ISSN: 2705-4853 | e-ISSN: 2705-4861

Social Inquiry: Journal of Social Science Research

2023, Vol. 5, pp. 29–55

https://doi.org/10.3126/sijssr.v5i1.65408

Open Access

Article History: **Received**: 08 September 2022 | **Revised**: 27 April 2023 | **Accepted**: 21 May 2023

Original Article

Need for Newer Perspectives on Violence: A Subaltern View

Avaniendra Chakravartty

School of Public Health and Community Medicine, B. P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal

Email: avaniendra@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5097-2217

Abstract

This article explains the intricate relationship between violence and health, aiming to transcend the conventional and restricted perspectives through which violence is typically perceived and conceptualized. The limitation

© 2023 The Author. This open access article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike (CC-BY-NC-SA) International Public License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium or format, provided the original work is properly cited and such creations are licensed under the identical terms.

regarding the conceptualisation of violence, by researchers, when the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is taken into consideration, leads us to think that those researching violence and health are limited to the WHO definition and conceptualisation of violence due to various historical processes of knowledge production and flows, which leads to a 'violence of closure'. I follow a reflexive approach and identify several types of violence from which I focus on cognitive violence, epistemic violence, ontological violence, and neoliberal violence. Understanding of violence needs to acknowledge that multiple forms of violence overlap entangle and intersect in a rhizomatic manner. Only sticking to the WHO definition of violence leads to a condition that creates a condition of 'violence of closure' that neglects various systemic and structural processes through which violence is experienced at the individual micro-level.

Keywords: *Violence, Cognitive, Epistemic, Ontological, Neoliberal*

Introduction

Violence has been a perennial feature of human civilisation throughout the ages. The way our ontological or metaphysical understandings are shaped, when researching on various issues. In the context of this paper, the way researches related to health issues in Nepal and other least developed and developing nations are conducted, have an overwhelming influence of 'Eurocentric and 'Northern epistemologies' (Santos, 2015). Eurocentric references are accepted as neutral, and as the norm in matters of science and research (Affun-Adegbulu & Adegbulu, 2020). Here I argue about the phenomenon of violence and health, and intend to see beyond the limited ways violence is understood and conceptualised.

Acts of violence from all over the world are continuously repeated. In an age of hyper-connectedness, we have constantly witnessed the perpetuation of violence in various places. Shown and reported are violence as a result of crime, terror, unrest, riots, homicide, and wars that result in physical harm to the human body and death, where the perpetrators are mostly identifiable. Physical violence receives the most attention, is most noticed, is dealt with most strictly and swiftly and punitive

measures exist to curb it and prevent it. The limited understanding of violence only relating to the physical or bodily level has been questioned by many (Kilby, 2013; Laurie & Shaw, 2018).

Based on one's ontological orientations, the way one perceives, comprehends, and distinguishes what constitutes violence can differ; it can be seen as necessary or unnecessary, as legitimate or illegitimate, as productive or destructive, and as purposeful or not purposeful (Adams, 2012). How violence is defined has moral and material consequences and implications for policy and practice (Rutherford et al., 2007). There have been past efforts to de-mystify human violence in all its forms and the social systems from which it emanates and to explore new forms of action through a conference named 'Dialectics of Liberation' held in London in 1967. Despite attempts by several intellectual figures, the Congress could not reach its objective, which was to 'demystify human violence in all its forms' (Has, 2016). The Congress was unable to problematize the meaning of violence itself satisfactorily, without which the de-mystification in question could not be understood.

Since then and now, as evident by the following excerpt, there is much more to how violence is understood. "The more we learn about violence and its variations, the clearer it becomes that studying it requires an assessment of complex relationships within a coherent theory. It is not possible to fully understand even one form of violence without understanding all the others, as these different phenomena are directly linked. To fully understand an individual, the entire ecological system of its evolution must be considered; To fully understand individual violence, social, structural, and environmental violence must enter the equation" (Lee, 2019).

Violence has been a recurring feature throughout human history and has also been a major public health problem, which was recognized at the Forty-Ninth World Health Assembly (WHA49.25) in 1996. In the year 2002, the World Report on Violence and Health was published. Acknowledging that they are many definitions of violence, the WHO (World Health Organisation) report defines violence as, 'the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either result

in or have a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation (Krug et al., 2002). The definition by WHO has has transformed existing ways of thinking about violence and has been shaping the approaches to violence since 2002 when the World Report on Violence and Health was published (Lee, 2019).

The WHO report on violence and health includes child abuse and neglect by caregivers, youth violence, intimate partner violence, sexual violence, elder abuse, self-directed violence, and collective violence. Being an authoritative organisation, the ways of defining and identifying violence as proposed by WHO have been axiomatic in the ways violence is defined, recognised, understood, and addressed in research on health issues. Indeed acts of violence, as mentioned in the WHO report, are serious concerns and have dire consequences for millions around the world, but acts of violence and what constitutes violence as mentioned in the WHO report as identified by many and as discussed here are the culmination of various cumulative intersectional structural processes at the societal, economic, cultural and political level.

Despite wide acceptance of the WHO definition of violence, it has limitations and fails to capture the complex overlapping global contexts of contemporary capitalism (Noiseux, 2020). The WHO classification and concept of violence are related to particular notions of individual agency and personal intention, thereby imposing major constraints on the effectiveness of the term ‘violence’ when attempting to study complex socioeconomic facts. For WHO, violence is something perpetrated by humans against other humans, and delimiting violence in such a rigidly anthropocentric manner has been questioned from an ecological standpoint (Noiseux, 2020). The WHO definition of violence constructs a straightforward linear conception of causal agency and specific non-ecological effects (Noiseux, 2020). By only concentrating on the physical aspects of violence it generates a ‘pornography of violence’ that offers a ‘voyeuristic’ illustration of sufferings and tortures that conceals the broader circumstances that affect violence, injustice, and suffering (Springer, 2011).

By focusing on the identifiable and locatable cause of violence, and

governing those causing the infringements on others, the mainstream ways of looking at the phenomenon of violence ignore what exists as 'a continuum of violence' embedded in the violence of poverty, hunger, social exclusion, and humiliation' (Schinkel, 2013). The dispassionate conceptual understanding of violence distances itself and does not take the systemic processes through which the direct violence unfolds, and this cold analysis of violence reproduces and participates in its horror (Zizek, 2008). When approaching violence, there has been a phenomenon marked by 'disciplinary decadence' that promotes silos. The existing discourse of human rights fails adequately to reveal the complex and multi-dimensional forms of violence imposed on subaltern populations, and it also fails to articulate fully the emancipatory aspirations and resistance strategies of diverse grassroots social and environmental justice movements and is void of non-western legal and cultural traditions (Gonzalez, 2015). Cultural perceptions influence the ways violence is recognised and also influence the ways certain acts of violence are deemed as legitimate or illegitimate, as having positive or negative connotations, as necessary or useless, as productive or destructive, and as purposeful or unintended (Adams, 2012).

Studies on violence have mostly taken the approach of creating smaller and smaller niches in an attempt to address and deal with the complexities of violence, without much interdisciplinary dialog (Lee, 2019). The reductionist Cartesian (Nicholas & Agius, 2017), depoliticized, individualist, minimalist approaches at the policy level have seen an increase in the prison population, increase in the homeless population, increase in the refugee population, increase in exposure to various pathogens, increase in natural calamities, increase in crime rates and an ever-increasing gap between the haves and haves not. Many differences exist when approaching the topic of violence, such as which definition of violence to follow, whether a 'restricted definition' (Schinkel, 2013) / 'minimalist conception of violence' (Bufacchi, 2005) or 'extended definition'/ 'comprehensive conception of violence' (Bufacchi, 2005) and based on how one defines, conceptualises and theorises violence will influence the steps taken to address it.

The identification of violence is left to common sense, something one sees in situations and will not fail to recognize (Schinkel, 2013). Any attempt to define violence is by nature itself political, and the tendency not to accept the fact and to believe the process of defining violence to be 'politically neutral' when defining violence is just another political move, as violence is, and has always been, the essence of politics (Bufacchi, 2005). As per critical theorists, the label of violence is at all times ideologically informed and selectively applied, and what seems like violence to some does not to others (Noiseux, 2020). The concept of violence has been seen as complex, mimetic, protean, nonlinear, productive, essentially contested, destructive, reproductive (Laurie & Shaw, 2018) 'slippery' and as a 'meta-concept' (Kilby, 2013).

Rationale

I believe that the 'principle of linguistic relativity' or (Humboldt-) Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Sapir–Whorf hypothesis) gives credence to the adage 'eyes see what the mind knows,' the reality is determined by the language one speaks..; it applies in the case of violence too. Also connected to symbolic interactionism, Sapir–Whorf hypothesis illustrates 'how the language one speaks influences the way one perceives the world' or in other words, 'we do not see or understand issues or concepts for which we do not have words' (Tracy, 2013). This hypothesis points out that different ways of seeing the world depend on the forms that languages take in different cultures (Payne & Barbera, 2010). 'Our ability to know is connected to the capacity of naming and an advanced vocabulary signifies a more expansionist and nuanced bank of knowledge; for example, before the 1970s, there was no phrase for 'sexual harassment' or before the 2000s, terms like 'blogging' (Tracy, 2013). Only with introducing these terms did people begin to thoughtfully consider, recognize, or discern the subsequent realities (what the concepts in question refer to). Through language, we comprehend the world, as well as ourselves' (Tracy, 2013) .

The Sapir–Whorf hypothesis specifies that "we cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, mostly because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way – an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language, all

observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated. It is as if our way of seeing, organizing and discussing the world depended on some gene possessed by all who belong to the same society or culture" (Hudonc, 2010). Despite the controversial nature of the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis, it accentuates a strong interconnection involving language and thoughtfulness (Zygmunt, 2016).

A cursory glance at research on violence and health reveals that violence is taken to mean intentional, usually interpersonal, physical harm (Schinkel, 2013). Just a superficial observation of research done on violence and health reveals that 'conception of violence is limited to various acts of harm, like does one count kicking and hitting? Is spitting included? Is pushing part of the concept of violence? What actually counts as violence is often to be read in the measurement classification used' (Schinkel, 2013). This limitation regarding the conceptualisation of violence by researchers when the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is taken into consideration leads us to believe that those researching on violence and health are limited to the WHO definition and conceptualisation of violence due to various processes of knowledge production and flows. In an age of experts combined with the authority and backing of global bodies like the WHO, World Trade Organisation, International Monetary Fund, and United Nations the discourses they construct are treated as axiomatic and are limited to the ways of these organisations and in the case of research on violence, being limited to WHO definition leads to a condition of 'violence of closure' (Horner, 2016) (Has, 2016) which ignores structural, political, economical and cultural aspects of violence.

The WHO definition of violence is invoked by professionals from varied fields in their respective contexts, which has implications at the policy level, at the research level and also gives credence to popular or mainstream understandings of violence. I believe that policy and research limited to WHO definition of violence has limited success in addressing violence. As mentioned earlier I argue for an understanding of violence beyond the limited way violence is conceptualised by researchers, especially for those

involving health. To proceed towards addressing existing limitations in conceptualising violence, first, we must be aware of the various ways and types in which violence has been conceptualized.

Multiple Types of Violence

On beginning my search I experienced a snowball phenomenon where I came upon the following - archival violence (Finigan, 2011), cartographic violence (Suleiman, 2019), cathartic violence (Ndlovu, 2017), chronic violence (Adams, 2012), colonial violence (Bloch, 2020), constitutive violence (De Lissovoy, 2019), cognitive violence (Battiste, 2010), cosmological violence (Yang & Wayne, 2012), chronopolitical violence (Malaklou, 2018), counterhegemonic violence (Hall, 2003), curative violence (Kim, 2017), cultural violence (Galtung, 1990), collective violence (Tilly, 2003), curriculum violence (Jones, 2020; Sepulveda et al., 2015), discursive violence (Holling, 2019), divine violence (Rasch, 2007), ecological violence (Absher, 2012), economical/economic violence (Sharp, 2012), electoral violence (Birch et al., 2020) epistemic violence (Dotson, 2011), epistemological violence (Teo, 2008), ethnocidal violence (Mignolo & Escobar, 2007), ethnocentric violence (Senanayake, 2021), everyday violence (Afroze, 2019), generalised colonial violence (Maldonado-torres et al., 2018), gendered violence (Mack & Na'puti, 2019), genocidal violence (Campbell, 2020), geographical violence (Neocleous, 2003), global capitalist violence (Olutola, 2018), green violence (Fletcher, 2018), hermeneutical violence (Chadwick, 2019), hidden violence (Keygnaert et al., 2012), horizontal violence (Walrafen et al., 2012), humanist violence (Kennedy, 2017), industrial violence (Sundar, 2012), institutional violence (R. A. Goldstein, 2005), intrahuman violence (Stanescu, 2013), lateral violence (Roberts, 2015), libidinal violence (Lushetich, 2020), metaphysical violence (Joronen, 2011), neocolonial violence (Ayotte & Husain, 2005), neoliberal violence (Berdayes & Murphy, 2016), Network-Centric Violence (Grayson, 2012), obstetric violence (Kukura, 2018), ontological violence (Andersen, 2020), onto-epistemological violence (Nilsson Sjöberg, 2021), pedagogical violence (Matusov & Sullivan, 2020), political economic violence (Malaklou, 2018), radical violence (Cohen et al., 2014),

repressive violence (Melamed, 2016), rhetorical violence (Lawrence & Karim, 2007), state violence (Gohdes, 2020), somatic violence (Lushetich, 2020), strategic violence (Christensen et al., 2019), symbolic violence (Thapar-Björkert et al., 2016), structural violence (Farmer, 1996), systemic violence (van der Linden, 2012), transnational violence (Alberto & Chilton, 2019), utilitarian violence (Cabrera Pérez et al., 2020), verbal violence (Hamzaoglu & Türk, 2019), virtualized violence (Fairbairn & Spencer, 2018), xenophobic violence (Ngcamu & Mantzaris, 2021).

From amongst these types of violence to identify certain violence as important would give the erroneous impression that different types of violence exist separately from each other which is not the case when violence is understood from notions of intersectionality, from a new materialist perspective, from a decolonial perspective, from DeleuzoGuattarian perspective or various other isms prefixed by post, neo or post-post. Here I attempt to identify the multiple forms of violence that keep researchers, social workers, professionals tied to the existing mainstream understanding of various facts such as violence. In other words, I identify from amongst the various types of violence mentioned above those types of violence that maintain and sustain the condition of 'violence of closure' that suppresses the possibilities of alternatives and normalises the existing ways of existence (Has, 2016). Ultimately our selection of violence is limited by our metaphysical conditioning and also is contextually based.

Violence in Understanding Violence

There exist several processes that condition our metaphysical of ontological understanding of various processes. This applies in the case of understanding violence too. As mentioned earlier, the WHO definition and notion of violence are linked to a notion of individual agency and personal intention, which imposes major constraints on the utility of the term 'violence' when attempting to study the complex socioeconomic phenomenon. Acts of 'social murder' though mentioned in 1845 by Engels committed by capitalism continues to exist even today. The violence associated with such 'social murders' is not recognised even today. Here I discuss violence that maintains the

'violence of closure'. The violence of closure is maintained through 'regimes of truth' that legitimize and authorize certain ways of perceiving and excludes labels and secludes any attempt to think otherwise (Horner, 2016).

Here, I further elaborate on the following types of violence – cognitive violence, ontological violence, epistemic violence/epistemological violence, and neoliberal violence. Though discussed individually below, in reality, the various forms of violence identified overlap, entangle, and intersect. Categorization offers limited insight, for violence is a complex and contextual field of operation that requires an interdisciplinary approach to attend to their multi-modalities (Balfour, 2013).

Cognitive Violence

Colonial discourse is a kind of "cognitive violence" (Qin, 2018), and it has been perceived as beginning with European colonialism. However, I think it existed in Hinduism in the form of caste stratification, where Dalits occupied the lowest position in the socio-cultural hierarchy. Colonial discourses that propagate the superiority of Eurocentric ways and maintain Western hegemony (Hamati-Ataya, 2011) are interdisciplinary a form of cognitive violence (Finigan, 2011). The natural attitude embodied within a scientist is cognitive conservatism, which protects and preserves both the network to which a scientist belongs and its 'verified set of methods' which is imputed to all its members, thereby rejecting anything contradictory to them which inevitably leads to cognitive violence (Bucholc, 2001). Reification of 'the making into a thing' is a sign of cognitive violence that is hidden to the naked eye (Denischenko, 2017). Both dualism and reductionism do cognitive violence to cultures (Dean et al., 2006). 'The Culture Industry', and globalisation of 'mass culture' functions as 'social control' leading towards fetishisation to the point of homogeneity in various spheres of life, ranging from education to entertainment, and subordinating real differences, to foundational modernist ideals of inherent sameness, and thus carry out cognitive violence in the process. The subjection to Western hegemony and the continuity of cognitive violence has been pointed out in various processes and entities such as international relations (Hamati-Ataya, 2011), philosophy (Elberfeld et al., 2019), language (Qin, 2018),

curriculum (Adzahlie-Mensah & Dunne, 2018), contemporary international legal order (Aalberts, 2018), political institutions (Lushetich, 2020) and education systems (Battiste, 2010). The gap among national and international science in policy understanding and people's perception on the ground structure cognitive violence (Leach, 2015).

Though cognitive violence has largely been shown to be occurring between whites (Americans, Australians, and other Anglos—are intrinsically superior to the rest of humankind) (Lawrence & Karim, 2007), and non-whites ontologies it has been in existence among non-whites too. The objective of cognitive violence is to maintain and sustain the hegemonic ideologies of existing systems and deny agency, rationality, and cognitive value to other indigenous modes of thinking by labelling them unscientific. By naturalizing science and language of 'developmentspeak' (Gause, 2016) as rational, developmental, and progressive the existing education systems continues the propagation of cognitive violence by the non-white, for instance on indigenous tribal population uprooted from their age-old habitats in the name of development. Quite identical to the governing forms of money, which effectively compel all users of money to partake in structural violence and exploitation through the fiscal system, the technological singularity encompassing the globe, structures and universalizes cognitive violence, exploitation and is a cause of human rights violence across space and time (Auvinen, 2016) .

Epistemic Violence

Epistemic means relating to knowledge or the degree of its validation (Porta Miquel, 2008). An episteme as per Foucault is the 'strategic apparatus that filters scientific from non-scientific, in 'any given culture and at any given moment'. There is only one episteme that defines the conditions of possibility of all knowledge whether expressed in a theory or silently invested in a practice (Howarth, 2013). Gayatri Spivak uses the term epistemic violence to refer to ways of silencing the subaltern in colonial and postcolonial discourse, and 'one method of executing epistemic violence is to damage a given group's ability to speak and be heard' (Dotson, 2011) . Epistemic violence refers to the violence of knowledge construction. Epistemic violence is violence exerted against or through knowledge and is a

key element in any process of domination (Brunner, 2015). The physical extermination of non-western knowledge producers as well as diverse technologies of intellectual genocide (Mendoza, 2016) over the ages has created a systemic process where other modes of knowing are inadmissible and are hence negated by being obliterated, a process referred to as an epistemicide (Ujuaje & Chang, 2020).

‘Epistemic violence does not need intention neither does it require capacity’ (Dotson, 2011). For epistemic violence to operate, it needs a subject, an object, and an action, even if the violence is indirect and nonphysical: in empirical public health, the subject of violence is the researcher, the object is the other, and the action is an interpretation of data that is presented as knowledge (Teo, 2014). The totalizing claim of modernity and modern disciplines like public health, where expert knowledge precedes local knowledge is a form of epistemic violence. In research on lifestyle diseases, a casual look at research done on the subject shows that the individual human is the focus of the research, and to decrease lifestyle diseases, behavioural modifications are recommended, with little or no consideration to the socioeconomic and structural conditions, that pushes an individual towards certain conditions in the race for survival. In the case of 'uterine prolapse’ that is a major burden for women in third world countries, the burden falls on the women who is advised not to carry heavy objects and to not do certain activities, despite the woman needing to carry water for the household from some distance. ‘Obstetric violence’ also functions as a form of epistemic violence in which the privileged embodied knowledge of labouring/birthing persons is systematically silenced and suppressed (Chadwick, 2019) . Epistemic violence is the intentional usage of knowledge networks by human beings, to harm other human beings through three subtypes of epistemic violence which are othering, silencing, and knowledge prevention (Lim-bunnin, 2020).

Epistemic violence can be seen in the education system in Nepal, which was based on Wood Commission, which in turn was adopted from what was practiced in India, and which again was influenced by Macaulay’s minutes on Indian education (Awasthi, 2013). The Macaulay minutes stressed producing an educated Indian class embodied with English taste, opinions, morals, and

intellect, who would act as interpreters between the British and the millions they govern (Gautam & Luitel, 2013). The 'banking concept' of education that the colonizers introduced in the colonies, and which was also adopted in Nepal, only filled students with the knowledge, which the students memorized mechanically, turning the students into containers, and in which education suffered from 'narration sickness' (Mayo, 2005) is a form of epistemic violence (Beth Titchiner, 2017). Academic languages reject several audiences, separated along lines of socioeconomic position, educational access, and many more groupings. Because of this, the usage of this medium, an academic peer-reviewed journal article, is a type of epistemic violence. Likewise, the expression 'epistemic violence' in and of itself is also an example of epistemic violence, since possessing the knowledge and cultural capital to comprehend and utilize this expression is not equally accessible to all (Lim-bunnin, 2020).

Ontological Violence

As mentioned earlier though I discuss violence by types in reality they interlink, intersect and overlap. Ontological violence also referred to as metaphysical violence, refers to the violence committed when certain categories become the primary referents of analysis, through which to encode and represent (Sundberg, 2015), hence depriving an entity of its essence (Andersen, 2020). When 'single world' logics of colonial modernity rule and alternative logics are obliterated ontological violence occurs. The European colonial process naturalized the 'Occidentalist modernisation', which denied authority and validity of the knowledge of the colonized and did not recognize the colonized being as a fellow human being, relegated them by labelling them as savages, which is profound ontological violence, that denies humanity and agency to the colonized (Venn, 2012). There is a direct link between the ontological violence and the texture of social violence (of sustaining relations of enforced domination) that pertains to language (Zizek, 2008). The language behind the idea of 'manifest destiny' gave legitimacy to the West's civilizing mission of the savages (the colonized) that framed a 'Manichaean aesthetics' which furthered the rationale for the tutelage of the global south.

Ontological violence is done by norms constructivism and the limited openings

offered by the Global International Relations project (Blaney & Tickner, 2017), ontological violence is done by the imposition of socio-political models to Iraqi society (Igarashi, 2013) , ontological violence is done through neo-liberalisation that governs the conduct of individuals through the embodiment of subjectivities for the use of market forces (Newman, 2014), ontological violence is reproduced through the coloniality of social work and neoliberal disciplinary state (Motta, 2017), and to break water down into merely H2O is doing ontological violence (Meehan et al., 2020). 'Coloniality of being', 'coloniality of knowledge' and 'coloniality of power' intersect to form a 'colonial matrix of power' that funnels knowledge into the uncivilized colonialized subalternate population, that frames the condition of 'coloniality of coloniality', which means the 'further colonialisation of coloniality by use of Western monopoly overpower and the means of discursive production acquired through epistemic and ontological violence' (Suleiman, 2019).

Neoliberal Violence

Neoliberalisation is a process of ontological violence, which does not merely govern the conduct of individuals by encouraging a particular form of subjectivity, but also enframes all entities for the use of market forces, which in turn supports the notion that policy developments are primarily driven by ideology, and those policy outcomes will largely reflect the interests of the dominant power holders (Newman, 2014). Neoliberal violence is at once structural and unquestionably physical; it requires an inequitable distribution of resources within a rigidly hierarchical society which eventually must be implemented and preserved by state violence, which in turn provokes violent responses (Goldstein, 2005). Neoliberal economics is a form of violent radicalism and neoliberalism is a discourse whose assumptions influence contemporary institutions normalizes violence (Berdayes & Murphy, 2016).

Neoliberalism has been labelled 'an unloved rascal concept' and has been understood in variegated ways (Peck, 2013). Much has been written on neoliberalism and its effects, but despite its ubiquitous nature in academic discussions, the phenomenon of neoliberalism in our lives continues unabated. "In everyday lives, the public is subjected to regular, pervasive, and equally radical violence connected with

the economic thesis of neoliberalism. Understood as the total restructuring of social way of life in quest of narrow economic interests, neoliberalism normalizes ideas and behaviour that would appear obscene outside of an economistic frame of reference" (Berdayes & Murphy, 2016). Neoliberalism is the elevation of capitalism into an ethic, a set of political imperatives, and a cultural logic that has been taking the form of theology in more recent times (Collins & Rothe, 2019). As a religion, neoliberalism serves to posit about the world, and the way the world should be. and neoliberal dictums of entrepreneurialism, hyper-individualism, profit-seeking, self-regulation, and market supremacy are accepted as obvious, true, and accepted without question (Collins & Rothe, 2019). Basically, under neoliberalism, 'everything either is for sale or is plundered for profit' (Giroux, 2004).

Within the social conditions of neoliberalism, violence and harm is systemic and inherent, in which symbolic violence is embodied in language and its forms, which in turn naturalizes systemic violence. Violence becomes completely invisible at the moment it merges with its opposite, that is with freedom (Valiente et al., 2019). Neoliberalism = violence, is as obvious as just as 2+2=4, yet it goes unnoticed (Berdayes & Murphy, 2016). By promoting an atomistic individualistic conception of the social world in which pecuniary interests are solely pursued, neoliberalism propagates violence through the reign and supremacy of the market (Berdayes & Murphy, 2016). 'War without bullets' has been the neoliberal way resulting in misery, morbidity, and mortality to a massive extent (INPA, 2015).

Neoliberalisation is a process of ontological violence, which does not merely govern the conduct of individuals by encouraging a particular form of subjectivity, but also enframes all entities for the use of market forces, which in turn supports the notion that policy developments are primarily driven by ideology, and that policy outcomes will largely reflect the interests of the dominant power holders (Newman, 2014). Neoliberal violence is at once structural and unquestionably physical; it requires an inequitable distribution of resources within a rigidly hierarchical society which eventually must be implemented and preserved by state violence, which in turn provokes violent responses (Goldstein, 2005). Neoliberal economics is a form of

violent radicalism and neoliberalism is a discourse whose assumptions influence contemporary institutions normalizes violence (Berdayes & Murphy, 2016).

Conclusion

As mentioned earlier though categories of violence have been identified and discussed, they overlap, entangle and intersect in a rhizomatic manner. When indigenous populations are forcibly removed, from their age-old habitats, in the name of development, larger interests, nation-building, and economic growth, because a dam needs to be built, or mineral deposits exist where they have been residing, the violence that occurs is several. Physical when bulldozers and police personnel ravage their dwellings. Ontological and cognitive when their mode of existence is deemed uncivilized or backward, and the justification given, is the need to incorporate them into civilisation. Epistemic when their voices and activists' voices are suppressed and negated, and neoliberal, when increasing economic indicators are desired and prioritized with no regard to the destruction of nature and livelihood that it entails. Construction of narratives, blaming the indigenous and overlooking the process of unhindered growth of extractive capitalism, leads to ontological violence, since it perpetuates false myths and constructs false realities that reduce the indigenous population to savages that lead to the deprivation of essence. The essence of being indigenous is negated through epistemic violence when indigenous voices and indigenous modes of knowledge and culture are sidelined.

Violence having its roots in systemic structures are traced to individual habits, for instance when a youth dies in a motorcycle accident in the mountainous roads of Nepal, the issues of concern will be whether the youth was drunk, was riding too fast, or was the youth doing some stunts when the accident happened? No concerns are raised regarding the sale of fast powerful motorcycles suitable for the roads of developed countries that are being sold in one of the poorest countries. The motorcycles advertising with slogans titled ‘born to race’ and advertisings portraying toxic masculinity, hegemonic masculinity, and hyper masculinity and the culture it inspires are not even slightly considered. Moreover, in many advertisements, female models are portrayed in manners suggesting that to attract a female’s attention a motorcycle

is required. In various sports females holding placards inform the spectators on some aspect of the game, this female holding the placard has to have a certain type of physical attributes to qualify for holding the placard. Images affect our ways of viewing, what we desire and value, which advertisements do by portraying an ideal female or an ideal male, hence committing a 'violence of closure', and in doing so cognitive violence is committed on all those who do not fit the traits of the ideal type shown in the media.

Fairness creams are particularly guilty of showing that whiteness means fairness. Advertisements depicting brown, black, or dark-skinned individuals as failures, or not being able to succeed, despite being amply qualified, and on use of the advertised fairness cream, the same individuals later succeed (Sarkar & Ghosh, 2016). Ontological violence and cognitive violence occur when being dark-skinned is made to be undesirable to the millions who use these products in hopes of achieving the desired trait. Indeed violence is a matter of perception, but when the natural conditions that one is endowed with are seen as not desirable such as one's skin colour and the individuals who face 'microaggressions' as a result, makes an act violence. Unless one is a believer in the idea of 'manifest destiny' and sees the world through 'Manichaean categories', it is difficult to not see violence in everyday events such as in advertisements that promote fairness creams.

At the local empirical level of non-white level, cognitive violence exists all around us, and constantly being exposed to media commodifying stereotyping, notions of femaleness and maleness, condition the human mind to see such notions as natural and many a time may not even be conscious of the process (Klassen, 2016). The extent of the conditioning of the mind is manifested when the word 'balatkar' (rape) is repeatedly used as a 'metaphor' in a popular Bollywood movie named *Three Idiots* to humor and entertain and the people. Subjugation, domination, sublimation, reification, commodification, thingification, objectification, dehumanisation, abrogation, appropriation, binarism, dislocation, universalism, standardisation are just some of the processes that result in violence and is usually invisible to the uninformed mind, and to just address the overt acts of violence that are physical is just a

small step towards reducing acts of violence. To, truly address and work towards violence-free globe the social, cultural, and economic processes and conditions that govern from the global to the local must be understood through new imaginaries not constrained by notions of 'discursive homogenisation', coloniality, and hegemonic entities.

Note

[1] Gregory Bateson, Allen Ginsberg, Lucien Goldmann, Paul Goodman, Ronald D. Laing, Paul Sweezy and Herbert Marcuse were among the participants.

Disclosure Statement

The author declares that no potential conflict of interest exists.

References

Aalberts, T. (2018). Misrecognition in legal practice: The aporia of the family of nations. *Review of International Studies, 44*(5), 863–881. https://doi.org/mr65

Absher, B. (2012). Toward a concept of ecological violence. *Radical Philosophy Review, 15*(1), 89–101. https://doi.org/fz72rx

Adams, T. M. (2012). *Citizen security and organized crime chronic violence and its reproduction: Citizenship, and democracy in Latin.* Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Adzahlie-Mensah, V., & Dunne, M. (2018). Continuing in the shadows of colonialism: The educational experiences of the African Child in Ghana. *Perspectives in Education, 36*(2), 44–60. https://doi.org/mr64

Affun-Adegbulu, C., & Adegbulu, O. (2020). Decolonising global (public) health: From Western universalism to global pluriversalities. *BMJ Global Health, 5*(8), e002947.

Afroze, J. (2019). *Threads of everyday violence: Childhood in an Urdu-speaking Bihari camp in Bangladesh* [The Open University]. In PQDT - Global.

Alberto, C., & Chilton, M. (2019). Transnational violence against asylum-seeking women and children: Honduras and the United States-Mexico border. *Human Rights Review, 20*(2), 205–227. https://doi.org/gnh2bx

Andersen, T. (2020). Ontological violence: Catherine Malabou on plasticity, performativity, and writing the feminine. *Culture, Theory and Critique, 61*(1), 4–21. https://doi.org/mr7j

Auvinen, T. (2016). Organizing for the end of the world with nothing more to say? The implications of non-consensually implemented singularity and " trans-/posthuman " technologies for social movements. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 209–247.

Awasthi, L. D. (2013). Importation of ideologies from Macaulay minutes to Wood Commission. *Journal of Education and Research, 1*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/mr7t

Ayotte, K. J., & Husain, M. E. (2005). Securing Afghan women: Neocolonialism, epistemic violence, and the rhetoric of the veil. *NWSA Journal*, *17*(3), 112–133. https://doi.org/dhs8x7

Balfour, L. (2013). Organic shrapnel and the possibility of violence. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action*, *6*(1), 68–82.

Battiste, M. (2010). Indigenous knowledge and indigenous peoples' education. In S. M. Subramanian & B. Pisupati (Eds.), *Traditional knowledge in policy and practice. Approaches to development and human well-being*. United Nations University.

Berdayes, V., & Murphy, J. W. (2016). Language, social order, and neoliberal violence. In *Neoliberalism, economic radicalism, and the normalization of violence* (pp. 37–52). Springer.

Beth Titchiner, M. (2017). *The epistemology of violence: Understanding the root causes of violence and "non-conducive" social circumstances in schooling*. University of East Anglia.

Birch, S., Daxecker, U., & Höglund, K. (2020). Electoral violence: An introduction. *Journal of Peace Research, 57*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/gjfmgz

Blaney, D. L., & Tickner, A. B. (2017). Worlding, ontological politics and the possibility of a decolonial IR. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 45*(3), 293–311. https://doi.org/gkggwn

Bloch, L. (2020). Animate earth, settler ruins: Mound landscapes and decolonial futures in the Native South. *Cultural Anthropology, 35*(4), 516–545. https://doi.org/10.14506/ca35.4.02

Brunner, C. (2015). Knowing suicide terrorism? Tracing epistemic violence across scholarly expertise. *Journal of Social Sceinces and the Humanities, 3*, 37.

Bucholc, M. (2001). The epistemology of the strong program in sociology of knowledge. *Justification , Truth , and Belief*, 1–18. http://www.jtb-forum.pl/

Bufacchi, V. (2005). Two concepts of violence. *Political Studies Review*, *3*(2), 193–204. https://doi.org/cp9rpc

Cabrera Pérez, P., Castañeda Capriroli, I., & Fernández Rosas, I. (2020). Violence, social bond and dream productions: The witness under consideration. *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society*, *25*(1), 18–35. https://doi.org/mr7n

Campbell, H. G. (2020). African international relations, genocidal histories and the emancipatory project. Part 2. *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations*, *20*(2), 367–381. https://doi.org/mr7b

Chadwick, R. (2019). Practices of silencing: Birth, marginality and epistemic violence. *Childbirth, Vulnerability and Law: Exploring Issues of Violence and Control*, 30–48. https://doi.org/mr7c

Christensen, D., Nguyen, M., & Sexton, R. (2019). Strategic violence during democratization: Evidence from Myanmar. *World Politics*, *71*(2), 332–366. https://doi.org/gf9cdj

Cohen, K., Johansson, F., Kaati, L., & Mork, J. C. (2014). Detecting linguistic markers for radical violence in social media. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, *26*(1), 246–256. https://doi.org/gf3g7r

Collins, V. E., & Rothe, D. L. (2019). The violence of neoliberalism: Crime, harm and inequality. In *The violence of neoliberalism: Crime, harm and inequality*. Routledge.

De Lissovoy, N. (2019). Decoloniality as inversion: Decentring the west in emancipatory theory and pedagogy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *17*(4), 419–431. https://doi.org/gpkpxz

Dean, K., Joseph, J., Roberts, M., & Wight, C. (2006). Realism, Marxism and method. In K. Dean, J. Joseph, M. Roberts, & C. Wight (Eds.), *Realism, philosophy and social science* (p. 206). Palgrave Macmillan.

Denischenko, I. (2017). Beyond reification: Mikhail Bakhtin's critique of violence in cognition and representation. *Slavic and East European Journal*, *61*(2), 255–277.

Dotson, K. (2011). Tracking epistemic violence, tracking practices of silencing. *Hypatia*, *26*(2), 236–257. https://doi.org/fcj3wm

Elberfeld, R., Graness, A., Dhouib, S., Arisaka, Y., Greco, F., & Franke, J. (2019). *Histories of philosophy in global perspective* (pp. 1–8). German Research Foundation.

Fairbairn, J., & Spencer, D. (2018). Virtualized violence and anonymous juries: Unpacking Steubenville's "Big Red" sexual assault case and the role of social media. *Feminist Criminology, 13*(5), 477–497. https://doi.org/mr7q

Farmer, P. (1996). On suffering and structural violence: A view from below. *Daedalus, 125*(1), 261–283.

Finigan, T. J. (2011). *Documenting Barbarism: The violence of the archive in contemporary American fiction* [University of Alberta]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. https://shorturl.at/giuR9

Fletcher, R. (2018). License to kill: Contesting the legitimacy of green violence. *Conservation and Society, 16*(2), 147–156. https://doi.org/gg4zmg

Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research, 27*(3), 291–305. https://doi.org/cdq2q4

Gause, J. A. (2016). *New developmentspeak - Old habits? The role of buzzwords in shaping alternative development approaches.* Roskilde University.

Gautam, S., & Luitel, B. C. (2013). A third space research methodology through the metaphor of Mokshya. *Journal of Education and Research, 3*(2), 96–116. https://doi.org/mr7w

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Cultural studies and the politics of public pedagogy: Making the political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education, 10*(2), 73–89. https://doi.org/cj5s5v

Gohdes, A. R. (2020). Repression technology: Internet accessibility and state violence. *American Journal of Political Science, 64*(3), 488–503. https://doi.org/gh533c

Goldstein, D. M. (2005). Flexible justice: Neoliberal violence and "self-help" security in Bolivia. *Critique of Anthropology, 25*(4), 389–411.

Goldstein, R. A. (2005). Symbolic and institutional violence and critical educational spaces: In the name of education. *Journal of Peace Education, 2*(1), 33–52.

Gonzalez, C. G. (2015). Human rights, environmental justice, and the North-South divide. In *Research Handbook on Human Rights and the Environment* (pp. 449–472). https://doi.org/mr6t

Grayson, K. (2012). The ambivalence of assassination: Biopolitics, culture

and political violence. *Security Dialogue, 43*(1), 25–41. https://doi.org/mr7h

Hall, J. R. (2003). Religion and violence social processes in comparative perspective. In M. Dillon (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of religion* (pp. 359–381). Cambridge University Press.

Hamati-Ataya, I. (2011). The "problem of values" and international relations scholarship: From applied reflexivity to reflexivism. *International Studies Review, 13*(2), 259–287. https://doi.org/dnrxjk

Hamzaoglu, N., & Türk, B. (2019). Prevalence of physical and verbal violence against health care workers in Turkey. *International Journal of Health Services, 49*(4), 844–861. https://doi.org/mr7p

Has, Y. (2016). Towards a historical ontology of violence. *Theoria, 62*(142), 26–49. https://doi.org/mr6q

Holling, M. A. (2019). Rhetorical contours of violent frames and the production of discursive violence. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 36*(3), 249–271. https://doi.org/gpkgj3

Horner, L. (2016). Uncertainty, fluidity, and occupying spaces in-between: Peace education practices in Mindanao, the Philippines. *Peace Education*, 125–140. https://doi.org/mr62

Howarth, D. R. (2013). *Poststructuralism and after structure, subjectivity and power.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Hudonc, M. (2010). The world through words. *The Indexer: The International Journal of Indexing, 28*(4), 146–150. https://doi.org/mr6x

Igarashi, M. (2013). *Genealogical analysis of the dispositive of humanitarianism/trusteeship: From colonial administration to peacebuilding* [University of Sussex]. http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/

Jones, S. P. (2020). Ending curriculum violence. *Teaching Toler, 64*, 1–8.

Joronen, M. (2011). Dwelling in the sites of finitude: Resisting the violence of the metaphysical globe. *Antipode, 43*(4), 1127–1154. https://doi.org/dhdjtw

Kennedy, D. (2017). The international human rights movement: Part of the problem ? *Human Rights,* 581–604. https://doi.org/mr7d

Keygnaert, I., Vettenburg, N., & Temmerman, M. (2012). Hidden violence is silent rape: Sexual and gender-based violence in refugees, asylum seekers and undocumented migrants in Belgium and the

Netherlands. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, *14*(5), 505–520. https://doi.org/ggk442

Kilby, J. (2013). Introduction to special issue: Theorizing violence. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *16*(3), 261–272. https://doi.org/mr8f

Kim, E. (2017). *Curative violence: Rehabilitating disability, gender, and sexuality in modern Korea*. Duke University Press.

Klassen, A. (2016). *Social construction and the possibility of emancipation*. York University.

Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). World report on violence and health. *The Lancet*, *360*, 1083–1088. https://doi.org/mr6r

Kukura, E. (2018). Obstetric violence. *Georgetown Law Journal*, *106*(3), 721–801.

Laurie, E. W., & Shaw, I. G. R. R. (2018). Violent conditions: The injustices of being. *Political Geography*, *65*, 8–16. https://doi.org/gjt7zb

Lawrence, B. B., & Karim, A. (2007). Violence: A reader. In *On violence*. Duke University Press.

Leach, M. (2015). The Ebola crisis and post-2015 development. *Journal of International Development*, *27*(6), 816–834. https://doi.org/f7nts7

Lee, B. X. (2019). Violence: An interdisciplinary approach to causes, consequences, and cures. In *Violence: An interdisciplinary approach to causes, consequences, and cures.* Wiley Blackwell.

Lim-bunnin, L. L. (2020). ‘ And every word a lie ’: Samoan gender - divergent communities , language and epistemic violence. *Women’s Studies Journal*, *34*(1/2), 76–91.

Lushetich, N. (2020). A Santa with a butt plug: Paul McCarthy and the obliterating violence of positivity. *Body, Space and Technology*, *19*(1), 203–223. https://doi.org/mr66

Mack, A. N., & Na’puti, T. R. (2019). “Our bodies are not Terra Nullius”: Building a decolonial feminist resistance to gendered violence. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, *42*(3), 347–370. https://doi.org/gjk2zz

Malaklou, M. S. (2018). “Dilemmas” of coalition and the chronopolitics of man: Towards an insurgent black feminine otherwise. *Theory & Event*, *21*(1), 215–258.

Maldonado-torres, N., Vizcaíno, R., Wallace, J., & We, J. E. A. (2018). Decolonising philosophy. In G. K. Bhambra, D. Gebrial, & K. Nişancıoğlu (Eds.), *Decolonising*

the university (pp. 64–90). Pluto Press.

Matusov, E., & Sullivan, P. (2020). Pedagogical violence. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 54*(2), 438–464.

Mayo, P. (2005). Education for radical humanization in neoliberal times: A review of Paulo Freire's later work. *Critical Theories, Radical Pedagogies, and Global Conflicts,* 164–184.

Meehan, K., Jepson, W., Harris, L. M., Wutich, A., Beresford, M., Fencl, A., London, J., Pierce, G., Radonic, L., Wells, C., Wilson, N. J., Adams, E. A., Arsenault, R., Brewis, A., Harrington, V., Lambrinidou, Y., McGregor, D., Patrick, R., Pauli, B., … Young, S. (2020). Exposing the myths of household water insecurity in the global north: A critical review. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water, 7*(6), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1486

Melamed, J. (2016). Being together subversively, outside in the university of hegemonic affirmation and repressive violence, as things heat up (again). *American Quarterly, 68*(4), 981–991. https://doi.org/mr7k

Mendoza, B. (2016). Coloniality of gender and power: From postcoloniality to decoloniality. In *The Oxford handbook of feminist theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 100–121). https://doi.org/mr7s

Mignolo, W., & Escobar, A. (2007). Globalization and de-colonial thinking. *Cultural Studies, 21,* 1–75.

Motta, S. (2017). Decolonizing Australia's body politics: Contesting the coloniality of violence of child removal. *Journal of Resistance Studies, 2*(2), 100–133.

Ndlovu, S. (2017). *The concept of alienation in the work of Frantz Fanon*. University of Kwazulu-Natal.

Neocleous, M. (2003). Off the map: On violence and cartography. *European Journal of Social Theory, 6*(4), 409–425. https://doi.org/cpdnbb

Newman, J. (2014). What ontological assumptions underpin David Cameron's 'modernisation' of Conservative Party welfare policy? *Journal of Politics and International Studies, 12*, 36.

Ngcamu, B. S., & Mantzaris, E. (2021). Partial, falsified and adverse print media reporting: Studying 2015 xenophobic violence. *African Identities,* 1–18. https://doi.org/mr7r

Nicholas, L., & Agius, C. (2017). The persistence of global masculinism: Discourse, gender and neo-colonial

re-articulations of violence. In *The persistence of global masculinism: Discourse, gender and neo-colonial re-articulations of violence*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Nilsson Sjöberg, M. (2021). Reconstructing truth, deconstructing ADHD: Badiou, onto-epistemological violence and the diagnosis of ADHD. *Critical Studies in Education, 62*(2), 243–257. https://doi.org/gjb78p

Noiseux, J. (2020). Work that causes harm: Violent labour and the ecology of suffering. Canadian *Review of American Studies, 50*(2), 276–301. https://doi.org/mr6s

Olutola, S. (2018). Blood, soil, and Zombies: Afrofuturist collaboration and (re-)appropriation in Nalo Hopkinson's Brown Girl in the Ring. *Journal Of Science Fiction, 2*(2), 64–81.

Payne, M., & Barbera, J. R. (2010). A dictionary of cultural and critical theory. *Choice Reviews Online, 48*(9). https://doi.org/mr6w

Peck, J. (2013). Explaining (with) neoliberalism. *Territory, Politics, Governance, 1*(2), 132–157. https://doi.org/gk5b43

Porta Miquel. (2008). *A dictionary of epidemiology*. Oxford University.

Qin, P. (2018). Achebe and the linguistic political criticism in the post-colonial vision. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 232*, 26–33. https://doi.org/mr63

Rasch, W. (2007). From sovereign ban to banning sovereignty. In M. Calarco & S. DeCaroli (Eds.), *Agambeni, Giorgio sovereignty and life* (pp. 92–108). Stanford University Press.

Roberts, S. J. (2015). Lateral violence in nursing: A review of the past three decades. *Nursing Science Quarterly, 28*(1), 36–41. https://doi.org/f6tnz7

Rutherford, A., Zwi, A. B., Grove, N. J., & Butchart, A. (2007). Violence: A glossary. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 61*(8), 676–680. https://doi.org/ff4nz2

Santos, B. de S. (2015). Epistemologies of the South. In *Epistemologies of the South*. Routledge.

Sarkar, P., & Ghosh, C. (2016). Ethical norms in fairness cream advertisement. *Global Media Journal: Indian Edition, 7/8*, 1–9.

Schinkel, W. (2013). Regimes of violence and the trias violentiae. *European Journal of Social Theory, 16*(3), 310–325.

Senanayake, H. (2021). Fear of small numbers and political behaviour of

ethnocentric majority of Sri Lanka: Undeclared war against upcountry Tamil females. *Open Political Science, 4*(1), 120–125. https://doi.org/mr69

Sepulveda, J. M., Pena, S. B., & Merino, M. E. (2015). Curriculum violence: Occidental knowledge hegemony in relation to indigenous knowledge. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 190*, 434–439. https://doi.org/mr68

Sharp, D. N. (2012). Addressing economic violence in times of transition: Toward a positive-peace paradigm for transitional justice. *Fordham International Law Journal, 35*(3), 780–814.

Springer, S. (2011). Violence sits in places? Cultural practice, neoliberal rationalism, and virulent imaginative geographies. *Political Geography, 30*(2), 90–98. https://doi.org/bq9p39

Stanescu, J. (2013). Beyond biopolitics: Animal studies, factory farms, and the advent of deading life. *PhaenEx, 8*(2), 135. https://doi.org/mr7g

Suleiman, M. L. D. A. N. (2019). *(Re)framing "The Jihad" in Western Africa : An epistemic disobedience.* The University of Western Australia.

Sundar, K. R. S. (2012). Industrial violence and labour reforms. Economic and Political Weekly, 47(41), 35–40.

Sundberg, J. (2015). Ethics, entanglement, and political ecology. In T. Perreault, G. Bridge, & J. McCarthy (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of political ecology* (p. 669). Routledge.

Teo, T. (2008). From speculation to epistemological violence in psychology: A critical-Hermeneutic reconstruction. *Theory & Psychology, 18*(1), 47–67. https://doi.org/c38845

Teo, T. (2014). Epistemological violence. *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology*, 593–596. https://doi.org/ggwwtx

Thapar-Björkert, S., Samelius, L., & Sanghera, G. S. (2016). Exploring symbolic violence in the everyday: Misrecognition, condescension, consent and complicity. *Feminist Review, 112*(1), 144–162.

Tilly, C. (2003). *The politics of collective violence.* Cambridge University Press.

Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.5613/rzs.43.1.6

Ujuaje, M. D., & Chang, M. (2020). Systems of food and systems of violence: An intervention for the special issue on "community self organisation, sustainability and resilience in food systems." *Sustainability, 12*(17), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12177092

Valiente, J., Sanchez-velasco, A., & Valiente, G. (2019). New geographies of violence. *Journal of Architetural Research by Design, 16.*

van der Linden, H. (2012). On the violence of systemic violence. *Radical Philosophy Review, 15*(1), 33–51. https://doi.org/fz72rt

Venn, C. (2012). The postcolonial challenge: Towards alternative worlds. in *The postcolonial challenge: Towards alternative worlds.* Sage.

Walrafen, N., Kathleen Brewer, M., & Mulvenon, C. (2012). Sadly caught up in the moment: An exploration of horizontal violence. *Nursing Economics, 30*(1), 6–12.

Yang, E., & Wayne, T. K. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society, 1*(1), 1–40.

Zizek, S. (2008). *Violence six sideways reflections.* Picador.

Zygmunt, T. (2016). Language education for sustainable development. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education, 7*(1), 112–124. https://doi.org/mr6z

Author Biosketch

Avaniendra Chakravartty is an assistant professor in the School of Public Health and Community Medicine at BPKIHS (Dharan). He has been serving at the BPKIHS since 2005. He has a Master's in Sociology and an MPhil from the Department of Social Medicine and Community Health from Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

To cite this article: Chakravartty, A. (2023). Need for newer perspectives on violence: A subaltern view. *Social Inquiry: Journal of Social Science Research, 5*, 29-55. https://doi.org/10.3126/sijssr.v5i1.65408

For other articles and journal archives, visit:
https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/sijssr/index