

**A STUDY OF THE CONCEPTS OF CONFLICT AND REMEDY IN
BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY****tanima Bag, Dr. Binod Prasad Karan**

Designation- research scholar sunrise university alwar

Designation- Professor sunrise university alwar

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the Buddhist philosophical notions of conflict and remedy and to develop a unified theory of conflict remedy. According to the findings of this research, the three unwholesome roots (Akusala-mula) of conflict in Buddhist thought are avarice (Lobha), hate (Dosa), and ignorance (Moha). Covetousness (Abhijjh), ill will (Bypda), and a skewed worldview (Micchadittadhi) combine to make mental strife (Mano duccharita) very impossible to eradicate. The principles of Kusala-kammapatha, which deal with conflict and its resolution in Buddhist thought, place an emphasis on physical and verbal dispute resolution first, and then on mental conflict resolution second. Majjhim patipadi, on the other hand, prioritizes dealing with conflicts from inside before turning to those from beyond. When combined, these ideas form the notion of conflict resolution in Theravada Buddhist thought, which demonstrates that, at any time, one may engage in proper practices in line with the morality (Sila), cultivating concentration (Samdhi) and insight (Pa).

KEYWORDS: Buddhist Philosophy, conflict remedy, Buddhist thought**INTRODUCTION**

Because of our social nature, most humans would rather not live alone. This has resulted in the development of several speech systems, cultural practices, social institutions, legal frameworks, and so on. Human civilization was a unified whole in ancient times, with fewer and simpler issues and fewer wars. In contrast, our modern society is characterized by a tangled web of entangled issues. Human communities have evolved rapidly in response to new challenges and escalating tensions. Disputes can be settled if they are small in number, but if they are widespread, it may be difficult to do so. This is how several skirmishes culminate in full-scale war. Over 14,500 significant conflicts have occurred since 3,600 BC, when written history began. These battles have resulted in the deaths of over four billion people. More than 200 million individuals lost their lives in the conflicts that plagued the

twentieth century. Since WWII, there have been around 30 active armed engagements annually. In addition, 90% of the victims in these battles have been civilians, whereas this percentage was 50% in WWII and 10% in WWI.

This proves without a reasonable doubt that conflicts have existed in human societies ever since the Stone Age. Thus, all human communities attempted to foreclose the possibility of disputes by adopting a law, promulgating an act, etc., to produce materials to serve as defenses. While these materials may have provided temporary protection or a temporary remedy, they were never intended to be permanent. Because of this, human communities experienced moments of peace and pleasure as well as times of sadness, misery, and chaos. Humans are crucial in that they have the ability to spread happiness or misery across human civilizations, depending on the state of their own minds, which is the root cause of all disputes. A person with a mentality full of negativity is a conflict generator. Peace between human cultures may be established, on the other hand, if one person has an objective mind.

Wars have exacerbated a lot of issues in human society. The first is a difference in worldview, especially a strong religious conviction, while the second is a distinction in ethnicity or ancestry. Humans are aware of these factors and have made several attempts to give a cure, but thus far, they have not been successful. They have found a way to give a stopgap measure, but a lasting answer has eluded them thus far. In particular, religious strife is real and becoming worse by the day. Across faiths, there is a consistent emphasis on doing good and refraining completely from evil. According to a statistical analysis conducted by M. Horowitz, the causes of the more than 200 conflicts that broke out between 600 and 1700 C.E. ranged from deeply religious to completely secular. Therefore, if we give this some serious thought, we can see that religion is unquestionably a safe haven for the human mind, and the human mind is often regarded as the most significant force. When people's emotional safe spaces are dissimilar, their beliefs, worldviews, and ways of life will naturally diverge. As a result, their faith in their inner sanctum (the Lord of God) is unwavering and uncompromising. And this is why there are wars and conflicts between people of various faiths. Since they originate in the human mind and may spread rapidly and widely, religious conflicts or wars are difficult to prevent or resolve.

Buddhism is a nonviolent faith that encourages people to stay out of fights. However, there are still open concerns, such as what constitutes conflict from a Buddhist perspective. Why do people get into fights? Is there a way to apply the Buddhist idea of conflict resolution to

the current circumstance, and if so, how? Conflicts on religious, social, economic, and political fronts plague today's global communities. Therefore, the Buddhist responses to these problems become crucial. Therefore, it is crucial to investigate the Buddhist idea of conflict repair and the viability of applying this theory to contemporary societal problems. According to a survey of the relevant literature, no studies have synthesized or integrated the fundamental ideas of conflict resolution as the Buddhist conflict remedy's theory. For instance, the vast majority of studies have exclusively focused on the Buddhist idea of conflict resolution. Conflict resolution in modern Thai society: an analytical study of Abhayadna., "The idea of Mett in Theravada Buddhist philosophy: a critical analysis", "Karuna and the Buddhist ideal of universal peace" "A Critical Analysis of the Concept of Santi (Peace) in Theravada Buddhism," and "The Visuddhimagga as a Lens through Which to Examine the Concept of Santi." Conflict in social settings can be mitigated to some degree using this method, but it won't be eliminated entirely. This is because there is often more than one factor at play when a disagreement arises. Therefore, problems should be resolved by synthesizing or integrating several approaches drawn from Buddhism's core ideas.

CONFLICT AND REMEDY IN PHILOSOPHY

Humans being humans, strife is a natural part of life and may happen everywhere and everywhere. It's safe to say that even solitary people have their share of problems with others. He could face danger from the outside world (animals, creatures, etc.) or from inside himself (anxiety, tension, rage, hate, etc.). As such, it is conclusive evidence that human conflict is inevitable, especially when people choose to share their lives in a community. Humans, as seen by the twentieth century, have attempted a variety of approaches to understanding and resolving conflict, but they have so far been ineffective in doing so. Therefore, it is important to learn about the notion of conflict and solution in the context of universal philosophies.

As such, the following will be studied and presented in order to comprehend it thoroughly but briefly:

- 1) Definition of conflict, growth of conflict understanding, causes of conflict, and conflict prevention, management, and resolution are all areas that will provide light on the overarching notion of conflict and its resolution.
- 2) Karl Marx, Lewis A. Coser, and Ralf Dahrendorf's perspectives on the concept of conflict and remedy in western philosophy will be discussed.

- 3) The perspectives of Cvrka, the Six Orthodox Schools, and Gandhi on the nature of conflict and the possibility of its resolution in eastern philosophy will be examined in this section.
- 4) The perspectives of Jainism, Christianity, and Islam will be used to argue for and against the concept of conflict and solution in religious philosophy.

Development of Conflict Knowledge

Because conflict resolution is a necessary life skill, it has been passed down from generation to generation throughout humanity's history. Since the rising tide of social strife since 1800 may be connected to a number of events including the development of science and technology and its application to armament, etc., I shall explore these changes starting with this arbitrary year. The Napoleonic Wars and the upheavals of 1848 brought unprecedented levels of warfare and brutality to the nineteenth century. The European governments established the Concert of Europe (sometimes called the Congress System) after the Napoleonic Wars ended in 1815. So, people have tried to control interstate conflict by using scientific methods and diplomatic techniques. The industrial revolution in the middle of the nineteenth century caused massive population shifts, widespread poverty, and a widening gap between workers and owners. Karl Marx's description of class struggle at this time was so convincing and strong that it became the ideology of the political revolution led by activists who sought to end social strife by reorganizing economic and social relations. Ethnicity accompanied class as a focal point of conflict studies in the late nineteenth century. To further diverse national and imperial agendas, strong ethnic nationalism was therefore cultivated. As a result, European rulers increasingly relied on beliefs of racial superiority and the concept of ethnic identity to establish colonial empires in other parts of the world.

By the turn of the twentieth century, European colonial empires ruled over most of the globe. Then, to free people from colonial authority, conflict theory and practice were created, refined, and put into action. Simon Bolivar and Toussaint Louverture are only two examples of colonial rebels that paved the way for liberty. As a theoretical and practical challenge to colonialism, Gandhi's Satyagraha, or disciplined nonviolent opposition to oppression, was one of the most fascinating approaches. The distinctive contribution of Gandhian conflict knowledge was that it offered a way to fight back against an oppressor without resorting to the kind of violent revolution that only ends up hurting everyone involved. And thus, not only

did Satyagraha help liberate India from British rule, but it also helped end caste violence and religious communalism inside the country.

The 1920s were a time of widespread labor unrest and violent struggle between workers and employers. It was not until the 1930s that the Department of Labor established its Mediation and Conciliation Service to oversee the review of grievances, the negotiation of contracts, and the prevention of violence during industrial conflicts and strikes in the United States. The American Arbitration Association's establishment as a mainstay in American dispute resolution is indicative of the country's maturing understanding of conflict. In reality, the United Auto Workers staged a sit-in strike against General Motors in 1937, borrowing heavily from Gandhian themes. As a result, our understanding of war had gone full circle. While the West was busy figuring out how to keep domestic wars under control, international tensions were rising. World War II's climactic events sparked a new wave of intellectual and practical attempts to mitigate war, and they also ushered in an age of political awakening and action among the people who were exposed to those efforts. Academic centers began with the Peace Research Institute in Oslo and the Center for Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan. Institutions like the United States Institute of Peace and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute were established by governments.

Roots of Conflict

Many different things may spark a disagreement. Therefore, we may start by looking at the probable causes of conflict to get a broad and concise understanding of their origins. There are both interest conflicts and value and perspective differences at play here.

1) Conflicts of Interests

Because ideological perspectives vary, it is possible to arrive at the identification of objective interests from a variety of theoretical or ideological vantage points, even while the conflicts of interests (objective) are not immediately evident. Marxism posits that, regardless of whether or not the two parties are conscious of it, the ownership of the means of production leads to the exploitation of the peasants and workers by the owners. In addition, Norwegian peace scholar Johan Galtung believes that "relative deprivation" is "structural violence" whether or not the people involved recognize it as such. This suggests that being hungry may lead to hostility or physical violence. For example, rank disequilibria may arise when certain groups score well on one dimension (say, education) but poorly on others (say, influence).

Another peace researcher, John Burton, basically agrees with this explanation, highlighting the paramount importance of "basic human needs" that are presumably inherent to human nature and universal, thus non-negotiable, such as the need for identity, recognition, security, and personal development, which will be pursued come hell or high water. Although the aforementioned theories argue that there is an actual antagonism between the "haves" and the "have-nots," they also point out that it is not just material deprivation but rather the psychological state of being "have-nots" that fuels violent conduct. Furthermore, the link, if any, between aggressive conduct and economic prosperity is weak. A level of life that is viewed as unacceptable in relation to anything else is what produces complaints and conflict behavior, not absolute poverty or suffering. Thus, the infamous "frustration-aggression hypothesis" suggests that decreasing living circumstances might lead to disputes because they can disappoint excessively optimistic expectations, leading to anger and a tendency for direct violence.

2) Conflicts of Values and Attitudes

Although conflicts of values and attitudes are less obviously visible than conflicts of interests, this is because values, beliefs, and attitudes are by definition held deliberately. Conflicts may arise over almost any principle or topic of interest. It seems that ethnicity (including race), nationalism, and religion are more likely than other reasons to become rallying grounds in wars. Ethnicity is seen as a reality by those of the "objectivist" or "primordialist" tendency, who point out that it is frequently based on "objective" traits like race or other physical or linguistic features.. While they acknowledge that ethnic identity may be muted (as it was in Eastern Europe under Soviet/Communist control), they argue that it will quickly emerge once the "lid" is lifted. A less "objectivist" but yet culturally sensitive definition might be.

However, a closer look indicates that ethnicity is a social creation, since objective traits are sometimes used as markers of identity but not always. In addition, there exist gradients and gradations of meaning for almost all objective measures, such as the distinctions across linguistic varieties. When a trait becomes a basis for social classification (or prejudice), only then do precise definitions become necessary. One particularly twisted use of this principle was the "pencil test" administered by apartheid South African security services. In cases when policemen were unsure whether a person should be classified as white (or Asian) or black, they would stick a pencil into the individual's hair. If it landed on the floor, the individual was considered white (with all the privileges it entails), but if it got caught in their

hair, they were automatically classified as a member of the oppressed and discriminated-against black group. To this end, it is helpful to think about ethnic groups in the same way that we think of nations: as "imagined communities" and social constructions. However, this does not make them any less real; rather, socially built reality is just as real as physical reality, although of a different form. However, this same process of social formation also permits political leaders to utilize ethnicity for their own ends, whether those ends are power or profit, often in the form of xenophobia or overt racism. Recent events in what were once Yugoslavia and, more dramatically, the Rwandan genocide of 1994 show that the repercussions may be severe or even catastrophic.

Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution

First, I'd want to define conflict prevention, management, and resolution, since they are all parts of the larger concept of conflict remedy. History and security and foreign policy studies have recently embraced the idea of conflict avoidance. Direct prevention and structural prevention are common subcategories of conflict prevention. By "direct conflict prevention," we mean actions taken to stop the immediate, dangerous escalation of a dispute. Long-term structural preventative approaches target both the root causes of a conflict and its aggravating and precipitating circumstances. Prevention of disagreements, their development into armed conflict, and the spread of armed conflict are all goals of preventive diplomacy, as defined by Boutros Boutros-Ghali." This only applies to diplomatic efforts and does not include things like economic sanctions or military action. Michael Lund has expanded this to include "any structural or intercessory means to prevent intrastate or interstate tension and disputes from escalating into significant violence and use of armed forces," as well as "means to strengthen the capabilities of potential parties to violent conflict for resolving such disputes peacefully" and "means to gradually reduce the underlying problems that produce these issues and disputes." For the purposes of this concept, any efforts that lower the likelihood of violent confrontations and increase the ability of the relevant parties to act structurally are included.

WESTERN PHILOSOPHY'S IDEA OF CONFLICT AND SOLUTION

1. The Opinion (Marxism) of Karl Marx.

Karl Marx (1818-1883) was a revolutionary socialist and prominent figure in the fields of philosophy, economics, sociology, history, and journalism in Germany. He was disillusioned with the current socioeconomic condition, the exploitation of the working class during the

Industrial Revolution in England, and he utilized the ideas of the German philosopher Georg Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) to explain it. The fields of social science and socialist politics owe a great deal to his views. Using social class struggle as an explanation for material growth, he developed dialectic with a straightforward triple rhythm of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. According to Marxist theory, the conflict approach centers on a materialist reading of history, a dialectical approach to analysis, a critical posture toward current social structures, and a political agenda of revolution or, at the very least, reform.

2. Lewis A. Coser's View

Coser argues that strife is inherent to human nature and may be found in every community. Furthermore, conflict in human societies might be goal-related, which is not the case for conflicts in animal societies. According to him, the path that people often take—through violence—is not the only one. Conflict is a natural and useful element of human life, therefore the availability of the potential of multiple pathways allows for possibilities for negotiation and varied sorts and degrees of conflict. Therefore, arguments are natural in human interactions and should not be seen as an indication of mental instability.

3. Ralf Dahrendorf's View

According to Dahrendorf, "imperatively coordinated associations (ICAs)" (a word he coined) form the social environment and reflect a unique hierarchy of responsibilities. There are hierarchical power structures inside this organization, with some groups of positions being more influential than others. Dahrendorf isn't quite clear, but it seems that any social unit, from a tiny group to a whole civilization, may be regarded an ICA for analytical reasons provided a system of roles with power differentials can be declared to exist. Moreover, these power connections in ICAs may be seen as authority interactions in which certain positions have the lawful or moral right to dominate others, although power often connotes the coercion of some by others. Therefore, authority is a foundational concept in an ICA and, presumably, in all tiers of social systems. Dahrendorf identifies the authority functions as a fertile ground for conflict. According to him, the authoritative structure that ensures social cohesion might turn into a contentious factor. The reason for this is that all forms of power include the use of force to maintain control. Further, coercion suggests specialization of interest and allows for the inference that authority not only enforces rules, but also sets norms. Dahrendorf places particular emphasis on this feature while attempting to understand dynamics of conflict and transformation. He can only provide an explanation for authority in



terms of the need for ruling groups, given the normsetting role. Here, norms are created by groups in positions of power, who then legislate those norms via the use of their power. And in an almost Marxist expression, Dahrendorf argues that the value system is enforced by the ruling class despite the fact that it is shared by all members of society.

CONCLUSION

The concept of conflict has several layers and meanings in Buddhism. In a nutshell, "conflict" refers to "the misconducts, bad actions or unwholesome actions in deeds, words, and thoughts that caused of the doers and others trouble, harm, discord, worry, and unhappy both in this life and the next." This line of inquiry has been pursued because it is the Buddhist ethics of the middle way that encourages good behavior in all spheres of life. In addition, it includes the core Buddhist ethical teachings, such as the Five Precepts and the Ovdapattimokkha. The Five Precepts, often known as the fundamental Buddhist ethics, are guidelines for Buddhists who are part of secular cultures. The three admonitions or exhortations of the Buddha that make up the Principal Teaching are the most essential to Buddhist thought. Therefore, Kusalakammapatha theory has been chosen to investigate the problem and its solution within Buddhist thought.

REFERENCES

- Allan, Kenneth D., *The Social Lens: An Invitation to Social and Sociological Theory*, 2 nd edn, USA: Pine Forge Press, 2011.
- Asmal, Kader, Louise Asmal & Ronald Suresh Roberts, *Reconciliation through Truth. A Reckoning of Apartheid's Criminal Governance*, 2nd edn, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Aziz, Zahid, *Islam, Peace and Tolerance*, U.K.: Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore Publications, 2006.
- Bartos, Otomar J. & Paul Wehr, *Using Conflict Theory*, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Best, S., *A Beginners Guide to Social Theory*, London: Sage Publications, 2003.
- Bhattacharya, Sabyasachi, *The Mahatma and the Poet*, New Delhi: National Book Trust, India, 1997.



Bhikkhu, Aggacitta, Dying to Live: the Role of Karma in Dying and Rebirth, Leong Liew Geok (ed.), Penang: Sukhi Hotu Dhamma Publications, 1999.

Bialer, Seweryn, The Soviet Paradox. External Expansion, Internal Decline, New York: Vintage Books, 1987.

Biswas, S. C. (ed.), Gandhi: Theory and Practice, Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance, Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1969.

Bondurant, Joan V., Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Burton, John W., Violence Explained. The Sources of Conflict, Violence and Crime and Their Prevention, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Cea, Abraham Velez de, „The Criteria of Goodness in the Pāli Nikāyas and the Nature of Buddhist Ethics“, Journal of Buddhist Ethics, Vol. 11, 2004, pp. 123-142.