



UDC: 323.285:321.01  
<https://doi.org/10.22182/spt.18212018.8>  
Manuscript received: 04.05.2018.  
Accepted for publishing: 02.09.2018.  
Review article

Serbian Political  
Thought No. 2/2018,  
Year X,  
Vol. 18  
pp. 127-140

Marija Đorić<sup>1</sup>  
Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

## On Violence and Nonviolence in Political Theory: Some Conceptual Dilemmas<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse the relation between the concepts of violence and nonviolence in the political theory. How these two concepts are correlated? Where is the dividing line between violence and nonviolence? By analysing some theoretical presuppositions of violence and nonviolence the author seeks to contribute to the scope of the political theory. Rather than presenting an anthology of different definitions of the violence and nonviolence, the intention of this article is to analyse different definitional criteria proposed by social scientists. In this regard, it will be first analysed the concept of violence in political theory. The analysis will be focused on the correlation between violence and power, force and aggression, as well as on the typologies of violence. Then, it will be analysed the concept of nonviolence and its relation with the concept of violence. The author concludes that violence and nonviolence are intertwined within the human society and thus create a dialectic circle.

**Key words:** violence, nonviolence, power, force, aggression, political theory, political science.

### Introduction

Generally speaking, the relation between concepts of violence and nonviolence in political theory is regarded as a relation between two antagonisms. However, the analysis of the concept of violence is not think-

1) Research Fellow  
[marija.djoric@ips.ac.rs](mailto:marija.djoric@ips.ac.rs)

2) This paper was developed within the project No. 179009, funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

able without nonviolence. It is hard to draw the line between violence and nonviolence, especially in terms of socio-political resistance. It is generally accepted that the *offensive dimension* is an integral part of violence, while the *defensive dimension* (or passivity) is attributed to nonviolence. If we start by saying that “violence is the work of force” (Simeunović 2009: 99-105), we can conclude that the force is that *demarcation line* separating violence from nonviolence. However, their relationship is much more complex. Violence and nonviolence might also be seen through the prism of love<sup>3</sup> and hate, light and dark, good and evil. This is due to the fact that the concept of violence is widely explored in many academic disciplines. In the political theory, this “Manichean” division has its roots in the Ancient Greek philosophy, Christian theoreticians, Buddhist Gandhi’s approaches, Kant’s understanding of the “eternal peace”, “tolstoism”<sup>4</sup>, etc.

The aim of this paper is to explore the correlation between the concepts of violence and nonviolence in the political theory. How these two concepts are correlated? Where is the dividing line between these two concepts? The author seeks to analyse some theoretical presuppositions of violence and nonviolence and therefore to contribute to the scope of the political theory. In this regard, it will be first analysed the concept of violence. In the focus of the analysis will be the differentiation of the concept of violence from other concepts used in relation to it, such as force, power and aggression. Then, types and typologies of violence will be explored. Finally, it will be analysed the concept of nonviolence as well as the relation between these two concepts. The conclusion of the author is that these two concepts are intertwined within the human society, and thus create a dialectic circle.

## On Violence in Political Theory

Thinking about violence leads to a certain confusion. Despite numerous definitions of this concept, two types of conceptual problems concerning the definition of violence can be distinguished. First, the concept of violence is closely intertwined with the concepts of power, force and aggression, which makes its clarification more difficult. Second, the concept of violence is an important subject of academic thinking in the field of sociology, psychology, biology, anthropology, political

---

3) According to Gandhi, “fear and love are opposed terms”. See more in: Gandhi, M. (2001) *Non-violent resistance (Satyagraha)*. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover , p. 384.

4) Theoretical concept named after the Russian writer, Lev Tolstoi.

sciences, etc, which leads to a certain conceptual confusion regarding this term (Damjanović 2015: 131). How then to define the concept of violence? In its everyday use, the violence can be defined as an “acting with or characterized by great physical force so as to injure, damage or destroy” (Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language, 1979). The similar broader definition of violence is stated by the World Health Organization (WHO): “Violence is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation” (World Health Organization 2002). In the same manner, the “typical” social science definition of violence refers to a “deliberate use of force to injure or destroy physically” (Gurr, 1973: 360). Defined broadly or narrowly, the concept of violence implies certain intentions as well as the use of specific means. Also, the concept of violence is generally perceived in a negative or destructive manner. It implies the use of force to inflict damage. However, violence does not represent only a mere destruction. It might also have a communicative function. According to Schmidt and Jongman, the violence always includes the subject of violence (the sender of the violent message), the object of violence (the receiver of the violent message), the type of message, as well as the reaction of the target to the message (Schmid and Jorgman 2005: 109).

Violence is, and has always been, the essence of politics (Bufacchi 2005: 193). Numerous studies in the field of political theory are dedicated to the research of violence. Most of these studies perceive the concept of violence in a negative or destructive manner. Ancient philosophers believed that “the use of violence, as a non-political resort in essence, pertained slaves and barbarians” (Tadić 2007: 21). Aristotle stressed that the man is a *zoon politikon* and as such, he owns a specific dose of rationality, given the fact that he is the creature of *praxis* and *lexis*. Given that politics is a rational activity, it does not solve problems with violence, but with the help of logos. It was Hobbes who described the pre-political “state of nature” as a place of violence, where everyone strives to destroy or subdue one another. But if violence was regarded as a problem, it became also a solution. By forming a political society under the rule of a centralised authority, the pre-political state of violence is eliminated and replaced by the legitimate use of violence (Bufacchi 2005: 193).

The differentiation of the concept of violence from other concepts used in relation to it makes theoretical issues involved when it comes to their possible interrelationship. The concept of violence is often related

to the term of force. Their relationship is one of the most debated in the academic studies on violence. It is generally accepted that the violence cannot be understood without connection to the concept of force. The abovementioned definitions of violence underline the correlation between these two concepts. There is means-ends relationship between violence and force. However, although correlated, qualitative differences need to be underscore in order to better understanding of the concept of violence. First, the concept of force is more general than the concept of violence: not all force represents violence and *vice versa*. Second, the difference between these two concepts lies also in the fact that violence is always dynamic, evaluative concept, while force is static, and therefore the violence can be defined as “a work of force” (Simeunović 2009: 102). Third, the concept of force refers to an ability or potentiality, while violence refers to the action itself (Buffacchi 2005: 196). The relation between force and violence was the central issue of anarchist school of thought. One of the most influential representatives of this school, Mikhail Bakunin, believed that violence implied necessarily the use of force or action. According to him, the state was a synonym for violence: “the state itself really means violence, the domination of violence, if possible, masked, and, in extreme cases, reckless and public” (Bakunjin 1979: 23). On the other hand, by distinguishing violence (*violence*) and force (*forca*), Georges Sorel described violence as having the motivating role, in terms of realization of political goals. Thus, violence represented the basic tool of revolutionary class, and it reaches the culmination in the form of general strike. According to Sorel, the force is used for maintaining the order in which the decisive role lays in the hands of the leading minority, while the concept of violence enables the overthrow of the unjust regime. Sorel glorified the role of violence through critics of the leading class (bourgeoisie) and the state. On the other hand, some philosophers, like Blaise Pascal, analysed the concept of force in relation to justice. In this regard, Pascal stated: “Justice without force is forceless. Force without justice is tyrannical. Thus, Justice must be joint with force, in a way that what is just becomes forceful, and what is forceful becomes just” (Paskal 1965: 298).

Apart from concept of force, the analysis of the concept of violence is linked to its relation with the concept of power. The correlation of violence with the term of power was for the first time introduced in a political context by Hobbes in his *De Cive*, using terms such as *potentia* and *potestas*. Hobbes believes that the biggest power lays not in the hands of the individual, but in the hands of the state. True power, according to Hobbes, includes owning social goods, as well as managing

them by a recognized and well-organized social group. One of the most influential determinations of power was provided by Max Weber, who stated that power is always bound to imposing our will to others, even if they do not wish it (Weber 1976). Weber distinguishes power (*Macht*) and authority/domination (*Herrschaft*). For Weber, the power (*Macht*) is “any chance within a social relation to impose one’s will also against the resistance of others, independently of what gives rise to this chance”. He outlines the connexion of power and violence to the very definition of politics. Thus, the politics is defined by its relationship to violence, as *ultima ratio*, “a violence which, to the extent it is consented to (is legitimate), has become monopolised by the rationally legitimised political system” (Guzzini 2017: 101). However, Weber admits the “*amorphous*” character of the concept of power (*Macht*), since it can include all possible situational constellations that can provide the chance to impose one’s will, and thus considers the authority/domination (*Herrschaft*) as a more fulfilled form of power. According to him, it is easier to determine authority/domination, as being more precise and bound by specific rules of conduct. Authority/domination signifies the intention of the powerholders to influence, by an expressed will, i.e. order/command, the action of the subordinates in that way that the later act in accordance to this order/command. By preferring the concept of *Herrschaft*, Weber made an attempt to turn the political theory of power into a theory of action, where domination plays an important role as cause (Guzzini 2017: 102). But how the concept of force fits into this correlation with power and violence? The concept of power is more general concept than force. Relying on Weber’s definition of power, we can consider that the concept of force is a mean to carry out one’s own will despite resistance. In sum, Weber’s and Hobbes’ theories unequivocally imply that the basic characteristic of power is imposing one’s will.

Among contemporary theoreticians, the correlation between violence and power was notably explored by Charles Kegley, who explained the contemporary state power through the phenomenon of *potential power*. Potential power is depicted through “the resources of a state that are believed to be necessary for confirmation of its power vis-à-vis others” (Kegley 2004: 646). For Kegley, military power is the most important of all powers, but economic power also plays a significant role. He introduced the term of “*transition of power*” in the field of political theory, defining it as “increase of deterioration of voluntary abilities of a state in comparison to a rival power” (Kegley 2004: 646), which might lead to the fear of provoking a war. Apart from Kegley, Hannah Arendt was also interested in explaining the differentiation between power and violence.

She considered that, in contrast to violence, the power represents the essence of all government. Thus, the state represents a monopoly of power, but it is never based solely on violent means. In this regard, she gives the example of totalitarianism regimes, dominated by violence, but which also use several “softer” forms of manipulations, such as secret police. Arendt believes that power has an absolute character (since it is the goal itself). Because of that, the relation of violence and power means that violence can always devastate power. Thus, violence and power are two antipodes. In her *On violence*, she states that the domination of pure violence comes when the power has been lost. However, in her research, she also stresses the fact that violence is “the most complicated manifestation of power” (Arendt 2002: 45). For Arendt, the difference between violence and power lay in the fact that violence implies the use of means, and thus does not pay special attention to quantity. On the contrary, according to Arendt, power is always linked to quantity, that is, numerosness, since it is not linked to the use of means.

When speaking of the concept of violence in political theory, it is also necessary to explore the relation of the violence with the concept of aggression. The aggression can be defined as a the basis of violent act, but “to the contrary of violence, which is always destructive, aggression might not have to be” (Đorić 2014: 101). Thus, aggression can be perceived as a category of motivation, while violence is classified in the category of action. Even Freud stressed that Eros and Thanatos pervade the human being in the form of urges. Such destructive urge (Thanatos), as a synonym for death, violence and destruction, might be sublimated in a positive way, and thus the destructive feature might be avoided.<sup>5</sup> Regarding this dual nature of aggression, in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, Erich From stressed the difference between benign (justified) and malicious (unreasonable and destructive) aggressiveness (Fromm 1986: 13). The former is always in the function of defence and existence, while the latter is predominantly in correlation with human pathology, and thus is seen as cruelty.

Contemporary social theorists have attempted to analyse various definitions of aggression. Thus, Harré and Lambe analysed over two hundred definitions of the term “aggression”. They concluded that the majority of elaborated definitions are dominated by two elements: bad intention and destruction (Harré and Lambe 1984).

Overall, theories of violence can be divided into theories of congenital violence and theories of conditionality. While the former type of

---

5) A good example is the sublimation of aggressiveness (as a form of negative energy) through sport, which might lead to outstanding results.

theories search for the reasons of political violence in genetics inherited by our ancestors, the latter links violence with learning from our environment, according to specific forms of behaviour. We cannot be strictly guided by one of the two theoretical approaches, since violence as a phenomenon is often a result of different factors, not only the genetic predisposition, but also of the influence of various social factors.

The main representative of the congenital theories is Sigmund Freud, who believed that the “death urge” (Thanatos) is in charge of the deleterious and destructive behaviour of a human being. And while according to him the main driver of a human being is his sexual urge, for Alfred Adler, this is the *will to power*. Adler was also one of the first Freud’s critics, pointing out that striving for individual power is the biggest evil of the contemporary humanity (Adler 1996).

Anna Freud developed the so-called hydraulic model, according to which aggressiveness is omnipresent in a human being, and is always waiting for a suitable moment to be released (Freud 1993). Every release of negative energy (through violence) creates a feeling of satisfaction in a human being. However, according to Anna Freud, aggressiveness sometimes might be released through a socially acceptable manner, and thus be avoided of destructive feature. For some authors, such as Konrad Lorenz, the aggressiveness might be seen as a biological term. In contrast, Sigmund Freud sees aggressiveness as a psychological term, while according to Viktor Frankl, aggressiveness might be predisposed by physiological or psychological factors.

The concept of aggression is widely explored by frustration-aggression theory, which states that violence occurs as a result of unfulfilled desire, which creates frustration. The founder of this theory, John Dollard, believes that accumulated aggressiveness in a human being is always oriented towards the most accessible object of violence, and the cause is always – frustration. At this point it should be stressed that not every frustration might result in violence and anger, which is one of the weaknesses of this theory.

Behaviourists such as Ted Gurr believed that the primary cause of violent behaviour is – relative deprivation. According to him, relative deprivation represents “a relation between value requirements and real possibilities for meeting these requirements” (Đorić 2014: 110).

When it comes to the theory of social learning, it emerges from a hypothesis that aggression is not congenital, but learned, i.e. is an acquired urge. Albert Bandura, one of the most prominent representatives of this theoretical approach, believes that aggressive behaviour corresponds with the principle of award and punishment. In this regard, there are



several learning models: modelling, observing, imitation and symbolic learning (Bandura 1970).

Erich Fromm aspired to surpass the division between instinctivists and behaviourists, stressing the existence of benign and malicious aggressiveness. Even though it is of a pathological character, malicious aggressiveness, according to Fromm, does not always need to be of a destructive character. He made a comparative analysis among human beings and animals and concluded that aggressive behaviour of a human being often surpasses aggression of animals in all segments.

There are also theoreticians who explained aggressive behaviour in relation to the hormonal reactions (as an increase of level of testosterone) (Ellison and Thorpe 2009), while, on the other hand, theories of Leonard Berkowitz denounce aggressiveness as a congenital occurrence and link it even with noise, the level of external temperature, etc. New research conducted by Robert Baron and Craig Anderson show that aggressiveness increases proportionally with the level of air temperature (Berkowitz 2000).

Thinking about violence implies also the analysis of the existing typologies of this concept. Various classifications of violence can be found in social sciences and especially in political sciences. One of the most famous typologies of violence has been given by Johan Galtung in his famous article "Violence, Peace and Peace Research" (1969), where he distinguished structural and direct violence. While in structural violence the perpetrator cannot be seen *in concretum*, direct violence is, on the other hand, distinguished by directness (i.e. terrorism or murder). In addition, the structural violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power as well as unequal life chances. According to Galtung, this type of violence is more destructive than direct violence. Galtung added later cultural violence to this dualist typology, as a form of subversive action, and this type of violence is based on the abuse of culture in order to realise some other form of violence or political goal.

According to the sphere of social life, violence can be divided into numerous categories: traffic violence, political violence, violence in sports, domestic violence, etc. Regarding perpetrators, i.e. subjects of violence, World Health Organization divided violence into interpersonal violence, self-directed violence and collective violence. For our research, the most important type of violence is the political violence, that can produce far-reaching consequences for the entire society. The distinction between violence and political violence often remains arbitrary despite some general criteria that can be given for political violence. In general, political violence can be defined as "direct or indi-



rect application of force in the field of politics and political, that is, as a direct or indirect application of force on the consciousness, body, life, will or material goods of a real or potential, that is, assumed political opponent” (Simeunović 1989: 27). Thus, political violence involves direct or indirect use of force in political sphere. In other words, political violence is use of force in order to damage a political adversary. Simple and complex forms of political violence can be distinguished regarding the criterion of complexness. Simple forms of political violence include “threat of force, coercion, pressure, psycho-physical abuse, political murder, assassination and diversion” (Simeunović 2002: 155), while complex forms of political violence include “violent protests, rebellions, riots, unrests, terrorism, subversion, repression, terror, uprising and war” (*Ibidem*). Of all forms of political violence, terrorism as a complex form of violence is nowadays the most widespread, since it represents one of the biggest global contemporary security threats<sup>6</sup>.

Apart from political, the social violence, which is often regarded as a form of domestic violence, is more and more gaining publicity. The domestic violence is analysed in close relation with cultural characteristics of a certain region, so that, for example, in India, burning brides in a common occurrence. This terrifying phenomenon is the product of traditional customs that include the idea that the bride should provide a certain dowry to her new family. If she fails to provide it, the husband or the mother-in-law, in an act of revenge, pour kerosene over the bride and burn her. The statistical data show that every hour one bride is being burnt in this country, all because the dowry was not paid.<sup>7</sup>

Even though it is a common belief that the main victims of domestic violence are usually women and children, it should be stressed that old people are also a very sensitive category, but are less often mentioned, usually due to shame and fear of the elderly. It should also be stressed that among the victims of domestic violence (even though it is a rare occurrence) in Serbia there are also men.<sup>8</sup>

With the emergence of internet, cyber-violence became more and more widespread, and it is especially dominant on social networks, often taking a form of cyber-bullying. It is believed that due to its anonymity and directness, this form of violence is very dangerous.

---

6) We are witnesses of the creation of the hybrid phenomenon called “The Islamic State”, which represents a specific combination of the quasi-state and terrorist organization.

7) <https://www.smh.com.au/world/india-burning-brides-and-ancient-practice-is-on-the-rise-20150115-12r4j1.html>, 11.04.2018.

8) First safe house for men was founded in Ćuprija in 2013.

## Violence vs. Nonviolence

Nonviolence is considered as a phenomenon directly opposed to the concept of violence. In a valuable and practical sense, these two phenomena are confronting each other. However, the concept of nonviolence is much more than the mere absence of force, it represents a specific axiological system built in the specific life philosophy. Among the first philosophers who dealt with the issue of nonviolence were stoics, who believed that the man's nature is benevolent, and thus a man never conducts violence without a reason, except in the case when he suffers of a lack of reason.

The *apogée* of the concept of nonviolence has been reached with the development of peace studies theories, and with the actions of various international organizations and institutions. It is believed that the first ideas of nonviolence were rooted in the great religions.<sup>9</sup> The Christian approach to violence and nonviolence comes from the "initial sin" when Eva, at the insistence of the serpent, offered Adam the fruits of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. At this point the nonviolent flow of humanity was interrupted, and the door to violent action of the human-kind was opened, which is personified in the Bible through the act of fratricide (when Cain kills Abel).

Today, in the field of political theory, it is very significant to analyse nonviolence in the field of the concept of the nonviolent struggle, i.e. resistance. Otherwise, Laozi might be seen as the creator of the nonviolent theories, since he stated even in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC that "violence is oriented towards every grain of the universe" (Zunes, Kurtz 2009: 3). The first recorded trace of nonviolent resistance in the history of human society has been found in the Ancient Egypt (1300 BC), when midwives refused to comply with the pharaoh's order to kill all the babies belonging to the class of slaves (Zunes, Kurtz 2009: 3).

The idea of nonviolent resistance can be explicitly found in Christianity, especially in terms of Jesus and his voluntary sacrifice and forgiveness for all the violence done to him by people. Even Islam in certain Surats points out that killing of one man is the same as killing of the entire human kind. Nonviolence is woven into the essential principles of Buddhism and Hinduism in the context of karmic debt, and thus violence is not recommended, given that it might burden our karma in some of our future lives. For that reason, these eastern religions insist on the principle of ethics. Namely, karma is the law of causality in the field of morality, and thus the man himself is responsible for his own misfortune, espe-

---

9) The idea of nonviolence appeared for the first time in buddhism. Later, it was spread in other religions, such as Christianity and Islam.

cially if he is prone to violence. In sum, the contemporary great religions predominantly negate violence and promote the nonviolent approach.

Even though the idea of nonviolence is practically as old as the man himself, the term nonviolence will be established in scientific circles only in 1923, thanks to Clarence Marsh Case and his *Non-violent coercion: a study in methods of social pressure*. In 1939, this idea will be further explained by Krishnalal Shridharani with his *War without violence*, where he examined Gandhi's concept of nonviolent struggle.

Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King were prominent proponents of nonviolence in the twentieth century. Mahatma Gandhi was not only the promoter of the nonviolent resistance that started in the South African Republic, to be finalized in India, but was also the creator of a unique philosophy based on two key phenomena— *ahimsa* and *satjagrahi*. "Satjagraha is the essential weapon of truth" (Bhuvan 2017: 3), stated Gandhi. The philosophy of Truth (*Satya*) and Non-violence (*Ahimsa*) were grounded in his belief that they are the product of the divine true way. Besides, he called upon different methods of civil disobedience, using self-control, discipline and persistence. These philosophical principles were the most explicitly depicted in the so-called "Salt March"<sup>10</sup>, when Gandhi showed a typical example of civil disobedience through passive resistance.

Gandhi's peaceful philosophy was to a great extent used by Martin Luther King. He is one of the activists who paid with his own life for the non-violent fight for African-American rights in the US. The depth of King's desire for freedom is also seen in his impressive speeches which contained segments of Gandhi's philosophy, "tolstoism" and Christianity.<sup>11</sup> As a Baptist preacher, he promoted some of the crucial principles of Christianity, insisting on one of the most important God's commandments "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", among which he even included the love towards the enemy, for whom he believed one should pray. According to him, nonviolence was an "active and coercive form of resistance" (James 2016: 23).

In general, non-violent struggle requires some significant elements:

1. Non-violent struggle is not a mere subordination to injustice. It is a struggle with the help of dignity and persistence;
2. Passive resistance is not a weakness. Gandhi himself stated that non-violent resistance is not for cowards, since it requires a lot of persistence, bravery and moral strength;

---

10) Gandhi asked the British government in India to give independence to this country. Gandhi will start a march on foot, 338 km long, from Ahmedabad to Dandi, wishing to reach the sea and make salt himself. Many people joined him as a support. This was the beginning of the end of the colonial authority of the Great Britain.

11) Among his most famous speeches we should mention "I have a dream" and "Love your enemies".

3. Non-violent struggle confronts injustice but does not cause damage to others.

Even though at first glance it does not seem so, but sometimes more strength is needed for non-violence than for violence. Mills wrote about this, stating that violence is “the last form of power” (Mills 2000: 86). He believed that violence corresponds with the loss of authority, and thus nonviolence represents a “tougher” category in comparison to violence. The sense of justice is often contributed to the context of non-violence. Believing that people act justly and in correlation with specific ethic principles provides an elementary strength for non-violent struggle, no matter how difficult it is.

By elaborating the relation of violence and nonviolence, especially in the context of fight, i.e. resistance, we can conclude the following:

1. Violence is characterized by active, and nonviolence by passive resistance;
2. In comparison to violence, which is destructive, nonviolence is mostly constructive;
3. Nonviolence often needs bigger bravery and strength than violence does;
4. The advantage of violence lays in the fact that (no matter the consequences) it gives faster results in comparison to nonviolence. Nonviolence asks for more time and effort.

## Conclusion

Contemporary humanity has grown in technical, military and scientific sense, clearly showing that the man is the only being having a superior *ratio*. However, despite the advance in human civilization, humankind has not denounced violent actions, as numerous low-intensity conflicts world-wide show. The fight for geopolitical domination and energy control is more dominant than any ethical principle and the principle of nonviolence.

Today, it is difficult to restrain the political power of great powers that are taking part in ‘the *fight of titans*’ in the international relations arena. This might be due to Hegel’s idea that states that wish to be recognized must wage wars. The similar idea was expressed by Heraclitus, when he stated that *struggle is a measure*, that is, *father of all things* (even though this thought is often wrongfully translated as – war is the measure of all things). In the course of fighting for dominance, the principles of ethics and non-violent acting have been forgotten. In a world where money is

the main religion, where the violence and the fight for supremacy prevail, a little space is left for non-violence. Still, if we look at the conscious individuals, we will see that in every religion, nation and ideology exists at least a little bit of ethics pleading for the principle of non-violence. This witnesses the existence of a man's consciousness which is not completely blurred with vanity, war and struggle for power. Machiavelli himself stated that a man has one half of animalistic and the other that is human within himself. No matter how much it contained elements of animalistic urges, a man is in his essence a conscious, rational being that knows very well what empathy, compassion and ethics are. Let us hope that this positive side of a man will nowadays prevail in this chaos surrounding us.

Since ancient times the fight between violence and non-violence has been perceived through a prism of light and darkness, alternating between each other. Relying on the man's rational part of the being, we might expect improvement of the human kind and creating awareness of everything that is good and that makes the human kind superior in comparison to the rest of the biosphere. Unfortunately, a modern man has shown significant inclination towards destructiveness and violence, which only shows that he invested much more into development of his irrational, instinctive side, which is coloured by violence. However, even though at a first sight violence seems more dominant, nonviolence has a peculiar, positive energy coming from the principle of ethics.

### **Bibliography:**

- Adler, A. (1996) *Poznavanje čoveka*. Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.
- Arent, H. (2002) *O nasilju*. Beograd: Alexandria Press.
- Aristotel, (2013) *Nikomahiva etika*. Sremski Karlovci-Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- Bakunjin, M. (1979) *Država i sloboda*. Zagreb: Globus.
- Bandura, A. (1970) *Social learning and personality development*. London: Rinehart and Winston, Holt.
- Berkowitz, L. (2000) *Causes and consequences of feelings*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhuvan C. (2017) Gandhi on Non-Violence (Ahimsa). *Diogenes*, 61(3-4): pp. 135-142.
- Bufacchi, V. (2005) "Two concepts of violence", *Political Studies Review*, 3(2): pp. 193-204.
- Damjanović, I. (2015) "Political violence and technology", *Nauka i*

- društvo*, Vol.1, pp. 129-145.
- Dorić, M. (2014) *Ekstremna desnica: međunarodni aspekti desničarskog ekstremizma*. Beograd: Nauka i društvo Srbije.
- Ellison, P., Thorpe, P. (2009) *Endocrinology of social relationship*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Freud, A. (1993) *The ego and the mechanism of defense*. London: Karnak Books.
- Fromm, E. (1986) *Anatomija ljudske destruktivnosti II*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Gandhi, M. (2001) *Non-violent resistance (Satyagraha)*. Dover [NY]: Mineola.
- Guzzini, S. (2017) "Max Weber's power". In: Richard Ned Lebow (ed.) *Max Weber and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harré, R.; Lambe, R. (1984) *The Encyclopedic Dictionary of psychology*. Cambridge [MA]: MIT Press.
- James, C. (2016) *Martin Luther King, Jr.: Apostle of Militant Nonviolence*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kegli, Č.; Vitkof, J. (2004) *Svetska politika – trend i transformacija*. Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka.
- Lorenz, K. (1970) *O agresivnosti*. Beograd: Vuk Karadžić.
- Mills, W. (2000) *The power elite*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Paskal, B. (1965) *Misli*. Beograd: Kultura.
- Schmid, A.; Jongman, A. (2005) *Political Terrorism: a new guide to actors, authors, concepts, data bases, theories and literature*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Simeunović, D. (2002) *Teorija politike*. Beograd: Nauka i društvo.
- Simeunović, D. (2009) *Uvod u političku teoriju*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Storr A. (1992) *Human Aggression*. London: Penguin.
- Tadić, Lj. (2007) *Nauka o politici*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Veber, M. (1976) *Privreda i društvo II*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language* (1979). Englewood Cliffs [NJ]: Prentice Hall Direct.
- World Health Organization (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Zunes S., Kurtz L. (2009) *Nonviolent Social Movements: a geographical perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell, Malden.