

**An Assessment of Gandhi's Misconception on the Origin of Violent Human Nature ; Metaphysical Justifications for the Inevitability of Human violence**

*Sisay Assemrie,*

Madawalabu University; Bale Robe, Ethiopia. Email:-sisay.assemrie @gmail.com

**Abstract**

***Sisay Assemrie . An Assessment of Gandhi's Misconception on the Origin of violent Human Nature ; Metaphysical justifications for the Inevitability of Human violence Journal of Science & Development 2(2)2014, 65-86.***

*In his project of Ahimsa (Ethics of Non-Violence), Gandhi believed that men are naturally non-violent. He argued that violent human behavior has originated merely from a social environment or human's culture. Thus, he advocated the possibility of eliminating human violent behavior through effectively practising the principles of Ethics of Non-Violence in our daily life. Although it is true that social environment (human's culture) has its own influence by aggravating or discouraging an aggressive behavior of men, scientific studies proved that this behavior has significant biological/genetic, evolutionary, psycho-spiritual and dialectical origins. Accordingly, violence is proved to be a part of human nature that universally describes man-kind irrespective of their culture, time and other circumstances. Therefore, the advocacy of principles of Ethics of Non-Violence that are required to eliminate violence is unrealistic. By highlighting the roles of science in the study of conflict, peace and security; this article can be helpful to serve as a ground-work for other researchers that want to conduct deep researches with regard to the naturalness of human violence. I employed critical approach to show gaps of Gandhi's project of Ahimsa and to illustrate the naturalness of human violence.*

**Key words:** Human Violence, Gandhi, Metaphysics, aggressive behavior

**INTRODUCTION**

*Ahimsa* is not only a theory but also it has been one of the major ethical principles in the real life of Indian people. The term *Ahimsa* as used by Gandhi has a very wide and deep moral connotation that had been mainly employed to liberate India from British colonial rule and to mitigate socio-economic and political upheavals of the Indian people during 20<sup>th</sup> century (I. C. Sharma, 1965: 325). Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence/*Ahimsa* is mostly considered as a means of solving conflicts without the use of physical force or violence. But the moral concept of *Ahimsa* is used in a

much wider sense than only the absence of violence or force. Because, the actual meaning of *Ahimsa* implies not causing any kind of hurt or making harm to anybody physically and mentally by using physical force, language or other means (Prana, 2003: 2 ). It also stands for the realization of the love born of universal element of spirit or God on the real world (I. C. Sharma, 1965: 325).

Gandhi considered violent behavior of men that inflict pain and injury on God's creations as the product of social or cultural

construction. Thus, he had advocated the possibility of eliminating violence and other social evils not only from India but also from the earth through his life. Scientific studies on the origin and nature of human aggression proved that violent behavior has

significant biological/genetic, evolutionary, psycho-spiritual and dialectical origins. Violent behavior is proved to be part of human nature. Thus, we cannot eliminate it by any means.

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The moral philosophy of Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence is too broad and has ideal and real components. As much as my observation is concerned adequate research works have not been conducted on the critique part of Gandhi's Ethics of Non-

violence or why Gandhi's project of *Ahimsa* has not been realized on the earth. Particularly, little research works have been done with respect to providing scientific foundation for the factual origins of human violence and other elements of social evils.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This article is designed to have the following main theoretical objectives:-

1. To Highlight Gandhi's project of Ethics of Non-Violence/ *Ahimsa*
2. To elaborate factual origins and natural inevitability of human's aggressive behavior and other social evils
3. To overview the roles of science in the study of conflict, peace and security
4. To give an important insight with regard to the naturalness of human violence for other researchers

### METHODOLOGY

**Sources:-** This study is based on secondary data sources/materials such as books, commentaries, magazines, publications, dissertations, journals, articles, and internet web sites. Due to shortage of published materials, unpublished sources are also used.

**Research Methodology** - In principle or theory, it is easy to understand that the

moral philosophy of Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence is interesting and ambitious to every body. But, when we critically evaluate its practicability on the real world or material life, it has many problems and failures. Thus, qualitative methodologies that are going to be employed in this research are both descriptive (for Part -One ) and critical approach ( for Part- Two).

### The Meaning of *Ahimsa* (Ethics of Non-Violence)

The concept of Ethics of Non-Violence is a very old, complex and basis of Indian moral philosophy. It is not only a moral philosophy but it has been also one of the major ethical principles in the religious and secular life of Indian people (I. C. Sharma, 1965: 325). Prophet Sri Chaitanya, Lord Krishna (dieties in Indian tradition), and the religion of Sanatana Dharma (the first traditional religion and base of other modern religions of India) had preached their believers that *Ahimsa* is the principle of non-injury of life and the only way to merge into the absolute truth or God (Prana, 2003: 1).

Among the dominant religions of India; Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Christianity are based on the religious teaching of "not causing injure to any living being". It implies the teaching of each of the dominant religions considered *Ahimsa* as the principle of human life to nurture and preserve all creations (Ibid). Particularly, Buddhism prohibits all forms of violence and destruction against any kinds of creatures. In order to build non-violent society that never cause injury to each and every human being, Lord Buddha had advised the following to his followers:

*Do not look at others' mistake, what others have done and not done, but rather look at what you yourself have done or failed to do... place yourself in others' position and refrain from beating and killing. By friendship you conquer the angry, by goodness you conquer the evil, by generosity you can conquer the miser and the liar by truthfulness. In battle, anyone [may] conquer thousands and thousands, still*

*the greatest victor is the one who conquers himself* (Ibid: 4).

From the above quotation, we can infer that Buddhism as a religion consists of non-violent moral values such as love, non-injury, honesty, fellow-feeling, patience, unity, and respect. Since Gandhi had lived among the follower of Buddhism in his childhood, he had built his personality by the moral principles of this religion (Gandhi: An Autobiography or the Story of My Experiments with Truth, 1948: 10).

In addition to the religious and traditional influences, Gandhi's personal relationships with many Asians, Europeans, Africans and his intellectual exercises had helped him to have a firm stand on *Ahimsa*. The essay of Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" and John Ruskin's "Unto This Last", which narrate the misery of inequality, unfairness, exploitation and the need to oppose unjust events had inspired him to struggle against all forms of evils that exist in the world. Even more, his personal correspondence with Leo Tolstoy that wrote many fictions on the power of spirit, from 1909 to 1910 had left a deep impression on his life struggle for political and social justice by non-violent strategy (Lal, 2009:285).

While employing the moral philosophy of *Ahimsa* as the guiding principle of his practical life, Gandhi had exercised both the warrior and pacifist motifs of religious and secular strategies of various traditions. "From the warrior motif comes the idea of fighting as the sacred duty, and from the pacifist the prohibition against harming" (Lester R. Kurtz and Ramadhani Kurtz, 2005: 350). This is to mean that practitioners of *Ahimsa* must fight like

the warrior but without causing any kind of injury or pain to his or her enemy.

In the history of Ethics of Non-Violence, Gandhi is the first to practically apply it to real life by giving broad connotation and identifying it with truth or God. Through spiritualizing secular life, his goal was to solve social, economic, and political upheavals of the world and to actualize the life of heaven on earth (Sharma, 1965:326 and 335).

Particularly to his country, Gandhi had employed it as a tactic to make India politically independent from British colonial rule and to bring about individual and collective improvement and regeneration of Indian society by rediscovering indigenous, historical and religious practices. He had also employed it to uplift the poor section of the society (mainly the rural population), to build Muslim-Hindu unity, and to ensure equality to the untouchable (the outcastes) and women. As result, in his country, he has been considered as the 'father of the nation and great saint ' (I. C. Sharma, 1965: 325 & <http://www.answers.com/topic/mohandas-gandhi>).

Gandhi's ethics of pragmatic non-violence is commonly defined as the means of God realization or getting nearer to God/truth, who is the source of human spirit (Sharma, 1965: 326). Other scholars, Lester R. Kurtz and Ramadhani Kurtz (2005: 352-50) defined Ethics of Non-Violence as a means of eliminating the existing disharmony that exist within the social organization and natural environment. According to those scholars, *Ahimsa* is a movement for eliminating violence in all aspects of social life and treating the entire nature with respect and civility to develop a

harmonious interaction between human beings and natural environment.

Ethics of Non-Violence is also defined as a means of realising peaceful co-existence, justice, stability, permanent safety, equality and freedom in the arena of national and international politics. This goal is assumed to be achieved through conducting open or non-secretive deliberations, dialogues, debates, persuasions and non-cooperation with evil actors (Sharma, 1965: 336 and Bhaneja, 2007:221).

In general, the comprehensive definition of Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence which includes the above definitions has negative and positive elements. The negative element of Ethics of Non-Violence is defined as not causing any harm to anybody both physically and mentally or, not making any pain or injury to any kinds of creatures by any possible way (Sihra, 2006: 42-43; Prana, 2003: 1; Bhaneja, 2007: 221).

Insisting the superior moral characters of *Ahimsa*, Gandhi had demanded his coworkers that they must be civil, non-conspiring, and under no circumstance counter violence with violence (Ibid). Because, he believed that by following the path of truth or accepting the moral superiority of negative elements of *Ahimsa*, it is possible to bring change in the heart of the opponents.

From the definitions of Sihra, prana and Bhaneja, we can infer that in the negative element of *Ahimsa*, individuals or practitioners of *Ahimsa* are not expected to forward love and charity to other creatures. Because, love and charity can't be extended only by refraining from injuring other

creatures or participating in to Non-violent actions.

In its positive element, *Ahimsa* connotes one's mental consciousness of oneness, love and charity, compassion, eternity of

the soul and omnipresence of truth. What is essentially important in this element of *Ahimsa* is, individuals must extend positive moral values to other creatures (Sihra, 2006: 42-43).

### Metaphysical Basis of *Ahimsa* (Ethics of Non-Violence)

Misconceiving the metaphysical aspect of Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence, people believe that Gandhi had preached the moral philosophy of meekness, passivism and unconditional obedience. But, he argued that non-violent behavior when "inspired from the inner most recess of human personality is mightier than the mightiest weapons on the earth " (Sharma, 1965: 327). Because, he believes that non-violent behavior arises from the central force or spirit of man which is man's being of God, by possessing his traits (Ibid). He analyzed this fact as the following:

*If God as truth is the basis and background of the universe and man, the only way to Godliness is the life of non-violence and love, and hence God, life, truth and love are identical , and all are again the ultimate good (Ibid: Emphasis is my own).*

From the above argument, we can infer that God, truth or the central reality, love and non-violence designate identical or one reality. This idea necessarily leads us to conclude that Ethics of Non-Violence is undoubtedly an ethical-religious-metaphysical system of thought that advocate activism, strength and courage for equality and social justice.

Throughout his life struggle for justice and equality among human beings by the non-

violent strategy, Gandhi consistently preached that every human being has potential to develop and attain godliness or divine spirituality. In his campaigns, Gandhi regularly reminded that non-violence begins with inner practice and all human beings have potential of such practice irrespective of cultural and socio-economic backgrounds (Ibid and Namita, 2008: 57).

The universality of godliness as defined by Gandhi is grounded on his metaphysical analysis of Ethics of Non-Violence. It is originated from his firm conviction that the soul force or the spirit is universally given to men, and men are expected to develop it by practicing spiritual awakening principles of *Ahimsa* (Ibid). Spiritual awakening or development through inner practices is the highest manifestation of humanity and absolutely necessary for practitioners of *Ahimsa* to attain moral progress, and self-actualization (godliness). This can be achieved through exercising moral principles of *Ahimsa* in our daily material life and conducting deep pray to God (Prana, 2003: 2 and Bhaneja, 2007: 222-3).

It is to mean that;- First, by cultivating the moral attributes/principles of *Ahimsa* such as selflessness, truthfulness, humility, tolerance, love, kindness, forgiveness, humbleness, patience, feeling of unity,

brotherhood, sense of justice, freedom fearlessness, honesty and alike in our daily material life; we can develop the "psychic divinity" which is a the kind of divine power that all prophets possess.

Second, in addition to cultivating the good moral qualities of Ethics of Non-Violence in our daily material life, we must also conduct spiritual practices of meditation and praying to God. Particularly, as Prana (2003: 7) indicated, we must meditate or pray to God, 'Take me from the temporal feeling of individuality to the Eternal feeling of universality, from darkness or

ignorance to Light or wisdom, from death or fear to Immortality which gives permanent happiness'.

In turn, these material and spiritual inner practices for spiritual awakening or self actualization have crucial contribution to practitioners of Ahimsa. Kashtan (2006: 13) elaborated that those practices are significant to increase strength, confidence, effectiveness, happiness, freedom, righteousness, acceptance, wellbeing, dignity, humanity, and feeling of immortality.

### Basic Principles of Ahimsa

Principles of *Ahimsa* are moral values and actions that are expected from practitioners of the Ethics of Non-Violence. Even though many scholars (such as Namita, 2008, Godrej, 2011, Prana, 2003 and Bhaneja: 2007) listed out many principles, the common and basic principles of Ahimsa are;- principle of searching the truth, non-possession, equality, complete self-purification, hate the sin and not the sinner, and the principle of civil disobedience, protest, persuasion and non-cooperation with evil doers . The principle of searching the truth is considered as the most significant principle in Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence. In this context, truth is defined as search for love or universal absolute/ God. It is to mean that; absolute truth/God can be expressed by the divinity and spiritual unity of human-kinds (Ibid).

The second principle of Ahimsa is principle of non-possession. This principle prohibits practitioners of Ahimsa to divest from both desiring and possessing private material property. Since there is no difference among human beings, in metaphysical aspects of Ethics of Non-Violence, all

material properties should be utilized for the benefit of humanity, not for private utility. In addition, lusting for private material property is also considered as soul destroying event, which inspires man for immoral actions and behaviors (Bhaneja: 2007, 216-17). The principle of equality dictates the absence of superior or inferior status among human kinds in the world. In our daily life, God has countless names and forms, which is expressed by individual's souls. These individual's souls collectively form one supreme soul or God. "One form can appear small or big, weak or strong, clever or foolish, but the inner vitality is the same". Thus, we must forget all feelings of individuality, class, race, sect and community and uphold equality (Prana, 2003: 3). To explain this principle, Gandhi said:

*A variety of incidents in my life have conspired to bring me in close contact with people of many creeds and many communities, and my experience with all of them warrants the statement that I have known no distinction between relatives and strangers, countrymen and foreigners, white and colored,*

*Hindus and Indians of other faiths, whether Musalmans, Parsis, Christians or Jews. I may say that my heart has been incapable of making any such distinctions. I cannot claim this as a special virtue, as it is in my very nature* (Gandhi: An Autobiography or the Story of My Experiments with Truth, 1948: 145).

The fourth principle of Ahimsa is the principle of complete self-purification of the heart or mind. This has been a life-long goal to be pursued in Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence. It is assumed to be achieved through self-devotion, sacrifice, or suppressing of all desires of self-interest and senses perception for the realization of higher or universal self (Bhaneja, 2007: 217-18).

To attain this goal; First, one has to become absolutely passion-free in thought, speech, and deed; to rise above the opposing currents of love and hatred, attachment and repulsion. Second, it is necessary to disengage his/herself from the desire of self-interest, which is the result of egoistic consciousness of individuals, class, race, community, etc. Egoistic people may not refrain from causing pain or injury to other people and at the same time may feel no considerable sympathy for the suffering of others.

The basic assumption of this principle is; since we are one, letting others suffer means letting oneself to be suffering. So, we have to understand that self-interest is based on common interest. According to Prana(2003:3), "Desire [of self interest] creates worries, sadness, jealousy, hatred, anger, pride, idleness and confusion. The inclination of desire [of self interest] is present when there is lack of love".

Ethics of Non-Violence requires the principle of hate the sin and, not the sinner (Bhaneja, 2007: 218). This principle is based on the idea that "Man and his deed are two distinct things", consequently, we must understand the difference between the action and the actor. In this case, a good deed must be appreciated and a bad deed needs to be condemned, but the doer of the deed, whether he/she is a cause for good or bad deed always deserves respect and love.

During his political movement to free his country from the British colonial rule, Gandhi did not show any hatred against the English people. 'He even got shocked and sorry if he heard that one white man had been killed or tortured by an Indian' (Prana, 2003: 4).

The sixth core principle of Gandhi's ethics of non-violence is the principle of civil disobedience, protest, persuasion and non-cooperation with evil doers. Although this principle is proved to be adversarial to opponents in practice, Gandhi always maintained that his social, economic and political non-cooperation principle has its roots not in hatred but in love (R. Kurtz, 2009: 5).

According to Kashtan's illustration (2006: 8-9), even though the British were resisting his efforts, he never wavered his conviction and had tried to convince what the British were doing in India was not to their benefit. He maintained that the goal of his non-cooperation campaign is to contribute to every one's benefit.

The underplaying argument of non-cooperation principle implies:-First, practitioners of Ahimsa must consistently oppose and scarify themselves to actualize love/truth on the world, without causing

any kind of injury. At the same time, their opposition must be guided by the benefits

of humanity, not by individual or group interest.

### Gandhi's Characterization of Non-Violence Ethics

Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence consists of many moral values and attributes which are highly interrelated. In this topic, I attempt to highlight the fundamental moral values or attributes of Ethics of Non-Violence. First, Ethics of Non-Violence is characterized as the law of wisdom, which enables practitioners of Ahimsa to express divine love, real freedom and happiness. We see everywhere only the names and forms of the individual souls or self. As long as we have ignorance this duality of soul exists. By wisdom or rationality we realize that everything is the manifestation of the divine self and whatever we see is a projection of one-self (Prana, 2003: 1-3). It implies that, since we are one, we must love everybody irrespective of the individual behavior or action. To elaborate this idea, Sharma (1965: 326 -328) wrote the following:

*We have to love all human beings, whether they are good or bad, kind or cruel, broad minded or selfish, because the spirit, central in them, is the unitive force. Thus, Gandhi believed that even the meanest person was capable of being reformed because man is the image of God [...] non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute or [jungle]. The spirit lies dormant in the brute and knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law to the strength of the spirit [...] it is an active force of the highest order. It is soul force or the power of God head within us.*

The basic argument of Sharma is that when we have knowledge of oneness or non-duality of soul; - hostility, enmity, jealousy, violence, etc., can't find a place in our mind. This knowledge inspires us to forget ourselves so as to realize the sufferings of others. In general, wisdom of non-dualistic human soul is the way to express divine love, compassion, patience, tolerance, emancipation (real freedom) and real happiness. Prana(2003: 30) explained the interrelation of wisdom, love/compassion, freedom and happiness as the following:

*We have seen that there is jealousy, hostility, and enmity between brothers and sisters or other members of the same family. It is because of lack of love, and it is the source of violence. Love cannot blossom as long as these tendencies are present. All these are born of ignorance. In divine love there is a feeling of oneness with the world. [Because] Love can break the selfish boundary of our ego. In love, anger turns into compassion, fear into friendship, and destructive excitement into calm tranquility. When there is a shower of love in our heart, the heart is automatically filled with kindness, which is the source of compassion.*

As Bhaneja (2007:221) elaborated, from divine love, the moral attributes of forgiveness arise in our mind, which plays a significant role to remove violence from our mind. Extending forgiveness and treating our enemies in the spirit of love



during our suffering enables us to be free from any kind of hatred and revenge. It also helps us to gain higher moral status over our enemies psychologically.

When practitioners of *Ahimsa* have done wrong, even if their faults are insignificant and negligible, they must feel repentant and confession. For the faults of other, even if it is significant and innegligable, they must extend forgiveness and love to the evil doers. Second, *Ahimsa* is not the creed of the coward or refuge for cowardice, but that of the brave and the courageous. It needs the quality of courage to face any kind of consequences or willingness to take risks in the face of threatening force. It includes the willingness to face physical death in order to achieve the intention and experience of pure non-violence (Sharma, 1965: 331 and Kashtan, 2006: 3).

What fuels courage is the conviction of truth and integrity, coupled with the abiding trust by power of love. Because, we apply our heart or consciousness for transcending fear and judgment, to be open-minded, and to excavate our eternal needs, dreams, and values so as to know and care the well-being of someone regardless of his or her actions without any kind of cowardice (B. Gregg, 1981: 26 and 60 and Bhaneja, 2007: 222-3).

Thirdly, as the method of solving conflict, Gandhi believed that Ethics of Non-Violence is the greatest, the most active, efficient and sounder force than the reciprocal violence in the world. Psychologists proved that a negative emotion such as anger, hatred, and fear eats up enormous amount of our energies and imagination (B. Gregg, 1981: 55-58). The man who pays attention to violent emotions has also probability to be attracted to

manners of evil doers (Ibid: 60). This implies, "If you hate a man sufficiently, you cannot get him out of your mind, you are attached to him, and you are his slave. The thought of him is an obsession; it wastes most of your time" (Ibid).

Fourth, Ethics of Non-Violence is also characterized by the absence of defeat in its application. Because, it is totally practiced for its own sake (whether or not the desired results could be attained). In times of great failure while practicing Ethics of Non-Violence, the campaign has never been stopped. Rather the inner peace initiates mental creativity in finding alternate strategies for the unmet needs (Kashtan, 2006: 12-13).

As Sharma (1965:331) illustrated, the principle of self purification or using soul force also leads practitioners of *Ahimsa* to rise above the contradictions of defeat and victory. Because, when men are able to get absolute purification of the heart, they will be changed in to spirit or God to rise above physical defeat or victory.

Gandhi's ethics of non violence has also the position of anti-modernity and civilization. Because civilization is believed to have been inspired by the rationalization of materialism and individualism that leads to soul destroying competition among human beings. Gandhi argued that the imperialist conception of man has corrupted the entire civilization to be a force of evil. In general, "Although it [civilization] had many achievements to its credit, it was fundamentally aggressive, imperialist, violent, exploitative, brutal, unhappy, restless, and devoid of a sense of direction and purpose" (Parekh, 2005:42).

This implies, because of modern society guided by capitalism had privileged the

body or neglected the soul; it had valued only material possessions and consumption by excluding almost everything else. In his view, modern civilization had resulted

greed, self-indulgence, sense of unlimited desires or appetite, unrestrained satisfaction of wants, and lack of moral psychology in the world.

## Part-Two: Gandhi's Misconception on the Origin of Violent Human Nature

### Introduction

Scholars (like Elsevier, 2009, Ramirez and Goetz, 2002.etal, Hobbes,1651, Hegel,1807, Nietzsche, 1886, etc.), which are both from natural and social sciences have been made a long lasting debate on whether human violent behavior is learned from the social environment or innate to human nature. Among those scholars, Gandhi argued that violent behavior of men (that cause pain and injury to other men) is learned only from the social environment. As a result, he advocated the possibilities of eliminating this behavior through practicing principles of *Ahimsa* in our daily material life.

Although it is true that the social environment or culture has its own influence by aggravating or discouraging violence, scholastic studies proved that violent behavior of men has significant biological/genetic, evolutionary, psycho-spiritual and dialectical origins (Elsevier, 2009, Ramirez and Goetz, 2002.etal, Hobbes,1651, Hegel,1807, Nietzsche, 1886, etc.). Thus, violence is proved to be part of universal human nature that transcends cultures, time, and circumstances.

### Biological and Evolutionary Origin of Violent Human Nature

Human aggressive or anti-social behavior is influenced by biological and evolutionary factors such as neural systems, hormones, and man's genetic drive to will to power, survival and reproduction (Ramirez, 2002: 5, H. Mehta. Goetz.etal, 2012:2, Neitsche, 1886: 40, and J. Bushman and F. Baumeister, 2004: 213). Assuming that this topic needs deep knowledge of science let me highlight how some of biological and evolutionary factors influence human beings to be violent. Among human neural systems, the two main regions that have received extensive empirical attention in scientific researches are the "amygdala" and the "orbit frontal cortex", cortical and sub-cortical (Ramirez, 2002: 5-15 and H. Mehta.

Goetz.etal, 2012:2-5). These studies proved that amygdala<sup>1</sup> plays a critical role in the affective and motivational drive to respond violently to the provocation of environmental discomforts, while an extensive network of cortical and sub-cortical regions are involved in the expression of violent behavior against agents of discomforts (Ibid).

Other scientific researchers (Elsevier, 2009: 180-3, Fox, 2005: 3-5 and G. Green, 1998: 24-25) also proved that in the course of violence among human beings, some of humans' hormones such as adrenaline,

<sup>1</sup>

serotonin<sup>2</sup>, endorphins<sup>3</sup> and testosterone play a crucial role. The amount of serotonin, adrenaline and endorphins in the low levels discourage aggression, and the high levels increase calmness and confidence, which inspires men for violence. The high amount or flood of these hormones is also associated with success at the end of violence. Seeking to increase the amount of these hormones in humans' anatomy or hormones, many anti-depressant drugs are deliberately given to troops during serious wars among sovereign states, terrorism and freedom movements.

---

*Amygdale and orbit frontal cortex are found in brain.their function is to link fearful stimuli and fear expression ,to increase sensitivity to stimulus,and are necessary for formation of fear memories and highly adaptive for survival (James Hall, laboratory of neuropsychology, national institute of mental health, 2002: 63).*

2

*Due to environmental discomforts, the message of the central nervous system to brain antagonize an essential action of serotonin normally present in the brain and thus provoke the mental disturbances that we observe in man's action and facial expression (B. Brodie & A. Shore, 2012: 632).*

3

*Endorphins are produced and released from the pituitary gland that exist around stomach). They are released during*

*continuous fear; when there is high stress in our mind; this stress stimulates the release of endorphin hormones which calms the brain in the stress situation and brings the feeling of happiness (P. B. Rokade, international conference on chemical , biological and environmental science, 2011: 436).*

From the above scientific evidences, we can infer that violent behaviors of men are significantly influenced by human anatomy (hormones and neural systems). As a result, Gandhi's project of ethics of non-violence to organize a society free from any kind of aggression, retaliation, revenge and other evil behaviors is contrary to this scientific fact.

On the other hand, biological life as "will to power" is characterized by the existence of many goals, paths, and bridges. This implies that life needs climbing to many steps through many over comings and be comings. Thus, "will to power" causes violence, competition and domination to be prevalent among human beings (Neitsche, 1886: 41-42 and 61-2).

Neitsche's argument implies two facts. First, plurality and multiplicity of biological life is only reconcilable with mastery and domination. Second, because of human life needs height, it needs conflict within each step. Jenkins (A/N:7-8) summarized the core idea of "Will to power" or the biological origin of competition, domination and violence as the following:

*Life is Will to Power and Will to Power is Life, I deduce that Will to Power is overcoming...It [Will to Power] appears to be about expansion, conflict, about having power, mastery and domination over what presumably, must be weaker people and things. This i s unavoidable as it is naturalistic. [It] naturally and inexorably follows from out of the nature of life itself. A person is perpetually going to be subject to the overcoming of others and will be subject to overcoming others.*

From his expression, we can deduce that violence; suppression, opposition, enmity, retaliation and competition among human beings have been originated from men's physiological drives to master others. This is inspired by self-overcoming, the spirit to destroy the alien and the drive of strangers to be tyrants against the weaker ones.

In the light of the prism of Gandhi's project of ethics of non-violence, Neitsche will to power is associated with moral backwardness and barbarism. Thus, it is assumed to be applicable in uncivilized and undemocratic system of governance. But, competition, inequality, domination, and divergence among human beings is also manifested even within the civilized or democratic society. To elaborate the nature of "Will to Power" within the liberal democratic frame work, W.Thomas (1996: 2) stated:

*We can think of nature and ecological systems as a vast "free market" of perfect competition, where all living organisms are competing with each other for limited resources (sunlight, water, minerals, etc.). Businesses and brands also compete with each other in a struggle for survival, and collectively tend to operate in ways analogous to natural eco-systems.*

The implication of his idea is, even in the liberal democratic framework, various instantiations of will to power are being contested for hegemony. Thus, the existing economical, politician and social values compete with each other at various levels. It is to mean that social structures, identities, and values can be contested by alternative ones inspired by active instantiations of will to power among human beings.

Other scientific studies considered violent human nature as the product and manifestation of evolutionary process. Current bioarchaeological and Paleontological researches proved, throughout the evolution of human species, interpersonal violence that causes pain, injury, homicide and warfare especially among men has been prevalent (L.Walker, 2001: 1-2).

Scientific studies proved that gene polymorphisms,<sup>4</sup> stages of quality and genetic variation by adaptation have been the main factors for the prevalence of violent human nature (J. Ferguson, 2009:1). It implies that violent behavior of men is originated from the influence of environmental variables that cause genetic or physiological changes throughout human evolution.

On the other hand, J. Bushman and F. Baumeister (2004: 213 ) and M.buss (2001: 968) analyzed that human violent behavior is transferred from our evolutionary past serving as a means of resisting challenges of nature to facilitate the biological motives of survival and

---

<sup>4</sup>

It symbolizes population differences in several morphological characters due to genetic variation mutations and

meiosis. Much of the morphological variations must be due to differences in the gene pools of the populations.

Because of the whole process of meiosis is suppressed and replaced by a single equational division. Accordingly,

there is no chromosome reduction. There is no recombination either. As the parthenogenetic weevils are also

polyploidy, new (and in general recessive ) mutations should have limited chances of expressing themselves (Juhani

& saura, department of genetics, 1980).

reproduction, not useless as Gandhi had advocated. Thus, violent or bad behaviors of men such as employing force, favoritism to group members, hierarchies, collective identities, fear, enmity, cowardice, hatred, revenge, retaliation, and sexual jealousy have been cultural universals throughout the evolution of man.

It is also true that most animals that are biologically similar to human beings have been behaving aggressively due to competition for resources, dominance, or to escape from potential threat of their species and other natural disasters. By using the analogy of animals' aggressive behavior, we can deduce that men are naturally violent. Because, by thinking power or employing their mind, human beings could not eliminate such kind of natural conflicts that occur among animal species.

### **Violence as the Manifestation of Psycho-egoistic Human Nature**

As stated by (Sharma,1965: 326 , Prana, 2003:3 and Sihra, 2006:42 ), in his Ethics of Non-Violence, Gandhi argued that, when men have knowledge or wisdom of the non-duality of the soul; they develop absolutely positive mind or mentality. Thus, they can transcend the feeling of egoistic judgment, hostility, jealousy, hatred, inequality, violence etc (Ibid).

Psychoanalytic theories contend that some of our actions and ethical behaviors are determined by the unconscious content of our minds. Among human actions and behaviors, aggressive behaviors are determined by unconscious psychic motivations, not by the rational conscious thinking process. As a result, by wisdom, we may not absolutely eliminate negative

Even more, as (J.Bushman and F. Baumeister, 2004: 205-207) explained, human aggression has many features that are essentially unknown among animal species. For instance, ideological and religious divergences, use of advanced military technology, genocide, long delayed revenge, multi-generation feuding, and many patterns of homicide have been unique to human race.

In general, since the above counter arguments against Gandhi's Ethics of Non-violence are based on scientific principles of testability, confirmation, observation and physical laws of nature, we can understand that men are naturally violent species at least in some extent. As a result, by using ethics of non-violence /divine love or absolute truth, it is difficult to actualize spiritual life on the earth and build a society free from any kind of violence, fear, hatred, harm and indignations.

feelings or bad moral values (J. Bushman and F.Baumeister, 2004 and Hobbes,1651).

Thus, violence is naturally originated from the unconscious psycho-egoistic motivation of human beings. As J. Bushman and F.Baumeister (2004: 205- 207) explained, Freud is one of the most famous proponents of this view. He analyzed that people have a recurring need to inflict or damage other creations, and this desire must be satisfied periodically one way or another. This innate aggressive drive resides in the "id" component of the tripartite personalities, mediated by a realistic "ego" and a moralistic "superego" (Ibid).

Freud's psycho-analysis of human nature vividly shows, to live an effective and satisfactory life, men should have to satisfy

their innate aggressive drive or necessity in the satisfactory amount. If not, it would be manifested by harming or killing human beings and smashing property.

Hobbes (1651: 52 &54) also illustrated that due to men are psychologically an egoistic animal, there is no standard principle of bad and good. In the moral calculation of men, whatever the object of men's appetite that produce felicity of life has been good and the object of aversion has been considered as evil.

To maintain the felicity of life which has no end and standard rule, men have the desire of power after power that ceases in death. This desire of power after power is a corner stone for violence to be prevalent among human beings through the course of human history. In *Leviathan* (part I, chapter 6), he stated that "[desire for] riches, honor, command or other power inclines to competition, enmity and war; because the way of one competitor to the attaining of his desire, is to kill, subdue, supplant or repel the other".

According to his argument, naturally we find three principal causes of violence. First, competition for material gain; Second, diffidence for safety; and Third, glory for reputation.

In general, the basic argument of psychoanalytic theory implies, while individuals are extending relationships with other creations, they are emotionally forced to calculate their private felicity of life. This vividly shows the psycho-egoistic nature of mankind and natural inevitability of competition and violence among human beings.

As a result, the positive elements of *Ahimsa* that promotes the interest of the whole humanity such as the mental

consciousness of unity, love, compassion, confession etc., could not be true. The project of building a classless society and the world without economic, political or social disparities and hierarchies is also unrealistic.

Other psychologists, J. Bushman and F. Baumeister (2004: 213) pointed out that men have an instinctual psychology toward both life and death. From the two instinctual psychologies, death is proved to be the aggression instinct. Naturally, men would not have any innate desire for death, because death is not adaptive in the psychology of survival and reproduction. It is to mean that the psychology of aggression is originated from its contribution for men's survival and reproduction.

Supporting the argument of J. Bushman and F. Baumeister, M. buss (2001: 966-7) and V. Rabstejnek (A/N:3 and 7) elaborated the nature of fear in evolutionary psychology as, due to strangers and other tribes have been dangerous to their interest (even to their life), humans beings have consciously developed fear to our group members, naives and competitors.

From the above argument, we can infer that negative feelings of men such as fear or phobia, conflict, anxiety, hatred, retaliation, cowardice, injury, separation, and etc., are the product of men's psychological desire to life and reproduction. Therefore, unless human beings are able to secure their survival and reproduction without any kind of fear (indeed impossible on the earth), eliminating bad moral values only through practicing principles *Ahimsa* is difficult.

In addition to its role for reproduction and survival, Machiavelli (1532: 102-5)

analyzed that the psychology of fear has positive contribution to the development of sovereign states and social institutions. Among the four responses of men to their leaders, the psychology of fear had been the most useful response of citizens that has significantly contributed for unity, victory and progress of ancient civilizations and morality.

Machiavelli (in page 104) also explained, during the formation of new principalities, it is much safer to be feared than to be loved. Because, in the real life situations, men love according to their own will and fear according to the strength of a man. Psychologically, men are "ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly, covetous, and as long as you succeed they are yours entirely; they will offer you their blood, property, life, and children, [if you failed] they turn against you". As a result, a wise man should establish himself on which is in his own control or strength and not in that of others or on the will of love.

In Gandhi's ethics of non-violence, evil-doers are generally considered as destructive and ineffective (Bhaneja, 2007: 218-222). Thus, we must always hate and non-cooperate with their actions and behaviors. But as explained by Machiavelli

(above) world history has been proving that this cannot be always true. Because, at least in some contexts, actions of evil doers have been empirically contributing for the betterment of human civilization and life improvement. At the same time, men have been cooperative to the activities and behaviors of evil doers.

From the above argument, we can infer that even though it has been true that "peace imposed by violence is not psychologically peace, but a suppressed conflict", in the history of world politics, violent methods has been in some contexts more moral, effective and efficient than Ethics of Non-Violence.

To evade such kinds of facts, Gandhi advocated that Ethics of Non-Violence must be "totally practiced for its own sake whether or not the desired results could be attained...the principle of self-purification ultimately enables practitioners of Ahimsa to rise above the contradictions of defeat and victory". While Gandhi had projected Ethics of Non-Violence to solve social upheavals that exist in the real world, to be effective and victorious in each and every of his life struggle, he slid into abstraction to hide his failures.

### **Dialectical Law of Nature Vs Ethics of Non-violence**

The main goal of Gandhi's project of Ethics of Non-Violence is to actualize absolute love, justice, equality, stability, peace, unity, attraction, etc., and to establish a world without fear, separation, anger, competition, hatred, indignation, exploitation and conflict. But, due to actions and behaviors of human kind in some extent (with limited power to control nature) is regulated by the dialectical law of

nature or contradictions, his project cannot be put in to practice.

The dialectical law of nature shows that the two contradictory realities (thesis and antithesis) and their product (synthesis) have been the governing principles of change throughout the development of human history (Hegel, 1807:18). Shimp (2009: 35-6) elaborated that the apparent contradiction between thesis and anti-thesis

has been resolved by making mutual compatibility or synthesis. The synthesis created by combination then becomes new thesis and for this thesis there has been anti-thesis. As a result, as Hegel (1807:207) stated thesis and anti-thesis compete with each other until a tipping point where human-beings are able to reach at a climax of civilization and consciousness. Miller (1984:175) reflected the existence of natural contradiction:

*Nothing appears pure in and by itself, but only combination with [it's opposite]; air, light, moisture, solidity, heat, cold, movement, exhalations, [bad and good], and other forces...between light and heavy, strong and weak, greater and less, up and down. Thus, that which is on the right is not so by nature, but is so understood in the virtue of its position with respect to something else: for, if that changes its position, the thing is no longer on the right* (Emphasis is my own).

As to the history of spiritual contradiction, vividly analyzed in Hegel's "phenomenology of mind", the development of historical process is considered as man's gradual movement towards the absolute truth. He argued that, the dialectical process is a progressive movement towards the absolute, by relieving men's ignorance, by increasing self awareness, and gradually replacing man's perception of reality with newer and truer forms (Hegel, 1807: 28-29 and 134). He stated that:

*Every time man's perception of reality is transformed in to a newer version, man takes one step closer to the absolute. Eventually reality as man perceives it will evolve to a*

*point where the alienation of man from the absolute no longer exists or the state of reality where man and the absolute are reunited in the end of history* (Ibid).

The underplaying idea of the dialectical process implies that mankind is separated or alienated from the absolute or moral perfection. As a result, the logical completion of man's gradual movement towards the absolute history will be realized, when men's conception of politics, morality, art, religion, science and other values arrive at definitive form to attain stable recognition institutionally. Which means, till the logical completion of men's development of consciousness or conception of those natural and social values, the whole course of human history is characterized by the prevalence of mistakes, contradictions, imperfections and conflicts.

The development of world history also shows that there have been no perfect human civilisations. It is characterized by the mixture of different civilizations (traditional and modern). The dialectics of individual's inner conscious with broader social life, and personal and universal narratives have been shaping major events and directions of world historical changes (Tamdgidi, 2002: 109). Generally, as Dragon (2009: 100) illustrated, world history has been the product of human alienation and reintegration.

The above argument implies that the role played by human agency in determining the direction of world historical events (including virtue) is interplay of objective truth and subjective interpretation of reality. Thus, till human beings are able to reach at the absolute consciousness that enables them to understand absolute or



universal truth, throughout the whole development of human consciousness, some kind of relative conception of truth or morality is inevitable.

At this point, Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence encounters two major challenges. First, since the development of human consciousness allows relative conception of reality, men have different moral judgment, which cause divergence, hatred, revenge, and violence to be prevalent. Second, till human beings reach at the point of universal virtuous consciousness or possess the traits of God, Gandhi's project of ethics of non-violence that needs absolute ethical mentality is inapplicable during the time of his non-violent struggle.

On the other hand, Marx had used the law of dialectical materialism to define class struggle /violence or contradiction that exist between the antagonism of the ruling and ruled class through out the development of human history. He analyzed that in all modes of human production, a type of contradictory relationships exist between the ruling class of society (as the thesis) and the lower class (as antithesis) is natural(Shimp, 2009: 37).

Marx's argument implies, the two contradictory realities (thesis and anti-thesis) are necessary for change or development of human history; and at the same time they are destructive of each other. For example, in the capitalist modes of production "A person cannot be a master without a servant and a person cannot be a servant without a master [...] Both a master

and a servant can only be defined in relation to each other" (Ibid). But, the movement or struggle of a servant always causes destruction against the master. This contradictory relationship is also true in earlier modes of production. Marx and Engels (1848: 1) wrote:

*In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.*

From the law of dialectical materialism, we can infer that all contradictions throughout the development of human history have been reconciled by resulting more clearly contradictory positions. Those contradictions has been created, due to all systems of thought in each modes of production are inextricably connected with the interest of the social class that controls the material means of existence (Marx , 1844 : 29 and McLellan, 1977: 187 and 91). McLellan (page 188) expressed, in the development of human history, "Every value judgment of right and wrong serves the interests of a particular social class at a given time".

### **Violence as One Aspect of Moral Subjectivism**

In his project of Ethics of Non-Violence, neglecting the influence of material world

on the relative and dynamics moral judgment of men, Gandhi had advocated

the possibility of ethical absolutism and spiritualism (Bhikhu, 1999: 6). Practitioners of Ahimsa are required to conduct delicate surgery of soul, to be free from any kind of environmental influence that causes contradiction, mistake and violence to be rampant among human beings. For this goal, Gandhi had kept experimenting all of his life to find ways of doing this delicate surgery (Ibid). However, in the real life situations of men, his ethics of absolutism and spiritualism cannot be practical. Because, human beings have different inner impulse to perceive the composition of their environment. As a result, men possess dynamic and relative conception of what is morally good or bad throughout the development of human history (Mitreanu, 2007: 5-8).

Men's understanding and interpretation of meaning of life or what is good or bad is determined by one's unique abilities (physical and mental), environmental conditions, culture, upbringing, education, continuously learning and all other life experiences (Ibid and Miller, 1984: 356). As a result, although there are universal or objective moral values ,

morality is mainly relative to the individual person, society, community, nation, culture or even to the whole human race. From the above expression, we can infer that men's moral judgment is determined by the uncontrollable (at least in some extent) and dynamic nature of the world. For example, as to the environmental determinism of human nature or morality, laboratory studies proved that hot temperature increase negative feelings such as aggression, annoyance and anger (G. Green, 1998: 42).

The implication of Mitreanu, Miller, G.Green and Voltaire's argument is, due to men's continuous learning or the influences of social and natural environment, they cannot become absolutely passion-free in thought, speech, and deed; to rise above the opposing events of love and hatred, attachment and repulsion consistently. Thus, the principle of complete self-purification of the heart or mind, which can be achieved through self-devotion, sacrifice, or suppressing of all desires of self-interest and sense's perception is almost ideal.

## FINDING AND CONCLUSION

Gandhi had failed to understand the true origin of violent human behavior. His principles and moral attributes of *Ahimsa* are unrealistic. The fact that men learn aggressive behaviors from socio-cultural environment, they have an innate tendency to be violent by nature. Violent behavior of men has significant biological/genetic, evolutionary, psycho-spiritual and dialectical origins. That means, violence is proved to be part of universal human nature that transcends cultures, time, and circumstances.

1. Human aggressive or anti-social behavior is influenced by biological and evolutionary factors such as human anatomy, neural systems, hormones, and man's genetic drive to will to power, survival and reproduction. As a result, Gandhi's project of Ethics of Non-Violence to organize a society free from any kind of aggression, retaliation, revenge and other evil behaviors is contrary to this scientific fact.

2. Violent human nature is also the product and manifestation of evolutionary process. Current bio-archaeological and Paleontological researches proved, throughout the evolution of human species; interpersonal violence that causes pain, injury, homicide and warfare especially among men has been prevalent.

Human violent behavior is transferred from our evolutionary past serving as a means of resisting challenges of nature to facilitate the biological motives of survival and reproduction, not useless as Gandhi had advocated. Thus, violent or bad behaviors of men such as employing force, favoritism to group members, hierarchies, collective identities, fear, enmity, cowardice, hatred, revenge, retaliation, and sexual jealousy have been cultural universals throughout the evolution of man.

3. Psychoanalytic theories contend that some of our actions and ethical behaviors are determined by the unconscious content of our mind. Among human actions and behaviors, aggressive behaviors are determined by unconscious psychic motivations, not by the rational conscious thinking process. As a result, by wisdom or principles of *Ahimsa*, we may not absolutely eliminate negative feelings or bad moral values.

4. The underplaying idea of the dialectical process implies that mankind is separated or alienated from the absolute or moral perfection. Which means, till the logical completion of men's development of consciousness or conception of those natural and social values, the whole course

of human history is characterized by the prevalence of mistakes, contradictions, imperfections and conflicts.

At this point, Gandhi's Ethics of Non-Violence encounters two major challenges. First, since the development of human consciousness allows relative conception of reality, men have different moral judgment, which cause divergence, hatred, revenge, and violence to be prevalent. Second, till human beings reach the point of universal virtuous consciousness or possess the traits of God, Gandhi's project of Ethics of Non-Violence that needs absolute ethical mentality is inapplicable during the time of his non-violent struggle.

5. In his project of Ethics of Non-Violence, neglecting the influence of material world on the relative and dynamics moral judgment of men, Gandhi had advocated the possibility of ethical absolutism and spiritualism.

However, in the real life situations of men, his ethics of absolutism and spiritualism cannot be practical. Human beings have different inner impulse to perceive the composition of their environment. As a result, men possess dynamic and relative conception of what is morally good or bad throughout the development of human history. Due to men's continuous learning or the influences of social and natural environment, they cannot become absolutely passion-free in thought, speech, and deed; to rise above the opposing events of love and hatred, attachment and repulsion consistently.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY****Books**

- Baumeister, Roy and Bushman, Brad (2004), *Human Nature and Aggressive Motivation: Why Do Cultural Animals Turn Violent?* Grenoble Published in Presses Universities Of De Grenoble.
- Bahikhu, Parekh (1999), *Strengths and Weaknesses of Gandhi's Concept of Non-Violence*, Kingston, Published in Hull University Press.
- Buss, David (2001), *Human Nature and Culture: An Evolutionary Psychological Perspective*, Oxford, Published By Blackwell Publisher.
- Donald, Rees (2004), *the New Brain Sciences: Perils and Prospects*, England, Published By Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, Paul (1958), *Hard and Soft Determinism, Indeterminism and Freedom in the Ages of Modern Science*, New York City, New York City University Press.
- Farah, Godrej (2011), *Gandhi's Corporeal Non-Violence: Ascetics, Warriors, And Ecological Citizenship*, California, Published in University of California.
- Fai Chen, Hon (2010), *Civilization and Competition: Study Societies and State Formation in Late Qing China* Hon, Center for Qualitative Social Research, Hong Kong, Published By Yan University.
- Finlay, Christopher (2006), *Violence and Revolutionary Subjectivity: Marx to Hisek Research Fellow*, Dublin, Published By Ucd Gray Institute and Dublin European Institute.
- Gramp, William (1965), *Economic Liberalism: The Classical World View*, Chicago, Random House, Published By University Of Illinois.
- Green Russell (1998), *Human Aggression; Theories and Implications for Social Policy*, University Of California, Santa Barbara Academic Press.
- Gregg, Richard (1981), *The Power Of Non-Violence* Wyoming, Published in Primer Of Company On Planting, Reprinted By Bio-Dynamic Literature.
- Hegel, Friedrich (1807), *the Phenomology of Mind*, Translated by J.B.Baillie (2001), (Accessible at Black mask Online. [Http: //Www. Blackmask.Com Pdf](http://Www.Blackmask.Com Pdf)).
- Hobbes, Thomas (91651), *Leviathan*, Ed. M. Oakeshott, Oxford, Published By Blackwell (1946).
- Hume, David (1739), *Treatise Of Human Nature*, Oxford, Published By Calderon Press (1896), Reprinted From The Original Edition in Three Volumes And Edited With An Analytical Index, By L. A. Selby-Binge.
- Locke, John (1668), *the Second Treatise of Government*, Ed. J. W Gough, Oxford, Published By Blackwell.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1532), *The Prince*, Translated By W. K. Marriott And Produced By Fable Publishing Of Chico, California. EBook classics at Fable Publishing Company.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich (1848), *the Communist Manifesto: Excerpts from English Language Edition*, Yale, Published By the Yale Avalon Project.
- Marx, Karl (1844), *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Translated By Martin Milligan (1959), From the Germany Text, Moscow, Progress Publisher.
- Mehta, Stefan and Justin, Carre (2012), *Genetic, Hormonal, and Neural Underpinning of Human Aggressive Behavior: Handbook of Nero-*

- sociology, Chicago, Published by Springer Science and Business Media.
- Miller, Ed. L (1984), Questions That Matters: An Invitation To Philosophy, Hill Company, Published By Mc Graw.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1887), On the Genealogy of Morals, Nanaimo, Translated by Ian Johnson of Malaspina University College.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1886), Beyond Good and Evil, Translated by Helen Zimmern, Produced by John Mamoun, Charles Franks, And David Widger (2013), New York, University Of Network City.
- Prana, Samhita (2003), Ahimsa: The Practice Of Non-Violence, Brisbane, Australia, Published In Griffith University.
- Ramirez, Martin (2002), Hormones And Aggression In Childhood And Adolescence, Department Of Psychology And Institute for Bio-functional Studies, Madrid, University Of Complutense.
- Rousseau, J. J(1762), The Social Contract, Translated By G. D. H. Cole, London, Published by J. M Dent and Sons Ltd (1913).
- Sharma, C. Ishwar (1965), Ethical Philosophy Of India, Lincoln, University Of Kebangsaan Malaysia, Nebraska Johnson Publishing Company.
- Sihra, Karen (2006), Philosophical Contributions Of Gandhi's Ideas On Non-Violence: Research And Practice In Social Sciences ,Vol.2,No.1,Ontario Institute For Studies In Education, University Of Toronto.
- Smith, Adam (1759), the Theory of Moral Sentiments (Second Edition), London, Printed For A. Kincaid and J. Bell in Edinburgh.
- Tamdgidi, Behrooz (2002), the Dialectics of World History: A Guiding Thread, Khorasan, Iran, Published in the Omar Khayyam Center for Integrative Research in Utopia, Mysticism And Science.
- Walker, Phillip (2001), Bio-Archeological Perspective on the History of Violence, Santa Barbara, Published in University of California.

### Articles, Journals and Other Documents

- Bhaneja, Balwant (2003), Understanding Gandhi's Ahimsa (Non-Violence): Reflection on an Autobiography, the Story of My Experiments with Truth.
- Drago, Antonino (2009), Swaraji Hind: the Birth of a New Model of Developmentalism.
- Elsevier (2009), Hormones, Brain And Behavior, Published At San Diego Academic Press, 2nd Vol, and Pp.167-203.
- Ferguson, Christopher (2009), Natural Born Killers: the Genetic Origins of Extreme Violence.
- Finlay, Christopher (2009), Hannah Arendt's Critique of Violence: Thesis Eleven.
- Fox, Robin (2005), the Human Nature of Violence: Social Issues Research Center, Originally Presented at an International Conference on Drinking and Public Disorder: Organized By Mcm Research to Largely Non-Academic Audience.

- Gandhi, Mahatma (1948), an Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments With Truth, Translated from The Gujarati By Mahadev Desai, Navajivan Publishing House.
- Jenkins, Martin (N/A), Examination Of Nietzsche's Doctrine Of Will To Power, Dissertation Submitted In Support Of Fellowship From International Society For Philosophers Journal.
- Kashtan, Miki (2006), Non-Violent Communication; Gandian Principles for Every Day Living.
- Lal, Vinay (2009), Gandhi's West, The West's Gandhi: New Literary History, Vol.40.
- Lester, Kurtz (2005), solving the Qur' anic Paradox.
- Mitreanu, Cristian (2007), a Business Relevant View of Human Nature.
- Namita, Nimbalkar (2008), Satyagraha as the Gandian Solution to Resolve Conflict (Accessible At Joshi-Bedekar College, Thane/Website:Www.Vpmthane.Org).
- Rabstajnek, Carl (N/A), Fear of Success (Accessible www. Houd. Info).
- Shimp, Kaleb (2009), Validity of Karl Marx's Theory of Historical Materialism.
- Soyler, Tamer (2010), Gandhi, Civilization, Non-Violence and Obama: Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences, Vol.2, No 1,430-445, Humboldt University.
- Thomas, Jerry (1996), Survival Of The Fittest (Accessible At Www. Decisionanalyst.Com).