

## Satyagraha and resilience: From violence prevention to liberation\*

Rashid Ahmed\*\*

Kopano Ratele\*\*\*

Umesh Bawa\*\*

*Oppression and social inequality are central to an understanding of violence. The review of resilience research suggest that there are potentially many protection facts at the individual, family and community level that could help mediate negative outcomes like violence. It is argued here that socio-cultural and socio-political dimensions are particularly significant for post-colonial contexts and that the notion of satyagraha is a useful construct to expand our conceptualization of community resilience, as well as inform violence preventions.*

### INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) report (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi & Lozano, 2002) identifies violence as a global public health priority and the increasing scholarship and intervention programmes attest to this global concern. It is identified as the leading cause of

---

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Hind Swaraj Centenary International Seminar, New Delhi, February 12-14, 2009. We thank Reneë Klink and Fatima Peters whose help was invaluable, and without whom it would not have been possible to complete this manuscript.

We also thank the University of the Western Cape for funding, that made this research project possible.

We take full responsibility for any errors but this paper is a collective effort. Thanks to all colleagues who helped in various ways. A special thanks to Prof. M. Mohanty and Prof Seedat for all that they have done.

\*\* Department of Psychology, University of the Western Cape, Private Bag XI7, Bellville, 7535, South Africa. <rasahmed@uwc.ac.za>

\*\*\* Institute for Social and Health Sciences, University of South Africa and Crime, Violence and Injury Lead Programme, Medical Research Council, South Africa. <ratelek@unisa.ac.za>

non-natural death, with homicide rates ranging from 0.9 per 100 000 for countries in Europe, and parts of Asia and the Pacific, to 17.6 per 100 000 in African countries and 36.4 per 100 000 in Latin America (Krug et al., 2002). In the South African context, researchers have called for scholarship to inform prevention initiatives (Stevens, Seedat & van Niekerk, 2004).

While the growing body of scholarship has enriched our understanding of risk processes and possible interventions for violence, two lacunae have been identified in the literature. First, in spite of significant differences in outcome measures like homicide rates between high and low income contexts, the social determinants of violence do not always appear to be foregrounded in the literature. Specifically, violence as being related to oppression and social inequality is an area that could benefit from a more substantive engagement. Second, the focus on violence appears to be on risk factors that lead to negative outcomes, with the focus on protective factors or resilience being relatively new and relatively unexplored. This study attempts to address these lacunae by starting to develop a conceptualization of resilience that can address these issues. We argue that the construct satyagraha could help to expand the current parameters of the scholarship on resilience and inform current approaches to violence.

The scope of the literature on the risk factors for violence is extensive and the WHO report (Krug et al., 2002) makes a distinction between collective and inter-personal violence. The emphasis in the literature is however focused on inter-personal violence. In line with this focus, we commence with a brief, selective review of the current literature on risk factors for inter-personal violence. Our argument is that while there is an acknowledgement of socio-political issues in the literature, mainstream approaches to violence still largely remain, ahistorical and acontextual. We therefore review this literature and foreground social inequality and oppression as central to an understanding of inter-personal violence. This is followed by a selective review of the literature on resilience. In particular, we focus on those resilience processes more directly relevant to risk for violence, as well as attempt to identify some of the limitations in current conceptualizations of resilience. Our discussion on satyagraha is framed as an attempt to broaden current conceptualizations of resilience. It is presented as a potential protective process in high risk environments. We conclude with a brief discussion of some of the areas for future scholarship in the area.

## INDIVIDUAL LEVEL RISK FACTORS

The breadth and depth of scholarship on individual level risk factors is beyond the scope of the current paper. What we do instead is highlight some of the more important risk factors and argue that rather than conceptualizing them as being discrete, independent, variables they paint a picture of social inequality that is also mirrored at the community and social levels.

Age, sex/gender, socio-economic status (SES), 'race'<sup>1</sup> and substance use consistently appear in the literature as the most significant individual risk factors for violence (Ekman, Kaasik, Villerusa, Satrkuvienne & Bangdiwala, 2007; Krug et al., 2002; Loeber, Pardini, Homish, Wei, Crawford, Farrington, Stouthamer-Loeber, Creemers, Koehler & Rosenfeld, 2005). Both globally and nationally, the age group 15-30 is found to be at greatest risk. Krug et al. (2002), report that the highest homicide rates were found among males between the ages of 15 and 29 (19.4 per 100 000). In the context of South Africa, Seedat, van Niekerk, Jewkes, Suffla & Ratele (2009), note that "a dominant feature of violence in South Africa is the disproportionate involvement of young men as perpetrators and victims. The highest homicide and victimization rates are found among men aged 15-29 (at 184 per 100 000) and in some areas, for instance in Cape Town's townships, rates are more than twice this level" (p. 69). Basing their conclusion on data from the National Injury Mortality Surveillance System, Ratele, Swart and Seedat (2009) indicate that physical inter-personal violence in South Africa is a phenomenon that involves males against males, who are under 45 years of age, occurring mostly during weekends, at night and during the month of December. Substance use has also consistently been identified as a risk factor for violence (Carcach, 1997; Goodman, Mercy, Loya, Rosenberg, Smith, Allen, Vargas & Kolts, 1986; Krug et al., 2002)

Low SES is strongly associated with a greater risk for violence and injury (Lafflamme, 2001; Loeber et al., 2005; Van Lenthe, 2001). Violence also affects different 'race' groups disproportionately. In both high income as well as low income countries, 'blacks', remain highest at risk for violence. In the USA, for instance, in 1999, African-American youth aged 15-24 had a homicide rate of 38.6 per 100 000, more than twice the rate of Hispanic youth of this age (17.3 per 100 000) and more than 12 times the rate of Caucasian youth of the same age (3.1 per 100 000) (Krug et al., 2002).

<sup>1</sup> The use of this term needs to be problematized. Other terms included in this category are 'white', 'black', 'African' and so forth. We do not imply any fixed differences and our usage is meant to engender social equality. In spite of this, usage however could entrench existing social inequality.

Studies have also focused on personality variables that increase risk (Krug et al., 2002; Piquero, MacDonald, Dobrin, Daigle & Cullen, 2005). While the literature explores a range of personality variables (Piquero et al., 2005), we suggest that the variables, self-destructive behaviour, difficulties with impulse control and self-centredness, appear consistently in the literature. Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) theory of self-control encapsulates these variables and suggests that both victimization and offending are related to poor self-control (which they define as having six elements, namely: future orientation, self-centredness, anger/temper, lack of diligence, preference for physical rather than mental tasks, and risk preference).

## COMMUNITY LEVEL RISK FACTORS

Community level risk factors remain prominent in explanations for homicide, with guns, gangs and drugs identified as a 'deadly cocktail', that increases risk for homicide (Krug et al., 2002). Unemployment, poverty and low social capital are also identified as significant risk factors for violence (Krug et al., 2002). In the South African context the legacy of apartheid has resulted in both racially divided communities, as well as communities characterized by various forms of deprivation. 'African' communities remain poorly resourced, marked by high levels of unemployment and the absence of very basic services like adequate housing, water, and so forth (Bond, 2000).

The link between poverty and homicide is complex, and various community processes have been theorized to either increase risk or act as a buffer for a range of negative outcomes, including homicide (Cantillon, Davidson & Schweitzer, 2003; Clauss-Ehlers & Lopez-Levi, 2002; Sonn & Fisher, 1998; Wilkinson, Kawachi & Kennedy, 1998; Wolkow & Ferguson, 2001). While these authors employ different constructs and identify different processes, there is consensus that neighbourhood or community level characteristics are clearly associated with homicide rates and other forms of crime and delinquency. The earliest explanations focus on the social disorganization theory to explain why delinquency rates remained consistently high in certain cities in the United States of America. The current focus is on the construct social capital (Emmet, 2003) which attempts to explain the link between crime and community level processes. The inability of a community to develop processes like trust, reciprocity and cooperative action to realize common values and goals is argued to result in numerous negative outcomes, such as crime and violence. In their

review of the social disorganization theory, Cantillon et al. (2003) suggest that the psychological construct, a sense of community, is a useful tool for assessing community level processes, since it includes all social interactions that may precede social action. Social disorganization theory and by implication, social capital, however focus on immediate collective efficacy measured by community action. Cantillon et al. (2003) distinguish between social interactions or an 'emotional' bond and community mobilization or social action. The most important implication of this conceptualization is that community cohesion may not necessarily be reflected in social action. Drawing from their conceptualization, we can theorize that in the South African context, negative outcomes in some South African communities may be indicative of both the breakdown of community cohesion or low social capital, while in others, the community cohesion or social capital created by apartheid adversity may still be present (Ahmed, Seedat, Van Niekerk, & Bulbulia, 2004), but not be accompanied by organized social action.

### **SOCIETAL LEVEL RISK FACTORS**

The rates of violent deaths differ according to country income with the rates of violent deaths in low to middle income countries twice as high (32.1 per 100 000) compared to those in high-income countries (14.4 per 100 000) (Krug et al., 2002). Some of the significant societal level factors identified in the WHO report (Krug et al., 2002) are political structures, social conflict, poverty and 'culture'<sup>2</sup>. Poverty and 'culture' have received considerable attention in the literature, and have also produced competing explanations for homicide rates (Parker, 1989). In the North American context the social sanctioning of violence as a means to resolve conflict has been used as an explanation for homicide (Parker, 1989). According to Wolfgang & Fenacuti, cited in Parker (1989) this explanation was developed and used to explain the high homicide rates in certain groups. High homicide rates in groups like 'blacks' and 'southerners' relative to other groups, are explained by societal sanctioning (implicit or explicit) for violence as a legitimate means of resolving conflict. Parker (1989) points to the racist and stereotypical assumptions emanating from this explanation, as well as the fact that subsequent research highlighted poverty as an alternative explanation for these findings.

2 Our usage of the term 'culture' is also problematized for the reasons given previously. We do not imply fixed or 'ethnic' differences in our usage of this term.

Two explanations of the link between poverty and homicide have appeared in the literature namely, absolute deprivation and relative deprivation. Absolute deprivation proposes that poverty in itself creates untenable conditions and leaves few options beside violence for those in these situations (Brookman, 2005; Parker, 1989). The relative deprivation theory proposes that the perception of inequality with no means of achieving wealth and status lead to frustration and consequently violence directed mostly at significant others (Parker, 1989). Numerous studies support the relationship between income inequality and both mortality and homicide (Wilkinson et al., 1998). Wilkinson et al., (1998) drawing from US state level data found strong correlations between income inequality and both mortality and homicide, and weak correlations between income inequality and property crime. These findings support the relative deprivation hypothesis and suggest that a more nuanced engagement with the poverty-homicide link is required. When cultural factors are included the complexity increases, and Parker (1989) concludes that the relationship is a complex one. Research needs to hold both the competing explanations for poverty, as well as, the interaction with 'culture', which may either increase or decrease the risk for homicide.

In the South African context, both poverty and 'culture' have been identified as significant risk factors. Scholarship points to the 'culture' of violence in South Africa (Dawes & Donald, 1994; Duncan & Rock, 1994; Rock 1997; Straker, 1992) that historically emerged in both the apartheid state terror on civilians, as well as the counter-insurgent responses to counter state violence. This 'culture' of violence is associated with a country for which poverty remains one of the foremost challenges (Bond, 2000; Terre Blanche, 2006). Some scholars argue that apartheid economic inequalities have not only been maintained in the post-apartheid period, but have worsened (Bond, 2000). Bond (2000) suggests the gap between the rich and the poor increased in line with global economic trends, and that 'black' household income has dropped in the post-apartheid period.

### **THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF RISK**

Our selective review of the risk factors for inter-personal violence suggests that social inequality is a significant thread for the different risk processes. The gendered, 'racial' and class face of violence appears consistently in the literature across different contexts. There is a significant body of scholarship that highlights these social cleavages and the interactions between them. Feminist scholarship points to patriarchy and its role in reproducing gender inequalities, while Marxist scholarship points to how capitalism produces

class, 'race' and gender divisions. Our interest is in exploring more fully the 'racial' face of violence and we argue that Fanon's work still remains useful for understanding violence in post-colonial contexts. While there is considerable debate about Fanon's work (Hook, 2004), certain key features relevant for an understanding of violence in South Africa can be highlighted. Bulhan (1985) drawing on Fanon's work makes a distinction between horizontal and vertical violence. Vertical violence refers to the process by which colonial structures through, both acts of commission and omission, perpetrate violence on the oppressed with significant consequences for both the oppressor and oppressed. Bulhan (1985) highlights the significant negative outcomes in areas like health, living and psychological well-being that follow. According to Fanon (1968), the 'psyche' is marked by dehumanization, identity conflict and rage; and this internal damage is often accompanied by a corresponding oppression of other oppressed persons, referred to as horizontal violence. For Bulhan (1985) horizontal violence is the process by which the rage against, and the damage of colonialism, is directed, through projection, against those who most resemble the most oppressed part within the psyche. Horizontal violence is an attempt to expel this damage to the other, while simultaneously being most provoked by this damaged other.

What is extremely useful about this framework is that it can integrate both empirical observations, as well as, many of the individual level theories focusing on specific aspects in the genesis of violence such as self-respect (Wilkinson et al., 1998), anger (Gottfredson & Hirshi, 1990) or other elements like target gratifiability and target antagonism (Finkelhor & Asdigan, 1996). More broadly it is helpful for explaining the 'racialized' face of violence, the consistently similar profiles of offending and victimization as well as the community dysfunction that is an important risk factor for violence. For this approach to have increased utility it is important that the analysis is not confined to 'race' only. Scholarship points to the multilayered nature of racism and violence. Issues like gender (Kiguwa, 2004) class or economic deprivation (Hayes, 2004) and culture (Mkize, 2004), amongst other issues further significantly enrich our understanding.

### **COUNTERACTING RISK: RESILIENCE AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION**

While there has been a considerable interest in resilience over the last few decades, the link between resilience or protective factors and violence is a more recent one. We selectively review the literature on resilience identifying both the utility as well as some of the lacuna in this literature.

In the South African context there has been necessarily and correctly, a focus on the damaging consequences of apartheid (Nicholes & Cooper, 1990) and as a consequence the study of resilience has been less well developed. Similar to other contexts, youths from low-income contexts are often presented as 'damaged' and 'victims' of their high risk environments. Against this background the focus on South African youth as resilient is a more recent one (Dawes, 1994). There are indications that personal attributes such as optimism, humour, reflectiveness, self-efficacy, playfulness and affability can help children combat deleterious circumstances (Barbarin & Richter, 2001). Group solidarity and a sense of peer group belonging have also been identified as a protective factor among South African ex-street children (Donald, Wallis & Cockburn, 1997).

Resilience refers to the observation that despite high risk environments, some children in these environments do not develop negative outcomes (Rutter, 1987; Werner & Smith, 1992). Rutter's (1987) definition remains one of the most useful and captures what is central to most conceptualizations of resilience and suggests that there is a relationship between risk and resilience (Rutter, 1987). While risk factors increase the likelihood of negative outcomes, protective factors could also become operative, which could help mediate risk and even prevent negative outcomes.

Unlike the literature that focuses only on either risk or resilience, Rutter (1987) suggests that risk and resilience are related. When an individual is exposed to adversity or risk this increases the likelihood of a negative outcome. However, when resilience becomes operative it helps mediate the risk and could help prevent negative outcomes. What is stressed in this definition is that resilience only becomes operative in the presence of risk. There also appear to be two elements identified in definitions of resilience. According to Rutter (1987) it refers to an individual's ability to function competently in the face of adversity, but also refers to the ability to 'bounce back' or recover from adversity. It is the relationship between risk or adversity and protective factors that lead to resilient outcomes.

There appears to be consensus that resilience is a dynamic, multi-dimensional construct (O'Donnel, Schwab-Stone & Muyeed, 2002). Researchers have recognized that resilience not only includes individual characteristics (Gilgun, 1999) but also broader protective factors. An ecological understanding of resilience suggests that it is operative at the individual, family and community level. The focus on individual resilience has more recently been complemented by a focus on community resilience and this has considerably expanded our conceptualization of resilience

(Ahmed et al., 2004; Kimhi & Shamai, 2004; Mangham, McGrath, Reid & Stewart, 2000; Sonn & Fisher, 1998). We focus on community resilience as it is at this level that we attempt to locate our discussion of satyagraha.

One of the earliest conceptualizations of community resilience (Sonn & Fisher, 1998) still remains one of the most useful. While oppression and the ensuing consequences such as socio-economic inequality place disadvantaged communities at a greater risk for a range of health problems, including violence and injury (Engle, Castle & Menon, 1996; Hill & Madhere, 1996), Sonn and Fisher (1998) – drawing on the work of Bulhan (1985) and Fanon (1968) – suggest that communities do not necessarily capitulate under conditions of oppression. Instead, Sonn and Fisher (1998) suggest that communities have the potential to develop positive outcomes. They identify three possible outcomes in response to oppression: negative outcomes, recovery and positive outcomes. Negative outcomes include, inter alia, pathology and dysfunction; positive outcomes comprise resilience, consciousness and well-being; while recovery outcomes comprise revitalization, reconstruction and reinvention (Sonn & Fisher, 1998). Community responses may therefore mediate the impact of oppression.

The introduction of the construct community resilience (Ahmed et al., 2004; Kimhi & Shamai, 2004; Sonn & Fisher, 1998) into the resilience literature provides a useful framework for understanding the numerous protective factors operative at this level. Researchers propose a dynamic, multidimensional understanding of community resilience that encompasses material, psycho-social and socio-cultural resources. Dimensions such as solidarity and hope, supportive community leadership and collective coping processes protect against negative outcomes across different contexts (Ahmed et al., 2004; Brenton, 2001; Clauss-Ehlers & Lopez-Levi, 2002; Clauss-Ehlers, 2003; Hernandez, 2002; Kimhi & Shamai, 2004; Kulig, 2000; Lyons et al., 1998; Sonn & Fisher, 1998).

We highlight two areas pertinent to our paper. First all the conceptualizations of community resilience implicitly or explicitly refer to a collective ‘we’. Lyons et al. (1998) suggest that the appraisal of adversity as ‘our’ issue, termed communal coping, facilitates cooperative and collective responses. Second, some of the conceptualizations of community resilience (Ahmed et al., 2004; Clauss-Ehlers & Lopez-Levi, 2002; Clauss-Ehlers, 2003; Sonn & Fisher, 1998) also highlight the cultural context of community resilience. It is suggested by Clauss-Ehlers and Lopez-Levi (2002) and Clauss-Ehlers (2003) that cultural values influence the development of community resilience.

The importance of cultural differences in resilience must be emphasized. Research suggest that adolescents from Anglo-American cultures more frequently express interest in their personal happiness, future family and leisure activities, whereas young people from traditional societies such as India are more oriented towards the health of others, marriage of others and societal topics (Gillispie & Allport, 1955; Sundbery, Poole & Tyler, 1983). This is similar to what Mkhize (2004) refers as the more collectivist orientation of African societies and could influence resilience in different ways. Two immediate implications are relevant here. Mrazek and Mrazek (1987) identify altruism as a dimension of resilience and there is a paucity of literature on this area. In the South African context, the stress of apartheid adversity was mediated by a corresponding altruistic desire by youth and others, to transform social conditions by involvement in the anti-apartheid struggles. Stevens and Lockhat (1994) suggest that the political activism of youth generated a “culture of collectivity,” that served as a protective factor.

### **SATYAGRAHA**

While there is a significant body of Gandhian scholarship (Bose, 1981) there is a relative dearth of Gandhian scholarship in the mainstream literature on violence and resilience. Weber (2001) points to the relative absence of cross-fertilization by surveying the conflict resolution literature. He suggests that in spite of Gandhi’s influence on peace activists, there exists a relative absence of Gandhi’s ideas on conflict resolution.

A discussion of Gandhi’s work is beyond the breadth and depth of the present chapter. However, a brief sketching of the context is necessary for understanding satyagraha. Some of Gandhi’s key ideas are described in his seminal text, *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule* (Gandhi, 1938/2006) which has been the subject of considerable debate and controversy and Gandhi (1938/2006) himself presents it as “a severe condemnation of ‘modern civilization’” (p. 15). He states quite unequivocally, “I feel that if India will discard ‘modern civilization’, she can only gain by doing so” (p. 15). This debate about the text is beyond the scope of the present chapter and our reading of the text is quite different. We argue that Gandhi, like Fanon was responding to the devastating effects of colonialism. What he presents as a critique of modern civilization, we view as a critique of capitalism and the attendant colonial domination. Yee (1994) points to the similarities between Gandhi and people like Edward Said and describes Gandhi’s approach as affirmative orientalism. For Yee (1994) Gandhi

viewed India as different, but not inferior to the west, and his philosophy was one of cultural resistance to western domination. Yee (1994) suggests that “Gandhi viewed cultures as changing through collective experiments and cultural innovation as occurring only in the context of people’s resistance to and struggle against cultural meanings” (p. 1). Divivedi (1990) suggests that Satyagraha is part of a larger cosmic, religious belief system. Divivedi’s (1990) definition of religion captures the essence of Gandhi’s philosophy. Divivedi (1990), suggests that ... “religion gives the moral strength to grow in virtue by nurturing restraint, humility and liberation from self-centredness” (p. 1). Yee (1994) also identifies some of the other critical elements of Gandhi’s vision and these are highlighted here. His definition of Swadeshi is one that suggests the other or the neighbour is served first. Yee (1994) further identifies Panchayat Raj- which recognizes “the village as a central institution, with government by consensus of leaders” (p. 2).

Within this context satyagraha is much broader than non-violence or a political technique. Divivedi (1990) suggests it can be broadly referred to as a superior power to confront injustice and is a worldview that is relevant to aspects such as conservation or the relationship to the natural environment. For Bose (1981), satyagraha is a mode of action and Sarvodaya, “meaning the welfare and good of all” (p. 159), are central to understanding Gandhi’s philosophy on peace.

Weber (2001) identifies the various translations of the satyagraha as ‘passive resistance’, ‘non-violent direct action’ and even ‘militant non-violence’ (Weber, 1991 cited in Weber, 2001: 494). For some the essence of Satyagraha is a belief in and unwavering commitment to the truth (Nakhre, 1982). It is precisely because of the subjective and relative nature of truth that Gandhi did not believe in the imposition of truth through violence (Gandhi, 1938/2006). To achieve satyagraha, Gandhi proposed Ahimsa, which refers to non-violence or non-injury (Bose, 1981; Mayton, Diesner & Granby, 1996). Ahimsa refers to a ‘conscious active process by which an individual refrains from violence and rather seeks to heal or find social justice through unity or ‘oneness’ (Bose, 1981). There is further an emphasis on the responsibility for and need to love the ‘other’ or the ‘enemy’ (Bose, 1981). While Gandhi acknowledged the humanity of the oppressor, he also recognized that the oppressor may respond with violence. However, instead of retaliating with violence, he proposed *tapasaya*. *Tapasaya* refers to self-suffering and refers to a conscious choice, even if one is able to, to refrain from imposing suffering on the other

(enemy). Gandhi believed that since truth was ‘relative’, a violent response asserted one’s truth without entertaining the possibility that one could be wrong. He believed that since truth would eventually prevail, the only option was self-suffering. Within this philosophy the means was as, or even more important, than the ends (Bose, 1981). Bose (1981) concisely captures this as “To punish the oppressor is to initiate a cycle of violence and hatred. The only real liberation is that which liberates both the oppressor and the oppressed” (p. 162).

### **SATYAGRAHA AND RESILIENCE: FROM VIOLENCE PREVENTION TO LIBERATION**

Our review has suggested that oppression and social inequality are central to an understanding of violence. The review of resilience research suggests that there are potentially many protective factors at the individual, family and community level that could help mediate negative outcomes like violence. While there has been a significant shift in resilience research from the individual to community level, as well as exploration of cultural resilience, resilience research could be enriched by a more substantive engagement with socio-cultural and socio-political protective factors. We argue below that these dimensions are particularly significant for post-colonial contexts and that the notion of satyagraha is a potentially useful construct to expand our conceptualization of community resilience, as well as inform violence prevention.

Our assertion is that there are potentially many areas in resilience research that could be enriched by an engagement with aspects of Gandhian scholarship. We focus in this section on two key areas. First, there is a relative absence of engagement in resilience research on the cultural context of resilience. Specifically, there is a scarcity of literature on values and how values influence protective processes. Second, a criticism of resilience research is that it focuses on the processes to overcome adversity without adequate attention to changing social inequality. The discussion below highlights how satyagraha attempts to address these issues.

Mayton et al., (1996) identified a predisposition for non-violence within their study and identified a link between values and a predisposition to non-violence. While their study is restricted to a sample of 102 predominantly ‘white’ females, the findings are consistent with the literature. They found that those predisposed to violence placed a higher priority on ‘power’ and ‘hedonism’ values which are about social status, prestige, control and domination. Mayton et al. (1996) refer to these values

as individualistic values. This is consistent with our selective review of the literature which identified these dimensions as possible consequences of relative deprivation. We also suggest that the self-control dimensions identified in the literature may be related to the individualism described by Mayton et al. (1996).

Conversely, it was found by Mayton et al., (1996) that those predisposed to non-violence had values similar to these proposed in satyagraha. In their study, subjects predisposed to non-violence displayed, universalism and benevolence referred to as self-transcendent values which are consistent with the sacredness of life as defined in Ahimsa. These subjects also prioritized self-restraint when likely to harm others which is consistent with *tapasaya* specifically, but also the essence of Gandhi's vision more broadly. These findings merit further investigation. Resilience resources are often framed as competencies and not enough attention is given to values or other cultural resources. Certainly, our discussion has suggested that the values that may underlie some of the risk processes can be countered by the values espoused in satyagraha.

While 'cultural' or value resources are important they must always be located within a social context. Our argument is that these values emerge within a context of social inequality. Individualism, consumerism and horizontal violence (inter-personal 'black' on 'black' violence) are responses to colonial domination and the outcome of capitalist exploitation. Both Fanon (1968) and Gandhi suggest that personal liberation or freedom of the 'psyche' must be accompanied by social action. This value shift or personal change is therefore, not individualistic and acontextual as presented in the mainstream literature, but both personal and 'political'.

Our argument is that both Fanon (1968) and Gandhi were responding to colonization, but differed in how to respond to it. There is a similarity between Bulhan (1985) and Gandhi in that they agree that resistance was necessary to prevent cultural domination. Through his conceptualization of cultural homogeneity, Bulhan (1985) appears to be more open to cultural integration. Gandhi by comparison, even though he has a fluid, dynamic definition of 'culture', seems to be less open. What is crucial to both authors is that cultural resistance was part of broader processes of overcoming oppression. There is a clear agreement that change at the personal and/or the political level can only be achieved by some form of social action. Fanon (1968) has been criticized for not condemning counter-violence. Gandhi by comparison in proposing satyagraha had the opposite view arguing that in no context was violence justified.

Gandhi (1928/2003) developed and refined satyagraha in the South African context. Apartheid laws were defied but protestors were not allowed to respond to state brutality with counter-violence. His account details both the capacity for social action but also satyagraha in practice. It demonstrated how devotees did not respond at any stage to police brutality. Gandhi's (1928/2003) conclusion is that this policy was successful. Certainly some of the outcomes were achieved and his account attests to the collective will and resistance that was achieved using this framework. Within a resilience framework the adversity generated by colonial oppression was transformed through collective action guided by a clear set of values. While there were clear success in using satyagraha, the debate is ongoing. Certainly in the South African context apartheid was maintained and liberation movements made a decision to complement civil resistance with an armed struggle. What constitutes transformative social action is a controversial and difficult issue beyond the scope of this chapter.

Our central argument is that while resilience research identifies the risk and protective process, social action is not proposed as a protective factor. Resilience factors like efficacy, supportive relationships and community cohesion are often framed within a context of adapting to rather than changing social inequality or what Garbarino (1995) refers to as socially toxic environments. Both Fanon (1968) and Gandhi offer this possibility, but the potential utility of satyagraha is that change is framed within the philosophy of non-violence. There are two implications for violence intervention programmes. First, it may be helpful to consider whether an explicit engagement with values could help develop intervention programmes. Second, attempts at community cohesion need to transform oppressive social conditions. Social action has the potential to create community cohesion.

## CONCLUSION

The gap between the rich and poor globally continues to widen at an unprecedented rate and the neo-liberal agenda remains entrenched in countries like South Africa (Bond, 2000). Within this context the potential for negative outcomes like violence is greater and resilience provides a helpful way of developing appropriate interventions. However, unless there is an attempt to understand and intervene with the social inequality that is a significant component of this picture, our attempts may be circumscribed. Our argument is that scholars like Fanon (1968), Bulhan (1985) and Gandhi (1938/2006) who critique colonization and propose forms of social action may still have utility. In our exploration of Gandhi's thought on satyagraha we conclude

that it provides a value shift and guidelines for social action which merit further investigation. In terms of future research it may be helpful more broadly to examine how worldviews that incorporate spirituality and collectivism can serve as protective processes. Further research into what specific protective processes emerge with specific risk factors in different 'cultural' contexts may moreover be useful. For example, can self-restraint, either psychologically based or morally located, emerge in environments that do not encourage them? Do certain societies, where spirituality may be central to worldviews, foster these more easily? Finally, an understanding of power remains central to post-colonial contexts. How can Fanon's (1968), Bulhan's (1985) and Gandhi's (1938/2003) work be located within these contexts? □

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, R., Seedat, M., Van Niekerk, A. and Bulbulia, S. (2004). Resilience in Disadvantaged Communities in the Context of Violence and Injury Prevention. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 34(3): 386-408.
- Barbarin, O.A. and Richter, L.M. (2001). *Mandela's Children: Growing up in Post-apartheid South Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Bond, P. (2000). *The Elite Transition: From Apartheid to Neoliberalism in South Africa*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Bose, A. (1981). A Gandian Perspective on Peace. *Journal of Peace Research*, 18(2), 159-164.
- Brookman, F. (2005). *Understanding Homicide*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bulhan, H. A. (1985). *Frantz Fanon and the Psychology of Oppression*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Cantillon, D., Davidson, W. S. and Schweitzer, J. H. (2003). Measuring Community Social Organization: Sense of Community as a Mediator in Social Disorganization Theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 321-339.
- Carcach, C. (1997). Youth as Victims and Offenders of Homicide. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 73: Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Claus-Ehlers, C. (2003). Promoting Ecological Health Resilience for Minority Youths: Enhancing Health Care Access through School Health Care. *Psychology in Schools*, 40(3), 265-278.
- Claus-Ehlers, C. and Levi, L.L. (2002). Violence and Community, Terms in Conflict: An Ecological Approach to Resilience. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 11(4), 265-278.

- Dawes, A. (1994). The Emotional Impact of Political Violence. In A. Dawes and D. Donald (Eds.), *Childhood and Adversity* (pp. 177-199). Cape Town : David Phillip.
- Donald, D., Wallis, J. and Cockburn, A. (1997). An Exploration of Meanings: Tendencies towards Developmental Risk and Resilience in a Group of South African Ex-street children. *School Psychology International*, 18, 137-154.
- Dwivedi, O.P. (1990). Satyagraha for Conservation: Awakening the Spirit of Hinduism. In J.R. Engel and J.G. Engel (Eds). *Ethics of Environment and Development*. London: Bellhaven Press.
- Ekman, R., Kaasik, T., Villerusa, A., Satrkuvieni, S. and Bangdiwala, S. (2007). Injury Mortality in Local Communities in Sweden and in the Three Baltic States: Implications for Prevention. *International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 14(3), 153-161.
- Emmet, T. (2003). Social Disorganization, Social Capital and Violence Prevention in South Africa. *African Safety Promotion: A Journal of Injury and Violence Prevention*, 1(2), 4-18.
- Engle, P.L., Castle, S. and Menon, P. (1996). Child Development: Vulnerability and Resilience. *Social Science and Medicine*, 43(5), 621-635.
- Fanon, F. (1968). *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press.
- Finkelhor, D. and Asdigian, N. L. (1996). Risk Factors for Youth Victimization: Beyond a Lifestyle/Routine Activities Theory Approach. *Violence and Victims*, 11 (1), 3-20.
- Gabarino, J. (1995). *Raising Children in a Socially Toxic Environment*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gandhi, M.K. (1928/2003). *Satyagraha in South Africa*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
- Gandhi, M.K. (1938/2006). *Indian Home Rule or Hind Swaraj*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
- Gilgun, J.F. (1999). Mapping Resilience as Process among Adults with Childhood Adversities. In H.I. McCubbin,, E.A. Thompson, A.I. Thompson and J.A. Futrell (Ed.), *The Dynamics of Resilient Families*. California: Sage Thousand Oaks
- Gillispie, J.M., and Allport, G. W. (1955). *Youth's Outlook on the Future (a Cross-National Study)*. New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Goodman, R. A., Mercy, J. A., Loya, F., Rosenberg, M. L., Smith, J. C., Allen, N. H., Vargas, L. and Kolts, R. (1986). Alcohol Use and Interpersonal Violence: Alcohol Detected in Homicide Victims. *American Journal of Public Health*, 76 (2): 144-149.
- Gottfredson, M. R. and Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hayes, G. (2004). Marxism and Critical Psychology. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 162-186). Lansdowne: UCT Press.

- Hernandez, P. (2002). Resilience in Families and Communities; Latin American Contribution from the Psychology of Liberation. *Family Journal of Counselling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 10(3), 334-343.
- Hill, H. M. and Madhere, S. (1996). Exposure to Community Violence and African-American Children; Multidimensional Model of Risks and Resources. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 24, 26-43.
- Hook, D. (2004). Frantz Fanon, Steve Biko, 'Psychopolitics' and Critical Psychology. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 84-114). Lansdowne: UCT Press.
- Kiguwa, P. (2004). The South African Context. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 278-315). Lansdowne: UCT Press.
- Kihmi, S. and Shamai, M. (2004). Community Resilience and Stress: Adult Responses to Israel's Withdrawal from Lebanon. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(4), 439-451.
- Kulig, J.C. (2000). Community Resiliency: The Potential for Community Health Nursing Theory Development. *Public Health Nursing*, 17 (5), 374-385.
- Krug, E.G., Dahlberg, L.L., Mercy, J.A., Zwi, A.B. and Lozano, R. (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Laflamme, L. (2001). Explaining Socio-economic Differences in Injury Risks. *Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 8 (3), 149-153.
- Loeber, R., Pardini, D., Homish, D.L., Wei, E.H., Crawford, A.M., Farrington, D.P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Creemers, J., Koehler, S.A. and Rosenfeld, R. (2005). The Prediction of Violence and Homicide in Young Men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(6), 1074-1088.
- Lyons, R.F., Mickelson, K.D., Sullivan, M.J., and Coyne, J.C. (1998). Coping as a Communal Process. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(5), 579-605.
- Mangham, C., McGrath, P., Reid, G. and Stewart, M. (2000). Resiliency: Relevance to Health Promotion Discussion Paper. Retrieved August 4, 2000.
- Mayton, D.M., Diessner, R. and Granby, C.D. (1996). Nonviolence and Human Values: Empirical Support for Theoretical Relations. *Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2(3), 245-253.
- Mkize, N. (2004). Psychology: An African Perspective. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 24-52). Lansdowne: UCT Press.
- Mrazek, P.J. and Mrazek, D.A. (1987). Resilience in Child Maltreatment Victims: A Conceptual Exploration. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 11, 357-366.
- Nakhre, A.W. (1982). *Social Psychology of Non-violent Action: A Study of Three Satyagrahas*. Delhi: Chanakya.
- Nicholas, L. and Cooper, S. (Eds.) (1990). *Psychology and apartheid*. Johannesburg: Vision Publications.

- O' Donnell, D., Schwab-stone, M. and Mueeed, A. (2002). Multidimensional Resilience in Urban Children Exposed to Community Violence. *Child Development*, 73(4), 1265-1282.
- Parker, (1989). Poverty, Subculture of Violence, and Type of Homicide. *Social Forces*, 67, 983-1007.
- Ratele, K., Swart, L. and Seedat, M. (2009). Night-time Fatal Violence in South Africa. In: Hadfield P, (ed). *Nightlife and Crime: Social Order and Governance in International Perspective* (pp.277-293). London: Oxford University Press.
- Piquero, A.R., MacDonald, J., Dobrin, A., Daigle, L.E. and Cullen, F.T. (2005). Self Control, Violent Offending, and Homicide Victimization: Assessing the General Theory of Crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21(1), 55-71.
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psycho-social Resilience and Protective Mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57(3), 316-331.
- Seedat, M., Van Niekerk, A., Jewkes, R., Suffla, S. and Ratele, K. (2009). Violence and Injuries in South Africa: Prioritizing an Agenda for Prevention. *Lancet*, 374, 68-79.
- Sonn, C.C. and Fisher, A.T. (1998). Sense of Community: Community Resilient Responses to Oppression and Change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 26(5), 457-472.
- Stevens, G. and Lockhat, R. (1997). "Coca-Cola Kids"- Reflections on the Development of Black Adolescent Identity in Post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(4), 250-255.
- Stevens, G., Seedat, M. and Van Niekerk, A. (2004). Understanding and Preventing Violence. In K. Ratele., N. Duncan, D. Hook, M. Nhlanhla, P. Kiguwa, and A. Collins (Eds) (2004). *Self, Community and Psychology* (pp. 13.1-13.20). Lansdowne: UCT Press.
- Straker, G. (1992). *Faces in the Revolution*. Cape Town: David Philip Publishers.
- Sundberg, N., Poole, M. and Tyler, E. (1983). Adolescents Expectations of Future Events: A Cross Cultural Study of Australians, Americans and Indians. *International Journal of Psychology*, 18, 415-427.
- Van Lenthe, F. (2001). Towards Understanding Socio-economic Inequalities in Injury Incidence and Mortality. *Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 8(3), 135-138.
- Werner, E.S. and Smith, R.S. (1992). *Overcoming the Odds: High Risk Children from Birth to Adulthood*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Weber, T. (2001). Gandhian Philosophy, Conflict Resolution Theory and Practical Approaches to Negotiation. *Journal of Peace Research*, 38(4), 493-513.
- Wilkinson, R.G., Kawachi, I. and Kennedy, B.P. (1998). Mortality, the Social Environment, Crime and Violence. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 20, 578-597.
- Yee, D. (1994). Book Review of: Gandhian Utopia: Experiments with Culture written by Fox, R.G. Retrieved from [http://dannireviews.com/h/Gandian\\_Utopia.html](http://dannireviews.com/h/Gandian_Utopia.html) ●