

BEYOND NON-VIOLENCE: EXPLORING DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO FREEDOM

Daljit Kaur, Parveen Kumar

Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo

Abstract

This study looks at the widespread obstacles that prevent the use of peaceful conflict resolution techniques at all conflict levels, from international to interpersonal. Nonviolence is sometimes written off as impractical or ineffectual, despite the rising awareness of the dangers and limitations of violence. The study uncovers a number of significant barriers to the acceptance of nonviolence, including as false assumptions about its nature, stereotypes of weakness, and deeply rooted convictions that violence is essential for survival and prosperity. The study highlights the significance of a mentality change and argues in favor of a more complex interpretation of conflicts that goes beyond the binary ideas of good and evil. It makes the case that in order to resolve conflicts peacefully, we must alter both the way we think and the things we think, leading to a more compassionate and all-encompassing approach. In order to overcome barriers to peaceful conflict resolution, the study suggests a multimodal strategy that includes awareness-raising, education, and the development of empathy and understanding. It emphasizes the necessity of a paradigm change in the way we view disputes, realizing the capacity of nonviolence to establish enduring and sustainable peace.

Keywords: *Non-violent conflict resolution, obstacles, misconceptions, violence, mindset shift, history, empathy, sustainable peace*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indian National Congress started the nonviolent mass mission for freedom from colonial power under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. For some, using nonviolence to liberate a frail country from a powerful imperialist power was a helpful strategy. In any case, Gandhi accepted that nonviolence was a basic idea and that liberation couldn't exist without it. He accepted that accomplishing freedom was corresponded with accomplishing non-violence. He said that rehearsing nonviolence required extraordinary dauntlessness and self-control. Sarvapalli Radha Krishnan noticed that Gandhi's nonviolent methodology "involves an internal conflict which requires us to overcome dread, eagerness, outrage, and responsibility" and that it "is based on the higher aspects of human instinct which oppose oppression, injustice, and authoritarianism." "Love is the law of the human species, and violence is the law of the wilderness," he said, on the improvement of human civilization.³ He contended for the rule's expansion into national and international spheres, having hitherto been restricted to interpersonal relationships [1].

The strategy "which delivered every one of the weapons of the British inadequate" was nonviolent, non-cooperation. Six No administration, regardless of how powerful, could exist without the support of its citizens. An administration forfeits its moral right to control on the off

chance that it savagely quells peaceful protestors; assuming that the last option are successful in persuading the authorities, the previous will right the wrongs. Did the nonviolent development of Mahatma Gandhi prompt the freedom of India? There were rough movements, alongside different factors. Men such as Bhagat Singh outside of Congress and Subhas Chandra Bose inside the Congress dismissed the nonviolent methodology [2]. There are those who keep up with that Mahatma Gandhi's nonviolent development stemmed from his faith in the British sense of justice and fair play, that the British treated Gandhi and his supporters with unprecedented generosity and compassion, and that the British left India when that's what they trusted "the second for political decolonization had shown up." Notwithstanding, this perspective on British kindness and "political realism" is offset by benevolent Englishmen expressing gratitude toward Mahatma Gandhi for empowering a peaceful and stately handover of power. Harold Wilson, the head of the state of England during the 1960s, concurs.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of a majority rules system has for quite some time been present in NVR writing. Early writings by compelling academics presented the defense that nonviolent resistance was democratizing essentially. Significant historical occurrences, such as the generally quiet post-Cold Conflict transitions in Eastern Europe (for example Hadjar, 2003) [4], offered help for these claims. Numerous studies have analyzed the effects of nonviolent campaigns (NVR) on democratization in this climate, specifically focusing on whether and what these campaigns mean for the shift from autocracy to a majority rules government and what they mean for later political developments.

Ackerman and Karatnycky (2005) [5] completed the first comparison research on the association among democratization and NVR. They discovered that following "bottom-up" non-fierce transitions, nations saw a more prominent improvement in their political and civil liberties than following "top-down" or savage changes. Johnstad (2010) later affirmed this result with another set of a majority rules system metrics. Be that as it may, multivariate analysis was not used in one or the other study. Considering how confounded democratization is, there are a ton of confusing variables that could make the association bogus.

Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) [6] By offering precise statistics on north of 300 resistance campaigns in their Non-Rough and Savage Struggle Result (NAVCO) database, they significantly progressed this research. Chenoweth and Stephan (2011: 213), using this information, reason that non-fierce resistance (NVR) campaigns emphatically raise a country's level of a majority rules government and the probability that it will be insignificantly just five years after the contention ends. Yet, their analysis just looks at how NVR initiatives admission in comparison to vicious campaigns; it leaves out instances of democratization spearheaded by the tip top. Moreover, resistance movements in just regimes are remembered for their sample.

Celestino and Gleditsch's (2013) [7] Subsequent research that focuses on fair transitions occurring in tyrant countries helps to make sense of some of these constraints. Their research

demonstrates that the probability of a vote based transition is increased when NVR campaigns are present. They didn't, notwithstanding, investigate what resistance movements mean for political development following the shift to a vote based system.

Scholars who have proposed causal explanations for how NVR enhances a vote based system have essentially focused on the advantages it provides to civil society. Civil resistance is available to far more noteworthy sectors of society, regardless old enough, orientation, or physical limit, however contribution in brutal operations is often restricted to a little unit of individuals, mostly young fellows [8]. NVR's success is helped by this participation advantage, which exacerbates world class divisions and threatens the state's material support bases. After a successful mission, it also advances a majority rules government since wide and fluctuated campaigns limit the impact of the new administration and keep the world class from straying from popularity based standards. This hypothetical case hasn't, be that as it may, been put to a rigorous test.

Besides, a ton of research have just incorporated a small number of control variables, or in specific situations, have not thought about any other possible causes whatsoever. This is a urgent omission because a huge collection of research on the structural prerequisites of resistance campaigns suggests that there are normal predictors among democratization and nonviolent resistance (NVR). For instance, one hypothesis contends that the rise of nonviolent resistance is strongly associated with financial downfall and the accessibility of free spaces for coordinating. **Lawson (2015)** [10] contends that the to a great extent non-rough "Bedouin Spring" revolutions succeeded to some degree because of the traits of the previous regimes, while **Ritter (2015)** [9] contends that a "iron enclosure of liberalism" fostered by tyrant regimes' connections to the West worked with the development and success of non-vicious action. Thus, making inferences about the causal relationship among NVR and democratization requires thinking about structural elective explanations.

A change in emphasis was provoked by democratization episodes where famous resistance assumed a basic part, such as those that followed the conclusion of the Virus Battle in Eastern Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa. In his clarification of how well known uprisings might topple communist governments in Eastern Europe, **Oberschall (2000)** [11] emphasized the significance of NVR for the ensuing popularity based consolidation in these countries. **Ulfelder (2005)** [12] discovered that in military and one-party governments, instances of nonviolent, contested collective action foster democratization.

Teorell (2010) [13] also investigated what public preparation meant for a majority rule government. As indicated by his findings, anti-government protests that are nonviolent can both briefly and forever raise the level of a majority rules system. Teorell emphasized the quantity and assortment of participants as the essential mechanism that explains how nonviolent protest promotes democratization, in accordance with the NVR research. To check public preparation, Ulfelder and Teorell, notwithstanding, both depend on occasion information from the Cross-

National Time-Series Information Chronicle (Banks, 2011 [1979]) [14]. Because of its dependence on newspaper articles, this information has been criticized for various issues, including geographic bias and absence of openness (Day et al., 2015) [15]. It has also been gone after for different reasons.

3. DIRECT ACTION AND CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

3.1.Liberal civil disobedience

Approaches to civil disobedience that are liberal and conscious emphasize the significance of authenticity. The objective is to demonstrate to the target group — the overall population — that specific laws and practices are invalid. The authenticity of the state is sabotaged assuming it uses power to suppress peaceful civil disobedience. This prompted the recognizable proof of civil disobedience as the "litmus test of the vote based constitutional state" by Jurgen Habermas (1985), and those who participate in it as the "guardian[s] of authenticity." John Rawls is credited with giving the most powerful description and justification of civil disobedience, despite constant criticism from political theorists who have analyzed the training throughout the course of recent years.

The liberal worldview is based on the necessity that civil disobedience be used as a last resort. As per Rawls, "the ordinary appeals to the political larger part have previously been made with honest intentions and that they have fizzled... [and] further attempts may reasonably be thought fruitless." This is a necessity for civil disobedience. Saying that disobedience is required is one more way to deal with outline the last resort. It "might be justified as a question of necessity just when legal efforts have over and over shown the greater part to be relentless or emotionless to this genuine cause," as per Kimberley Brownlee.

3.2.Anarchist direct action

Disruptive protest according to an anarchist perspective emphasizes what makes anarchist direct action novel from different types of protest. While the writing on civil disobedience often aims to work on liberal or extremist majority rule government, anarchist direct action writing investigates how protest could debilitate state power and capital while propelling vote based system. The writing on civil disobedience has mostly been composed separately and in lined up with anarchist theories and historicalizations of direct action. The two sides have staked claims to specific individuals and movements: liberals have worked to deradicalise the legacy of figures like Martin Luther Lord and Henry David Thoreau to squeeze them into a liberal structure, while anarchists have emphasized the elements of these figures that are anti-capitalist and anti-state.

The essential part of anarchist direct action is prefiguration. Prefigurative politics is sometimes associated with anarchism, albeit later surveys of the writing have connected it to non-Leninist Marxist currents like Gramscian and others that arose during the 1970s. As an idea, it has expanded well past these anarchist and Marxist literatures and is presently generally used in social development research and action. The topic has gathered significant scholarly interest, to

some degree because of the significance of prefigurative politics in the Development of the Squares and the Worldwide Justice Development. The "endeavored construction of option or utopian social relations in the present" is a central part of prefiguration, as per Yates (2015). Flat just methods have been a critical part of social development prefiguration. These behaviors are beneficial all by themselves, yet they also question the absence of a majority rules government in society in general [3].

4. OBSTACLES TO NONVIOLENT OPTION

At every one of the various levels of contention, the nonviolent sector is seldom seen as a realistic other option, despite this mounting "crisis of violence." The dispute is excluded from the so-called "realistic" possibilities, regardless of whether it is international, intrastate, interstate, societal (male controlled society, misogyny, racism, workers' grievances, and so on), or interpersonal. For what reason is it the case? The essential driver is most possible obliviousness. Choosing not to retaliate, keeping away from struggle, passive resistance, and inaction are normal perceptions of nonviolence. Albeit this might be the valid for a small number of nonviolent supporters who participate in non-resistance, the sector all in all exhibits the specific opposite conduct. Second, it's accepted that nonviolence stems from a place of weakness. This perspective is pervasive in a discourse that portrays political interactions as conflictual and holds that the main way for a person or society to flourish is to use "power over" others, which in the end translates into using physical power against them after any remaining options are exhausted. Thirdly, expanding on the previous contention, peaceful action is often seen as being powerful just specifically situations, such as when one is managing a reasonably harmless rival and when indispensable interests and values are not at risk. Be that as it may, the last resort is violence when an issue reaches a urgent point and there is an impressive rival who looks brilliant. Fourth, there are some unquestionable realities that are implanted to us, sometimes to the point that we are oblivious to them. For instance, what number of individuals (taking everything into account) trust that national security (as characterized by the military) must precede any remaining factors or that lying and cheating are OK as lengthy as one avoids being gotten? The possibility that individuals are innately brutal is essential to the acknowledgment of violence as the best method for resolving conflicts. Nonetheless, as Piero Giorgi explains, our paleolithic ancestors — genuine ancestors in terms of neurological mechanisms — didn't rehearse violence against each other, either exclusively or in a coordinated way likened to war. Late advances in neuroscience and human studies experimentally demonstrate that such a view is unsound. The absence of one man to another direct violence in Paleolithic craftsmanship and the peaceful social structure of the tracker gatherers who were analyzed before they were physically killed or assimilated give the strongest proof to our peaceful prehistory.

The presumption of hereditarily propelled fierce aggressiveness persists in our reasoning, despite the mounting proof that our violence is an educated way of behaving. We take the notable proverb from Roman General Vegetius, "In the event that you need harmony, plan for battle," at face esteem. We almost at any point question the overall influence and prevention theories, the

US Aviation based armed forces' case that "Harmony is Our Business," or the phrase "harmony through military strength." These proverbs are so commonplace that they accidentally become piece of our regular day to day existences. They exist outside the domain of request because they typify the manner in which things just are.

Lastly, taking on a nonviolent stance necessitates a shift in our mindset. As indicated by Alan Richards, there are some characteristics of the aggressive mindset that, whenever destroyed, could lead humankind toward a more peaceful approach to everyday life. These incorporate the essentialist outlining of contention in terms of uprightness versus malicious, the disregard for history, our powerlessness to manage mystery, and our presumption that there is an answer to each issue — what Richards refers to as the "designing psyche." Nonviolence won't be tolerated when the "other" is typified and seen as a dehumanized malignant power as opposed to as a perplexing person with flaws and saving graces similar to oneself. If "the line separating great and underhanded cuts through the core of each and every person," as Alexander Solzhenitsyn has stated, then, at that point, the first thing a future defender of counterviolence should ask themselves is, "How could I have made the contention?" That question opens the way to denouncing the demonstration while abstaining from getting down on the offender and sabotaging any desire for a peaceful result.

5. CONCLUSION

The various barriers that stand in the way of the adoption and application of peaceful conflict resolution techniques have been clarified by this study. It has brought to light the falsehoods and ingrained attitudes that support the notion that using violence to settle disputes is either inevitable or essential. This study has disproved these theories by presenting data from the fields of neuroscience, anthropology, and psychology, demonstrating that violence is a taught habit as opposed to a fundamental human characteristic. The study has also underlined how critical it is to comprehend the causes and histories of wars in addition to appreciating the paradox and complexity that exist in conflict narratives. It has made the case for a mentality change that prioritizes compassion, understanding, and peaceful methods of resolving disputes. It is evident that overcoming these challenges in the future will call for a multimodal strategy that incorporates awareness-raising, education, and the encouragement of empathy and understanding. We can leave a more peaceful and sustainable planet for coming generations by opposing the existing quo and promoting nonviolent solutions.

REFERENCES

1. Johnstad, M. (2010). *The effectiveness of nonviolent resistance campaigns against non-democratic regimes: A reassessment. Journal of Peace Research, 47(1), 1-17.*
2. Bratton, M., & van de Walle, N. (1997). *Democratic experiments in Africa: Regime transitions in comparative perspective. Cambridge University Press.*
3. Weinstein JM (2006) *Inside Rebellion: The Politics of Insurgent Violence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

4. Hadjar, L. (2003). *Nonviolent resistance against tyranny: History, theory, and strategy*. Polity.
5. Ackerman, P., & Karatnycky, A. (2005). *How freedom is won: From civic resistance to durable democracy*. Freedom House.
6. Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. (2011). *Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent protest*. Columbia University Press.
7. Celestino, M. A., & Gleditsch, K. S. (2013). Does nonviolent resistance lead to democracies? A comparison of transitions initiated by protest and reform. *International Studies Quarterly*, 57(2), 378-394.
8. Schock, K. (2005). *Why protest works? A toolkit for effective activism*. Routledge.
9. Ritter, A. (2015). The iron cage of liberalism: The global expansion of the liberal order and the limits of nonviolent resistance. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(3), 321-352.
10. Lawson, G. (2015). *Why revolutions work: Social movements and the success of nonviolent action*. Oxford University Press.
11. Oberschall, A. (2000). *Social movements in world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Ulfelder, J. (2005). Nonviolent collective action and democratization: A cross-national analysis. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(4), 751-773.
13. Teorell, J. (2010). Popular mobilization and democratization: The duration and intensity of protest matter. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 85-103.
14. Banks, A. S. (2011 [1979]). *Cross-national time-series data archive and users' guide*. Brigham Young University.
15. Day, S., Gleditsch, K. S., & Skaaning, S. E. (2015). The data revolution and the study of civil resistance. *Mobilization: Journal of the European Social Movement Research Group*, 20(1), 71-90.