

Waiting for the crow

Ahmed Abdul Hussein

Violence isn't new on the humanistic nature, it's an origin. Yet the objection of the Angels in the Quran verse inspires to such thing. The letter from Freud to Einstein after the First World War is a scientific witness for the settlement of violence nature in humans.

But as for the violence to be an origin matter doesn't mean that non violence is something marginal. For all of the earlier violence incidents "which are mentioned in religions as well as the earlier legends", violence and non violence were alternating in forming the event. There are two persons, one of them laid his hand to kill his brother who told him: *"If thou dost stretch thy hand against me, to slay me, it is not for me to stretch my hand against thee to slay thee: for I do fear Allah, the Lord of the worlds"*, both of the two persons, Kane and Abel are necessary to form the violence model scene. So, non violence is inside every incident which can be called violence. For it something origin and a natural humanistic matter, too, on the contrary of what disclaiming (no) means which is in front of "violence" by considering that disclaiming follows a verb which needs a disclaim. But the disclaiming here is disclaim within the verb, and except for this abstention of killing for one of them, the killing which was done by his brother didn't deserve this dispraised term: violence. No violence prevented violence yet it gave it the name it deserved and put it into a discarded spot, and that is the symbolized force of no violence which will make it qualify from (disclaiming no) to (forbidding no) as in the ten commandments: no killing. No violence is unnecessary only for being a losing side within the killing incident, but it's a winner in spite of that: in the explanation of the incident by relating it and the moral attitude gained from it, a winner in every thing surrounding it and what to be imposed on by speeches and relations, even if it was weak and inactive. The weakness of no violence doesn't give a result of an instant value. That disclaim doesn't work on the violent action in the event, but it's a symbolical disclaim, proving that in every event there is a dual origin consisting of two opposite forces, the first requires an instant price to enthrone its excessive power, while the other postpones its victory as it plants that big (no) in violence itself, this (no) starts as disclaiming and grows to be forbidding, to include force of moral and legitimate obligation. So, no violence loses in the scene, yet it wins in history. But, as we move to the time we live in, no violence has not only became a symbolical award which can make rarefaction on violence by disclaiming it and then forbidding it; its force is no only presenting twinge of conscience, for today, no violence has been an organizational "work" which money is spent on and the people volunteer to work on and

lookout for to carry it to wherever violence is. And for this important move which made the "moral" organizational, even though quitting murder must be active as it has such activeness within. The non violence one also demands an evaluation for his work, wants his share in the present effectiveness of events. And what "Gandhi" did was like a big gate which will be an entrance to those whom desire to reach this global space which is, step by step, accepting the idea of making "non violence" within the forces that form the world we live in. so, here in Iraq which is full of killers, we find the voice of victims with a reflective echo disclaiming and forbidding what they do, a soft and whispering voice, so if we don't learn from it now, we'll be waiting for the crow which will soon come and teach us how to bury our residues in the ground.

**From Al Sabaah Newspaper / Ara'a Page
Issue no. 838, 20th of May – 2006**