CHAPTER V

JUSTIFICATION FOR POLITICAL VIOLENCE

The preceding chapter dealt with the Relative Deprivation concept in length by incorporating both the psychological and societal variables which contribute to it. Data collected from Kerala was then presented to substantiate the hypothesis framed for Relative Deprivation.

Both the psychological and group conflict theories back the proposition that the greater the intensity of discontent, the more likely is violence. This impulse to action is determined by men's beliefs about the sources of deprivation and about the normative and utilitarian justifiability of violent action.

When attitudes and beliefs focus on political objects, discontent leads men to political violence. The discontent gains potency, if institutional frameworks are weak or opposing organisations are strong.

The question that arises here is: How these attitudes influence men to take collective action against their rulers and political competitors?

There are two relevant perspectives that influence the decisions to resort to political violence. The first is the norms which people hold about the extent to which and the conditions under which violence generally, and political
violence specifically, is proper.

The other one is men's expectations of the relative utility of violence as a means for value attainment.

In Gurr's words: "The greater men's 'normative justification' for violence, the more likely they are to be willing to participate in political violence. Similarly, the greater the utility people attribute to tactics of violence in getting what they want, the more readily they will resort to political violence."

The two justifications for political violence normative and utilitarian have got separate and distinguished psychological and social origins, hence, they stand independently.

In this chapter, the two justifications and their variables are examined in detail along with the data collected on the basis of these variables from Kerala.

Political violence has already been described as the collective attacks within a political community against the political regime; its actors include competing political groups as well as incumbents or its policies.

"Normative justifications for political violence are the attitudes and beliefs men hold about the intrinsic desirability of taking or threatening such action." Next is the utilitarian justifications for political violence on the beliefs men hold about the extent to which the threat or use of violence in politics will enhance their overall value position, and that of the community with which they identify.
The intensity of justifications for political violence is a function of two responses—the "range of circumstances," and the "relative desirability" of violence in normative or utilitarian terms. The scope of justifications refers to the prevalence of supporting attitudes and feelings among the members of a collectivity.

**Determinants of justification for political violence**

Determinants fall under two heads: normative and utilitarian. There are several kinds of normative justifications for violence. Some of the psycho-cultural sources of normative justifications for violence and some characteristics of perspectives on politics which affect both normative and utilitarian justifications, are examined in the survey.

**Psycho-cultural justification for violence**

Men possess certain perspectives on violence which are moulded by psycho-cultural factors. These are the result of socialization patterns, which either encourage or discourage outward displays of aggression and the cultural traditions which sanction such violent responses in different forms of deprivation. These perspectives are underlying attitudes, which may differ within the culture also. These attitudes are distinguishable from the doctrines, i.e. "Ideologies", which men accept in the course of their lives, that justify vio-
lence in response to their immediate political circumstances.

There are two types of psychocultural approaches explaining aggression and consequent violence, "Individual Aggressiveness" and "Cultural". The former refers to explanations of aggression in terms of "the actual experiences of individuals, usually in early life, which create a need for, or at least a tendency towards aggressive behaviour". The latter stresses "the extent to which aggression is accepted or rejected by the traditional social mores of a community".

**Individual Aggressiveness**

"Individual aggressiveness" is the outcome of the socialization process. Certain child raising practices and interpersonal family relationships can create frustration in individuals; socialization would result in a defense mechanism developed by the individual to overcome that frustration.

The demands and constraints of socialization, the securing of livelihood and the interaction with other members of the community are more or less painful to the individual.

The gravity of this pain or stress compels the individual to develop various forms of personal dysfunctions such as neuroses, psychosomatic illnesses, suicidal or homicidal tendencies, alcoholism, use of narcotics, etc.

Several studies have investigated individual aggressiveness and the affects of socialization on individual behaviour.
Bandure and Walters opined that both parents of aggressive adolescent boys encouraged their sons' aggression outside the house, but they did not tolerate displays of aggression toward themselves and showed little affection toward the boys. Therefore, such boys will learn to exhibit their aggression outside the house in a relatively direct and uninhibited way.

Another study by Stagner claims that individuals who are aggressive in one sphere of life, tend to be aggressive in others too, and to be aggressive in both overt and verbal behaviour.

Many studies have been done on authoritarian personalities and on individual attitudes to aggression in political violence.

On the basis of the psycho-analytic theory, Laesswell came out with an argument, after case studies, that political agitators are strongly narcissistic men, whose yearning for emotional responses, acquired in the maturation process, is displaced upon generalized objects and manifest in a desire to arouse emotional responses from the community at large.

Wolfenstein carried out a comparative study of Lenin Trotsky and Ramdhi as examples of "revolutionary personality", and came to conclusion that "the revolutionary is one who escapes from the burdens of Oedipul guilt with ambivalence, by carrying his conflict with authority into the political realm". For this to happen, two conditions should prevail: the conflict with paternal authority must be alive and unresolva-
ble in the family context and the existence of a political context where one can express the conflict.

There are other studies linking personality characteristics to collective violence also. Darbin and Hoffer asserted that revolutionary attributes are twentieth century phenomenon due to widespread psychological disturbances which are the outcome of education. Frustrations are the result of socialization processes, but the point to be noted is the existence of variations, to the extent people learn to act out or to internalize their anger.

Another significant suggestion is on socialized attitudes toward aggression which vary depending on members of a culture who internalize aggression. It was observed that in a society, intrapunitiveness is promoted among sub cultures and status groups, i.e. people develop certain normative dispositions to blame their frustrations on themselves and to internalize their aggressive feelings. Some others develop extrapunitiveness i.e. attributing blame on others and justify the acting out of aggression against others.

It can then be concluded that greater emphasis on extrapunitiveness in the socialization process helps people to justify individual as well as collective violence. This disposition on extrapunitiveness supports normative justification of violence.
The politicisation of Discontent:

Many historical and contemporary studies on violent events all over the world conducted in different periods assert that the motive behind all events is not always political, but generally gets politicised. This phenomenon is more apparent in increasingly modernized societies, because of two reasons, ambiguity of origin of deprivation in complex societies and widening scope of governmental responsibilities.

The former is supported by the psychological theory of frustration, which arises due to the presence of some stimuli that culminates into aggression. In modern and developing societies, the origin of deprivation is vague. People find difficulty in pinpointing the specific group of institutions behind their miseries. Increasing specialisation of roles and functions in modern societies, and ever increasing interdependencies of socio-economic spheres has further worsened the ambiguity.

This situation has given rise to new ideological acceptance, concerning the widespread beliefs and organizational support to the State as the ultimate authority for solving problems and welfare of its citizens. This has been expressed thus: "the political system becomes the chief means as well as the chief end of action". The development of this attitude has channelised assorted discontent, originating from econom-
ic, interpersonal and power deprivations, to the political system.

Studies have been conducted all over the world on the motives and targets of civil strife. Most of the studies opined that motives are not always political, but get politicized later. For instance, studies of turmoil in Europe from the seventeenth through the nineteenth century revealed that motives were economic and communal, targeted against political actors and institutions.

Another cross national survey also supported this theory and suggested that people in the 1950s and 1960s were more concerned about their economic lot than politicised issues.

However there are diverse reports and studies available which point out that participants have political motives and direct their demands at political targets.

The reason for this is the growing tendency of people in modern society to perceive deprivation in terms of power rather than economic or interpersonal values. Another factor instigating men to politicize violence is "past regime action", i.e. how effectively the government remedied any past relative deprivation and whether the number of people who benefited from it, determined the scope of governmental action.

In other words, if the government or the political system has the capacity to resolve problems and to alleviate the
discontent of people and it has succeeded in resolving issues in past that have affected a good number of the people in the society, the normative expectation that other problems should be dealt with and the utilitarian expectation that they can be dealt with, would be strengthened.

One more factor, resource allocation, helps in politicising violence. If the regime allocates available resources in disproportionate manner to different groups, the less advantaged group is likely to resort to collective violence to increase its share of values.

**Utilitarian Justification for Political Violence**

All the illustrations of determinants of normative justification of violence are remote rather than immediate causes of political violence. These norms developed for violence, aggravated by the influence of utilitarian justifications for political violence, depend partly on psychological factors and partly on cultural ones. The utilitarian determinants are ideological, utilitarian and communication factors.

Ideaology: Ideologies are the "framework of consciousness" which provide men with an interpretation of the world for the purpose of acting in it.

In Dion's view, political ideology "is a more or less integrated system of values and norms rooted in society". Participants in political violence, whether revolutionary or
otherwise, do not choose complex ideologies. Intensely discontented people are more susceptible to new doctrines, when they are not sure about the origins of discontent and uncertainty in the social environment. In such a situation, they are prompted to opt for doctrinal justification of aggressive action. And diverse ideologies, slogans, and rumours will appeal to those who resort to political violence.

Mere existence of intense discontent does not justify violence. Empirical studies have concluded that a person will act aggressively if he is aware of the source of frustration. It is however, important to note that acceptance of new ideas, sanctioning political violence as a function of the scope of relative deprivation, depend on the extent and openness of communication networks which disseminate the new ideas.

New ideological justifications for violence are effective, if they make sense to discontented people in terms of their specific deprivations and their past experiences. In other words, the more specific new ideas are in identifying the sources of deprivation and prescribing remedial action, the greater their likely appeal to groups who experience highly specific deprivations.

The utility of violence: The acceptance of the utilitarian motives of political violence is possible, when men believe violent action will improve their overall value positions.
The most potent determinant of the perceived utility of political violence is people's previous success in attaining their ends by such means. Psychological and comparative studies reveal that people who achieve their demands through aggression are likely to use it again as a tactic in the future.

The Communication of Aggressive Symbols: The development of modern communication systems are said to be "both index and agent of change in a total social system". Effective revolutionary leadership requires open communication channels, leaders and followers.

Aggressive political symbols are verbal or graphic representations of violence against political targets, including descriptions of actual violence, past and present, and assertions about the desirability or lack of desirability of violence against such targets.

The characteristics of communication systems that directly affect the dissemination of aggressive political symbols in a collectivity are the number of channels or media. The more in number, the more they articulate aggressive symbols. In the absence of such channels, other media, such as wandering preachers and propagandists, serve as communication agents.

The effects of different kinds of communication media are apparent from comparisons of the number and frequency of outbreaks which occurred in different eras and cultures. Control on aggressive political symbols in media may minimise
the immediate demonstration effects of violence and thereby gradually eliminate the tendency to violence.

This is the presentation of data collected from Kerala on the basis of the hypothesis regarding the determinants of normative and utilitarian justifications for political violence.

The first determinant is psycho-cultural justification for violence, which has two approaches/propositions, individual aggressiveness and culture. The roles of these two variables in moulding aggressive tendencies in an individual, have been examined through questions on child raising practices and psychological defense mechanisms, posed to the respondents.

Q 1 How do your parents react to any mischief that you do at home?

(1) punish you
(2) scold you
(3) advice you
(4) they don't care it
(5) both punishment and scolding
(6) first scolding and then give proper advice.

Q 2 What would be your parents' stand if you quarrel with your friends and neighbours?

(1) punish and scold you
(2) advice you
(3) blame both the parties
(4) take casual stand.
Since individuals acquire aggressive characteristics during the socialization process, mainly through child-raising practices and interpersonal relationships in the family, both these questions delve into the upbringing and interpersonal relations of the respondents in their homes. Answers to both the questions were coded and tabulated under low aggressiveness, moderate aggressiveness, and high aggressiveness.

In the first question, low aggressiveness has been judged from the responses 3 and 4, moderate aggressiveness from responses 2 and 6 and high aggressiveness from 1 and 5.

In the second question, the classification has been done on the basis of responses 2 and 4 for low aggressiveness, response 3 for moderate aggressiveness and response 1 for high aggressiveness.

Both tables 5.01 and 5.02 reveal that parents of both males and females showed marked low aggressive tendencies of giving advice to their children when they do mischief. Table 5.01 reflects this inclination in 70% of male and 59% of female respondents' parents, resulting low aggressive tendencies in their children. Table 5.02 manifests moderate aggressiveness in only 3 of the male and 2 of the female respondents.

However, high aggressiveness is evident in as high as 11.33% and 12.67% of the males in both the tables. In the case of the females, the high aggressive response to both was
TABLE 5.01
PARENTS' REACTIONS TO MISCHIEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5.02
PARENTS' STAND ON QUARRELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GQ How would you justify your failure to win the first prize in a competition, which you were confident of winning?

(1) fate
(2) blame oneself
(3) outburst - express anger on somebody/something
(4) other

This was the first of three questions to identify what sort of psychological defense mechanisms and responses have been developed during the socialization process.

Once again, the classification was under low, moderate and high aggressiveness. Responses 1 and 4 have been placed in the low category, 2 in the moderate category and 3 in high aggressive, as depicted in Table 5.03.

**TABLE: 5.03**

**AGGRESSIVE REACTIONS TO FAILURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE NO.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE PER.</td>
<td>64.67</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE NO.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE PER.</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENTAGE**
It was evident that 97.4% of both male and female students preferred to accept their failure as either fate or decided to improve their performance to gain their goals in the future. The figures of moderate aggressiveness was also fairly large, at 46 and 34 in males and females respectively. However, 74% of both sexes indicated violent reactions to the deprivation of a cherished goal.

Q4: What would you do in the face of stiff opposition from family/relatives to your love affair?

(1) carry on the affair
(2) try to stop relation with the partner
(3) take some dastardly step
(4) any other step.

Responses were designated "low" for 1 and 4, (most of these respondents claimed that they would try to remove any misunderstandings with relatives and parents and continue the affair); moderate for 2 and high aggressiveness for the third option.

Table 5.04 makes it clear both male and female respondents preferred a submissive approach to an aggressive one, even when they had to face stiff opposition. Nearly 90% of the males preferred to carry on their affair or were willing to stop it. Similarly, in the case with the females also, almost 96% form the low and moderate categories. Only 10 and 4% of the males and females respectively opted for any aggressive moves.
How will you react to the bus not stopping for you, when you are in an urgent hurry?

(1) stand calmly
(2) curse the driver
(3) plan to stone the bus next day
(4) beat the driver

The classification was similar to the earlier questions, with response 1 being low, 2 moderate and the last two being in the highly aggressive category.

Table 5.05 places approximately 85 and 97% of the males and females in the low and moderate groups. 15.33% of the males opted for beating the driver and stoning the bus.
Such wide support revealed the prevalence of such practices, from past experiences by the student community. Year-wise data of student strikes reveals that the first targets of their attacks are usually buses and at the first sign of chaos, they take revenge on those drivers who have irked them. The responses to the query on attacking the bus and driver therefore support the assumption that the perceived utility of political violence is proportionate to the actors’ previous success in attaining their ends by such means.

The next two questions concerned the role of culture in moulding the personality of individuals. Different cultures apply different degrees of stress on individuals during the
process of socialization. The more painful or stressful the process, the more the likelihood to develop different personal dysfunctions such as: neuroses, suicide, homicide, alcoholism, use of narcotics, etc.

06 Do you know anyone who takes drugs? Yes/no

07 Do you prefer to take drugs? Yes/no

The replies to these two questions were tabulated in Tables 5.06 and 5.07, directly since only two options were available.

**TABLE: 5.06**

**KNOWLEDGE OF DRUG CONSUMPTION BY OTHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER-PERCENTAGE
The number of male and female respondents who admitted to knowledge of persons taking drugs in family, neighborhood, or friends’ circle is substantial at 95 and 65 respectively. Only 25 males and notably, 5 females acknowledged a preference for taking drugs themselves.

Since taking narcotics has been accepted as a form of personal dysfunction resulting from sense experiences of socialization, it can be concluded from these findings that the socialization process in Kerala has been filled with such distress and pain, that individuals cultivate the habit of intrapunitiveness rather than extrapunitiveness.
Q8 How will you solve problems caused by misunderstandings or squabbles with the following persons:

(a) if the person is older than you
(b) if the person is younger than you
(c) if the person is your friend or neighbour
(d) if the person is a hooligan
(e) if the person is a college authority
(f) if the person is a policeperson
(g) if the person is a local political leader
(h) if the person is your girl/boy friend

This question pertains to individual aggressiveness, acquired during the learning process, to justify violence on the base of normative and utilitarian terms. It compelled the respondents to give independent answers without any set options or scales. These have been clubbed under low, moderate and high aggressiveness.

(a) In the responses to this first option on squabbles/misunderstandings with elders, low aggressiveness is denoted by answers like, obey him, keep mum, compromise etc.

Moderate aggressiveness covers non-violent techniques such as non-cooperation, satyagraha, hunger fast etc. And high aggressiveness is denoted by retorts, quarrels.

Table 5.08 makes it clear that the majority of the respondents of both sexes, 141 males and 132 females, prefer low aggression tactics. Significantly, only 6% males, but a
higher 7.33% females opt for high degrees of aggressiveness.

Several psychological studies have proved the relationship between aggressiveness and authoritarianism, in which case even the small percentage of high degree of aggressiveness becomes significant, since young people are conditioned to authoritarianism from childhood socialization.

(b) In the second option, low aggression is denoted by giving advice and taking a casual stand, moderate by scolding and high degree aggressiveness by punishment. Once again the majority of both male and female respondents, 73 and 78% respectively, prefer to adopt low aggressive tactics. 11% males and 20% females fall in the moderately aggressive category, while
as many as 17\% males and only 3\% females have opted for highly aggressive tactics as depicted in Table 5.09.

**TABLE 5.09**

**DEGREE OF AGGRESSIVENESS TOWARDS YOUNGSTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER=PERCENTAGE

Table 5.10 portrays the responses to squabbles with friends / neighbours with low aggressiveness comprising of avoiding, keeping quiet, advising and compromising, moderate of quarrelling and high of punishing.

The same low aggressiveness is predominant in 93 and 91 \% of the males and females respectively, with only 1.33 percent in the highly aggressive category.
(d) In the quarrels with hooligans, low aggression is taken to be avoiding or compromising, moderate to be quarrelling and high punishing. In Table 5.11, 44% male respondents emerge the low and high aggressive respectively and 12% in the moderate. Among the females, while 87.33% indicated low aggressive responses, 6.67% opted for high and 6% for moderately aggressive tactics.

(e) With respect to confrontations with college authorities, low aggressive tactics consist of obedience, moderate of trying to clarify or compromise and high of resorting to strikes.
In Table 5.12, the division of the male respondents in the three categories is fairly equal at 34% low, 38.67% moderate and 27.33% high, while the females are decided low at 66.67%, with 26.67% moderates and 6.67% highly aggressive.

(f) The reactions of the respondents to the policeperson at Table 5.13 indicate a remarkable increase in the highly aggressive bracket with 39.33% males and 25.33% females, depicting the student community's predilection to violence as a method to achieve their aim by striking at the legitimate symbol, the police. 59.34% females and only 33.34% males indicate low aggressive postures such as avoidance or obedience. The moderate posture of clarifying their stand appealed
TABLE: 5.12
DEGREE OF AGGRESSIVENESS TOWARDS
COLLEGE AUTHORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGE

TABLE: 5.13
DEGREE OF AGGRESSIVENESS TOWARDS
POLICE AUTHORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>59.34</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGE
to only 27.33 % and 15.33 % males and females respectively.

(g) Political leaders appear to invite maximum aggressiveness from the student community, at 25.33 % of the males and 17.33 % of the females opting for sharp reactions and revenge. Table 5.14 depicts 39.33 % males and 20 % of the females opting for a moderate compromise in cases of misunderstandings with political leaders. Almost half the females and one third of the males indicated low aggressive responses.

TABLE: 5.14
DEGREE OF AGGRESSIVENESS TOWARDS POLITICAL LEADERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER-PERCENTAGE
Table 5.17 gives the schematic representation of the findings, in which the majority of males, 41.33% and 37.33% of the females fall in the moderate category, opining that police maintain a partial and indifferent attitude during riots/strikes. While 21.33 percent of the males and 17.33% of the females complained of low official legitimacy citing the ruthless behavior of the authorities, 37.33% males and 45.33% of the females rated the authorities' responses at high.

### TABLE 5.17

| ROLE OF LAW ENFORCING AGENCIES DURING TROUBLE |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | LOW  | MODERATE | HIGH | TOTAL |
| MALE: NO.       | 32   | 62       | 56   | 150   |
| MALE: PER.      | 21.34| 41.33    | 37.33| 100   |
| FEMALE: NO.     | 28   | 56       | 68   | 150   |
| FEMALE: PER.    | 17.34| 37.33    | 45.33| 100   |

PER = PERCENTAGE

**Q3 How do political parties play their role in chaotic situations?**

This question analyses student opinions of the role of political parties during chaotic situations. Since the ques-
tion was open-ended, the answers were lengthy. A majority opined that political parties tried to exploit such situations for their political gains, with shows of strength.

This political tug-of-war generates insecurity in society. Some have also surmised that the intervention of political parties helps to minimise tensions to a certain extent.

Q4 Are you satisfied with the present political situation in Kerala?

(1) yes (2) somewhat (3) not at all

The responses represented Table 5.18 makes it evident

TABLE: 5.18
OPINION ON PRESENT POLITICAL SCENARIO OF KERALA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER = PERCENTAGE
that the majority comprising 43.33% males and 64% females are "somewhat" i.e. moderately satisfied with the regime prevailing at the time of the survey (conducted in 1987). Only 8% of the females and a slightly higher percentage of males, 20%, approved of the regime, while 36.67% males and 28% females accorded low legitimacy to the prevailing political regime, indicating high student political awareness and expectations from the government, which the regime has failed to fulfill.

Q 5 Are you satisfied with present economic situation in Kerala?

(1) yes (2) somewhat (3) not at all

Answers to this query on the then prevalent economic environment were classified thus:

High legitimacy : yes
moderate legitimacy : somewhat
low legitimacy : not at all

Table 5.19 illustrates the low legitimacy that the student community, 66% males and 50.67 females, offers to their economic scenario. Only a bare handful, 6 males and 12 females express satisfaction with the existing economic situation, with the remaining 30 and 41.33% respectively falling in the moderate classification.
Finally the legitimacy of the political system in the eyes of the respondents was again probed in the question:

**Q6 Against whom would you like to take strong action in society?**

1. Hooligans
2. Corrupt Bureaucrats
3. Corrupt Politicians
4. Muslims and Harijans
5. Capitalists
6. Police
7. Upper Caste Hindus
Responses have been grouped in Table 5.20 under:

- high legitimacy: 4 and 7
- moderate: 1 and 5
- low: 2, 3 and 6

**Table: 5.20**

**Against Whom Legal Action Should Be Initiated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: No.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Per.</td>
<td>63.34</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: No.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Per.</td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PER: PERCENTAGE**

It reflects the rather poor opinion the respondents held and their dissatisfaction with the government. The majority of them believed that the lop-sided economic development was on account of corrupt politicians, bureaucrats and capitalism. Only 5% males and 7% females gave the authorities a high legitimacy label, while 63% males and 54.67% females accorded it low legitimacy.

This low level of legitimacy may be the result of the low
(h) On the other hand, in affairs of the heart, aggression is significantly low, with only 4% of the males opting for pressure tactics such as quarrelling or punishing. Significantly, female aggression in this category, at 7.33, exceeds male. Table 5.15 shows a majority of the students, 59.33% of both males and females, prefer moderate tactics, with nearly 36.67% of males and 33.33% of females opting for low aggressive tactics like advising or avoiding in dealing with problems with their lovers.

TABLE: 5.15
DEGREE OF AGGRESSIVENESS TOWARDS LOVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE: NO.</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE: PER.</strong></td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE: NO.</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE: PER.</strong></td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the determinants of normative justifications for political violence, Legitimacy of the Political System plays an important role. This is the extent to which citizens
regard their regime, or political system, as proper, deserving of support and legitimate. Questions were posed to judge how far youth in Kerala support their political community, the regime, and its incumbents.

Q1 Do you have any insecurity problem in your locality?

(1) communal riot
(2) party conflicts
(3) hooligans mischievous
(4) group rivalries
(5) no problem
(6) any other

The responses were clubbed with relation to the extent of support extended by the respondents to the prevailing political system, as emerged from their selection of options.

high legitimacy : 5
moderate legitimacy : 2 and 4
low legitimacy : 1 and 3

Table 5.16 exhibits the findings, with nearly 55 % of the males and females revealing that there were no problems. Although moderate party and group conflicts were identified by 30 % and 28 % respectively from both sexes, a significant 15.33 % males and 14 % females indicated low legitimacy as a result of communal riots and the prevalence of hooliganism.
02. During strikes/riots, how do the law maintaining agencies play their role?

(1) ruthlessly
(2) indifferently
(3) partially
(4) justly and impartially

This question probes the respondents' assessment of the role played by law maintaining agencies during strikes/riots and the answers have been classified under:

- low legitimacy: ruthlessly
- moderate legitimacy: indifferently, partially
- high legitimacy: justly and partially
profile of the political system, the role of which in a democratic society, is vast, raising expectations accordingly. If anything fails in the system, the blame falls on the political actors and institutions.

Another of the determinants of normative justification for political violence is cultural traditions. The most relevant of these traditions is political violence itself. If violent conflict is common in the history of a collectivity, obviously traditions justify such violence.

And the greater the historical magnitude of political strife in a community, the greater the intensity and scope of normative justifications for future political violence.

Q1 Can you identify any groups in our society who can’t get justice without resorting to violence?

In Table 5.21, while only 10.67% males and 7.33% females have answered in the negative, the remaining have answered in the affirmative, with a majority of them identifying the groups as "labour unions" and "student unions", both of whom have generated considerable political violence in Kerala in the past too.
TABLE 5.21
KNOWLEDGE OF GROUPS DENIED JUSTICE WITHOUT INDULGING IN VIOLENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>92.67</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGE

TABLE 5.22
KNOWLEDGE OF GROUPS RESORTING TO VIOLENCE FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE: NO.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE: PER.</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: NO.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE: PER.</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGE
G2 Do you know of any class or group which has used violence for solving its problems successfully?

The answers, tabulated at Table 5.22, indicate on 13 - 14% negative replies with nearly 85 to 87% respondents of both sexes affirmative. Once again the majority identified the student unions/federations.

A few direct questions were also posed to analyse the determinants of utilitarian justification for political violence and the utility of violence.

Q 1 Would you prefer violent means for solving your problems or peaceful ones?

From the answers received, a third category had to be added to violent and peaceful. This was: Both. Table 5.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>METHODLOGY ADOPTED FOR SOLVING PROBLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>PEACE</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE NO.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE PER.</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>77.33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE NO.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE PER.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER=PERCENTAGE
reveals that while 6.67% males and 4.67% females opted for the violent alternative, another 16% and 3.33% favoured a combination of both. 77.33% of the males and 92% of the females prefer peaceful ways for solving their problems.

**Q 2** Do you think that violent conflict is needed in order to bring about economic and political changes in your society? **Yes / No**

Quizzing the respondents' assessment of the necessity of violence elicited the information, tabulated at Table 5.24 that an overwhelming 92.67% females and 48% males gave the nod to violence to bring about economic and political changes in the system!!

**TABLE 5.24**

**ATTITUDE TOWARDS NECESSITY FOR VIOLENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male NO.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male PER.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female NO.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female PER.</td>
<td>92.67</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER-PERCENTAGE
Have you ever used violent methods to solve your problems? Yes / No

This question to adjudge the utilitarian justification for political violence in the respondents directly, was answered in the affirmative by 38.67% of the males and 26% of the females as is depicted in Table 5.25.

TABLE 5.25
RESORT TO VIOLENCE FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE NO.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE PER.</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE NO.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE PER.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER=PERCENTAGE