CHAPTER - 6
CONCLUSION

Violence is the use of physical force to injure any being—human or non-human or property. Violence may cause physical pain to those who experience it directly, as well as emotional distress to those who either experience or witness it. Individuals, families, schools, workplaces, communities, society and the environment all are harmed by violence. Actually, violence thrives in the absence of democracy, respect for human rights and good governance. We often talk about how a ‘culture of violence’ can take root. This is indeed true—as a South African who has lived through apartheid and is living through its aftermath. It is also true that patterns of violence are more pervasive and widespread in societies where the authorities endorse, the use of violence through their own actions. In many societies, violence is so dominant that it thwarts hopes of economic and social development. No community is untouched by violence. Images and accounts of violence pervade the media; it is on our streets, in our homes, schools, workplace and institutions. Violence is a universal scourge that tears at the fabric of communities and threatens the life, health and happiness of us all. In Chapter -1 ‘Introduction’, we tried to take all the aspects of violence by explaining its types i.e. Physical Violence, Sexual Violence, Emotional Violence, Psychological Violence, Spiritual Violence, Cultural Violence, Verbal Abuse, Financial Abuse and Neglect, with this we have also taken violence against animals, against embryo and fetus and against environment into consideration. With the explanation of these types we also gave the causes of violence stating that there are two basic conditions that produce violent tendencies in human
beings. One condition is that the person has been hurt. The second basic condition is less well understood. The person has not been allowed to release the emotions resulting from the hurts. Added to these two basic conditions is the fact that violence is tolerated and glorified in the most industrialized countries, and is culturally linked to appropriate male behaviour. Children are exposed to violent male sports and to television programs, films, and electronic games with mostly violent male protagonists. Little boys are given toy soldiers, guns and other war paraphernalia with which to play. Story books and school text books often glorify war, a predominantly masculine activity, and describe great male conquerors as heroes. Many parents are pleased when their sons fight back in self-defence with playground bullies, and adults worry about boys who refuse to fight. Combined with the fact that boys are expected to be tough and not to cry, it is not surprising that men commit more violent crimes than women. If we were to purposely design a culture with the goal of producing violent people, we would create it exactly like the culture in which most modern boys grow up. To prevent violence, we must, first, stop perpetrating violence on children. This means no spanking or hitting. We also need to protect children from violent scenes on television or videos. We must change the messages about violence that we give to boys, and expect the same standards of nonviolent behaviour from boys that we expect from girls. However, violence cannot be attributed to a single factor. Its causes are complex and occur at different levels. To represent this complexity, the ecological, or social ecological model is often used. The first level identifies biological and personal factors that influence how individuals behave and increase their likelihood of becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence: demographic characteristics (age, education, income), genetics, brain lesions,
personality disorders, substance abuse, and a history of experiencing, witnessing, or engaging in violent behaviour.

The second level focuses on close relationships, such as those with family and friends. The third level explores the community context — i.e., schools, workplaces, and neighbourhoods. Risk at this level may be affected by factors such as the existence of a local drug trade, the absence of social networks, and concentrated poverty. Finally, the fourth level looks at the broad societal factors that help to create a climate in which violence is encouraged or inhibited: the responsiveness of the criminal justice system, social and cultural norms regarding gender roles or parent-child relationships, income inequality, the strength of the social welfare system, the social acceptability of violence, the availability of weapons, the exposure to violence in mass media, and political instability. Then we tried to explain all preventable measures of violence that can be helpful for stopping violence among children, adolescents, and adults and these are; Forming an attachment, Developing a conscience, Developing empathy, Getting attention, Building Self-esteem, Avoiding harsh punishment and learning calming techniques etc. The solution to the problem of violence is never to turn our backs, but to keep our hearts and minds open to how we can individually affect change. And that change starts with how we raise our children from the day they are born. However from all discussion we conclude that, Violence is among the most serious health threats in the nation today, jeopardizing the health and safety of the public. The health consequences for those who are victimized or exposed to violence are severe and can include serious physical injuries, post traumatic stress syndrome, depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and other longer-term health problems. In addition, the
social impacts of violence-diminished academic achievement and worker productivity, the deterioration of families and communities- are substantial and costly. For all these reasons, understanding and approaching violence as a preventive/public health issue can have added value. Further, such an approach emphasizes prevention in the first place, community-wide solutions rather than one individual or family at a time, and public health practitioners have experience as a neutral facilitator of collaboration. Recognizing that law enforcement alone cannot solve the problem of violence; practitioners have increasingly turned toward a broader, more comprehensive approach. This work also describes framework that incorporates public health, law enforcement, social service, and education perspectives.

In Chapter - 2 ‘Notion of Equality’, we explained the concept of equality. The terms “equality,” “equal,” and “equally” signify a qualitative relationship. ‘Equality’ (or ‘equal’) signifies correspondence between groups of different objects, persons, processes or circumstances that have the same qualities in at least one respect, but not all respects, i.e., regarding one specific feature, with differences in other features. ‘Equality’ needs to thus be distinguished from ‘identity’ — this concept signifying that one and the same object corresponds to itself in all its features: an object that can be referred to through various individual terms, proper names, or descriptions. For the same reason, it needs to be distinguished from ‘similarity’ — the concept of merely approximate correspondence. Thus, to say e.g. that all men are equal is not to say that they are identical. Equality implies similarity rather than ‘sameness.’ The difference between a general concept and different specific conceptions of equality may explain why according to various authors producing
‘equality’ has no unified meaning — or even is devoid of meaning. For this reason, it helps to think of the idea of equality or for that matter inequality, understood as an issue of social justice, not as a single principle, but as a complex group of principles forming the basic core of today's egalitarianism. Further this chapter is explained with reference to Peter Singer views regarding Equality. Singer is of the view that in present century, like many other changes in attitudes of people of the whole world, there has been change in attitude regarding equality of human beings. Today, in principle all humans are equal. Singer argues that though, in principle we can say all are equal but when we try to apply this principle on particular cases, the consensus starts to weaken. Another issue that Singer raises is that, if we favor members of disadvantaged minorities even then it is kind of discrimination. Whether for or against the worst members of society. These arguments lead us to enquire into ethical foundations of the principles of equality. Singer questions – How all human beings are equal or in what sense all humans are equal. People differ in physical, mental, emotional basis. The plain fact is that humans differ, and the differences apply to so many characteristics that the search for the factual basis on which to erect the principle of equality seems hopeless. The other objection which is more serious according to Peter Singer is that – it is not true that all humans are moral persons, even in the most minimal sense. Peter Singer says, the possession of ‘moral personality’ doesn’t provide a satisfactory basis for the principle that all humans are equal. I says Singer, doubt that any natural characteristic, whether a ‘range property’ or not, can fulfil, for I doubt that there is any morally significant property that all humans possess equally. Peter Singer is of the view that we should use the basic principle of equality: the principle of equal consideration of interests. The
essence of this principle of equal consideration of interest is that we give equal weight in our moral deliberations to the like interests of all those affected by our actions. No special status is given to anybody. All persons affected must be given equal weight. Singer emphasized that equality means to give equal considerations to all those affected without giving priority to any one person or a group of persons. There is no discrimination on the basis of race or nationality or color etc. Peter singer also equality with genetic diversity and racial difference. Peter Singer explains how there is difference in the average of IQ of two different ethnic groups, and that genetic factors are responsible for this difference and the impact of alleged differences in temperament and ability between the two sexes and also that there are differences in intelligence between the different ethnic groups of human beings, then what significance would this have for our views about racial equality? When people talk of differences in intelligence between ethnic groups, they refer it to the differences in score in standard IQ tests. Now IQ stands for ‘intelligent quotient’ but this does not mean that an IQ test really measure what we really mean by ‘intelligence’ in ordinary context. Peter Singer give three important points to refer the racial differences on the basis of IQ level which is based on genetic differences.

First, the genetic hypothesis does not imply that we should reduce our efforts to overcome other causes of inequality between people, for example, in the quality of housing and schooling available to less well-off people. Admittedly, if the genetic hypothesis is correct, these efforts will not bring about a situation in which different racial groups have equal IQs. But this is no reason for accepting a situation in which any people are hindered by their environment from doing well as well as they can.
Perhaps we should put special efforts into helping those who start from a position of disadvantage, so that we end with a more egalitarian result.

Second, the fact that the average IQ of one racial group is a few points higher than that of another does not allow anyone to say that all members of the higher IQ group have higher IQs than all members of the lower IQ group – this is clearly false for any racial group – or that any particular individual in the higher IQ group has a higher IQ than a particular individual in the lower IQ group – this will often be false. The point is that these figures are averages and say nothing about the individuals. There will be a substantial overlap in IQ scores between the two groups. So whatever the cause of the difference in average IQs, it will provide no justification for racial segregation in education or any other field. It remains true that members of different racial groups must be treated as individuals, irrespective of their race.

The third reason why the genetic hypothesis gives no support to racism is the most fundamental of the three. It is simply that, as we saw earlier, the principle of equality is not based on any actual equality that all people share, Singer argued that only defensible basis for the basis for the principle of equality is equal consideration of interests and the most important human interests – such as the interest in avoiding pain, in developing one’s ability, in satisfying basic needs for food and shelter, in enjoying warm personal relationship, in being free to pursue one’s projects without interference, and many others – are not affected by the difference in intelligence. We can be even more confident that they are not affected by differences in IQ. These three reasons are sufficient to show that claims that for genetic reasons, one racial group is not as another at IQ test as it do not provide grounds for denying the moral
principle that all humans are equal. While describing sexual difference and sexual equality Singer says, we accept biological hypothesis then what are the implications of this hypothesis. The differences in the intellectual strengths and weaknesses of the sexes cannot explain more than a minute proportion of the difference in positions that males and females hold in our society. So even if one accepts biological explanation for the patterning of different abilities, one can still argue that women do not have the same opportunities as men to make the most of the abilities, they have. Singer says on the grounds of biological explanations, we are never in a position to say: You are a woman so you can’t become an engineer or you are a man and don’t have sufficient gentleness and warmth to stay at home with children while mother goes out to work and so on. We must access, people as individual, not merely lump them into ‘female’ and ‘male’ if we are to find out what they are really like; and we must keep the roles occupied by females and males flexible if people are to be able to do what they are best suited for, says Singer. So sexual difference is based on biological hypothesis or it is environmental conditioning, this difference does not imply sexual inequality. So, everybody irrespective of race and sex must be given equality in terms of avoiding pain, developing their abilities, having adequate food and shelter, enjoying good and personal relationships etc. While taking consideration the notion of Equality, Peter Singer is of the view that the correct meaning of equality is equal consideration of interest rather than consideration of race and sex or IQ etc. Then he moves on to see whether equality of opportunity irrespective of race, sex, income group, IQ is possible. According to Peter Singer, “life on this view is a kind of race in which it is fitting that the winners should get the prizes, as long as all get an equal start. The equal start represents equality of opportunity and this,
is as far as equality should go”. But he goes further and looks into what is the real meaning of equal opportunity. Genuine equality of opportunity requires us to ensure that schools give same advantage to everyone, but making schools equal is difficult says Singer. But how does one equalize a home or parents? This is impossible unless we are prepared to abandon the family settings and bring up our children in communal nurseries. This is enough to show the inadequacy of equal opportunity as an ideal of equality. Further Singer argued, the basis of equality is equal consideration of interests, and the most important human interests have little or nothing to do with these factors, there is something questionable about a society in which income and social status correlates to a significant degree with them. Further, by affirmative action Peter Singer means those steps or actions which are used to bring the minority groups or downtrodden to the level of equality with other classes of society. Singer feels that such an action is required to some extend to bring equality as there is no more promising alternative to bring equality. Regarding equality and disability Peter Singer is of the view that mere equality of opportunity will not be enough in situations in which a disability makes it impossible to become an equal member of the community. For e.g – Giving disable people equal opportunity to attend university is not of much use if the library is accessible only by a flight of stairs that they cannot use. Many disable children are capable of benefitting from normal schooling, but are prevented from taking part because additional resources are required to cope up with their special needs. Since, such needs are very often very central to the lives of disabled people, the principle of equal consideration of interest will give them much greater weight than more minor needs of others. For this reason, it will generally be justifiable. Moreover, the attitude of the
society must be positive towards disabled people and they must be encouraged to do all kind of task whatever they are willing to spend more on behalf of disabled people than we spend on behalf of others. With views of Peter Singer then we tried to explain why killing is wrong? In order to understand ‘Why killing is wrong’? We have to understand ‘What is life’. The term life defines the breathing of any living organism under the sky. A being which has a life form series in it, which can inhale or exhale, which is born and doomed to die, has one or the other thing as its food due to which it grows, lives its life until it is destined and then die, can be called as the life cycle of any living being, organism or creature. But the life of human is considered to be pious or sacred as compared with other non human beings, if it is not the case than why only the human life is given special value. We tried to understand this by overlooking on all the reasons given by Peter Singer. According to Singer, the killing of a species cannot depend on the membership of a species we belong to nor is the pain of killing different for the rest living beings as compares to human being. Every living being feels alike when it is killed, else it would be the same position as of racist who gives preference to its race only. Singer also blames Christian way of thinking for the deep-seated belief in ‘the uniqueness and special privileges of our species’. As Singer has refuted the claim that there is a special value in the life of a member of our species. Further, Singer discusses classical utilitarianism to explain the difference of the value of life of rational and self-conscious being and a being that is merely sentient. “A self conscious being is aware of itself as a distinct entity with past and future” and whereas a merely sentient being is not capable of having such desires. For classical utilitarian’s, there is no direct significance in the fact that desires for the future goes unfulfilled when people die. If you die
instantaneously, whether you have any desire for the future makes no difference to the amount of pleasure or pain you experience. Thus for the classical utilitarian the status of ‘person’ is not directly relevant to the wrongness of killing. They however feel that there is difference between killing a self conscious being and a merely sentient being indirectly, as when a self conscious being is killed other self conscious beings are affected by the killing. Singer further analyses indirect reason for taking the life of a person more seriously than killing of a non-person. According to him, this is valid under certain conditions e.g. the killing of a person may become known to other person, who derive from his knowledge a gloomier estimate of their own chances of living to a ripe old age, or simply become fearful of being murdered. But if a person is killed in complete secrecy then this indirect reason against killing would not apply. At this point Peter Singer emphasizes on moving beyond the standard of utility while judging each individual’s action. He wants “instead to think along the lines of some broad principles that will cover all or virtually all of the situations that they are likely to encounter”. All the discussion in chapter -2 leads Peter Singer to the conclusions about the value’s of a person’s life. There are four possible reasons for holding that a person’s life has some distinctive value over and above the life of merely sentient being: the classical utilitarian concern with the frustration of the victim’s desires and plans for the future; the argument that the capacity to conceive of oneself as existing over time is a necessary condition of a right to life; and respect for autonomy. Although at the level of critical reasoning a classical utilitarian would accept only the first, indirect, reason and a preference utilitarian only the first two reasons, at the intuitive level utilitarian of both kinds would probably advocate respect for autonomy too. The distinction between critical and
intuitive levels thus leads to a greater degree of convergence, at the levels of everyday moral decision making, between utilitarian’s and those who hold other moral views then we would find if we took into account only the critical level of reasoning. In any case, none of the four reasons for giving special protection to the lives of persons can be rejected out of hand. We shall therefore bear all four in mind when we turn to practical issues involving killing. Before we do turn to practical questions about killing, however, we have still to consider claims about the value of life that are based neither on membership of our species, nor on being a person.

Peter Singer’s views on violence done with animals have been discussed in chapter-3 ‘Violence Against Animals’, Peter Singer is one of the most important advocate of Animal liberation. Peter Singer’s some personal experiences led him to ponder on animal equality. He is of the view that the basic principle of equality should be extended to all animals and not restricted to humans only. Though he is a utilitarian philosopher but his views are more radical in the sense that he wants equal treatment for all animals as well and wants to maximize happiness of all animals. Jeremy Bentham had said, “The question is not, can they reason? Nor, can they talk? But, can they suffer? Influenced by these lines of Jeremy Bentham, Peter Singer wrote an article on “Animal Liberation”. People started becoming aware of animal suffering. The significance of the new animal liberation movement is its challenge to this assumption. Animal liberationists have dared to question the right of our species to assume that human interests must always prevail. They have sought – absurd as it must sound at first - to extend such notions as equality and rights to non-human animals. Peter Singer begins with the
more familiar claim that all human beings are equal. When we say that all human beings, whatever their race, creed or sex may be, are equal, what is it that we are asserting? Those who wish to defend a hierarchical, inegalitarian society have often pointed out that by whatever test we choose, it simply is not true that all humans are equal. Like it or not, we must face the fact that humans come in different shapes and sizes; they come with differing moral capacities, differing intellectual abilities, differing amounts of benevolent feeling and sensitivity to the needs of others, differing abilities to communicate effectively, and different capacities to experience pleasure and pain. In short, if the demand for equality were based on the actual equality of all human beings, we would have to stop demanding equality. It would be an unjustifiable demand.

But if the case for animal equality is sound, what follows from it? It does not follow, of course, that animals ought to have all of the rights that we think humans ought to have - including, for instance, the right to vote. Peter singer observes that though comparison of sufferings of different species is difficult to make, and that for this reason when the interests of animals and human beings clash the principle of equality gives no guidance. He further says, even if we were to prevent the infliction of suffering on animals only when it is quite certain that the interests of human beings will not be affected, we would be forced to make radical changes in our treatment of animals that would involve our diet, the farming methods we use, experimental procedures in many fields of science, our approach to wildlife and to hunting, trapping and the wearing of furs, and areas of entertainment like circuses, rodeos, and zoos. Singer says that the aims of the movement can be summed up in one sentence to end the present speciesist bias against taking seriously the interests of nonhuman animals. Further Peter Singer explains how in the
past few years the animal liberation movement has made unprecedented gains. The entire animal liberation movement is based on the strength of its ethical concern. It must not abandon the high moral ground. Instead of going down the path of increasing violence, the animal liberation movement will do far better to follow the examples of the two greatest-and, not co-incidentally, most successful-leaders of liberation movements in modern times: Gandhi and Martin Luther King. With immense courage and resolution, they stuck to the principle of non-violence despite the provocations, and often violent attacks, of their opponents.

Another issue of concern is violence against unborn. Bioethics deals mainly with decisions about health care, often hard choices requiring close scrutiny and the sensitive balancing of rights, principles, values and interests. Not surprisingly some of the most difficult of these choices take place at the beginning and at the end of life. And this important issue is discussed in chapter-4 ‘Violence against Embryo & Fetus’. Mostly violence against embryo and fetus is done when a woman goes for abortion. The definition of an abortion is the premature exit of the products of conception (the fetus, fetal membranes, and placenta) from the uterus. It is the loss of a pregnancy and does not refer to why that pregnancy was lost. Different views regarding abortion were discussed in this chapter. There are three main views: first, the extreme conservative view (held by the Catholic Church); second, the extreme liberal view (held by Singer); and third, moderate view which lie between both extremes. But according to Peter Singer, the strength of the conservative position lies in the difficulty liberals have in pointing to a morally significant line of demarcation between an embryo and a newborn baby. Peter Singer argued that the life of a fetus is of no greater value than the
life of a nonhuman animal at a similar level of rationality, self-consciousness, awareness, capacity to feel, etc., and that since no fetus is a person no fetus has the claim to life as a person. But opponents of abortion argued that because the fetus is a ‘person’, abortion violates its constitutional rights. They argued that because the right to life is more important of fundamental than the right of privacy, the government should protect the fetus’ right to life rather than its mother’s right of privacy. They maintained that because (human) life begins at conception, the state has compelling interest in protecting that life from and after conception. In this context Peter Singer takes into account only the actual characteristics of the fetus, and not its potential characteristics. Singer says, if we consider the actual characteristics of a fetus, there is no difference in animal fetus and human fetus. But the difference comes when we take into consideration the potentiality of the fetus. We have also discussed various examples in which abortion is not taken as wrong step. Peter Singer argues the chief problem with this as an argument against abortion – apart from the difficulty of establishing that rational and self conscious beings are of intrinsic value – is that it does not stand up as a reason for objecting to all abortions, or even to abortions carried out merely because the pregnancy is inconveniently timed. The claim that rational and self-conscious beings are intrinsically valuable is not a reason for objecting to all abortions because not all abortions deprive the world of a rational and self-conscious being. We have also tried to discuss the maternal fetal conflict in this regard. The relationship between a pregnant woman and her fetus is unlike any other in law, medicine, or ethics. Within the same body, there exist one person and one potential person with both similar and separate interests and, for the fetus, developing rights. As the maternal-fetal relationship is complex and
unique, it gives rise to dilemmas with both legal and ethical implications. Of particular concern are situations in which the welfare of the woman and fetus appear to be at odds. In such cases, it is often the perceived responsibility of society to promote the well-being of both or, if that is not possible, to choose between them. And when the perceived interests of the pregnant woman, her fetus, and society come into conflict, these principles are weighed and balanced as part of the ethical calculus for e.g. Autonomy, Beneficence and Nonmaleficence, Justice, along with this we explained all the rules, laws, moral rights and responsibilities. Most importantly, we also tried to explain the moral status of an embryo & fetus. Relative to the moral status of the human embryo there are three positions of which two are commonly held and one is somewhat revisionist:

- Embryo as property
- It has no moral status, so allow any type of stem cell research
- Embryo as person
- It has full moral status, so allow no stem cell research
- Embryo as transient
- It has some moral status, so allow stem cell research under certain conditions.

This discussion also led us to know how embryo and fetus are being used for commercialization on and for experiment purpose. We have explained all the philosophical arguments both in favour and against the moral status of embryo and fetus. Peter Singer’s view regarding the status of embryo in the laboratory are based on two claims i.e., there should be always provision for the protection of human embryo either it is a human being or it should be given protection because it is a potential
human being. Singer is not willing to grant embryo either the status of a human being or a potential human being. He has given the arguments for this rejection which we have already discussed in this chapter. By analyzing all the factors, arguments, objections and discussion, the researcher could say that both embryo and fetus is potential human being which possesses life and terminating pregnancy does amount to killing in some form of life. Every new life begins at conception. This is an irrefutable fact of biology. There are degrees of consciousness and life in every living being and it is true for animals and true for humans when considered alongside the law of biogenesis -- that every species reproduces after its own kind- we can draw only one conclusion in regard to abortion. No matter what the circumstances of conception, no matter how far along in the pregnancy, abortion always ends the life of at least a potential human being. Every honest abortion advocate concedes this simple fact.

Violence is done not only to human beings, animals, embryo & fetus but also with environment that we explained in chapter 5 ‘Violence against Environment’. We have discussed all the issues and factors which make human beings to live in an environment without being concerned with the harm that is done to the environment in fulfilling our daily needs. The environment is our life support system. It includes everything that we rely on during our life time such as air, water, metals, soil, rocks and other living organisms. It is important to remember that the state our environment is influenced by our behaviour and that we have the opportunity to either nurture or mistreat it. Thus, we can say that the environment is a complex and is made up of different factors, any substance or external force which influences the life. Environment is the
investigation of total relations of the animals, plants, human life and nature. Both to its inorganic and organic environment, which comes directly or indirectly into content. All the components interact with each other and this interaction which is called Ecology. Ecology can be described as the study of the interactions and interdependence of plants, animals and their environment. Thus there is close relationship between environment and ecology because change in one environmental factor concurrently affects the dynamic state of an entire ecosystem.

Environmental violence is a complex phenomenon, and it is very important to understand because it produces and reinforces certain harms. Its ethical relevance is undeniable, given its relationship to morally reprehensible and legally prosecutable actions. One could even argue that success in the project of eradicating evils like terrorism or xenophobia is closely related to the capacity we have to face these situations of environmental violence. Nevertheless, despite its transcendence, environmental violence seems to escape the control of ordinary justice in the framework of a liberal scheme that only allows interference with liberty when a harm results. We are facing a phenomenon centred around, rather than concrete actions, an accumulation of shared attitudes and inclinations, such that it is difficult to establish legal and moral causal relationships with the harms we observe.

So environment protection is one of the major issues that attract the attention of everyone in the contemporary world. The very reason that attracts the attention of the world towards environment is the awareness of the world towards environment related issues as damages in the environment results damages on the livelihood, health and well being of human beings. Global warming, depletion of ozone layer, Trans boundary movement of hazardous waste/chemicals, and desertification are some of misuse,
mismanagement, or improper utilization of natural resources or the environment at large. We have discussed our responsibility towards natural world. Instead environmental ethics focuses on the moral foundation of environmental responsibility and how far this responsibility extends. There are three distinct theories of moral responsibility to the environment:

1. Anthropocentric: First of these theories are anthropocentric or human centered. Environmental anthropocentrism is of the view that all environment responsibility is derived from human interest alone. Since the environment is crucial to human well being and human survival, we have an indirect duty towards the environment that is a duty which is derived from human interest. This involves the duty to assure that the earth remains environmentally hospitable for supporting human life and that its beauty and resources are preserved, so that human life on earth continues to be pleasant.

2. Extension of strong animal rights: Second general theory to Environment responsibility is an extension of the strong animal rights. If at least some animals qualify as morally significant persons, then our responsibility towards the environment also hinges on the environmental interests of these animals. On this view, then environmental responsibility is derived from interest of all morally significant persons which include both human beings and animals.

3. Eco-Centrism: The third and most radical theory maintains that the environment deserves direct moral consideration and not one which is merely derived from humans and animals interests. The terminology used in the nature to express this direct responsibility is varied. It is suggested that the environment has direct right that it qualifies for
moral responsibility that it is deserving of direct duties and that has inherent worth.

The overwhelming impact of these issues had led some people to reject the progress in science and technology and go back to simpler age. But this is a short-term solution. The best use of science and technology within the frame work of evolving environmental ethics is a long term solution. With the reference of Peter Singer we had also tried to explain how western tradition is responsible for the degradation of our environment. These traditions gave religious sanction to the human-centred morality, and considered humans alone as morally significant beings of the world. The biblical theory of creation, the Genesis, establishes the Hebrew perspective of the special place given to humans in the divine plan. The Christian community believes that the grant of man’s ‘dominion’ over nature is a God-given decree. Though the western tradition has been very harsh but is still concern for the preservation of nature, as long as that concern can be related to human welfare. The western tradition is concern for pollution, destruction of forest, the greenhouse effect, and the rising level of sea etc. So Peter Singer says that the preservation of our environment is a value of the greatest possible importance even within a human centred moral frame work. But when we take a long term view even within a human-centred ethic the preservation of wilderness becomes very important. Peter Singer is of the view that violence against environment is not only a loss for us at present but also for many future generations to come. He mainly focuses on three main issues of concern for the present as well as for the future. He cited many examples while explaining this problem which we already discussed in the chapter 5. In this nature whether sentient or non-sentient/ biotic or
abiotic things have its own value says Singer. But when we take the issue of environment violence such as the loss of habitat of different species, soil erosion, land degradation, destruction of wilderness, increase of green house effect etc., much of the importance is given to the intrinsic value of human beings and maybe it is because of the misconception that human beings have dominion over all the other creatures in the world. Now, here question arises if we find value in human experiences, we cannot deny that there is value in at least some experiences of non-human beings. Then, how far does intrinsic value extend? To all, but only, sentient beings? Or beyond the boundary of sentience? The researcher had tried to explain all possible answers of these questions while discussing the chapter ‘violence against Environment’. Further we focused on the concept of ‘Deep Ecology’. Deep ecology goes beyond a limited piecemeal shallow approach to environmental problems, and attempts to articulate a comprehensive religious, and philosophical worldview. Deep ecologists claim that argument and debate are not the only means we must use to help people realize their ecological consciousness; we must also use such things as poetry, music and art. So, in order to cope with the environmental crises there is a need to develop environment ethic. Such an ethics would regard every action that is harmful to the environmental as ethically dubious and those that are unnecessarily harmful as plainly wrong. An environmental ethic would find virtue in saving and recycling resources, and vice in extravagance and unnecessary consumption. Peter Singer here illustrates an example from the perspective of an environmental ethic. Our choice of recreation is not ethically neutral. Singer also says a truly environmental ethics fosters consideration for the interest of all sentient creatures, including subsequent generation, stretching in to the far future. It is accompanied
by an aesthetic of appreciation for wild places and unspoiled nature. An environmental ethic rejects the ideals of a materialistic society in which success is gauged by the numbers of consumer goods one can accumulate. Instead it judges success in terms of the development of one’s abilities and the achievement of real fulfilment and satisfaction. In the last of the chapter 5, we discussed how much importance is given to environment in Indian philosophy since time. Nature is considered as an entity from which everything has evolved. So human beings are a part of nature. Nature is not considered merely a physical world which is separate from humans. Humans are also not considered as essentially spiritual and alien to Nature. According to Samkhya Darshan, Prakriti is material cause of everything. It is the vital source of every being. Human beings as conscious beings are conditioned by the natural world. The interaction between physical world and human beings are logical necessity. Prakriti is necessary for manifestation of consciousness. There are many hymns of Rig-Veda which consist of the praises of the different personified powers of nature at deities or devas, such as Agni, Marut, Varun, Indra, Savita, Upas and even plants, and sacrifices were offered to all these Devas. In Rig-Veda, it has been prayed that medicinal plants may prosper with many leaves, flowers and fruits for the benefit of the sick. Devas were regarded as the realities underlying and governing the different departments of nature. Though the nature was peopled with different deities, it was thought that it was subject to some basic law, which governed the whole world of objects, living and non-living. This basic law is called Rta. It denotes the order of the world. Advaita Vedanta recognizes Brahman as the ultimate reality, pure cosmic consciousness. Everything in the world has evolved from Brahman by operation of law of duality; Brahman expresses itself in the form of manifold particular
“Akohaman bahu bhavishayamah”. He is not creator of many, but has become many. The whole world is pervaded with Brahman. The Indian scriptures teach the innate relation and the attitude of human race with nature and its forces. Among the customs of all ancient people were nature rites whose purpose was to acknowledge man’s dependence on the natural forces and bounty of his environment. In ancient time, people adored and worshipped the natural powers due to a feeling of allegation; they felt kinship without being akin to nature. It is no coincidence that utilitarian attitude prevailing in the modern age has spawned a civilization out of touch with the beneficence of nature. The God given role of guardianship of the earth did not confer on man absolute sovereignty. His wanton domination is destructive for the very conditions necessary for his existence. The only way in the present circumstances is to thrive on our old sentimental legacy, increase our awareness and broaden the frontiers of empathy. This is possible only by increasing rationality, so that human mind may be trained to feel more identified with the rest of the creation. Love and be loved should be the very creed of humanity.

After discussing all issues, problems and kinds of violence, we can say that violence is not only killing/harming of one human being by another, which is most obvious form of violence but it is more subtle than this. To do any kind of negative action, thought and speech is violence according to Indian philosophy. In this sense, violence starts with thinking in a negative and selfish way regarding any living or non-living being, because action and speech is the result of thinking. In this regard, it can be said that our mind is the main source of violence. Many great philosophers have emphasized on changing our thinking pattern to change ourselves and this in turn can change the whole world.
Violence is the result of selfish desires to preserve oneself. Everybody is in search of security. This sense of gaining security has moved man to search means of security. The advancement in the field of science and technology is the result of this urge to secure oneself in this vast universe. There has been progress in the field of science of technology ever since man came into existence, though it has been very slow earlier. The invention of fire and wheel are the one of the earliest inventions of man mind. In the last 200 years this progress of scientific discoveries and inventions gained rapid pace. Man can today enjoy such comforts as could not imagine by him in his wildest dreams a few decades ago. Such a mechanical life that we are enjoying today is shaped, conditioned and controlled by outer environment. In this process, man naturally becomes more and more dependent upon outer circumstances for the fulfilment of his inner life. Inwardly poor and empty, he seeks his security in the things offered by outer environment— which is changing rapidly. The tempo of environmental change has increased a million fold. The outer circumstances of man are changing with such rapidity the man is unable to cope with them. With the rapid changes in the outer circumstances, what he has today becomes utterly insignificant tomorrow. This race of possessing more and more, and of outstanding the other man is fraught with frustrations leading to violence whether it is towards other human beings or animals or environment or even unborn child (embryo and fetus). Man due to his selfish, ever growing desires is waging a war against every other thing in the world. The more he tries to gain over other things or factors, the more insecure he feels.

Thus we can say that human mind which is the source of all these selfish and never ending desires is the root cause of violence. So in order
to overcome violence we have to make a drastic change in our mind – in our thinking pattern. Our mind is always engaged in trying to fulfil one desire after another, and is never ending process. To be aware of our desires is one way to control our desires. For this we need to be very attentive of our actions – what we have done in the past and what we purpose to do in future must be attentively looked at in present. We must get rid of our conditioning by keen awareness – by observing what is happening, outwardly and inwardly – the conflicts, the wars, and the misery, the confusion in oneself and outside oneself.

It is the mind that has created the social problems, and having created the problems, it tries to solve it without fundamentally changing itself. So our problem is the mind, the mind that wants to feel superior and thereby creates social inequality that pursues acquisition in various forms because it feels secure in property, in relationship, or in ideas, which is knowledge. It is this incessant demand to be secured that creates inequality, which is the problem that can be never solved until we understand the mind that creates the difference. As Peter Singer has also pointed out the basic principle of equality that is the principle of equal consideration of interests explained in Chapter – 2 ‘Notion of Equality’, Peter Singer says that there should be equality on moral, social, political, spiritual grounds; discrimination in any one of them can be cause of violence. And to achieve this kind of equality one must follow the golden rule “To unto others as you wish to be done by”. Gandhi following Advaita Vedanta says that “the essential unity” of man, goes to prove that everyone is to count for one and none for more than one. Gandhi is able to do this because he not only believes in individual self, but also believes in other selves. (1) Existence of other individuals and (2) Equal value of
every individual, are two important axioms of his philosophy.

Although the notion of individual is fundamental to Gandhi, but he also refers to social dimension of an individual that transition from individual to society is effected in two different ways:

(1) By accepting the universal principle that every man must essentially be the same; that is, what applies generally to A must equally apply to B, C and so on; and

(2) By following the general egoistic principle, that is by gradually enlarging the notion of the self and including in it the other selves, such that ultimately the whole universe would be identical with the individual self. That is how a man gradually identifies himself with his family, clan, nation and so on.

Here concept of love or non-violence becomes central. For many, practicing nonviolence goes deeper than abstaining from violent behaviour or words. It means overriding the impulse to hate and holding love for everyone, even those with whom one strongly disagrees. In this view, violence is learned and it is necessary to unlearn violence by practicing love and compassion at every possible opportunity. For some, the commitment to non-violence entails a belief in restorative or transformed justice, an abolition of the death penalty and other harsh punishments. This may involve the necessity of caring for those who are violent.

Nonviolence, for many involves a respect and reverence for all sentient and perhaps even non-sentient beings. This might include abolitionism against animals as property, the practice of not eating animal products or by products (vegetarianism or veganism), spiritual practices of non-harm to all beings, and caring for the rights of all beings.
Mohandas Gandhi, James Bevel, Tom Regan and other nonviolent proponents advocated vegetarianism as part of their nonviolent philosophy. Buddhist extend this respect for life to animals and plants while Jainism extend this respect for life to animals, plants even for microorganisms.

In this way we can see that almost all Indian systems of philosophy advocate non-violence and respect for life in one way or another, but in the western philosophical tradition there have been not many philosophers who propagate philosophy of non-violence. The main proponents of non violence and vegetarianism in the west are Martin Luther King, Tom Regan, Arne Naess, Nelson Mendela, Peter Singer. Peter Singer’s contribution in this regard is seminal. He not only talks of equality among human beings but also among all living creatures. His whole philosophy is an effort towards creating equal and non-violent attitude towards other humans, animals and even plants etc. His approach is practical. He has shown by his different arguments that life in any form must be respected and must be given equal moral treatment in equal situations. Animal and plants also suffer when hurt or inflicted pain. His ideas took the shape of an animal liberation movement for the first time in English speaking world. Now many people are becoming aware of the pain that animal suffer in the name of scientific research. Many laws have been created to lessen the pain of animals. His ideas have also contributed towards creating awareness regarding environmental protection. Thus there is an urgent need to incorporate his ideas in our daily life to make this world happier and peaceful.