Conclusion

In the preceding chapters we have dealt with the concepts of conflict and violence Vis a Vis peace and non-violence of Mahatma Gandhi, Johan Galtung and Jiddu Krishnamurti. We have also elaborated the implications of their approaches.

The first chapter prepares the perspective of the thesis in terms of a general overview of the explications of the concepts of conflict, violence and peace from the individual philosophical stand points and world-views of these three thinkers. The second chapter is a comparative study of the view points of Gandhi and Krishnamurti. Though there are certain points of convergence between Gandhi and Krishnamurti in terms of emphasis upon the source of violence in man himself and the need of change or transformation of the inner psyche of individual human being, the basic difference between them prevails. Gandhi projected the need for identification of man on the basis of his cultural tradition. But Krishnamurti rejects this approach.

Gandhi stressed on inward purification of human being. His concept of non-violence has a humanistic approach. He tried to change the very character of every Indian. He said that man is basically a violent being, but gradually he can become non-violent if he desires. He recognizes that man is a conditional being and as such subject to the determination of the physical world. He recognizes the brute in man but believes that man is also a part of the Divine; he can know his true nature and become truly man as a lion brought up in the company of sheep does. The ultimate end in man's life for Gandhi is realizing the Absolute. The path for this realization can be paved only through self-knowledge, initially a through process of self transformation, and inward change rather than outwardly.
We have found that the concept of non-violence had already existed in our society even before Gandhi. Many traditional literature and philosophical systems speak of non-violence. But after Gandhi the concept became widespread in our society. In the second chapter entitled ‘Concept of Non-Violence: Gandhi and Krishnamurti’, we have tried to find out the parities and disparities of concepts of Gandhi and Krishnamurti. Like Gandhi, Krishnamurti also stressed inward/psychological transformation. He held that when we examine the phenomenon of violence, we find first the violence in ourselves because what we are inwardly, we project outwardly. Like Gandhi, Krishnamurti also holds that truth is superior to God. He holds that truth is the power within each one of us which urges us on to attainment.

Gandhi holds that when one identifies himself as Hindu or a Christian or an Indian he is adopting violence, because the moment he identifies himself through his nation or religion he is isolating himself from the rest of mankind. But Gandhi wanted to rescue India from British rule adopting non-violent means. Gandhi sometimes encouraged people to defend themselves violently if they did not know how to do so non-violently. His advice to the villagers of Bihar, to women and his views on the defensive wars in Spain, Poland, Abyssinia and elsewhere are examples of this. He holds, “I do believe that where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advice violence. Thus when my eldest son asked me what he should have done, had he been present when I was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should have run away and seen me killed or whether he should have used his physical force when he could and wanted to use and defended me, I told him that it was his duty to defend me even by using violence.” But Krishnamurti holds that there is no condemnation or justification or the question of duty or anything in being non-violent.

The problem, according to Krishnamurti, is the violence – non-violence binarism. Non-violence or peace cannot be conceptualized as a form of reaction
to violence and conflict, because, in reaction we become violent. The complete negation of violence is possible when we understand its true nature through an uninterfered self-perception and an alternative way of living transcending the conceptual self of ours gifted by tradition, institutions, cultures and fostered for our psychological security. Krishnamurti, in a way, upholds the absolute value of non-violence realized in this alternative mode of life and in awakened consciousness of the individual,-not as a counter-thesis but as a thesis *per se*.

There is a point of similarity between Johan Galtung and M.K. Gandhi. Like Galtung’s structural violence Gandhi holds that conflict in its negative sense is not the essential character of a person; it is inherently built into the very structures of society. Galtung holds that violence is of two types direct and indirect. Direct violence comes from personal sources and indirect violence comes from society i.e. from structures. The third chapter entitled as ‘Concept of Peace: Galtung’s view and its implications’. In this chapter, we have discussed the concept of peace, Galtung’s views on it and their implications. In this chapter we have found that Galtung focuses on three principles of peace viz. the term ‘peace’ shall be used for social goals, these social goals may be difficult but it is not impossible to attain them and the term ‘peace’ is the absence of violence shall be retained as valid. Galtung’s intention is to make a link between violence and peace. The role of individual, however, assumes a greater importance in Galtung’s context when the question of enhancing the positive conflict energy arises. Individuals themselves or in groups work as peace actors to minimize and check the negative conflict energy, which essentially leads to violence. Direct violence which is more individual centric requires to be tamed on the basis of the value-perspective that emerges along with peace design.

Galtung’s thesis, as we have outlined and explicated, is to be understood more as practice-oriented. Peace designing is at the same time acting for peace that is
binarily opposed to conflict and violence. While Galtung, like Gandhi, is quite eloquent on the efficacy of non-violence as a value and ideal, his emphasis is more on translating this value in and through peace designing, peace processing and social scientific understanding of causes of conflict and violence in different actual contexts. In and through these action programmes Galtung’s proposal is to enhance the positive conflict energy i.e. to negate the negative conflict energy through transformation of conflicts from one into another only within the domain of love-non-violence force framework and thus overpowering the negative energy. Galtung’s philosophical position thus comes close to that of Gandhi as Gandhi also believed that ‘perfectibility’ and ‘soul force’ is fundamental to human nature and inter-personal, inter-cultural and inter-religious relationships became more and more humane on the basis of a self-conscious moulding of them with reference to this basic component of human nature.

The fourth chapter is entitled as ‘The Practical Importance of Gandhian, Krishnamurtian and Galtung’s concept of Non-Violence and Peace’. Here, we have found that these three thinker’s concepts of non-violence and peace have a great importance in the present crisis of world. All the three thinkers approach is humanistic in nature.

Gandhi repeatedly told us that to become human one has to cease to be bestial or brutal. He believed in oneness of God which directly unites all communities’ people and thereby breeds the sense of humanism in society. His concept of non-violence has important ethical consequences. The basic moral concern for Gandhi is human being itself. Non-violence means respect for all. His concept has a great significance in the present crisis of world as the world is fragmented and presently people are striving for more and more wealth and power over others.
According to Jiddu Krishnamurti, conflict in society arises due to improper understanding of relationship. Understanding of relationship is of prime importance for sustaining peace in society. In the present world violence emerges due to improper understanding of relationship, due to the urge for domination of one over the other, of a country over another country or state. If we be able to understand that we the human beings belong to same species and there is no one superior and no one inferior, no state is less powered or more powered then we may be able to restore peace in society. According to him, each individual is a molecule of society and each one is responsible for our social evils. So, before blaming others we have to rectify ourselves. And when an individual is able to rectify himself, the society will automatically be rectified. In this sense, Krishnamurti’s viewpoint is not really individual-centric. It speaks more of a continuum from individual to society. If society has to reflect the real self of man, one has to start from the individual. In the present crisis, to start from society is to start from thoughts, concepts and an already conceptualized self, not the real self. But fragmentation within man will continue in that case. Hence the only way to understand the fragmented and unreal self and to discover one’s true, actual self is to turn back to one’s own individual psyche.

Johan Galtung suggested eight steps for designing peace process and for sustaining peace in society. In present world this type of theory has great practical value. Here he mentioned that for sustaining peace in society there is a need for time frame and the participation of local actor. This is based upon his basic philosophy of peace envisaged as a counter-thesis of conflict and violence. The central and state agency at the time is trying to talk with the insurgent groups to solve their problems. So, if we design a peace process in such a manner where local actors may participate as mediators, as they are well aware of the problems and root causes of emergence of insurgent groups, and fix a
time frame so that without delay we may solve the problem, peace process may succeed.

In the fifth chapter entitled as 'An Alternative Image of the Human', we have tried to find out an alternative image of human being in the context of practicing non-violence and designing peace. As Gandhi tells us that human beings are basically violent but gradually he can become non-violent, Krishnamurti tells us that if man is able to know himself, if he is able to rectify himself he would be able to restore peace in society. Hence, in the fifth chapter, we have tried to discuss an alternative image of human being, as a parameter or yardstick to delve into the depth of the crisis, nature of peace and non-violence.

The present work has two aspects. On the one hand, it concentrates upon the nature of non-violence and peace from social philosophical and moral philosophical standpoints of Gandhi, Galtung and Krishnamurti, and, on the other hand, it posits the entire perspective of the thesis within the domain of philosophical anthropology. It is concern over existence of mankind in an authentic and non-coercive state that constitutes the philosophical background of all these three thinkers. The issue regarding the starting point of any discourse on non-violence and peace, as it appears from our discussion is whether it is the individual man and his psyche alone (Krishnamurti) or individual man in society and cultural tradition (Gandhi) or an action-oriented and programmatic version of human self negotiating with conflict situations and violence for peace (Galtung). The issue remains to be addressed further. Our proposal, however, is to deal with it from all three directions. To project the primacy of any one of them is to miss a deep dimension of the present crisis which we have highlighted in the beginning of chapter IV. Individual-society continuum (Gandhi), peace-violence binarism for peace and non-violence (Galtung) and real self-conceptual self cleavage for transcendence to a creative, non-coercive and non-violent existence (Krishnamurti), they all together form
the backdrop of moral philosophical anthropology for a future existence bereft of violence and negative conflict energy.
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