

Political Violence: A Study of Naxal Movement in India

Dr. B.K. Mahakul

Faculty, Department of Political Science, Hidayatullah National Law University, Uparwara, Abhanpur, New Raipur 493661(Chhattisgarh).

Abstract- Political violence is a phenomenon that, in the past century, has been growing in alarming proportions across the world. Violence is a common method used to achieve particular ends. The turn of the century make a new goal threat. The most important cause of socio-political violence is the feelings of "Relation Deprivation." As and when people perceive or believe that injustice and frustrated, and tend to strive violently, as the last option. It may have distabiling consequences for the Socio-political violence, its forms, casual factors and implications for the political-systems.

Index Terms- Violence, Structural Violence, Relative Deprivation, Frustration, Inequality, political System.

I. SOCIO-POLITICAL VIOLENCE – THE CONCEPT

Violence refers to any physical force or any damage or injury to person or property. According to Webster's New Collegiate dictionary¹, violence means, "exertion of any physical force for instance: (a) Violent treatment or procedure, (b) Profanation infringement, outrage, assault, (c) strength, energy, activity displayed or exerted for vehement, forcible or destructive action or force, (d) vehemence in feeling, passion, order, furry, fervor.

According to Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice², in a broad sense, "violence is a general term referring to all types of behaviour either threatened or actual, that result in the damage or destruction of property or injury or death of an individual.

According to Black's Law Dictionary, "violence means unjust or unwarranted use of force usually accompanied by fury, vehemence, or outrage, physical force unlawfully exercised with the intent to harm"³.

The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences⁴ define violence as "the illegal employment of methods of physical coercion for personal or group ends...., which is distinct from force or power".... a purely physical concept. It goes beyond the dictionary meaning of the term 'violence' as merely the exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury or damage to persons or property both spiritual; and non-spiritual. The 'illegality' and 'illegitimacy' of social violence will differ in situational norms and social context. There is noticed overlapping between "force" and 'violence' on the one hand, and 'discrimination' and 'oppressions' on the other hand. For all these reasons, 'Social Violence' is roughly defined as the illegal use of physical, mental and social concern or use of threats for personal or group ends reflected in the present day developmental processes.

One social psychologist Moyer⁵ defines violence as a form of human aggression that involves inflicting physical damage on persons or property. For psychologists, violence and aggression are twin terms but with certain differences between them. Allena⁶ uses the term aggression in both constructive and destructive senses, whereas violence is used only in destructive senses. Aggression can be sublimated in intrinsic, assertive or domineering behaviour, but violence can not be sublimated. It can only be redirected or substituted. Social psychologists have dealt with inter-personal behavioural violence. They have tried to define violence in terms of human aggression which inflicts physical injury.

A definition of aggression, acceptable to most social psychologists focuses: "Aggression is any form of behaviour directed towards the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment"⁷ However, the concept of intentionality is important in separating aggressive behaviour from other forms of behaviour that might lead to some harm.

According to the American Heritage Dictionary⁸, violence involves: (i) physical force exerted for the purpose of violating, damaging, or abusing, (ii) the act or an instance of violent action or behaviour, (iii) intensity or severity, as in natural phenomena, (iv) abusive or unjust exercise of power, (v) abuse or injury to meaning, content or intent, (vi) vehemence of feeling of expression.

World Health organization defined violence as the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against a person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation⁹. In the above definition of violence, the inclusion of the word "Power", in addition to the phrase "use of physical force", broadens the nature of a violent act, and expands the conventional understanding of violence to include those acts that result from a power-relationship, including threats and intimidation. The "Use of Power" also serves to include neglect or acts of omission, in addition to the more obvious violent acts of commission. This definition covers a broad range of outcomes including psychological harm, deprivation and mal-development. This reflects a growing recognition of the need to include violence that does not necessarily result in injury or death, but that nonetheless poses a substantial burden on individuals, families, communities, and health care systems.

According to Moser and Clark violence and power are intrinsically connected in a relation that involves "an uninvited but intentional or half-intentional act of physically violating the

body of a person”¹⁰. Historically, violence has been expressed through different means such as physical attack, which involves a direct aggression against an individual or a group. It is used in order to weaken in a more rapid manner the power of the other. Moser and Clark, define political violence, as “the Commission of violent acts motivated by a desire, conscious or unconscious, to obtain or maintain political power”¹¹. Political violence is about the acquisition of power through violent acts. It is driven by desires for power that lead people to transgress others private domains.

Violence is a common method used to achieve particular ends. According to Moser and Clark, violence takes place in different domains: the public domain, usually recognized as political and social conflicts, and the private domain or domestic violence that exclusively deals with family and interpersonal conflicts. They categorize violence in three different levels: economic, social and political. Economic violence is conceptualized as “street crime, robbery/theft, drug trafficking,

kidnapping and assaults”¹². Social violence represents disturbances at a more inter-personal level such as domestic violence. The political level portrays a more collective sphere manifested in “guerrilla conflict, paramilitary conflict, political assassinations, armed conflict between political parties, rape and

sexual abuse as political act”¹³. These three levels of violence usually interact simultaneously, especially in developing countries where economic and social violence are triggered by the extreme conditions of deprivation and oppression in which poverty stricken and backward classes are forced to live due to the unequal distribution of wealth and material goods. Since violence is a continuum influenced by different factors and circumstances, the boundaries among social, economic and political violence are sometime diffuse and difficult to distinguish. Political violence involved in any or in all of these instances of violence share similar desires for gaining and maintaining an idealized power that allows control over others. It is in the public domain where political violence, intertwined with economic and social violence, takes place.

Political Violence is related to the large-scale social structure; it is embedded in society in the form of age-old discrimination and deprivation when privilege and opportunities are distributed asymmetrically. Arthur Kleinman writes, “Massive political violence must work through local worlds in which social and cultural violence is already a routine part of day-to-day living”. Political violence is differentiated from general violence by its specific political goal as violent action is directed toward achieving power and it has more collective rather than individual political actors. Collective political violence involves destructive/constructive attacks by groups within a political community against its regime, authorities or policies. It is expressed through different means such as physical or mental attack, which involves direct or indirect aggression against the structure, a group or an individual. Political violence is defined as the commission of violent acts motivated by a desire, consciously or unconsciously, to obtain or maintain political power. Political violence is rampant around the world at intra and

interstate levels. Most of these conflicts have involved violence including homicide, arson, and destruction of property.

Sammuel P. Huntington and Ted Robert Gurr advocate that preservation of “Cultural identity” by states is the central issue of national and transnational violent politics, and that the fault -lines between civilizations are becoming primary fronts of geo-political conflict. They further opine that in coping with identity crisis, what counts for people are blood and belief, faith and family; that people rally with those with the similar ancestry, religion, language, values and institutions, and distance themselves from those with different ones. Spurred by modernization, Huntigton says, global politics is being reconfigured along cultural lines; and that modernization and political violence are somehow connected. According to him, development is directly related to the increasing political instability and violence in Asia, Africa and Latin America after the Second World War. Similarly, Ted Robert Gurr focuses on the political fact that most of the world’s populations do not share a commitment to the preservation of the state system as it is now constituted. They do not identify primarily with country or ideology but with people. What unites these people is not a government, but a sense of identity rooted in a common culture, a common history, and often a common memory or myth of conquest and oppression by outsiders.

1.2 CAUSAL FACTORS:

Most of the social scientists who are concerned with the study and analysis of socio-political violence identify inequality and injustice as its basic causal factors. Historically, modern capitalist society characterized by high level of inequality and injustice- xxx what Galtung²² describes as “Structural Violence”. Ted Robert Gurr, in his study of 114 countries, found deprivation to be the major cause for the magnitude of Civil Strife, and 60 country study by Muller and Seligson suggests that inequality is the major cause of Political Violence.

There may be discerned two major schools of thought that have focused on the causes of socio-political violence. Marxists (Communists) agree that unequal ownership of the mode of production is the root cause of violence. Classical doctrine of Communism states that armed struggle is necessary to overthrow Capitalism which is founded totally on exploitation. In several countries in Latin America, Africa and South Asia, violent movements have occurred on the basis of communist ideology. The motive of these movements was to establish a classless society. Violent conflict arose in those countries because of abysmal of poverty, corruption, and unequal distribution of wealth and power reflected in significant class differences. These factors contributed greatly to the emergence of organized violent rebel groups.

The other school argued that ‘Identity’ politics is the cause of socio-political violence. Ethno-nationalism is a collective identity which some times is sufficiently strong and exclusive to lead to genocide. Ethno-nationalist violence may be the most intense and frequent in modern days. The growing trend of ethno-nationalism over the world has sidelined the ideology and the boundaries of territory.

What leads civilians to take up arms against a state or its citizens towards some political aim? The reasons given by

scholars are diverse, but it can be grouped into three basic categories: institutional, ideational and individual.

Institutions define and shape human activity; and the institutional explanations assert that their specific qualities or combination are essential to generate socio-political violence. The emphasis is on political violence, such as violence against states or regimes, economic institutions, or societal institutions, culture, or religion. It may be that institutions contain certain values or norms that implicitly or explicitly encourage such violence or that certain institutions constrain human activity, thus provoking socio-political violence. Institutional explanations can be seen as a quest for a 'root source' for violence, a necessary condition for such actions to take place.

If institutional explanations emphasize the impact of distinct organizational and patterns in fostering Socio-political violence, ideational explanations focus more on the rationale behind that violence. Ideational cause refers to ideas as may be institutionalized and rooted in some institutions such as a political organization or a religion- but often they are un-institutionalized, with no real organizational base. The argument here is that ideas play an important role in socio political violence in the way they set out a world view, diagnose a set of problems, provide a resolution, and describe the means of attaining it. Any or all of these elements may be bound up with a justification of violence.

Finally, individual explanations center on those who carry out the violence themselves. It emphasizes the personal motivations that allow people to contemplate and carry out violence. It emphasizes psychological factors, and conditions that lead individuals towards violence. Such factors may be a function of individual experiences or they may be shaped by broader conditions in society, such as standard of living, level of human development, or gender roles. Such an approach tends to focus on how people may be driven to violence as an expression of desperation, liberation, or social solidarity. For example, some scholars who study religious violence emphasize the role of humiliation as a motivating force, a sense that one's own beliefs are actively marginalized and denigrated by society or other groups of people. Revolutionaries or terrorists, in this view, see violence as a way of restoring meaning to their lives, and may, in many ways, be largely unconcerned with whether they are effectively achieving their goals.

24

One important element of comparison among these three explanations is the extent of will of the people who are the primary actors in socio-political violence. Institutional explanations, often, are quite deterministic as the focus is on people who are shaped and directed by larger structures that they do not control. An individual's recourse to violence is simply the final step in a much larger process. In contrast, individual explanations focus squarely on people; they are the primary makers of violence because they choose to be. Ideational explanations reside somewhere in between. Ideas are influenced by institutions but are also actively taken up and moulded by individual to cause and justify socio-political violence.

Moreover, the peculiar psychology of the individual may also pave for causation of political violence. In this context, it may be noted that Human being's vital interests go beyond those of other animals. He is a symbol-making animal and

orients himself in life by loosing certain values, images, persons and institutions and considers them sacrosanct; he can not give them up as he seeks his identity in them. So, an attack on these symbols, whether these be an ideal, the tribe, the nation or the idea of honour, is considered as an attack on his life and living in both biological and social sense. It does not matter in this context whether the values or symbols he defends have some rational basis; what matters from a psychological point of view is that, for him, these are necessary in order to live and retain his mental balance and that any threat to them is a threat to his vital interests. Hence, he tries to protest them as he attempts to protect his own life.

Another aspect human nature is man's suggestibility. If leaders try to make man believe that he is or will be threatened, and if he lacks critical judgement and is prone to accept as real what his leaders tell him, he will react to the alleged threats in the same way he reacts to a real threat. It does not matter whether he is really threatened; what matters is whether he is convinced of the threat, and this depends upon the degree of his dependence on his leaders, his suggestibility and his lack of critical reasoning. This kind of aggressiveness is provoked by a real or alleged threat to vital interests of the individuals.

Another important factor which may give rise to the acts of violence and destructiveness is the incongruity between the values we profess and practise. Modernity has made an individual a being in transition. He fails to relinquish his old values and embrace the new ones suitable for modern life. There is a deep contradiction between the values we aspire for and the values we practise.

One of the most outstanding characteristics of the present day society is the perpetual competition among the individuals and groups as generated by their sense of actual or perceived deprivation. Especially, when the neglected people adopt a shortcut to achieve their goals, they take up a method which is against the normal principles of conflict resolution. Very often they adopt violence as a means due to its tactical values, because both the strong and the weak among them believe that they can attain their goals with the help of limited resources. If the genuine demands and perceived interests are not fulfilled by the existing political and legal institutions, through legitimate peaceful channels, these demands and interests – whether real or imaginary-get aggregated in a belligerent form, disrupting social peace and political stability.

Therefore, the most important cause of socio-political violence seems to be rooted in the social psychology of the people who become frustrated because of feelings of 'Relative Deprivation'. As and when they perceive or believe that injustice prevails in socio-political life, or that their cherished ideals, and values, and aspirations are not fulfilled, they feel dissatisfied and frustrated, and tend to strive violently, as the last option, at the imputed source of frustration. In this context, the subjective feelings may be termed as 'Relative Deprivation; which is defined by Ted Robert Gurr as "The tension that develops from a discrepancy between the 'Ought' and the 'is' of collective value-satisfaction".

25

In socio-political life, the individual as well as collectivities may value many objects such as wealth, status, power, security, equality, freedom, national self-determination etc. when they become unable to achieve their cherished values,

they feel relatively deprived, dissatisfied, and tension-ridden. In the context of their sense of 'Relative Deprivation', 'ought' refers to the conditions or values of socio-political life that they believe to be entitled, whereas 'is' refers to their subjective sense of non-achievement of the cherished values or objects, and their perception of the injustice inflicted on them. The discrepancy or the gap between the 'ought' and the 'is' of collective value-satisfaction generates in them a sense of 'Relative Deprivation' that makes them dissatisfied and frustrated, and motivates them to undertake measures for removing the cause or source of their subjective sense of deprivation and frustration, and to organize a political movement if necessary. When they become unable to get their grievances redressed through conventional channels of conflict-resolution because of indifference or incapacity of the Authority of the Political System, they do not hesitate to strike violently at the imputed source of frustration. Therefore, as scholars such as Ted Robert Gurr²⁶, Daniel Lerner²⁷, James C. Davies,²⁸ W.G. Runciman²⁹, H.Nieberg³⁰, and Crane Brinton³¹ assert, the chief causal factor of 'Political Violence' and 'Political Movement' seems to be the subjective sense of 'Relative Deprivation' of the collectivities or the mass of people.

1.3 FORMS AND TECHNIQUE

Socio-political violence can manifest itself in many different forms and with different technique. In this context, there may be discerned some major forms of socio-political violence.

1.3.1. Revolution:

Revolution refers "as an attempt by the use of force against the government legally in power to compel change in what are held to be, by those using such force, the actual purpose of the state"³² It can be defined as a public seizure of the state in order to over turn the existing government and regime. There are several factors. First, revolutions involve some element of public participation. To be certain, there are typically leaders, organizers, and instigators of revolution who play a key role. In revolution, the organized people play an important role in seizing power. Second, the core leaders of the Revolution seize control of the state. This aspect distinguishes Revolution from violent acts within its groups which intend to gain local control or even seek independence but do not or cannot take over the entire state. Finally, the objective of revolution is not simply the removal of those in power but the change of the entire regime itself. Revolutions seek to fundamentally remake the institutions of politics and often economic and societal institutions as well. As a result, scholars sometimes speak of "Social Revolutions" to indicate that they are referring to events that completely reshape society.

A well documented theory of revolution is found in Ted Gurr's "Why Men Rebel". In Gurr's view, rebellion is the result of 'relative deprivation', brought about by the gap between what people expect to get (their value expectations) and what they actually get (their value capability). The greatest likelihood of revolution therefore occurs when a period of economic and social development that has produced rising expectations is abruptly reversed. This creates a gap between expectations and

capabilities that can lead to revolution. The notion of relative deprivation is significant because it draws attention to the fact that people's perception of their position is more important than their objective circumstances. What is crucial is how people evaluate their condition relative either to the recent past, or to what other people have.

Revolution involves the use of violence in civil social relations. It is one special form of social change. It has for its target of attack the constitution of society in the sense of law and justice on which a society rests at any particular point of time. Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher, who wrote that we must know how people want their society to be organized, has observed:" The Universal and Chief cause of revolutionary feeling is the desire of equality, when men think that they are equal to others who have more than themselves; or, again, the desire of inequality and superiority, when conceiving themselves to be superior they think that they have not more but the same or less than their inferiors; pretensions which may or may not be just". According to Aristotle, revolutions may occur due to unequal distribution of wealth in the society, serious disputes over ideas of justice involving the society in conflicts and divisions; power seeking by the leaders of the society, and a strong desire for the achievement of a radically different social order. In fine, Aristotle was suggesting that the seeds of instability and change in a society could be found in the form of the social structure itself.³³

The important long term causes of revolution have been identified as under:³⁴

- economic growth leading to dissatisfaction among certain segments of the society;
- technological innovation raising false hopes of remedying the defects and drawbacks of the existing social and political order;
- process of democratization making the higher status groups critical of the leveling up process and the lower status group impatient about the slow speed of social change;
- process of secularization undermining the role of organized religion that had in the past upheld the legitimacy of the old regime;
- growth of modern nationalism seeking to engulf the entire society by promising, political, economic and social equality universally;
- growth of the modern state involving a painful and occasionally Jerky Process of regime changes.

Revolution is often the catalyst of formation of modern state as it happened, for instance, in the creation of the former USSR and the present day People's Republic of China. However, revolutionary leaders may seek a high degree of state power, rejecting democracy as incompatible with the sweeping goals of revolution. It is often destructive and bloody. The events that bring revolutionaries to power may themselves not claim many lives, but in the immediate aftermath, revolutionary leaders and their opponents often use violence in their struggle over the new order.

1.3.2. Terrorism:

Terrorism usually refers “to threats, violence, intimidation and physical manipulation of the behaviour of others by using violent methods”.³⁵ It is also defined as the purposeful out and or threat of act of violence to create fear and a climate of panic or collapse, to destroy public confidence in government and security agencies or to coerce communities and others into obeying the terrorist leadership.³⁶ Terrorism is clearly a sub-category of socio-political violence. It is a pre-meditated, usually politically motivated, use or threatened use of violence, in order to induce a fear of terror in its immediate victims, usually for the purpose of influencing another, less reachable audience, such as the government.³⁷ Alexander defines terrorism as “the use of violence against random civilian targets in order to intimidate or to create general pervasive fear for the purpose of achieving political goals.”³⁸ Crenshaw defines terrorism as, “the systematic use of unorthodox political violence by small conspiratorial groups, with the purpose of manipulating political attitudes of the authority rather than physically defeating the enemy.”³⁹

Terrorism may be defined as the use of violence by non-state actors against civilians in order to achieve a political goal. Over time, the term came to be associated with non-state actors who used terrorism in part because conventional military force was not available to them. When states use violence against their own civilian populations, it is called human rights violations. There is also state-sponsored terrorism. States do sometimes sponsor non-state terrorist groups as a means to extend their power by proxy, using terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy. Definition of terrorism emphasizes that the targets of violence are civilians. Here the issue of intentionality is important. In violent conflicts, there are often civilian casualties. But terrorists specifically target civilians, believing that such actions are a more effective way to achieve their political ends than by attacking the state. Finally, there is the issue of the political goal. It is important to recognize that terrorism has some political objective; as such, it is not simply a crime or a violent act without a larger goal. Terrorism and other forms of violence can be sorted out by the primacy of political intent.

There are varieties of definitions on terrorism. The common threads of the various definitions identify the basic features of terrorism as: (i) Political:- a terrorist act is a political act or is committed with the intention to cause a political effect, (ii) Psychological- the intended results of terrorist acts cause a psychological effect. They are aimed at a target audience other than the actual victims of the act, (iii) Coercive- violence and destruction: There are used in the commission of the act to produce the desired effect, (iv) Dynamic- terrorist groups demand change, revolution or political movement, and (v) Deliberate- terrorism is an activity planned and intended to achieve particular goals.

Scholars have differently viewed the causes of terrorism. They range from demographic to socio-economic to political factors. Demographic factors may include congestion and high growth rates. Socio-economic factors may include poverty, unemployment, ethnic conflict, religious conflict, territorial

conflict, access to resources, or even revenge. There are many factors which contribute to Terrorism: high population growth rates, high unemployment, lagging economies, extremism, ethnic conflict, religious conflict, territorial conflict, political frustration, identity crisis, illegitimate or corrupt governments, humiliation of the masses, soft attitude towards criminals, wrong policies of the government, deprivation of the basic human rights and poverty among the people.

Terrorist activities may be classified, as per the UN Resolution into six categories⁴⁰

1. **Civil Disorders:-** A form of collective violence interfering with the peace, security and normal functioning of the community.
2. **Political Terrorism:-** Violent criminal behaviour designed primarily to generate fear in the community, or substantial segment of it, for political purposes.
3. **Non-Political Terrorism:-** Terrorism that is not aimed at political purposes but which exhibits conscious design to create and maintain high degree of fear for coercive purpose, but the end is individual or collective gain, rather than the achievement of a political objective.
4. **Quasi-Terrorism:-** The activities incidental to the Commission of Crimes of Violence that are similar in form and method to genuine terrorism but which nevertheless lack its essential ingredient.
5. **Limited Political Terrorism :-** It refers to acts of terrorism which have committed or ideological or political motives but not a part of a concerted campaign to capture control the state.
6. **Official or State Terrorism:-** It refers to nations whose rule is based upon fear and oppression of such proportions that it can be regarded as similar to terrorism.

Terrorism poses a serious challenge to the domestic population as well as the global community. It is the use or threatened use of violence for the purpose of creating fear in order to achieve a political, economic, religious or ideological goal. The targets of terrorists acts may be civilians, government officials, military personnel or people serving in the interests of government. It is being used as a method whereby any organized group or party seems to achieve it's a vowed aims chiefly through the systematic use of violence having a strategic plan.

2.3.3. Domestic Violence

Domestic violence refers to “Violence between members of a household, usually spouses, as assault or other violent act committed by the member of a household against another”⁴¹ It has been defined as “a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner”⁴² Domestic violence can be physical, sexual, emotional, economic or psychological actions or threats of actions that influence another person. This includes any behaviour that intimidate, manipulate, humiliate, isolate, frighten, terrorize, coerce, threaten, blame, hurt, injure, or wound someone. This definition adds that domestic violence “can happen to anyone regardless of race, age,

caste, religion or gender". The United Kingdom in its "Domestic Violence Policy" uses domestic violence to refer to a range of violent and abusive behaviour. It defines domestic violence as: - "pattern of behaviour characterized by the misuse of power and control by one person over another who have been in an intimate relationship. It can occur in mixed gender relationships and some gender relationships and has profound consequences for the lives of children, individuals, families and communities. It may be physical, sexual, emotional and/or psychological. The latter may include intimidation, harassment, damage to property, threats and financial abuse"⁴³ According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, domestic violence is "the inflicting of physical injury by one family or household member on another"⁴⁴

Domestic violence occurs in all societies and all cultures; people of all races, ethnicities, religions, and classes can be perpetrators and victims of domestic violence. Domestic violence is committed by and on, both men and women and it occurs in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships.

Domestic violence has many forms, including physical violence, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, intimidation, economic deprivation or threats of violence. There are a number of dimensions of domestic violence in terms of mode, frequency and severity. In terms of mode it may be physical, psychological or social; in terms of frequency, it may be committed occasionally or it may be chronic and in terms of severity, it may cause both psychological or physical harm involving for transitory or permanent injury, and also the extent of injury may be mild, moderate or sometimes severe, which may end in homicide.

The latest attention to domestic violence has been drawn as a result of women's movement. It is the most serious violation of all basic rights that a woman suffers in her own home at the hands of members within her own family. We may take the case of India which has passed an Act for the protection of women from domestic violence.

The Government of India has passed the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. The same Act defines the expression "domestic violence" to include actual abuse or threat of abuse physical, sexual, verbal, emotional or economic violence. Section 3 of the said Act says that any Act, omission or commission or conduct of the respondent shall constitute domestic violence in case it -⁴⁵

- a) harms or injures or endangers the health, safety, life, limb or well-being, whether mental or physical, of the aggrieved or tends to do so and includes causing physical abuse, sexual abuse, verbal and emotional abuse and economic abuse; or
- b) harasses, harms, injures or endangers the aggrieved person with a view to coerce him or any other person related to her to meet any unlawful demand for any dowry or other property or valuable security; or
- c) has the effect of threatening the aggrieved person or any person related to her by any conduct mentioned in clause (a) or clause (b); or
- d) otherwise injures or causes harm, whether physical or mental, to the aggrieved person.

The Salient Features of the Protection from Domestic Violence Act 2005 are as follows:

- The Act seeks to cover those women who are or have been in a relationship with the abuser where both parties have lived together in a shared household and are related by consanguinity, marriage or a relationship in the nature of marriage, or adoption ; in addition relationship with family members living together as a joint family are also included. Even those women who are sisters, widows, mother, single women, or living with the abuser are entitled to get legal protection under the Act.
- "Domestic Violence" includes actual abuse or the threat of abuse that is physical, sexual, verbal, emotional and economic. Harassment by way of unlawful dowry demands to the women or her relatives would also be covered under this definition.
- The Act provides the power of the court to pass protection orders that prevent the abuser from aiding or committing an act of domestic violence or any other specified act, entering a workplace or any other place frequented by the abused, attempting to communicate with the abused, isolating any assets used by both the parties and causing violence to the abused her relatives and others who provides her assistance from the domestic violence.
- The Act provides for appointment of Protection Officers and NGOs to provide assistance to woman.
- The Act provides for breach of protection order or interim protection order by the respondent as a cognizable and non-bailable offence punishable with imprisonment. Similarly, non-compliance or discharge of duties by the Protection Officer is also sought to be made an offence under the Act with similar punishment.

II. NAXAL MOVEMENT

The term "Naxalism" comes from Naxalbari, a small village in the Darjeeling district of West Bengal, where a section of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) led by Charu Majumdar and Kanu Sanyal led a violent uprising in 1967. They formed a revolutionary opposition group against the official CPI (M) leadership. On May 25, 1967, a landlord attacked a tribal who was granted by the court the right to a piece of land on the basis of tenancy rights. Revolutionary cadres of the CPI (*M) counter-attacked the landlord, giving rise to the "Naxalbari Uprising". The uprising was spearheaded by Charu Mazumdar. Similarly, a peasant revolution was launched in an area called Srikakulam of Telengana region of Andhra Pradesh led by C.Pulla Reddy. Both incidents were violent in nature and drew their inspiration from the success of the Communist Movement in China and Russia. The radicals comprehended the Indian situation then to be similar to that in China prior to 1949 and characterized it as essentially semi-colonial and semi-feudal. Based on this, the revolutionaries concluded that the "People's Democratic Revolution" should be launched in India by immediately resorting to an armed struggle following the Chinese lines.

In November 1967, Left wing extremists, from the whole country, gathered in Kolkata, founding the All India Coordination Committee. They concluded that India officers an excellent situation for a revolution in terms of socio-economic conditions. In May 1968 the Committee renamed the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries and declared its ideological aims: Protracted People's War in accordance with Mao's teachings, including adoption of guerrilla warfare; establishment of rural revolutionary base areas and finally encircling the cities as well as abstaining from Parliamentary elections. Inspired by the Naxalbari experience, armed struggles broke out in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh.

Violence is, mostly, based on socio-economic-political factors which in fact contribute and create conditions conducive to physical violence; particularly for the growth of Naxalism, the socio-economic-political condition prevailing in the country can be regarded as one of the major reasons. Naxal violence, both in its quality and quantum, is in fact directly related to the intensity of the feeling of people of their actual or perceived deprivation and their commitment to take revenge against those who are believed to be responsible for such denial; thus, the Naxals Wage a War of Protest against the land lords, exploiters and even government security forces and its other agencies.

Naxal violence is designed to inflict injury on a person or damage to the property. Broadly speaking, any act by the Naxalites, whether covert or overt that coerces or causes physical hurt, material loss or mental anguish or which degrades human being or which violates human rights, dignity and decency should be viewed as an act of violence and is always depicted these days as Naxal violence.

The problem of Naxalism in India has created great concern for the whole country as it has disturbed the peace of different areas. The movement in different regions has its own specific complexities. The topographical suitability for continuing their strategic advantage and the notion of lack of progress among the people of the areas seem to have encouraged the presence and growth of Naxalism in some regions. The main support for the Naxalite Movement comes from the marginalized people such as the Dalits and Adivasis, the deprived people of India. The people of the tribal areas through out the country remain outside the mainstream of socio-economic-political process and they resent their alienation.

The causes for the growth of Naxalite problem are many and varied. The slow implementation of Land reforms is the main reason for the growth of Naxalism. Landlords frequently move the court to delay implementation of these reforms. They also connive with local politicians and bureaucrats, making the land reforms process slow and cumbersome. Land reforms have failed in the end.

The social structure of society in these areas could be cited as another reason for emergence of the Naxalite problem. Invariably, wherever the Naxalite problem exists, there is a poor section of society, with no resources to meet their minimum economic requirements. Of course the caste or tribal structure may not be exclusively attributed as a reason for the problem. The poor include various castes and not any particular caste or group of castes. However, their poverty and lack of ability to improve their lot due to financial constraints for accessing

education, the government machinery or even legal remedies remain an important factor to their support for the Naxalites.

More-over, the younger generation of people in the rural areas want to have the facilities that are available in urban areas, which remains a distant dream given the infrastructural problems and the failure of governments to perform.

Therefore, the failure of the government to reach out to the rural areas is another major factor that aids to the growth of Naxalism in these areas. The good governance is poor, in certain places it is non-existent. Popular schemes take long to devise but much longer to implement. Even while implementing, the benefit always reach those who are the 'Haves', and not those who are in need in reality. The failure in formulation and implementation of the right schemes at the right time, and targeting the right people is the major problem. Despite the rise of the Naxalite problem, the state has failed to tackle it effectively in undertaking the needed economic and political measures. The State has failed to perform its duties, in short, governance, or the lack of it, in these areas is a primary reason for the growth of the Naxalite problem. Furthermore, political interference has also played a significant role in the implementation of governmental schemes. Leaders have always tried to delay the projects which are promoted by opponent parties.

The Naxalite leaders take advantage of miserable socio-economic condition of the poor and the down-trodden people, and organize Naxalite groups. They collect levies from the local population, collect funds from individuals, groups, and even government officials as commissions for letting them function in areas that are under their control. This money is used by the Naxalite groups to buy arms and recruit new members, especially from the unemployed youths in rural areas. Since the Naxalites provide a monthly salary and uniform, they have become popular amongst the unemployed youths. Thus, the growth of Naxalite movement is due to various factors.

2.3.4. Caste Violence

Caste based violence has been growing in India. The Harijans or Dalits are discriminated against by the caste Hindus and they are subjected to atrocities and exploitation. The present decade has witnessed the upsurge of Dalits who have also started retaliating. Thus, there have occurred violence between the forward castes and Backward castes especially in Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, Bihar, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. Most of these conflicts have been due to atrocities against the Dalits, Land disputes, disputes over sharing of crops, payment of minimum wages, molestation and even rapes of Dalit women, prevention of Dalits from participating in local religious festivals, old enmity arising out of traditional caste feuds and rise of Dalits. Caste has been a major factor of Indian Society and Politics and it has been a source of caste conflict and violence.

The Indian Constitution has formally abolished castes. In this context, mention may be made at article 15 that prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth, Article 17 that abolishes untouchability, Article 29, that protects the interests of minorities, and Article 46, that promotes educational and economic interest of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other weaker sections. Thus, the

constitution of India forbids any discrimination on grounds of religion race, caste, sex or place of birth.

Following such constitutional guarantees, the Indian government has successively passed the Protection of Civil Rights Act, 1955, the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989, and the Employment of Manual Scavenging and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act 1993. Despite these efforts, the effects of these and related laws have been in many cases painfully minimal, and by reaction, caste violence is on constant rise since the early 1990s, causing
49
thousands of death.

It is unfortunate that in recent years the persecution of lower castes by members of some of the upper and middle castes seems to have intensified, and in some regions this oppression has taken a sharply violent form. Members of Scheduled Caste and Tribes seeking a better economic and social deal have been subjected to harassment, beating, burning of houses, and even murder. Caste riots have taken place in areas such as Bihar, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Maharashtra where a radically anti-Brahmin Movement has been strong. While the offenders have been brought to justice in many cases, the preventive measures have been quite inadequate, and incidents of such violence continue to occur in different parts of India.

2.3.5. Communal Violence

Communal violence refers to a situation where violence is perpetrated across ethnic lines, and victims are chosen on ethnic
50
group membership.

The term is commonly used to describe those incidents where conflict between ethnic communities results in massacres. Communal conflict is violent conflict between non-state groups that are organised along a shared communal identity. Violent conflict refers to the fact that the parties use lethal violence to gain control over some disputed and perceived indivisible resources, such as a piece of land or local political power. This follows a generally accepted

conceptualization of armed conflict.
51
The groups involved are non-state groups, meaning that neither Actor controls the state and armed forces. Finally, the groups are organized along a shared communal identity, meaning that they are not formally organized rebel groups or militias but that the confrontation takes place along the line of group identities. Communal identity is conceptualized as subjective group identification based on, a
52
common history, a common culture or common core value.

Communal violence continues to be a sad and hard reality in India. Even after the adoption of the objectives of justice, secularism, and equality of all the people, communalism continues to afflict India. The fact remains that it has been even increasing in intensity and spreading its fangs. It constitutes the biggest strain on the unity and integrity of India. The communal riots which accompanied the dawn of independence and the unfortunate partition of India greatly shook of people of India. Communalism involves the exploitation of social pluralism of Indian society by fundamental groups, organisations and sects for securing their respective narrowly conceived political, religious and sectarian goals.

Hindu-Muslim conflicts in north and south India, Hindu-Christian Communal riots in Kerala and Hindu-Sikh riots in Punjab, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh and certain other parts of north India are the examples of communal violence. For instance, after the state's intervention in Golden Temple in Amritsar in 1984 which was followed by the assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, anti-Sikh riots took place in many parts. In the wake of demolition of disputed structure of Babri Masjid, the communal violence took place in different parts of the country. In 2002, communal violence took place at Godhra in Gujrat. Mostly, Hindu-Muslim Communal violence has plagued the country in both, the pre-independence and the post-independence periods.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

Socio-political violence, both in its wake and aftermath, may have destabilizing consequences for the society and the political system as well. It originates mostly in the feelings of injustice and the perceived sense of 'Relative deprivation' of the collectivities or the mass of population, and its incidence, in the contemporary time, seems to increase by geometrical progress in mostly as a consequence of the impact of modernization of the people, and the associated process of social mobilization. As modernization involves increasing education and literacy, spread of media-communication, industrialization, and urbanization, there ensues the process of social mobilization which may be defined, in the words of Karl W. Deutsch as the process through which "major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are either eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behaviour" It brings about significant and drastic changes in the attitudes, values, and expectations of the people from those associated with the traditional life to those of a modern life. Therefore, the traditional man, on being exposed to new styles of life, new standards of material enjoyment, and new possibilities for their satisfaction, obtain new experiences that breaks decisively the cognitive and attitudinal barriers of the traditional culture, and that generates in him new aspirations and wants to live a modern life. Thus, People become socially mobilized with new aspirations and expectations, and make huge demands on the Political system for providing opportunities and amenities for their realization. However, the traditional or transitional Political System finds itself unable to fulfil their increasing aspirations and demands owing to its lower level of economic development. Hence, when social mobilization far exceeds economic development of the society, there arises a wide gap between people's aspirations and the governments' achievements; between want-formation and want-satisfaction; and this gap generates social frustration and dissatisfaction. Moreover, people become more and more frustrated when they find themselves deprived of 'Justice' in the sense of occupational and social mobility opportunities for fulfilling their aspirations. In such a situation when social frustration far exceeds mobility opportunities, people tend to make a huge number of demands upon the Government of the Political System; and their participation in the political process becomes increasingly unruly, alienated, and aggressive. Such unconventional and anomic political participation of the people tends to challenge the prevalent constitutional order that contains the fundamental rules

of the political game. Consequently, the Political System experiences tremendous stresses involving difficulties in making and implementing public policies effectively as it 'Political institutionalization' becomes seriously undermined, and the political system lapses into a situation of political instability. Hence, when political participation for exceeds Political institutionalization, the out-come would be most likely, political instability entailing disorder and eventually dis-integration of the society. These correlations between social mobilization, socio-political violence, and political instability are succinctly pointed out by Samunel P. Huntington in the following formulation.

1.

$$\frac{\text{Social mobilization}}{\text{Economic development}} = \text{Social Frustration}$$

2.

$$\frac{\text{Social frustration}}{\text{Mobility opportunities}} = \text{Political Participation}$$

3.

$$\frac{\text{Political Participation}}{\text{Political institutionalization}} = \text{Political Instability}$$

Thus, socio-political violence paves for instability of the Political System, and creates a situation of intense social disorder that endangers the life and property of the people, and impedes the development of the Society as a whole. Hence, it is the onerous duty of the Political System and also of the Civil Society to enquire into its causal factors, to devise remedial measures, and to implement them effectively to nip it in the bud for attaining and ensuring socio-political stability and development.

REFERENCES

[1] Webster's New Challenge Dictionary (1961) p.952.
[2] Encyclopaedia of Crime and Justice, (1983), Vol. 4, pp.1618-19.
[3] Black's Law Dictionary, VIIth ed. (1999), p.1564.
[4] Seligman, R.A. Edwin (1935)- The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol. XV, p.264.
[5] K.E.Moyer (1976): The Psychology of Aggression, (New York, Harper and (Row) p.19.
[6] F.H.Allen (1948): Aggression in Relation to Emotional Development: Pree, Int. Conf. Child Psychology (London, Lewis), pp.4-11.
[7] R.A.Barow (1977): Human Aggression, (New York, Plenum Press), p.11.
[8] The American Heritage Dictionary (2009). (USA, Houghton Mifflin Company), p.18.
[9] World Health organization (2002), "World Report on Violence and Health", p.20.
[10] C.Moser and F. Clark (2001a): Victims, perpetrators, or actors? Gendered armed Conflict and Political Violence (New York: St. Martin Press), p.6.
[11] Ibid. p.36.
[12] Ibid.p.36.
[13] Ibid.p.36.

[14] David Apter (1997): The Legitimization of Violence. New York: (New York University Press), p. VIII.
[15] M.Wieviorka (2003) The New Paradigm Violence . In J.Friedman (eds.), Globalization, the State, and Violence, (Walnut Creek, C.A: Altamira Press), p.135.
[16] Arthur Kleinman (2000): The Violence of Everyday Life: the Multiple Forms and Dynamics of Social Violence (New York: New York University Press), p.226.
[17] Stanley Tambiah (1996): Leveling Crowds: Ethnonationalist Conflicts and Collective Violence in South Asia (Berkely: University of California Press), p.3.
[18] Max Abrahms (1994) : "What Terrorists Really Want", International Security, 33, No.5, p.78.
[19] Aban O Ebenstein (1994) : Today's Isms: Socialism, Capitalism, Fascism and Communism, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. p.116.
[20] Samuel P. Huntington (2009): Political Order in Changing Societies (New Delhi, Adarsh Enterprises), pp.39-58.
[21] Ted Robert Gurr (1997): Why Do Minorities Rebel? In Bachler Gunther, ed., Federalism against Ethnicity. (Zurich, Verlag Ruegger), p.128.
[22] J.Galtung (1969): Violence, Peace and Peace Research. Journal of Peace Research (6), pp.167-1912.
[23] Patrick H.O' Neil (2010): Essentials of Comparative Politics. (New York, Norton and Company), p.264.
[24] Max Abrams (2008): "What Terrorists Really Want", International Security, 32, 90.4, p.78.
[25] Ted Robert Gurr: Why Men Rebel. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970), p.23.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Daniel Lerner: The Passing of Traditional Society. (Glencoe; Illinois: Free Press, 1958).
[28] James C. Davies: When Men revolt and Why: A Reader in Political Violence and Revolution. (New York: The Free Press, 1971).
[29] W.G.Runciman : Relative Deprivation and Social Justice. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).
[30] H. Nieberg: Political Violence -The Behavioral process. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969).
[31] Crane Brinton: The Anatomy of Revolution. (New York: Random House, 1985).
[32] H.J.Laski (1960): The State in Theory and Practice (London), p.104.
[33] Aristotle: Politics, Edited and Translated by Ernest Borker. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958).
[34] Mark N. Hagopian (1978): Regimes, Movements, and Ideologies. (New York, Longman P. p.286.
[35] Michel Wieviorka (1995): "Terrorism in the Context of Academic Research", in Marth Crenshaw (ed.), Terrorism in Context, (Pennsylvania University Press), p.115.
[36] Michael Stohl (1988) :The Politics of Terrorism, (New York, Marcel Dekkar), p.73.
[37] Charles P. Webel (2004): Terror, Terrorism and the Human Condition. (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), p.9.
[38] Yonah Alexander (1997): International Terrorism: National, Regional and Global Perspective (New York, Praeger Publications), p.8.
[39] Martha Crenshaw (1998): Terrorism, Legitimacy and Power (Middle Trawn, Wesleyan University Press), p.5.
[40] Disorder and Terrorism (1976): National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standard and Goals.
[41] Bryan A. Garner (1999): Black's Law Dictionary, VIIth ed. (West Group, St. Paul, Minn).
[42] U.S. Department of Justice (2007), National Domestic Violence Hotline.
[43] Untied Kingdom (2007) "Domestic Violence Assessment Policy", Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service.
[44] Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2011) Domestic Violence.
[45] Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice (Legislative Department): The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2004. No.43.
[46] V.Marwah (2009): India in Turmoil (New Delhi, Rupa Publication , p.98.

- [47] Manoranjan Mohanty (1977): Revolutionary Violence; A Study of Maoist Movement in India.
- [48] V.Marwah (2009) p.99.
- [49] Siddharth Narrain (2006): Abolition of Manual Scavenging Slow. The Nindu, Feb. 26.
- [50] D.L.Horowitz (2000): The Deadly Ethnic Riot. (University of California Press) P. 30.
- [51] Johan Galtung (1965): Institutionalized Conflict Resolution : A theoretical paradigm (Journal of Peace Research) 2 (4), p.348.
- [52] Ted Robert Gurr (2000): Peoples versus States: Minorities at risk in the new century (Washington D.C., United States Institute of Peace Press), pp.4-5.
- [53] Karl W. Dentsch “Social Mobilization and Political Development”, American Political Science Review, No.55 (Sept. 196111), p.494.
- [54] Samuel P.Huntington: Political Order in Changing Societies. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p.55.

AUTHORS

First Author – Dr. B.K. Mahakul, Faculty, Department of Political Science, Hidayatullah National Law University, Uparwara, Abhanpur, New Raipur 493661(Chhattisgarh).