
UNIT 5 STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

Structure

5.1 Introduction

Aims and Objectives

5.2 Defining Violence

5.3 Typology of Violence

5.4 Direct Violence and Structural Violence

5.4.1 Direct Violence

5.4.2 Structural Violence

5.4.3 Difference between Direct and Structural Violence

5.5 Dimensions of Violence

5.5.1 Cultural Violence

5.5.2 Economic Violence

5.5.3 Political Violence

5.5.4 Social Violence

5.6 Poverty as Structural Violence

5.7 Structural Violence, Gender Inequality and Sexism

5.8 Structural Violence and Racism

5.9 Summary

5.10 Terminal Questions

Suggested Readings

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Violence is an endemic problem in the world and captures one's attention like few other human events. People on daily basis hear, see or witness incidents of violence, which victimise millions of people each year with varied degrees of intensities. Violence can come from many sources and can be inter-personal like domestic violence; inter-community or communal violence; violence in armed conflicts; legitimate use of force by the state and structural violence. In this Unit we focus on structural violence.

Violence can be defined from many perspectives such as from an injury perspective, criminal justice perspective, a domestic violence perspective, a medical perspective, and a sociological perspective, among others. If we look at major categories of violence discussed in the literature, we find primarily the crime-related violence, like homicide, robbery, rape and aggravated assault. One also comes across events, which involve firearms, suicides, and domestic violence. There is however, lesser use of the concept of structural violence.

Aims and Objectives

After reading this Unit, you would be able to:

- Define as to what is violence.
- Differentiate between direct and structural violence.
- Understand different dimensions of violence.

5.2 DEFINING VIOLENCE

Violence as commonly thought of is something one party does to another by use of force, an overt, physical act causing injury to a person or property. Nevertheless, such understanding of the forms of violence is inadequate because it focuses only on crime related events like killing, torture, rape, sexual assault etc. That is why the 'status quo definition' of violence was challenged when people understood violence not only as the harmful use of force against persons but also as social structures which cause the oppression of human beings.

Violence as an act or force exerted to impart physical harm or injury on other person becomes inadequate on at least three accounts. First, the standard definition of violence exclusively refers to physical harm or injury and neglects the psychological abuses or attacks. Secondly, it lists only human beings as the potential victims of violence, whereas animals or inanimate objects can also be the targets of violence. Last but not the least, the definition assumes that there is a direct link joining the perpetrator and the victim of violence, overlooking the fact that violence often operates in indirect ways.

These definitional inadequacies of violence over the years have led to many fragmented, diverse perspectives, models and theories that try to explain people's 'commitment' towards conflictive behaviour in general and violence in particular. These perspectives not only led to richer and accurate determinants and standards of violence but also to the conditions of non-violence. For the purpose of our study of structural violence, we shall deal with violence as the direct or indirect physical attack, injury or psychological abuse of a person or animal, or the direct or indirect destruction or damage of the property or potential property.

5.3 TYPOLOGY OF VIOLENCE

It was not until the World War II when the interest grew in the relationship between concurrent process of modernisation and decolonisation, on the one hand, and enlarging expectations, inequality and grievance formation, on the other. Kenneth Waltz (1959), in his book *Man, the State and War*, analytically examined violent conflicts from various viewpoints, from intrapersonal dissonance to interpersonal disputes, civil unrest, interstate war and global conflagrations. The dominant notions of evolutionary social change had come under increasing pressure, and tended to offer functionalist and linear accounts of industrialisation, population growth, urbanisation, education and the increased role of the nation-state in the bureaucratic management of everyday social interactions.

Prominent writers like Talcott Parsons and Walt Rostow, in late 1950s and early 1960s, offered accounts of the societal factors that promote or inhibit the development, industrialisation, population growth, urbanisation, education etc. Their objectives were to understand why some countries adopted them while others did not. Doing so, they noted

a shift from being 'traditional' to being 'modern' from segmented, contained communities to complex societies of greater interdependence and complex division of labour.

The shift further brought newly decolonised nations under the Western bloc's influence. In due course of time, particularly in the late 1960s, the conflict between the West and the Warsaw Pact, along with associated weapons transfers and highly destructive proxy wars nullified much of the possible benefits of economic assistance. It, despite considerable economic growth over the post war period, resulted in a divide between rich and developing countries.

The divide between rich and developing countries combined with vociferous social forces in the West, such as the radicalisation of black consciousness, the anti-Vietnam movement, student protest and industrial unrest, which brought in sharp rise in civil dissent. At the wake of dissatisfaction and frustrations of the sixties, Johann Galtung in 1969 articulated the notion of **structural violence**. He faced some of the conceptual difficulties in trying to present the notion of structural violence as both a response to ascendant radicalism and an attempt to reconcile its iconoclasm with the order of peace.

Some forms of violence are instantly recognisable but there are others, which are unrecognisable, latent and hidden. Galtung, a Gandhian philosopher in his seminal works *Violence, Peace and Peace Research*, clarified the muddling concept of violence. He established that a good typology of violence should conceptualise violence in a way, which brings under the concept of violence phenomena that have something very important in common, yet are disparate. Galtung distinguished types of violence, from 'impairment of fundamental needs' perspective and established the concepts of direct, structural and cultural violence. He reiterated that people have four classes of basic needs as an outcome of extensive dialogue in many parts of the world.

According to his basic needs theory, the first 'need groups' category is survival and its negation is death or mortality. Second category is well-being and its negations are poverty, illness and misery. The third one is identity, meaning or purpose of whose negation is alienation. The fourth 'need groups' category is that of freedom and its negation is oppression or repression. The denial to these basic needs or 'need groups' result in eight types of violence with some subtypes which are easily identified for direct violence but more complex to identify for structural violence.

5.4 DIRECT VIOLENCE AND STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

5.4.1 Direct violence

Direct Violence is the only type of violence that is acknowledged as real violence. At interpersonal level, direct violence is the act or force, which one or more people use to impart or inflict physical harms or injuries on other people including nature. It is also known as personal violence and is static. These acts insult the basic needs of others. These acts are of war, torture, fighting, arms violence, physical abuse and emotional abuse and are the example of direct violence. Actor or actors are the fundamental ingredient of the direct violence and make it a personal act.

Many forms of direct violence are the result of structure-based inequalities exacerbated by ethnic tensions, environmental degradation, and economic desperation. Sometimes particular expression of direct violence such as armed violence causes damage and promotes conditions for structural violence. It also weakens a society's capacity to resist or adapt

to other life-threatening harm. Thus, armed violence and its debilitating direct and structural effects threaten peace—both negative and positive peace. The mechanisms of direct violence are killing, injury, siege, sanctions, poverty, de-socialisation, re-socialisation, underclass, repression, imprisonment, expulsion, deportation etc.

5.4.2 Structural Violence

Structural violence is a permanent state of violence, which is embedded in the social, political and economic structures that make up a society. Due to the absence of concrete person and its camouflaged nature, it is also known as indirect violence. The structural violence is often accepted as norms in the society. Primarily, structural violence is the result of hierarchical relations within and between societies that privilege those who are on top and oppress, exploit and dominate those who are at the bottom. Johan Galtung describes the mechanisms, and the forms of structural violence, which are: exploitation, penetration, segmentation, marginalisation, and fragmentation. We explain these as argued by Galtung:

Exploitation is based on unjust economic and social relations. It happens within complex structures and at the end of long and ramified legislation chains and cycles. It represents the main part of an archetypical violence structure and means nothing more than just a situation of ‘unequal exchange’ in which the ‘top dogs’ or the elite, draw substantially more profit from the interaction taking place within this structure than the ‘underdogs’ or the people excluded from development. In reality, the ‘underdogs’ might be disadvantaged to such a degree that they starve or die because of illness and disease or are left in a permanent involuntary state of poverty that usually encompasses malnutrition and illness. People tolerate and rationalise structural violence due to important psychological reasons. A structure of violence not only leaves its marks on the human body, but also affects the mind and the soul.

Penetration involves the implantation of agents of the powerful within the collective ‘underdogs’, which create a harmony of interests between the global centre and the comprador (compromising) bridgehead within the periphery. In a nutshell, with the help of penetration, elements of the ‘top dog’ or elite ideology reach the consciousness of the underdog- or exploited sections of society. The penetration of the ideology is linked to segmentation.

Segmentation allows the underdog only a limited view of reality. It acts to obscure the true nature of the relationship between strong and weak. The segmentation is the result of two processes, marginalisation and fragmentation.

Marginalisation and **Fragmentation** exclude the peripheral agents from the centre and from each other. Together, marginalisation and fragmentation serve to create greater level of disharmony within the periphery than within the centre, while simultaneously preventing the interests of the exploited within the periphery from coinciding with the exploited within the centre. In other words, both marginalisation and fragmentation force the ‘underdogs’ to the edge of society, condemn them as insignificant, divide them and keep them away from each other. Here it needs to be stated that while exploitation and oppression might go hand in hand, they are not identical. Galtung stated that ‘these are short-hand formations for complex matters in economic, social and political orders that have consequences such as shortage of nutrition, lack of freedom, lack of togetherness, deprivation of well-being in general’.

In a similar vein, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. had spoken about the Giant Triplets i.e. racism, materialism and militarism as structural forces that propagate violence or the causes of all violence. Since indirect violence is deeply rooted in pervasive societal forces, its effects are as diverse as racism, poverty, hunger, sexism, violation of human rights and militarism.

Johan Galtung also pointed out that the threat of violence is also a form of violence. He defined violence beyond direct violence and pointed out violence as an 'avoidable impairment of fundamental human needs and life, that lowers the actual degree to which someone is able to meet their needs below that which would otherwise be possible'. He argued that apart from deliberately inflicted harm, economic misery, repression and alienation are also types of violence. Therefore, violence is any physical, emotional, verbal, institutional, structural or spiritual behaviour, attitude, policy or condition that diminishes, dominates or destroys others and ourselves.

Structural violence may be contained through granting rewards and not simply by giving punishments, for instance, immoderate expenditures are readily awarded under capitalism. Structure violence confines the range of options that individuals have available to pursue their objectives and fulfill their potential. It exists even though someone is not hurt. Conflicting behaviour such as the issuing of credible threats to others' interests and values, the destruction of property and forced displacement can lead to people acting violently; obstruct a realisation of the potential, and therefore do violence. Structural violence is present even when there is no subject-to-object relationship or no overt and distinguishable goal incompatibility. It emerges from non-violent intentions and is therefore included in attitudes despite the absence of a self-proclaimed intention to harm. Structural violence is latent as well as manifest. Moreover it increases the latent potential for violence, such as highly tense situations which reduce individual's capacity to pursue their objectives.

5.4.3 Difference between Direct and Structural Violence

Structural violence is both conceptually and empirically separable from direct and behavioural violence in many ways.

Direct violence refers to intentional events that harm or kill individuals or groups. Like direct violence, structural violence also kills people but does so slowly because it manifests in social inequalities. It can be both physical as well as psychological. It may work on the body and soul. The harm is exacerbated by socio-political structures and decisions that deprive people of their access to basic needs necessary for fulfilling their full potentials in life.

In direct violence, the consequences of the act can be traced back to concrete persons as actors. In structural violence, the consequences of the acts cannot be traced back to concrete persons or are no longer meaningful because there may not be any person who directly harms another person in the structure.

Negative peace is characterised by the absence of direct violence. Positive peace is characterised by the absence of structural violence. Both (direct and structural violence) can be expressed through physical and psychological violence, directed at specific objects or not, with acts that are intended or unintended, and expressed in manifest or latent terms. Both (direct and structural violence) are interdependent forces. Although direct violence tends to be more visible and easily perceived, there is no reason to assume that structural violence amounts to less suffering than direct violence.

5.5 DIMENSIONS OF VIOLENCE

5.5.1 Cultural Violence

Before understanding cultural violence, it is imperative that one should know what culture is conceptually. Culture is a dynamic living concept of values and ideas, which reflect the context within which people live and work. It is dynamic because the 'derivation of experiences' are rarely the same for any two persons and, never the same over time. Avruch contends that culture 'to some extent is always situational, flexible and responsive to the exigencies of the worlds that individual confront'. He posits that 'cultural attributes may even vary from person to person within a single culture because of overlapping group memberships'. In nutshell, culture is a totality of values, norms, attitudes, beliefs, gender relations, child-rearing practices, governance, etc. It is an economic, political, social, and spiritual organisation of people's existence.

In the 1990s, Galtung supplemented his violence typology with another category and introduced the concept of cultural violence. Galtung, in the early 1990s, explained how culture could in some instances, constitute a type of violence. He established a sort of triangle between direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence. On cultural violence, he stated that 'by cultural violence we mean those aspects of culture, the symbolic sphere of our existence – exemplified by religion and ideology, language and art, empirical science and formal science – that can be used to justify or legitimate direct or structural violence. Stars, crosses and crescents; flags, anthems and military parades; the ubiquitous portrait of the leader; inflammatory speeches and posters – all of these come to mind...The features mentioned above are 'aspect of culture', not entire culture.'

There is no truly complete violent culture, but within culture, there are certain aspects, which could be used to justify or legitimise structural violence or direct violence, for example, female genital mutilation in some African tribes. Nevertheless, there are cultures, which transmit traditions of nonviolent behaviour and commemorate and honour nonviolent values and qualities. But, nonviolent traditions in most cultures, religions and philosophies most of the time remain dormant due to the prevalence of violent manifestations.

The legitimisation of the culture aspects, which justifies the direct or structural violence, is known as cultural violence. Pierre Bourdieu also states that the 'cultural violence is the unjust distribution of opportunities for determining the symbols and cognitive components prevailing in a society'. The fundamental inequality of differential access to power and resources is justified through the normative and enshrined ideological beliefs, cultural proclivities and equal access. For example, Eurocentric domination has limited the ability of the African Americans to advance and prosper in the United States. The trickled down effect of the massive direct violence against blacks had resulted in colossal structural violence. Structural violence has produced and reproduced massive cultural violence with racist ideas everywhere. The vertical cultural mosaic – result of colonialism, has structured societies in a way that different groups are wedged between the perceived 'truly dominant' and 'truly subjugated'. Similarly caste oppression of the schedule castes in India by upper castes for generations is a form of cultural violence.

This wedging of different groups between 'truly dominant' and 'truly subjugated' has led to the hierarchy of cultures. In the hierarchy of cultures, the indigenous cultures are at the bottom, overlaid by immigrant cultures consisting of those brought over as slaves, indentured labour, and others, and the dominant colonising cultures are at the top. As a

result, the experiences and interpretations of 'truly dominant' - who had more power, relative to other groups or societies, dominated the socio-cultural landscape of the 'truly subjugated'. This domination is endorsed and imposed onto all who rely on societal institutions whereas the experiences and interpretations of 'truly subjugated' - who wield less control, find little support and expression in the broader society and face discrimination.

Throughout the world, cultural practices systematically discriminate against women where they are denied the right to vote, suffer from domestic abuse, and are excluded from employment opportunities. The justification to curtail women's human rights is that the concept of human rights is 'imperialistic' and the 'rights are culture-specific and culturally determined'.

From the above discussion, it is clear that direct violence is an event, structural violence is a process and cultural violence is an evolution. Cultural violence makes direct and structural violence look, even feel, right or at least not wrong. As studied in this Unit the religion, ideology, language, etc not only exemplify the people's symbolic sphere of existence but also are used to justify or legitimise direct or structural violence.

5.5.2 Economic Violence

Economic violence is rooted in the structure of the production relationships and its consequences for workers and consumers. Poverty, unfair hiring procedures, insufficient health care, joblessness and wage dumping etc are the expressions of economic violence. The unjust economic power structures create conditions due to which certain social groups possess more capital than other groups and the materially rich groups utilise their privileged status to exploit other groups. These unjust economic structures are seen as the state's failure to provide people access to basic needs. Poor people suffer from poverty, hunger and malnutrition while the rich of that society live in relative luxury.

All these conditions lead individuals to believe that they have not received a fair share of the benefits and resources available in that society. Thus, the inequalities in wealth create circumstances for conflict and violence. For example, the class conflict within a society and international conflicts between the rich developed countries and poverty-stricken developing countries are the manifestation of economic violence and unjust power relationships. The neo-liberal economic policies of North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, G8 countries and (World Trade Organisation (WTO) lead sometime to severe economic violence.

Globalisation has widened the manifestations of economic violence. There is no doubt that globalisation has resulted in market growth. However, it has also increased the income disparity around the world. Relaxed trade regulations and increased communication networks have created powerful multinational conglomerates that derive huge profits off under-paid labourers in developing countries. The result is horrific structural violence to workers who toil under brutal conditions. It has also created conditions of chronic poverty, food and nutrition insecurity in urban as well as in rural areas. Globalisation has influenced people's incomes and livelihoods and consequently their life style and food habits. As a result, the problems of under-nutrition and over-nutrition are increasing which are putting extra burden on the health care system.

5.5.3 Political violence

Political violence has no single accepted definition. Generally, political violence consists of those types of collective action that involve great physical force and cause damage to

an adversary or violence for political gain. It encompasses naxalism, guerrilla warfare, national liberation movements and sometimes even strikes and demonstrations that turn violent. The state can also be violent in repressing dissent on minority communities that seek political or other rights. 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'. 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. This phenomenon can be seen among guerrillas, paramilitary groups, tyrannical regimes, extremist religious and ethnic groups and others, that aim at undermining the other in order to achieve hegemony over a region, state or a group.

If one leaves aside state or state sponsored violence then political violence comprises of the 'collective attack within a political community against a political regime'. Violence in political movements may emerge intentionally or accidentally as the 'deliberate infliction or threat of infliction of physical injury or damage for political ends' or as violence 'which occurs unintentionally in the course of severe political conflict'. According to Apter, 'political violence disorders explicitly for a designated and reordering purpose; to overthrow a tyrannical regime; to redefine and realize justice and equality; to achieve independence and territorial autonomy; or to impose one's religious or doctrinal beliefs'.

Various forms of political violence have been recognized by state and non-state actors including wars, terrorism and other violent political conflicts that occur within or between states and state-perpetrated violence such as genocide, repression, disappearances, torture, organised violent crimes and other abuses of human rights.

Political violence takes place due to many political, economic, societal, community and demographic factors. For example, the lack of democratic processes, unequal access to power, grossly unequal distribution of resources, unequal access to resources, rapid demographic changes, control over key natural resources and inequality between groups, the fuelling of group fanaticism along ethnic, national or religious lines and the ready availability of small arms and other weapons lead to overt political or collective violence. At times, governments and police forces also engage themselves in terrorism and political violence.

Terrorism is a specific form of political violence that usually has the purpose of creating fear or terror among a population. Political violence may or may not have the purpose of causing fear among a populace. Sometimes it targets a given political figure to remove that individual from power, as in an assassination. Or it may be a more general insurrection or violent protest on political grounds.

5.5.4 Social Violence

Structuralism asserts that the 'individual actors are not completely free agents capable of determining particular outcomes. Rather, individuals are embedded in relational structures that shape their identities, interests and interactions.' Therefore the social location of a person, group or groups is crucial if one wants to understand their vulnerability to violence of all types.

Social structures include sexism, racism, caste system (in the case of South Asia) as well as class-based structures. These structures are the social axis of the structural violence. The relational structures constrain the agency as well as individual choices, which result in the violation of human rights. However, it is still debatable as to how much these

structures constrained agency. The person or group that violently resists structural violence becomes an aggressor because he uses overt or obvious violence. Those who maintain injustice by police or military power are more clearly the aggressors than those who react to them.

Social violence is an important consequence of the abuse of political and economic powers. The manifestations of social violence cover a large spectrum of possibilities that go from the disproportionate increase in robberies and crime, mob rule, revolt and guerrilla warfare that may turn into revolutions and civil wars. Another important factor is rooted in the rapid technological changes that accelerate and stampede social changes, trans-culturalisations that burst traditional norms and leave a void.

An example of social violence is the caste system which forces people to accept a demeaning role from birth or the one which forces them to acquiesce in demeaning patterns of life is a structure maintained by dominant groups in power. Labour riots, race riots, lynching mobs, fights among delinquent gangs, and attacks by organised criminal syndicates are the manifestations of the social violence that have punctuated the history of social change.

5.6 POVERTY AS STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

Poverty is one of the worst or deadliest forms of structural violence. As a social condition, poverty is prevalent all over the world but with varying expressions. Poverty is extreme, structural, systemic and sustained economic deprivation, which in the first instance typically produces powerlessness. As Amartya Sen has shown, such structural denials of basic freedom result in agency constrained to the extent that individuals become unable or lack the 'capability' to meet their basic needs. It not only denies 'one freedom' to human beings but also amplifies or multiplies the other forms of freedom, which render the poor people disproportionately vulnerable to a whole array of violations. Poverty means a concomitant impairment of access to resources, access to adequate healthcare, water, shelter, etc.

The present day growth of disparity between rich and poor has resulted in an unequal world system. The exploitative and unjust social, political and economic systems have given birth to extensive poverty and hunger, which have become a pressing issue for much of the world. According to one analyst, 'nearly a fifth of all human beings live below one dollar per day.' UNU-WIDER, in its report of 2006, mentioned that 'the richest one per cent of adults alone owned forty per cent of global assets in the year 2000 and that the richest ten per cent of adults accounted for eighty five per cent of the world total.'

Radical disparities in poverty are rampantly apparent among children and women. Even the booming economy has failed to reach them. Women and children suffer from the unjust, harmful, institutionalised inequalities of wealth, social status, and power. Due to poverty, these disadvantaged and socially marginalised groups suffer from disproportionate death, disability, despair, humiliation, and heartache.

5.7 STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE, GENDER INEQUALITY AND SEXISM

Systematic structures of society lead to endemic global sexism that is termed patriarchy, which in turn brings in the patterns of violence, discrimination and exclusion towards

women. Patriarchy is based on gender inequality and male dominance. It thrives on the basis of masculinity associated with the use of force. Nevertheless, violence against women has many forms but it has only one dimension, both in public sphere and private space – that violence is structural. The horror-stricken forms of violence, from domestic abuse, rape, and female infanticide to state violence - all violate women's fundamental human rights. Violence against women is also endemic to patriarchy, class and caste society and power relations that construct society.

Browne posits that 'sexism is a system of beliefs and attitudes based on the alleged inferiority of women; an inferiority which translates into attitudes that hold that women cannot be believed, that women are inferior, and that women are inherently subordinate to men'. Such permeated values of 'sexism' first at home from birth and upbringing are later reflected in or spread out to their public spheres. Here again cultural and customary practices perpetuate structural violence be it in the realm of religion, class or caste or other prejudices.

Socially, in their daily life, women are subjected to a state of affairs where imposed unequal and unfair obligations are accepted as something natural. Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois contend that 'since social structures institutionalize structural violence, social structures therein render that violence invisible'. The social constructs see women as sexual, reproductive and cultural objects. For men, her family, her children, the State and its institutions, as well for the market, the woman is just a sexual, reproductive and cultural object. Patriarchy supports a system of social reproduction based on sexual differentiation and promotes the ideas and values of male supremacy. Besides restraining, trivialising and dismissing women's concerns, patriarchy also re-victimises them.

The lower location of women in the cultural hierarchy makes them extremely vulnerable to structured inequalities and violence because many of the inequalities are gender-based. In the economic sphere, the neoliberal welfare policies and social welfare programmes have further degraded women's human conditions. They suffer severe exploitation because their domestic work is not considered productive and lacks usage and exchange value in the formal and informal labour market outside the home. Especially, rural women are either excluded from the formal labour market or are paid less due to their low level of literacy.

5.8 STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE AND RACISM

Cultural racism categorises groups or societies on the bases of 'negative' and 'positive traits' of their race. Race can be based on an imagined or constructed origin, or on the colour of one's skin, body features, etc. The 'positive' traits, which can be appreciated and controlled in small doses such as food, clothing, music, dance, literature etc, are regarded acceptable because they are considered to be non-threatening to the dominant culture. And, if the 'positive traits' are controlled they shift to 'negative' traits. The 'negative' traits are thought to be signs of maintenance of traditional ways, violation of social norms and law, lack of assimilation and integration into the dominant mainstream cultures.

Based on such perceived negative and positive traits, certain cultures appear to be inferior, deviant, and inherently inassimilable and reinforce certain cultural groups; the dominant mainstream, basically an invisible group, is able to reinforce its sense of superiority and maintain its normative power. To conclude, it is the tendency to focus on

culture rather than violence or power, which allows violence to be enacted, works to the advantage of the dominant, colonially entrenched culture.

5.9 SUMMARY

Systemic structures place populations at a greater risk of human rights violations. The theory of structural violence provides a useful framework for understanding the structural violations of human rights and need for human security. It has been also found that uneven distributions of power lead to economic and social inequality in a society.

Structural violence is a useful theory to locate the origins of structural violations of human rights, that cause human insecurity, which ultimately leads to crime, military conflict, group violence, non-peaceful transfers of governmental power, diseases and public health problems, acute environmental disasters, floods, droughts, earthquakes, environmental changes, global warming, water shortage, pollution, and economic crises.

To secure an over all security from structural violence, one has to look at alternatives that focus on both direct and structural violence and its mitigation. One such concept is that of human security. It is personal security for the individual from violence, access to the basic essentials of life, protection from crime and terrorism, diseases, political corruption, forced migration, absence of human rights, freedom from violations based on gender, rights of political and cultural communities, political, economic, and democratic development, preventing the misuse and overuse of natural resources; environmental sustainability; and efforts to curtail pollution.

5.10 TERMINAL QUESTIONS

1. Define violence and give its typologies.
2. Sum up Galtung's ideas on structural violence.
3. How is poverty a cause of violence?
4. How do racism and patriarchy constitute silent violence?

SUGGESTED READINGS

Arendt, Hannah., *On Violence*, Brace and World, New York, 1970.

Brock-Utne, Birgit., *Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective*, Pergamon, New York, 1985.

Caprioli, Mary., "Gendered Conflict", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 37, No. 1, 2000, pp. 51-68.

Chan, Steve., "The Impact of Defense Spending on Economic Performance: A Survey of Evidence and Problems", *Orbis*, 1985

DeGrasse, Robert W. Jr., *Military Expansion, Economic Decline*, Council on Economic Priorities, New York, 1983.

Domenach, J. M., "The Ubiquity of Violence", *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 30, No. pp. 717, 1978.

Elias, Robert, and Jennifer Turpin., (eds.), *Rethinking Peace*, Boulder, CO, Lynne Rienner, 1994.

Galtung, Johan., "Violence, Peace and Peace Research", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 4-5, 1969.

Galtung, Johan., *The True World - A Transnational Perspective*, The Free Press, New York, 1980.

Ghali, Boutros Boutros., *An Agenda for Peace*, 2nd Edition, United Nation Press, New York, 1995.

Hawkesworth, Mary E., *Beyond Oppression: Feminist Theory and Political Strategy*, Continuum: New York, 1990.

Kakar, Sudhir., *The Colors of Violence: Cultural Identities, Religion, and Conflict*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1996.

Kaldor, Mary., *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1999.

Mintz, Alex, and Randolph T. Stevenson., "Defense Expenditures, Economic Growth, and the Peace Dividend: A Longitudinal Analysis of 103 Countries", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 283-305, 1995.

Sandler, Todd, and Keith Hartley., *The Economics of Defence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

Sivard, Ruth Leger., *World Military and Social Expenditures*, 16th Edition, World Priorities, Washington DC, 1996.

Tilly, Charles., "Inequality, Democratisation, and De-democratisation", *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 37-43, 2003.

Toffler, Alvin., *Power shift, Knowledge, Wealth and Violence at the Edge of the 21st Century*, Bantam Books, New York, 1990.