CHAPTER-I


The concept of non-violence is basically an axiological and ethical one. In modern times, it is more a counter-thesis than a thesis per se. It is not a fact, but it counters the fact of violence and the world-view grown upon this fact. In countering the fact of violence, the idea of non-violence is translated into action plans giving rise to many more allied concepts like ‘Truth’, ‘God’, ‘Swaraj’ or ‘Self-rule’, ‘well-being’ etc. On the basis of the equation of means and end, it speaks of a societal transformation and also a transformation of human subjectivity from the state of violence to non-violence. In the context of the critique of modern civilization which is beset with different forms of violence it is M.K. Gandhi who is the pioneer in spelling out the meaning of non-violence in terms of this equation. The end of human action is the cumulative consequence of the means used. As Bandopadhyaya points out, “The means, in other words, are themselves end-creating in the context of deliberate societal transformation. The end as a goal exists only in the mind of the doer; whether it coincides with the actual result of human action depends on the whether the means used are qualitatively of the same kind as the end. In concrete terms, a non-violent international system cannot be brought into existence through the use of violence in interstate relations.”

This idea of non-violence as an end flowing from a non-violent agency is again based upon a moral struggle that in Gandhian phraseology may be called a struggle between the ‘soul force’ and ‘brute force’ in human subject and finally upon a victory of the ‘soul force’. In this sense, non-violence as a moral state-
of affairs countering violence as a fact is indicative of an inner transformation within human subject. Human freedom lies in this transformation. Gandhi would call it ‘Swaraj’ or ‘self-rule’ in the truest sense of the term.

Johan Galtung, the father of peace studies, explicates the concept of non-violence in terms of the nature of peace. Peace is not simply an absence of violence; it consists in execution of human energy in a non-violent manner for settling and transforming conflict inwardly and outwardly. For Galtung too, non-violence in and through peace or peace in and through non-violence is a counter-thesis. It counters violence in and through conflict or conflict in and through violence i.e. conflict in its negative sense. In contrast with the paradigm of conflict transformation or conflict termination through submission or surrender to a stronger opponent hierarchically placed at a higher level, Galtung argues for a Buddhist paradigm that consists in horizontality. This paradigm nurtures and exhibits non-violence from the very outset of conflict transformation process. Buddhist approach, being based upon horizontality would speak for a multilateral conference for conflict transformation and resolution instead of a plain submission. Horizontality prevails in the domain of inter-subjective and inter-cultural communication where dialogue among the moral equals is an essentials component. Galtung’s experiment with non-violence as a value in all sectors of humanity reveals a synergy of this paradigm and Gandhi’s view.

Jiddu Krishnamurti’s notion of non-violence is thoroughly existential in nature. It is primarily based upon (i) self-perception without interference of tradition, customs, Institutional ideas and presuppositions, and (ii) psychological mutation. On the basis of this perception and mutation violence in human individual is detected. With mutation self is re-discovered as it is. A process of cleansing it up begins therefrom. For Krishnamurti, social or collective transformation is ultimately grounded upon this mutation of individual psyche. Change in external system is not indicative of real change. Real change is possible from within. The
meaning of non-violence can be sought alongside this change and re-discovery of the true self of the individual. The positive dimension of it comprises care and love without any self-interest.

Our purpose is to move from ‘What is the case’ to ‘What should be the case’, from the fact of violence to the value of non-violence. This movement at the theoretical plane is possible if and only if we can explore into the possibility of an alternative world-order. It is neither a theoretical nor a practical (in the sense of moral) impossibility. But to translate the value perspective of ‘non-violence’ and ‘peace’ into action plans for the purpose of upholding the conceivability of an alternative world-order, it is necessary to identify and explicate the nature of conflict and violence. The close connection between conflict and violence lies in the fact that violence is often a result of solidification of conflict between two parties and incorrigibility of incompatible interest goals harboured by them. The point, however, is to break this incorrigibility and transform the conflict into a play-like situation and finally resolves it. The possibility of it has been differently spelt out and argued for by these three thinkers. Before we go into it, let us explicate the nature of ‘conflict’, ‘violence’ and ‘peace’ according to Gandhi, Galtung and J. Krishnamurti.

**GANDHI:**

Conflict refers to a situation in which a person is motivated to engage in two or more mutually exclusive activities.

The term ‘Conflict’ is indicative of a state of incompatibility as a condition. Incompatibility generally may take two forms. In its clear form, it is an incompatibility between the subjective goals of actors in a society. And in its less clear form; it is an incompatibility between the objective interests of patterns of a society.
Gandhi holds that, conflict is not in the essential character of a person; it is inherently built into the very structures of a society. He observed that the evil laid in each social structure, not in the persons who carried out their obligations within them. A person may commit acts of sin but such acts do not make him sinner. Hence, Gandhi draws the distinction between the sin and sinner. This reminds us of the famous utterance of Vajrasen, the hero of Rabindranath Tagore’s drama ‘Shyama’, “for the purpose of taking sin to task, I hurt the sinner, Oh! My lord, I know that you won’t forgive my mercilessness.”

On the basis of these philosophical notions one should appeal to persons who are the carriers of evil structures, to consider not their own sinfulness, but sinfulness of the structures.

For Gandhi, one should fight the evil, not the evil-doer. From this point of advice it is clear to us that Gandhi draws a sharp distinction between the conflicts as such and its manifestations. To dominate the evil is the opposite of defeating the others. We should avert the wrong acts created by conflicts; it is not a proper method that to avoid blood shed or destruction in general to avoid conflicts. But one should avoid the wrong wrought by conflicts. Conflicts are to be resolved. And for resolving conflicts one should adopt these methods.

Gandhi maintained that conflict did not necessarily lead to a negative approach. He tried to find out that a relation between the parties or actors in the conflict between A and B, means that A and B have something in common i.e. a bond or relation that relates A to B and the cause or reason for conflict between A and B means that they have some common factors or common problems which is functioning for both of them. Hence, conflict is treated as raw material, to be molded in to harmonious social relations. Hence, we may say that Gandhian concept of conflict or method of conflict resolution has a positive strand or implications. And such positive implication of conflict is comparable to J. Habermas’ ‘Discourse Ethics’, according to which an ethics of argumentation
needs to be followed in cases of conflict for the purpose of reaching a reasoned conclusion. Habermas’ concept becomes relevant to conflictological studies when incompatible claims of partners in a conflict situation assume an ethical character in terms of justifying each of it by the respective partner. There is a formal character of discourse ethics. It is based on a procedure of moral discourse rather than specific ethical prescriptions. From this point of view it has a universalistic stance for addressing specific moral / ethical issues. But it also takes cognizance of diverse cultural contexts, forms of life and individual life projects. Its fundamental target is to reach universal structural aspects of ways of life which can relate to communicative action as such and thus to bridge the gulf between pure ethics of Kantian type and questions related to ethical justification of individual or collective interest goals that may come in conflict with that of other individuals and collectivities. Gandhi’s notion of conflict, however, is more practice oriented. As Mark Juergensmeyer points out, it is to “redirect the focus of a fight from persons to principles,”. “Gandhi called it Satyagraha, “grasping onto principles” or “truth force.”.”
Juergensmeyer says, “He (Gandhi) assumed that behind any struggle lies another clash, a deeper one: a confrontation between two views that are each in some measure true. Every fight, to Gandhi, was on some level a fight between differing “angles of vision” illuminating the same truth…. . This means that most of the ways that you and I fight simply miss the point. We either grapple with the person who represents a position or else try to accommodate that person, without struggling with the position itself. That, to Gandhi’s mind, leaves the real conflict unresolved. “. In course of struggling with the position there is a change i. e moral change in consciousness.
We can assume six approaches of conflict resolution viz, resolving the incompatibility, compromise, trading, multilateraization, integration and decoupling. Besides these, there is another family of approaches which includes
parties turning inward or turning more positively towards each other or letting
one conflict recede into the background by introducing a new conflict to displace
it or the use of direct and structural violence is also to be counted as a mode of
resolving conflict.

Gandhi rejected most of the six approaches. He also rejected the use of direct
and structural violence. Because his philosophy of non violence is totally against
the injunction to resolve conflict .To him, resolving conflict is the desired
outcome of conflict .His criterion of resolving conflicts demands a higher level
of self- reliance and self purification .If the two parties remain unchanged in
their position, and if any of the tries to resolve conflict in that situation, it will be
futile to him; it is no means at all. According to Gandhi, these protective devices
only escape from conflict are merely ways out for those who are unfit to face it
squarely and as such they cannot be a part of doctrine of ‘Satyagraha’.

Gandhi’s criterion of success of resolving a conflict demands a higher level of
self- reliance in both parties as well as destruction of negative structures, in
consequence of which the exploiter would also be liberated by the destruction of
institutionalized exploitation.

Gandhi believed that man is basically a violent being, but gradually he can
become a non-violent being through his inward purification. Violence in man is
founded upon the brute force within him but non-violence is possible because of
the ‘divine spark’ and ‘perfectibility’ which are also within him. The ideal
history of human kind is based upon expression of this ‘divine spark’ and
cultivation of ‘perfectibility’. Hence, for Gandhi, history of mankind is a moral
history. Man learns the evil consequences of violence and inhuman dimension of
society resulting from violence. This education is imparted to humankind by the
history of facts, crude and stark reality. Man can have education because of
‘perfectibility’ and ‘divine spark’ within him and envisages an alternative
conception of history which is the history of struggle of man against violence.
However, absolute and perfect non-violence appears to be a well-high impossibility in view of biological, environmental, organic and societal intricacies in human existence. In this connection Gandhi holds "......... No activity and no industry are possible without a certain amount of violence. What we have to do is to minimize it to the greatest extent possible". But he always tried to avert the strategy of violence, because it breeds fear and escalates anyhow. Gandhi believed violence fails to attain permanent stability. Violence begets violence. Hence he approached and favoured non-violence. He emphasized on non-violence that brings forth protection of the self for the cause of humanism.

Gandhi believed that a votary of violence all the time seeks the help of a rifle, a sword, or any weapons to save or to counter him because violence is exterior and physical force, hence it is not applicable to weak person. On the contrary, non-violence is the spiritual force, and it is universally applicable. So in all respect non-violence is a stronger and matured method to counter the anti party, as its fruits last permanently. Gandhi believed that violence is the law of the brute, not of human. The violence of the evil doer includes its effects in setting the evil doer to himself. It is also self infliction and not just infliction upon others. Hence he strongly rejected all types of violence.

A non-violent person is always greater than that of a violent person. The end of violence is surest defeat; the ultimate end of non-violence is surest victory. Gandhi was against violence because when it appears to do well, the good it produces is only temporary. It brings no good to mankind, rather it proliferates further ominous problem endlessly. For protection of external things violence may be needed, but this protection is temporary and weak. But for the protection of oneself (atman) and one’s honour non-violence is much needed and it lasts long. Violence is much weaker than non-violence because a votary of non-violence needs helps of the arms and weapons to protect him, which only
breathes violence. But for a votary of non-violence nothing is required to protect himself except love and tolerance. Gandhi offers a comprehensive critique about the inferiority of violence as a way of proceedings. He sees a violent society is unwilling to acknowledge the essential dignity and worth of each of its members and finds the violent life is at war with itself. In such a society, fear and suspicion are widespread and speech is used not to uncover Commonalities but to intimidate and terrify others. When this occurs, individual is confined to the stage of “brute” and unwilling to develop morally.”

In limited cases Gandhi thought that violence may be justified, though he was totally against violence and he continuously tried to minimize the level of violence from the society. Gandhi holds. “...Cowards can never be moral, because they are uncommitted to their own integrity or moral projects, unless it is safe or convenient.”

Gandhi prefers violence than cowardice. He argued, “There is hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a coward. I have there fore said ............. that if we don’t know how to defend ourselves, our woman and our places of worship by the force of suffering i.e. non-violently, we must, if we are men be at least able to defend all these by fighting.”

From this standpoint, non-violence is more a moral concept. It is like a Platonic eidos or ‘form’ continuous translation of which in our day to day actions transforms the socio cultural and political life. But unlike Plato Gandhi does not situate non-violence or ahimsa or any moral concept in a purely conceptual world to which only rational self can have access. The search for true nature of human soul in terms of non-violence was an epistemic search for Gandhi, the search that involved lot of risks and challenges. Such risks and challenges that cleans the inner being of man by cultivating perfectibility and brings about a transformed subject cannot be forced by coward man. The moral concept of non-violence was thus brought down by Gandhi from the abstract rational level to the
domain of existential practice. The search for its logos does not any more necessitate a Platonic recourse to pure rational intuition. Reason, for Gandhi, is subservient to heart, but not the vice versa. This primacy of heart over reason does not morally permit violence on any so called rational ground. From this point of view, violence, even when it is necessary, should be minimized to the extent it is possible, or as much as possible.

Minimization of violence and promotion of non-violence as a process and goal of self-purification the effect of which can transform society and world as a whole is a moral task. But its meaning does not lie in surrender or submission to anything evil, enemy or exploiter. In this connection Gandhi cited an example of the people of a village near Bettie that how they surrendered in front of enemy or opponent party for becoming non-violent. Gandhi argues that this is simply a misunderstanding of the use of non-violence. “The people of a village near Bettie told me that they had run away whilst the police were looting their houses and molesting their woman folk when they said they had run away because I had told them to be non-violent, I hung my head in shame-----I expected them to interpret the mightiest power that might be in the act of harming those who were under their protection, and draw without retaliation all harm upon their own heads even to the point of death, but never to run away from the storm centre. It was manly enough to defend ones property, honor or religion at the point of the sword. It was manlier and nobler to defend them without seeking to injure the wrongdoer. But it was unmanly, unnatural and dishonorable to forsake the post of duty and, in order to save ones skin, to leave property, honor, and religion to the mercy of wrong doer. I could see my way of delivering the message of ‘ahimsa’ to those who were afraid of death”.

Though Gandhi suggested for violent activities in some special cases but he strongly denied all forms of violence, because he found no value in it.
For Gandhi, only the things attained through love and peace were imperishable in contrast to brutal methods. He holds—"Hitler and Mussolini on the one hand and but Stalin on the other..... to show the immediate effectiveness of violence. But it may be transitory as that of Chenguish slaughter. But effects of Buddha’s non-violence persist and are likely to grow with age. And the more it is practiced the more effective and inexhaustible it becomes and ultimately the whole world Stands agape and exclaims miracle has happened."

Gandhi averts the strategy of violence because it breeds fear in society. Gandhi prefers to be non-violent in approach because to be non-violent is to be free from inhibition of fear that eats up the inner growth of humanism.

The English connotation of peace is cessation of war, the state of quiet. The meaning of the term implied the negative aspects of the phenomena. Gandhi, who was a protagonist of non-violence and peace, found that the meaning of peace as it is in vague is inadequate and wrapped. For Gandhi, peace was meaningless if it were not an absolutely positive value. To Gandhi, peace meant the elimination or destruction of all kinds of tyranny. It is a positive concept conducive to the realization, preservation and promotion of human dignity and social justice. As an advocate of non-violence Gandhi firmly believed that peace could be gained through love and non-violence. He holds that to think of it by means of any annihilation of the party in conflict, say by means of war, is to lead to a disaster. He says, "But I do not want peace at any price, I don’t want the peace that you find in the grave; but I do want the peace which you embedded in the human breast which is exposed to the arrows of a whole world, but which is protected from all harm by the power of the Almighty God."

Gandhi firmly believed that only through Satyagraha or ‘adherence to truth’ man could hope for permanent world peace. He holds that the Satyagraha movement for the conduct of which he is responsible may prove a vain effort, if he represents no one but himself. If he alone remains true to his faith, he may be
satisfied, but so far as the world peace is concerned, the effort will prove inadequate. For producing the desired result during the life time of the present generation, it is necessary to give an unmistakable demonstration that a substantial part of the nation is behind the effort. Much more has to happen before such a demonstration becomes possible, the Satyagraha movement is a humble attempt in that direction, in it there is no room for hatred, certainly not for camouflage. (Sevagram, March 29, 1941.) Gandhi holds, 'Despite my being the originator of this struggle, I venture to say that only through it (Satyagraha) we can hope for permanent world peace. Peace can never come through war.' For Gandhi, "'peace' was never an end in itself, it was but a means to a nobler goal; that of just world order. The way of peace is the way of truth. Truthfulness is even more than peacefulness."

Gandhi holds that to say that there is peace, where one party forces the other to agree to something against its will causes it's under the brute strength, was a violation against truth. He insisted that peace must be just and in order that, it must neither punitive nor vindictive. The fruits of peace must equally be shared.

A peace concluded through war was not real peace; it was at best a patched up Situation resulting from mutual exhaustion. Such a temporary affair and such a method could possibly not create a world order. A victory attained by violence is purely temporary, but the real peace could be gained through only non-violence. If non-violence were adopted as a design of life, it will certainly promote happiness and peace, and that type of peace will be ever lasting, permanent and pure. Gandhi firmly believed that the moral force of Satyagraha would oblige a nation to ascertain a spirit of co-operation rather than and it would be the highest contribution in bringing world peace.

He firmly believed that this moral force of Satyagraha would oblige a nation to ascertain a spirit of co-operation rather than Selfishness. The choice of
Satyagraha would transform every character of the state, and thus of interstate relations and the consequent state of world. And once the method is adopted, the process of inter state domination and competition will be gradually abolished. And for this reason, Gandhi prescribed to adopt the method of Satyagraha to establish peace in the state. Gandhi holds, to think that peace could be established through war and violence is to labor under a disastrous delusion. He holds that he reiterate his conviction that there will be no peace for the allies or the world unless they shed their belief in the efficacy of war and its accompanying terrible deception and fraud are determined to hammer out real peace based on freedom and equality of all races and nations.”

For Gandhi, exploitation and domination of one nation over another can have no place in world striving to put an end to all war. In such a world only the militarily weaker nation will be free from the fear of intimidation or exploitation. In Gandhi’s conception, a durable and dynamic peace is a desperate necessity and can only be brought about by pure and moral means. And there is such an intimate relationship, interdependence between means and ends. The purity of means in bringing about the peace consists in the adoption of non-violence in international relations, an initial step in the direction of which is universal disarmament through unilateral disarmament. Non-violence leads to truth and it acts as a means to attain ends or to bring about ends. Gandhi argued that, it is a universal law that violence could only be quenched by non-violence rather than by superior form of violence. He firmly believed that if the method of non-violence be adopted by any individual or a society it would be very convenient for bringing about peace and it would be the easiest method for bringing about peace and happiness in the society.

Describing the nature of ideal global system Gandhi holds that it must be based wholly on truth and non-violence. The prevailing global system by and large violates both the concept i.e. truth and non-violence and particularly for this
reason may be the western peace movement or WPM totally seems forgetful. He
prescribed to adopt the technique of satyagraha, swaraj to replace violence
among nations without over looking or abandon the idea of conflict among
individuals. Gandhi’s actual experience in the field – the many satyagrahas he
led and inspired not merely sustainable but steadily strengthen ones conviction
that violence locally, or war internationally was no solution to the dilemma of
peace and freedom (Gandhi on War and peace). He eagerly believed freedom
and peace to be intermingled, not only for that reason that they are equally
important, but one could not last without other. Peace is a prerequisite and
consequences of Swaraj or self-rule or rule of the govt.

The source of evil, for Gandhi, is in disbelief in God. By ‘God’ he means the
equation between ‘Truth’ and ‘God’. Though he proposed these two notions to
be synonymous with each other, he did not qualify ‘God’ as ‘Truth’. On the
contrary, he said, ‘Truth is God’. This proposition is founded upon a relentless
epistemic search of ‘Being’ continuously discovered in terms of disclosure of
human perfectibility in diverse facets of his ‘being’ as individual subject.
Gandhi’s unflinching faith in God is also to be regarded as a discovery of this
kind. But this discovery, perhaps validly, becomes the final reference –point for
him, - a reference -point that is unquestionable and ever living. The maximal
meaning of the concept of swaraj is to be sought here in this epistemic search
which can be, and needs to be extended to socio-political spheres of individual
existence. Evil, at individual and thereby at collective level, follows from
ignorance and oblivion of this reference-point. Peace may be attained through an
unconditioned performance in this search and finally in encountering this living
reference point. This is what brings about Gandhi’s concept of religion, which is
to be understood more in the sense of religiosity, in the social and political
domain. This is not sheer subscription to an institution but to remain committed
to truth in its equation with God, - in its moral and epistemic dimension as its backdrop. Disbelief in it results in disaster. As Miri Points out, Gandhi’s experiments with truth are to be understood in terms of two fundamental points: “(i) that experiment for Gandhi meant a deep engagement with oneself, traversing the interior route until the possibility of the moral life was firmly established; and (ii) that this interior journey is not just psychological but an epistemic one with its aim to achieve a self-awareness, ‘a quickening of consciousness’ which is the same as freedom or swaraj where one’s action flows, with utter spontaneity from one’s knowledge.”

Understanding of conflict, from this point of view, is possible within a holistic framework of relationship between self and morality, self and truth, self and God, self and self-rule or swaraj, self and society. The framework, however, can be essentialized as consisting of a non-invasive and dialogical relationship between self and other as moral equals.

Gandhi believes that the root of the every evil lies in the disbelief of God. And for attainment of peace renunciation is necessary. Peace may be attained by unconditioned performance. He holds that peace is unattained by part performance of conditions. If the recognized leader of mankind who has control over the engine of destruction were wholly to renounce their use with full knowledge of its implications, permanent peace can be attained.

GALTUNG:

The term ‘peace’ may in itself be peace productive; it produces a common basis, a feeling of communality in purpose that may pave the ground for deeper ties. But when a peace researcher uses the term ‘peace’ he should have gained some experiences when it comes to definition. To discuss the idea of peace, it is better to start from three principles.
1. The term ‘Peace’ shall be used for social goals at least verbally agreed to many, if not necessarily by most.

2. These social goals may be difficult, but not impossible to attain.

3. The statement peace is absence of violence shall be retained as valid. What we intend is only that the term ‘peace’ and ‘violence’ be linked to each other in such a manner that ‘peace’ can be regarded as ‘absence of violence’.

Violence may be said to persist in a society / community / group as long as the psychosomatic being of the people there or in any section of it is below the potential realizations. Violence is that which increases the distance between the potential and the actual, and that which impedes the decrease of this distance. Galtung focused on six dimensions of violence:

1. The distinction between physical and psychological violence.
2. The distinction between negative and positive influence.
3. The existence or non-existence of an object that is hurt.
4. The existence or non-existence of a subject who acts.
5. The distinction between intended and unintended violence.
6. The distinction between manifest and latent violence.

The first one is self-explanatory. The second refers to the violent potential of positive influence. The third refers to the treat of violence occurring without any evident recipient. In the fourth dimension, the distinction between personal and structural violence is introduced.
Galtung took from Gandhi’s distinction between ‘actor- oriented and structure- oriented analyses. A view of human beings both as having free will and being willed by every strong structure oriented analysis. The last dimension of violence makes a distinction between manifest and latent violence. For Galtung latency is structural potentiality, violence is being done to the slave regardless of any subjective comprehension of the facts on the part of any actor in the question. Direct and structural violence can be latent or manifest. Direct violence may become manifest in social instability. Structural violence might be eradicated through revolutionary action. Direct violence attracted analytical attention simply because it was dynamic and highly visible. Structural violence, on the other hand, is silent and it does not show; it is highly static.

For Galtung, positive peace refers to the absence of structural violence. Peace is not only a matter of control and reduction of the overt use of violence. Peace theory is intimately connected not only with conflict theory, but also equally with developmental theory.

KRISHNAMURTI:
The present situation of the world is such that the humanity is fragmented into innumerable tiny groups, based on different distinctions viz, racial, cultural, ethical, religious, class and ideological differences. The each groups complete with another i.e. how one dominate other, they engaged with overtake with other. Conflict among nations is not only due to ideological differences. It is seen that nations have gone to wars even within the same spectrum of social system; large nations have dominated small nations. No matter what the ideological differences are, big nations have tried again and again with new strategies to colonize, suppress and keep small and poor nations backward. So, conflict arises due to the urge of dominations. Every individual, every society and every nation
tries to dominate others on different grounds. Conflict is in every form between individuals, societies and also between nations.

According to Jiddu Krishnamurti, the understanding of conflict in relationship is of primary importance, for in that conflict one can discover the whole process of the mind. Without knowing the actuality of the conflict in daily existence i.e., economic, social and ideological, it is impossible to go beyond it. Relationship is response to the movement of life and life is a constant challenge and when the response is inadequate conflict arises and when the response is appropriate and adequate there is the cessation of conflict. Hence it is of prime importance to know oneself i.e. what he/she is rather than what he/she thinks about or what his/her ideas are. If one can understand what one is, he/she can create a world and that world will be free of conflict. In everyday life we are facing crisis in the world and we are observing that today’s world is full of misery and the rates of destruction and conflict war are increasing very rapidly.

It is true that it is impossible for an individual to stop these things, but he or she can alter his/her relationship with the world i.e. the world of his wife, his work, his home etc, not necessarily the world of any other continent. Through these alterations one can bring a great change, and this change moves in a wider circle through which one can built a peaceful society.

Hence, understanding of the concept and nature of violence is of utmost importance. As Malik points out, “Etymologically, violence means ‘to carry force towards’ something. This can have endless meanings; maybe all human action in the normal sense whether the ego is involved, implies violence. Even other wise, it is clear that violence is related to physical force, injury or harm to another or even to one’s self with same intensity. Its psychological complementarity is vigorous psychological abuse. This is meant to disempower the other, to exploit in many other, often subtle devastating ways, within the ‘domination versus subordination’ paradigm.”

Krishnamurti holds that once one
observes and understands this violence within one’s own self in a rather non-interfering way, it is possible to think of an alternative, i.e. non-violent order of existence. Here non-interference means a conscious suspension of interference of thought or traditionally and institutionally constructed self with the actual and real self, the mental process. Violence to other and violence to one’s own self continues because each of us wants to retain, nurture and sustain this constructed self and thus refuses to realize the conflict between ‘I’ and ‘me’, the real actual self and the constructed self, idea and reality, image and actuality. As a result, relationship between human beings gets based on image-forming. As Krishnamurti points out, “In all our relationships each one of us builds an image about the other and these two images have relationship, not the human beings themselves. The wife has an image about the husband --- perhaps not consciously but nevertheless it is there- and the husband has an image about the wife. One has an image about one’s country and about oneself, and we are always strengthening these images by adding more and more to them. And it is these images which have relationship. The actual relationship between two human beings or between many human beings completely ends when there is the formation of images.”

For Krishnamurti, these images are fictitious. Hence, according to him, life becomes a battle among various images, - images of self in conflict with each other and self-image versus other image. This conflict is like the one between a schizophrenic patient, his image forming and the reality outside him. The psychological structure of society is thus essentially schizophrenic in nature. Krishnamurti says, “All our relationships, whether they be with property, ideas or people, are based essentially on this image-forming, and hence there is always conflict.”

So if we able to understand the conflict of every day existence, then we can go further because therein lies the whole significance of life. A mind that is in
conflict is a destructive mind, and one who is in conflict can never understand. Understanding of conflict is possible only when one steps out of its dynamics and perceives it with a free and alert mind. This is also to understand the flawed perspective in the name of human relationship. For a man who is understanding the relationship there is no outsider or insider. So, relationship is the process of understanding oneself and to understand oneself moment to moment in daily life is self knowledge. Self knowledge in this sense is the beginning of wisdom.

Krishnamurti holds that the urge of domination whether it is by individual, society or nation is the root cause of conflict. He points out, “every body is fighting some body, one man feels less than another, and struggles to get to the top………………. Our society is a constant battle of man against man.”

Krishnamurti holds that- from the very moment we born, a type of battle starts with our life and it last till death; it is a never ending process. So, life is a series of constant struggle and battle. He perceives the problem of existence primarily as that a conflict. By the term ‘problem’ he means to say, a state in which there is conflict. And as the conflict prevails in us, we regard it as a problem, which is to be dissolved, to be understood or from which we wish to escape. Hence, to be aware of the problem means to be the aware of the conflict. Dynamics of conflict moves from inner being of the individual towards the collectivity in terms of conflict among religious, ideologies, nationhoods etc. Conflicts are a total process and it is the psychological process. No theory, method or formula can be able to eradicate conflict from the society or to minimize conflict from the society. It will be a touch on the surface, and not in the deeper post of it, so it will be just like a soldering effect to the society. So, for understanding the very nature and structure of conflict, one has to go in to psychologically and inwardly into one’s mind, and not outwardly to the systems and institutions. Replacement of one system with another system is an external physical change. In fact it is not change. Change comes from within through a psychological mutation .Hence,
for Krishnamurti, understanding of conflict and violence as well requires a beginning from ‘within’ and thereafter a movement from individual psychological revelation towards the externalities for removal of conflict and violence from collectivity.

Krishnamurti observes, when one is to conforming to a pattern, religious or psychological, or the pattern, which one has set for oneself, there is always a contradiction between what one actually is, and the pattern, there is always is a conflict and this conflict is endless. But if the pattern creates conflict, is it possible for any one to live a life without any pattern, without any idea of future, a life without conflict? Krishnamurti’s answer to this question is ‘yes’, it is possible only when one lives completely with “what is”, that which is actually taking place. To live with “what is” implies no conflict whatsoever. Therefore, there is no future transforming it into something else. And the very ending of it is the gathering of supreme energy which is a form of intelligence.

In the social field, conflict arises due to relationship, the relationship with things or with individuals or with ideological relationship. It is the challenge of every day life. If we do not know how to meet with other, how to behave with other, this very ignorance creates conflict in society. Because, the society is the projection of individual, the problem persists with individual only. In his famous philosophical work *You are the world*, Krishnamurti holds that the problem is related with the individual only, not the society or the world. Without the psychological transformation, the conflict situation can not be eradicated from the society. This psychological revolution comes into being when need for using the other ceases. And this revolution is possible through the positive aspect i.e. love and non-violence.

Krishnamurti does not think that any partial revolution in the economic, social or political organization of society can provide a lasting solution to the crisis in human consciousness and world. The only revolution that is essential for
bringing peace and order to the suffering humanity has to be psychological. And the psychological revolution can come into being by the participation of every individual. Psychological revolution, for Krishnamurti, is total revolution.

For understanding the nature of conflict and conflict leading to violence, Krishnamurti, unlike many other contemporary Indian thinkers, hits on the negative and subversive force in every individual psyche, - the very nature of man that is carefully concealed for the sake of security at individual and collective levels and for the sustenance of each one’s hierarchically glorified and respectable position. He says, “We human beings are what we have been for millions of years—colossally greedy, envious, aggressive, jealous, anxious and despairing, with occasional flashes of joy and affection. We are a strange mixture of hate, fear and gentleness; we are both violence and peace. There has been outward progress from the bullock cart to the jet plane but psychologically the individual has not changed at all, and the structure of society throughout the world has been created by individuals. The outward social structure is the result of the inward psychological structure of our human relationships…”  

The violence that is embedded in the structure of society is thus nothing but an extension and reflection of this deep structure of individual psyche. Structural violence has thus two dimensions for Krishnamurti of which the individual dimension is primary and understanding of it is more urgent. Unlike Galtung, Krishnamurti would not make a distinction between ‘direct violence’, which is physical and psychological aggression and ‘structural violence’ resulting from social structure. For him, all violence flows from the deep-rooted structure of individual psyche and we individuals only are the creators of structural violence within society.

According to J. Krishnamurti, a man who is seeking to understand violence does not belong to any country, any religion, to any political party, he is choicelessly concerned with total understanding of mankind. He perceives that when we
isolate ourselves in terms of or on the basis of a class or nation, it is violent activity. When we call ourselves as Indian, Pakistani, Muslim, or Christian and so on, we are being violent because at that particular moment we are isolating ourselves from the rest of mankind.

When we examine the phenomenon of violence, we find violence first in ourselves and then violent outwardly. What we are inwardly, we project outwardly. There are thousands of explanations of violence. What is violence? Why are we violent? What are the causes of violence? But if we analyze the question repeatedly, character and primary means of violence will remain the same. In India, from time immemorial ideologists and intelligentsia have been talking about the problem of non-violence, that they are practicing non-violence. But non-violence as a sheer ideal gives them a certain sense of hypocritical escape from the fact, the fact they continue inwardly violent. Krishnamurti perceives violence as a fact, not as an idea. He perceives violence as a fact which exists in the human being.

According to Krishnamurti, if we know how to look at violence, not only outwardly in society- in the wars, the riots and the class conflicts- but also in ourselves then we may avert violence from the society. He holds that, the most common expression of violence is anger. When our sister, wife or beloved is attacked by any person and if I rebuke that person, I may say that I am righteously angry because here for protection of my close one I may be angry and that anger is justified. Krishnamurti observes, to investigate into the fact of our own anger, we must pass no judgment on it, for the moment we see in an opposite situation we condemn it and therefore we can not see it as it is. To see the face of violence clearly is to be in a very deep meditation; it is not possible to understand violence through verbal agreement or disagreement.

The above analysis of the phenomenon of violence reveals that peace in its true sense is never achievable by changing or modifying the external systems or
social dynamics. Nor it is possible by blindly subscribing to some institutional religious measure. To be non-violent by following the ideal or value of non-violence cannot make us really non-violent. To be really and truly non-violent one needs to understand violence within oneself and then to practice non-violence experimentally. It is not the ideal of non-violence which can bring peace in life and society. On the contrary it is by exposing oneself to oneself and a clear self-perception that can help us in going beyond it and trading the path of peace.

For Gandhi and Galtung both understanding of violence and the practice of non-violence fall within a common and holistic social programme. This programme includes the self-correction of individual as well. Moreover both of them highlight the ‘perfectibility’ of human beings as their essence. Gandhi traced the source of violence and conflict to the ‘brute force’ within man in a universalistic sense. But he at the same time placed human being on a higher citadel with reference to his ‘soul force’ which too is universally present in each man. Thus bringing about peace for him would be a victory of ‘soul force’ over the ‘brute force’. Galtung also holds that ‘the peace researchers must look for causes, conditions, and contexts in various spaces—Nature, Human, Social, world, Time, Culture’.

Reference to individual human mind as the primary focus and source of violence is not so much in Galtung’s philosophy of peace as well. However a comparative analysis of the positions of these three thinkers may help us in striking a balance between extreme individualism and absolutely collectivistic approach to peace and non-violence. An important common parameter is the thought of all three of them is the practical emphasis on peace and non-violence setting aside the pure theoresist approach.
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