggest what justice is, but justice should dictate the law. And to Gandhi that is possible through the force of nonviolence. The moral force is an example of truth. On the other hand, nonviolence has created a

great many tactics and fighting methods, of nonviolent direct action, which, alone, constitutes an excellent and relevant instrument to achieve peace, as their growing use proves. Indeed, they are used even by those who do not wholly share the philosophical and moral principles of nonviolence. But ultimately they have to realize the utility and relevance of non-violence because violence does not create but only destroys.

However, to Gandhi “non-violence is not merely a personal virtue. It is a social virtue to be cultivated like the other virtues... what I ask for is an extension of it on a larger, national and international scale.” Yet the essence of Gandhi’s work was peace and he did more than to raise a general desire for it; he also laid the groundwork for a specific peace keeping institution, the Shanti Sena (“Peace Army”), which 40 years later was very effective in containing the Chinese incursion into Tibet as well as in other conflicts. It has been the parent of the World Peace Guard and other peace brigades such as the Witness for Peace Movement which has been furnishing extremely effective nonviolent protection against terrorism in Central America. However, not much serious attention has been paid for its philosophy and action.

It is sometimes claimed by many that nonviolence has failed; but this puzzles the followers of Gandhi who know that it can't fail since it has hardly been sincerely tried. At the 1985 “Beyond War” award ceremony, then the Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi said that in the long travail of history only the non-violent philosophy of Jesus, Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi had survived. Gandhians of today feel that humankind can't survive by using and

accepting the method of violence. We must make a great leap forward, which can only be by turning this philosophy into a living personal and social truth. That is the only homage Gandhi ever could accept. Only in this way we not only respect his spirit but, also in the immortal words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, “give solace to innumerable hearts- who must live on in this violence-stained World.”

Nonviolent culture means not only non-injury but also love, selfless service, suffering and sacrifice for others, overall friendliness and cooperation with the ultimate aim of the good of all in order to attain perfection and fulfilment as envisaged in the inherent aspiration incipient in the human race as a matter of evolutionary urge; this urge is not an imaginary one but has been indicated in the course of human progress from the stage of the first 'cave man' to the present man living in the several continents in groups living together and aspiring to live as one human family.

It is said that when Gandhi spoke to villagers, he frequently pointed out to the fingers of his left hand to represent five great calls for problem-solving action that confronted India during the struggle for independence; spinning, removal of untouchability, improvement of the status of women, abstinence from drugs and alcohol, and achievement of Hindu-Muslim harmony. Then, it is said, he would point to his wrist and say something like “this is nonviolence.”

If we had the grace and joy of his presence today, Gandhi might summarize the pressing problems confronting our global village in a similar way. Pointing to the fingers of his left hand, he might say: “Here are the
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problems we must solve – peace and disarmament, economic justice, human rights, preservation of the environment and realization of problem – solving cooperation among all the peoples of the earth.” Similarly, he also might had added “this is nonviolence, the way we must go about solving these problems.”

If we try to go through the entire philosophy of the present day happening from one perspective, these threats are being perceived as global problems requiring global solutions. From another view-point, they are the problems that we confront in our daily lives-individually; in our families; in our villages, towns, and cities; in our nation; and in our regions. That is, we are faced with violence, economic needs, violations of dignity, deteriorating environments and divisiveness in each circle of our lives from the individual to the global.

As we confront these problems, many of us are gradually becoming aware that our continued acceptance of violence, our willingness to kill – while not the only causal factor, is nevertheless a major cause of these increasing threats to human survival and well-being. Our historic readiness to kill for security and revolutionary change has brought us to a mental and technological state in which no one on earth is safe from destruction. We are now able to kill more people, more quickly, in more ways, and with more far reaching consequences than in any other age. As ancient wisdom warned us, and as Gandhi taught us, violence begets violence, and we are faced with prospects of infinite ingenuity in discovering new ways to destroy each other. Is it the mindset of a few to destroy the whole humanity or our ignorance and silence over these important issues which concern each one of us?
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In fact, commitment to violence in pursuit of human rights places them in eternal jeopardy. The violent freedom and so-called justice fighters of today become tomorrow’s deadly threat. One righteous atrocity evokes another and hate-filled grievances echo across the centuries. No individual, family, group, organization, community, religion, culture, or even nation can be safe in respects of freedom and justice as long as right depends on might. Besides, the more human needs such as cultural identity, material adequacy and freedom of expression are suppressed by violence and more and counter violence can’t be ruled out. Because such needs are common to all, the poor and the rich, the strong and the weak, the use of violence to assert human rights leaves one and all in perpetual constant fear. Furthermore, continued commitment to violence threatens to kill the life – sustaining capabilities of our Mother Earth. We kill directly by employing and testing of nuclear and biochemical weapons and air missiles. The vast military consumption of fossil fuels adds the wastes produced by nuclear power contamination. The resource depletion and toxic wastes produced by industries that are deemed necessary to produce weapons and services for modern warfare further contribute to environmental devastation. So great is the environmental destructiveness of global militarization and associated disrespect for ecological vitality that environmentalist Marry Commoner has recently warned us that we are in a suicidal “war with the planet” and that the planet inevitably will win. He warns that “survival depends equally on ending the war with nature and on ending war among ourselves...To make peace with the planet we must make peace with the peoples who live in it.”

However, without doubt, the influence of Gandhi’s nonviolence can be expected to increase in world affairs as we have entered the twenty-first

century. Despite the darkness of the past and of the present moment, the lights of nonviolence being lit throughout the world provide signs of great hope. The past and the present scenario of violence compels to think over the problem immediately otherwise it will be too late to control the alarming situation under which man will not matter but violence and material will have their domination. If we go through a few present incidents of violent acts such as the assassinations of Mahatma Gandhi, Johan F. Kennedy, Indira Gandhi, Martin Luther King (Jr.), Rajiv Gandhi and many others, we will realize that the world has got nothing out of such violent and heinous methods but only loss of great lives and their contributions for the welfare of the masses which they could do while alive.
"If humanity is to progress, Gandhi is inescapable. He lived, thought, and acted inspired by the vision of humanity evolving toward a world of peace and harmony. We may ignore him at our own risk."

---- Martin Luther King (Jr.)