

In excess of 1.6
million people each



In the last few years, we have visibly seen a considerable spike in violence not only in the United States but all over the world. One of the main reasons why this is made possible comes down to the use of social media and the ease of having something recorded. While there are many negatives to being able to have such a power, such as seeing the nature of man as they truly are and the death and destruction they can cause, it also has positive effects such as showing the most accurate events of an incident or the third side of man. This paper looks to define violence, understand why it happens and show that there are clear forms of illegal and justified violence.

Violence is characterized by the World Health Organization (WHO) as the deliberate utilization of physical power or control, whether it be threatened or actual, against another person, group, or community which results in the likely event of psychological harm, injury, and/or death. WHO also defines violence with the intentionality of committing the act itself without the regard of the outcome produced. Generally speaking, even something that was never intentionally supposed to be conceived as violent can be considered as such if it damages in any way.

Violence comes in many forms and as a whole can be preventable. Violence has become a global circumstance resulting in the deaths of an excess of 1.6 million people each year, constituting it to being one of the leading most cause of death in the world. 1 This violence can either be directed at oneself, such as the acts of self-abuse and suicide; interpersonal violence, which can include violence by a close family member or friend and has the examples of domestic violence, elder and child abuse, assault and property crimes; and lastly, violence can be collective, which is found within groups

and include hate crimes and are usually socially, politically or economically based.

These crimes are also committed by strangers and are usually the rarest kind out of the three types. The act of violence itself, is as old as time as the

oldest recorded conflict was the Battle of Zhoulo in the area of China, approximately 2500 BC. Like the greater part of primates, we battle and sometimes also kill individuals from our own species, and this conduct is normal and almost widespread across the board that it shows up all through our history. Be that as it may, while deadly viciousness is a piece of our individual hereditary predisposition, it is for the most part administered by the development of our social structures and the communities inside them. Violence is universal. We see it in network shows, films,

computer games, and commercials; we read about it in news articles, magazines, and books; we talk about it—both when we describe what's occurring in today's society, and more regularly metaphorically with a variety of fierce expressions that infest our ordinary every day speech; we fear it while having our security systems, firearms, and police and military presence; and we encounter it, straightforwardly or in aroundabout way, in our homes, schools, groups, work environments, playing fields, and war zones.

2 From a sociological point of view, it should not shock anyone that the manner by which we comprehend and assess viciousness is uneven, possibly unpredictable. Violence, similar to all types of conduct, is very logical and somewhat contextual. It is difficult to imagine that there could be an all inclusive “ violence gauge” that could impartially figure out what is or isn't vicious without representing certain factors.

<https://assignbuster.com/in-excess-of-16-million-people-each/>

To completely see any demonstration of violence, we should consider the normal line of inquiries that we ought to ask of all actions: when and where did it happen, who were the actors, what was the motive behind it, what really happened, and how did people respond to the act. There might be extra things that need to be asked however those will at any rate get us on track for a clearer total perception. In the event that we agree that violence is very contextual, then the following logic can be argued that violence is socially built as a construct. Be that as it may, for some individuals, this sociological interpretation of violence is missing the main point. For the regular person (non sociologist), viciousness has little to do with the idea of nurturing and nearly everything to do with the nature. On the off chance that violence is in fact in our genetic makeup, at that point we would not be required to look at the social institutions we have built that empower and excuse this same viciousness. In the event that violence is supposed to be common, and if some individuals merit what they get as a result of violence, I would argue that at that point every single one of us should just be worried about our own particular conduct; the societal impacts are auxiliary to our individual and natural inclinations. 3 Specialists in the field of criminology, psychology, education, and sociology have all been endeavoring to comprehend the pathways to violence in which a couple of basic perceptions develop.

The initial, and most alarming, is that people, similar to a couple of different species, are unavoidably brutally violent to each other. The real predator of the human race has always been other humans. 4 The second observation is that all brutality isn't the same. Some violence is because of impairment due

to drugs and alcohol, mental illness, revenge and retribution and finally in the heat of the moment.

How any individual comes to the idea of committing violence is a mind boggling blend of conditions, and it is relatively difficult to know precisely “why” for any given demonstration of violence. We do however understand that not all people are violent by nature and that some societies in the world are more violent than others. It is because of this, that we are able to objectively view violence as a whole and its impact in the world. 5 This brings me to my main argument if violence is justifiable.

One of the main things one would need to look at is philosopher Hannah Arendt in her work *On Violence*, where she takes a separate stance on the notions of power, force, and authority by placing them in their own categories and defining them as individual entities. She would label power as the ability to take a certain action, a violent force of the energy being exerted by the group and the violence itself as the opposition of said power. 6 As I said before about the contextually of violence, it still is far too vague for us to perceive. At whatever point an individual or a group is the unfortunate victim of an act of violence, they are surely being abused in a certain type of way.

Particularly there are inalienable rights we as people take to be basic human rights which are disregarded; those rights are that over one's own body (i. e. the privilege to have one's own body) and that of autonomous independence. In this way when somebody is the gambit of violence, they are either having their body or their self-governance damaged, or in some

cases, both. As I have previously argued, violence can materialize in various distinctive ways. It could, without much of a stretch, be demonstrated that violence can be characterized into four various types dependent of two criteria.

Violence can be personal or it can be institutional, and can be either obvious or secretive. Individual or personal violence alludes to those actions which are directed at specific people. These can be actions spurred by anger, passion, jealousy or greed and can come with an entire host of different expectations. Interpersonal violence is somewhat exponentially different in relation to institutionalized violence in which it is an act that is directed at specific communities or individuals. Some could argue that violence is never justifiable. The main idea could be seen by some taking a philosophical approach to the idea that all violence is justified if the person claims that it is.

An example of this could be the use of the 1940's and the rise of Nazism. Everyone can agree that overt violence is and always will be justifiable otherwise, we'd all be speaking Deutsch and it would probably be like an episode of *The Man in the High Castle*. It would be said that it places civilization on a slippery slope on determining what makes it constitute justification.

The logic stems from quite possibly Immanuel Kant's universality theory in that, if it is good for all than it is good. In some examples, violence is not justified and therefore under the universalization law, no violence is ever justified. It is my theory that you cannot have a universal law as the standard to determine that if violence is justified, it is always justified and if

there is one way it is not, then no violence is justified. For me, it seems that when looking at the question about justifying violence, we need to look deeper into the ethics and the circumstances. I am well aware that this also comes down to too many different variables as everyone perceives things differently. As there are also so many different moral theories such as Kantian, utilitarianism, etc. it is hard to say which is right.

Universally, does having this moral backing make us morally less violent in society? Life in itself is not merely black and white but is constantly in a state of gray. But, we must also remember that gray is the byproduct of black and white together. To create the gray area, you need both to white and black to exist; therefore, it can also be said that as both white and black are two distinct colors in themselves that when combined make the shade of gray, the justification or lack thereof of violence are also likewise the two distinct actions/behaviors which result from a myriad of situations. I'd like to give an example of when I feel an act of violence is justified. The scenario will be loosely based on my training and experience of being a law enforcement officer.

While patrolling my assigned area, I am dispatched to a possible domestic violence incident call (one that happens fairly regularly). For the sake of the example, let's say that this is the first time I am responding to the residence and the info that I was provided was that an argument is pursuing. When I arrive, I find a man physically beating his spouse and promptly use the proper use of force continuum as dictated by the FBI. Unfortunately, the situation escalates and I am forced to discharge my primary weapon killing him. There will be those that feel what I should've done in my situation

would be to try to subdue him by less lethal means or worse yet, try shooting him in an extremity. My response to that is fairly simple. While yes, we are trained to shoot and to do so well, the probability of hitting that target is much harder especially in a stressful environment with adrenaline pumping.

It is much easier to hit a larger, center mass target than one that is smaller and moving. Also, an officer is personally responsible for every single round that is fired from his weapon. None of us as officers want to bear the thought that while attempting to neutralize a dangerous threat, we miss and either wound or kill someone in our line of fire. The example I have given, while fairly simple, shows how violence can be justified.

The violence that I had employed to defend not only innocents around me, but also to keep myself safe from harm, I had used the proper use of escalation that the circumstances permitted me, and the violence that I used was proportional to the force needed to stop the threat. 7 It is that criteria, that I firmly believe that you could find my gray area in which violence can be justified. For the ones that say nay, that situation could possibly have resulted in the injury or death of someone and it was because of my own action of violence, that helped prevent a tragedy. I would also like to show a secondary example but this time as political violence. Sinn Féin is the political party of the Republic of Ireland and strives to have a united Ireland free of British rule. It was well documented that before the Easter Rising of 1916, protestants had widely oppressed Irish Catholics. Feeling that only violence was needed to stop this, a few men took up arms against Parliamentary rule to claim Ireland as free.

While this could be widely debated, the fact remains that if it wasn't for the the act of war for independence, Ireland would not be a free state today.

8 As a whole society, one could only hope that violence starts to fade away (and some statistics suggest as such⁹). However, we need to be realistic in the idea that we still possess violent traits and tendencies.

Violence is simply just man recreating himself and there is a general inclination for all men to desire some type of power in life. However, when violence is warranted, it must be considered merciful and appropriate.

Philosophers, possibly including myself, rarely claim that there is an intrinsic value to human life. Kant would suggest that we should all treat others "as ends and not as mere means" which suggests that we value others as they are.

10 By reevaluating the ethics behind actions and looking at the morality of society, we can determine what needs to be changed to lead to less violence. The fact that violence is a never ending spiral, also makes it its very weakness. Until then, great men will be forged in fire as it is the privilege of lesser men to light the flame.