About the possibilities of nonviolent solution that conflicts have

The non-violent solution to any conflict is always possible, the only requirement or condition will be that the actors in question are reasonable enough to reach agreements. Each party will give their arguments, the other will listen to them and in turn will formulate the respective reply, until the agreement is reached.

The rational dialogue assumes same conditions in the interlocution. This fact not always happen, it is very common, it is almost the norm in our daily life, but it does not always happen. The difference in the interlocution occurs by excess or default, that is, it may be that one of the parties feels rights to demand mere obedience from their counterpart, or on the contrary, one of the actors not having enough awareness of their own dignity, for that reason he or she feels incapable of assuming the choice of his/her own life and delegates such responsibility to another.

The character of a valid interlocutor is a political question, not a metaphysical one. That is, it is included in the practices that occur between the actors and has nothing to do with any nature, character or condition inherent in them. Social practices are always historical and contextualized, they depend on a particular culture, a specific historical context, some presupposed world images, a series of traditions and customs. It has been asserted that this is not a metaphysical question. That is, the preconditions for interlocution are not inherent to the nature of the actors, to their character, to their context, in the contrary, everything is part of the same social construction.

The example that comes almost automatically to the fore is that of the so-called gender relations. In contemporary Western culture slowly, but unequivocally, women have taken a place they did not have just a century ago. It was considered that the woman had a place naturally subordinated to man, that she should depend economically on him and from there depend on all other aspects of social life. Practically the twentieth century has brought a new perspective in this respect. Women have joined the labor markets and from this, all the relationships between men and women have been reconfigured. The independence that women receive by sustaining their own income breaks the dependence that until then seemed natural and makes it look like what it really is, a mere social practice, embedded in a specific context and in specific historical and geographical conditions too.
Inequal practices seem normal until something makes them see what they are: unequal. We say that inequality is suddenly evident. In effect, "something" occurs, for which a repeated social practice begins to be seen as discriminatory, inequitable, unjust. Everyday life and habits "naturalizes" practices, but these are never natural, in the contrary, social practices always are, that is, they are always a specific social construction that responds to specific requirements to address a specific situation. The repeated practice was normalizing them, making them appear as obvious, as natural and even necessary. Everything occurs like this, but suddenly an event occurs and it makes inequality obvious.

A warning that occurs immediately is that this fact is not merely an individual behavior. The individual himself is not but a social construction. Social practices are governed by symbolic frameworks through which individuals or social actors guide their actions and behaviors without almost noticing the effect of those symbols. Every individual behavior has a social pattern, was for example, the claim of American feminists in the 60s of the XX century. They perceived that the patterns in which relationships develop within the home was not but behavior patterns socially and symbolically structured.

Nevertheless, the decision can only be made by the individual person. Everything starts there, without the individual decision to configure their practices in such and such a way there is not social process possible.

What can be done to transform inequitable social practices that are already operating and regulate unequal relationships between people? Obviously we must reestablish a valid interlocution, for it will be necessary to work in establishing the conscience of the own dignity of the part that seems weak. This process must be reach a state that he or she is able to formulate its own arguments and make them stay in front of the interlocutor.

This is precisely the process that Gandhi pushed with his non-violent action proposal, called Satyagraha. Gandhi takes up three concepts of Indian culture 01) satya, 02) ahimsa and 03) tapasia, and transforms them into categories of political struggle that acquire meaning in universal history.

01) Satya is truthfulness, “sat” is a root word that means to be, in this way it is understood that Satyagraha means to stay attached to the truth, to what it really is. Surely in our western mind operates at this time the thomistic - aristotelian definition of truth as adequacy, of the word with the thing, however, this conception aims at something totally
different, inevitably connected with pragmatism. The truth or falsity of the statements will be given by their practical effects in reality. In this way in the Gandhian approach, truth and morals are unequivocally connected. Satya will be the practical parameter of verifying the truth. If religion does not transform social practices, then this religion does not work.

02) Ahimsa or nonviolence is the second key concept in the approach that Gandhi makes. It really is an ethical virtue in the tradition of Indian philosophy. Of all the principles of religion, this is the first, violence is the antithesis of truth, antonyms are principles. When one goes out to meet the other through dialogue and empathy, there is an encounter with the truth.

03) Tapasya is asceticism, that is, it is religious austerity, mortification, penance. These are practices and habits followed by the individual who wants to achieve moral and spiritual perfection. The expected or sought after is the constitution of power or spiritual strength and this is achieved only by reaching full freedom, it is about learning to love unconditionally, a question that is probably problematic and even painful, but it will be the main goal of any path spiritual. The suffering, the hardships, the shortcomings have no value in themselves, in any case, the value of asceticism is given in that it becomes the only way through which spiritual strength is achieved.

Finally, there are three characteristics that close this reflection on the non-violent struggle to achieve peace.

01) It is an educational process. The individual or the collective actor does not "know" everything from the beginning, they discover it and the rhythm can be already more accelerated, and slower, because it is a process that each one has to travel by himself. The process may not even reach its final goal, however, the journey will always be an advance for those involved, because improvements in the life of the person or community life, as well as in the processes of communication and empathy will be effective.

From certain perspectives, perhaps the Satyagraha is very slow, but in exchange for the speed the internalization and the consequent appropriation of the process for the actors involved in it is the main achieved.

02) The second aspect to highlight is the rescue of the value of the individual in all social processes. The decision starts in each one, but it must also socialized been, communicated and became collective, in the contrary, if there is no individual decision, there
is no possible social process. So, it is a dual process, begins in the individual person, but is carried out in the own community.

03 The third principle takes distance from a purely Western social conception, because it refers to private property. There is no desire for accumulation, rather, the sense of belonging to a specific community is directed in the sense of what is now called sustainability, that is, the individual and the community have the right to extract from the land that and only that which it is necessary for them to subsist, bearing in mind also the possibility that the following generations can also achieve the satisfaction of their own needs with the same resources.

The presentation of the arguments set forth here confirms that any dialogue between mutually recognized interlocutors is a way to resolve any controversy that may arise in the daily interrelation. If this recognition of mutual validity is not given in the dialogue, the corresponding process must be done to achieve it.
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