Let’s consider in the most general sense how do people react to external signals, to influence? At that let’s be interesting only in objectively observable human actions in response to external influences. Moreover, only one characteristic will be used to distinguish human responses, namely, whether the person evaluates external influence positively or negatively, i.e. does she undertake any action to encourage the external influences or she tries to fence herself from them. Of course the reaction can be not only positive or negative but also neutral. Thus, as an initial postulate let’s use the following statement.

***AXIOM. Human reaction to external influence unambiguously reflects positive or negative or indifferent human's assessment of this influence.***

In this statement as in the beginning of the reasoning I consider external influences as that that acts directly on receptors. Except for influences affecting directly on physiology much of them requires a certain understanding and interpretation to form a certain attitude towards them, and often not only to them. For example, if a person sees a tree falling on a car she perceives only light photons by eye’s receptors and sound vibrations by ear’s receptors if she is close enough to this site. But the human reaction may differ significantly for the cases when a car is her own or another’s. In the former case the person assesses positively or negatively not so much influences on her body’s receptors as that of on her car. I.e. people evaluate as influences on their own body by receptors as well on material objects that they considers as belonging to them to some extent. The last clause is connected with the fact that one can assess an influence on something or someone that does not belong to her unconditionally. For example, a person can negatively assess and appropriately react to influences on her relatives, her family and friends, on any community the member of which she considers herself, on her State at last.

Let’s consider now the case when human reaction to an influence is negative. How can person react in this case? Can one react in no way? In this case if the influence is prolonged and it can continue a person all the time will get negative influence on her. Is this conceivable? One can consider the examples of that seem can confirm this. For example it seems that masochist nothing does to cease the influence that causes physical suffering. But this is suffering for other people whereas for masochist infliction of pain is accompanied by obtaining a set of positive feelings which greatly cover the negative sensations of pain. In this case, the influence on receptors that others evaluate as unwanted pain a masochist estimates it as bliss. One cannot say that there is no reaction. It is, and the reaction is positive. A masochist encourages getting the pain.

Or, for example, when hiding from a mortal danger a person can endure considerable pain or other negative influence and nothing does to cease the influence for not be subject to much more serious danger. In this case not only a pain as negative influence but combination of influences takes place. Except influence that causes pain a person tests other influence that give him information about the much greater danger and a person have to make decision on the base of a combination of factors. Her reaction differs from the reaction on a pain because total influence differs. But the reaction exists. In situation where human usually reacts on a pain instinctively she must suppress her instinctive reaction and this suppression, of course, is an action and reaction respectively.

Let’s consider now that non-permanent influence takes place and a person has not time to react to prevent the influence and to protect her against it. It is already over. Does it mean that the person will not react at all? If she takes no action and does not react to this influence she may be subjected to it again and again in the future. I.e. even in this case a person must respond to a negative influence somehow. Let’s formulate these arguments in the following statement.

***STATEMENT. In response to influences estimated as negative a person undertakes action that, by her opinion, can protect her partly or fully from such influences in the present and/or in the future.***

Till now I considered a person without any connection with other people, I considered only natural human reactions on external influences. Let’s now consider the relations between people in accordance with this statement.

The presence of other people is expressed in the fact that in addition to influences of purely natural origin a person can test influences initiated by other persons. But according to the Statement the origin has not any importance. A person reacts to an influence in the same way, i.e. positively or negatively. The reaction of a person is expressed in the initiation of physical strength. It depends on a person, on his knowledge and skills and experience where strength will be applied, will it be effective or not. It would be reasonable to say that the response should be directed at the source of the influence. And if another person is this source then response should be directed at her. But it is not always the case due to lack of human knowledge, in other words, due to the fact that to err is human. I.e., not always a person can pinpoint the source of undesirable influence and the reaction can be directed not at the source. Nevertheless, a person who is the source of the initial influence cannot be completely sure that she will not be subjected to reaction. If the recipient assessed the influence as negative she has to react in accord with the Statement. And to protect her partly or fully from such influences she must direct her reaction to the source of influence, to other person for to make her to cease her influences at least. Usually such a reaction is also assessed negatively by the source of initial influence; otherwise, the source may further continue her action. Thus it is possible to deduce the consequence.

**Consequence 1 (C1)*. When planning any influence on something belonging to other person one must keep in mind that she may be subjected to response influence on something that she consider as belonging to her.***

C1 is not a strict statement because it implies a probable rather than inevitable event. In order to make a strict statement let’s remember that, by definition, "a reaction on something" implies a unique connection: no action → no reaction.

**Consequence 2 (C2). *A person 1 cannot be subjected to the response influence from a person 2 on something that the person 1 consider as belonging to her if the person 1 does not act on anything that the person 2 consider as belonging to her*.**

Now let’s try to answer the eternal question: "What to do?" Or more precisely - "What not to do?"

In the course of her life a person constantly feels external influences. She assesses negatively a large part of them and accordingly reacts. Is it possible to reduce the flow of the negative influences? In accordance with C2 a person can completely eliminate the response influences from other persons if she does not act on something belonging to them. At that she protects herself both from negative and from positive reactions. Is it possible to protect oneself from negative reactions only? Yes, of course, if one can know what kind of reaction of other person will take place. And to know this one can ask the opinion of other person. And if one makes her influence on something belonging to other person with consent of the last she can protect herself from negative reaction. In our ordinary life this is called as a contract.

Thus answering the question: "What not to do", - the answer is: "Do not make any actions with something belonging to another person without asking her consent."

Let’s use this conclusion to determine the well-known but not uniquely interpreted term of violence.

**DEFINITION. *The violence is an action with something belonging to a person without her consent*.**

One can see that in this definition a disputable point is. A person can consider a thing as belonging to her, but also another person can consider this thing as belonging to her. Whose is the thing really? It seems the unresolved paradox takes place with an objective definition of the owner of a thing. Throughout human history the paradox was resolved usually by force, on the right of the strong. And if two parties interact the strongest one becomes owner of a thing. The case is more interesting when there are three parties and the strongest one is arbitrator who defines the owner. A society can present such a strongest third party. As a rule a society has considerably greater force than that of any of its member. And this force is an incentive to be under its auspices to have the protection of their things. If one of disputing parties is not a member of society then practically she has nothing to opposite to a force of society. And this is why she is forced to join to society. If a dispute is between members of different societies then it can be solved within union that includes societies. One can see that this tendency demands the Society of all people in the limit. Nevertheless this does not provide theoretical decision of the problem of the initial assignment. The arbitrator should be guided by some objective prerequisites in decision.

I can imagine only two such prerequisites and both relate to the original resources provided to us by nature. First, the body of a person is her exclusive property and nobody can make with it any action without the consent of the person. Naturally, I talk about the adult person of legal capacity. This condition gives the ground for all to come to agreement because it allows everybody to protect herself, her body from unwanted influences from others. Otherwise, refusing not to influence on a body of another without her consent a person becomes vulnerable against similar claims to her. And second, natural resources can not belong to anyone individually but only to all and equally at that. The condition is based on the fact that there are no objective criteria to divide the resources among people without controversy. Some of them will always be dissatisfied with the partition and they will assume that neighbors got better pieces. And only under the second condition nobody can claim to a share of another on the grounds that her share differs. And if a person would try to claim to any part of the share of another she becomes vulnerable against similar claims to her share.

Further, it is easy to see that under these conditions absolutely all things can be attributed to their owners on the basis of contractual relations. By the sale of non-renewable and by rent of renewable resources they move from society to private ownership. At that a society receives revenue which can be spent on social needs. And private owners receive resources at their disposal that can be used at their discretion. In particular, applying to them human resources one can create new things and new resources. The ownership of these things and resources is determined by the conditions of attracting of human resources. For example, if a person has acquired a natural resource and using her own body she made a new thing, obviously the thing must be her and only her. On the other hand, a person can rent out her body and her labor-power and her knowledge and skills to someone who has resources to which human resource can be applied. At that human resource becomes belonging to employer during the time stipulated by the contract of employment, and new emerging product becomes employer property, while salary as well as everything that employee can purchased on it becomes a worker property.

Thus, the ownership of any object can be established and the definition of violence is deprived of ambiguity. In modern society both these conditions are implemented at some extent. Although not so long ago some societies have practiced and maintained slavery for example. Also not so long, only a few decades ago few societies have supported segregation, i.e. different access to public services for different populations. The citizens in all countries have very weak and indirect relation to resource management. Their influence on the distribution and use of revenues from resources is negligible too. Can these conditions be implemented entirely and how it is the subject for additional study.

Returning to violence, throughout the history mankind has constantly had to deal with it. People committed violence and fought with it. It's even got a common name the EVIL. The necessity of rejection of violence is reflected in the Bible, in particular in the last five commandments given to Moses concerning to material side of life.

Can we hope to get rid of violence at least amongst people? Most likely the answer to this question is negative. People's needs are unlimited and people always were and are and will be which pretend to something not belonging to them. And some of them can be not aware of the negative consequences of their violence for themselves. The children can be the significant example of this. They only become acquainted with laws of nature and society and to a certain age they are not yet familiar with those or other laws. This is why the relationship between adults and children are often violent. And this is why children often do violence in relation to other children. Quite quickly learning who can fight back they do violence towards weaker.

In fact, the history of human society is quite reminiscent of the children's formation of identity. First, they are only concerned with the nature. Even their parents may be perceived as a part of nature. The children can neither exchange of any information with parents nor negotiate with them. But they already have needs. They grab everything that comes. They burn their fingers, they get experience and they limit themselves in their desires. Growing up and somehow learning to deal with nature and to communicate with others the children are trying to meet their increasing demands, in particular, at the expense of others. At first they do, of course, by means of violence. They just don’t know yet that they can and must negotiate. Attacking their coevals and getting repulse they turn their aggression on those who are weaker. When the latter join together and fight back they organize gangs and terrorize even somehow joint weak ones, forcing the latter to unite into larger community. So gradually maturing people and society aware that any their violence will meet resistance in the end. And with this knowledge the understanding comes that people must limit their needs or they must meet them on a contractual basis with others.

Following this logic humanity has not yet reached its majority. This is evidenced by wars and conflicts between states and armed conflicts both between and within countries and even between religious communities. And often violence takes place from the side of a state with respect to its citizens. Nevertheless, the state as an institution establishing laws in society and providing their execution can play a major role in minimizing the violence in society, first of all by means of eliminating the violent tools from its own use.

Thus obtained above answer to the question - "What not to do?" - actually shows natural regularity that forces people to abandon violence through the natural mechanism. The action of this regularity resembles the action of the Newton's Third Law that states that for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. The regularity discovered above also states that every action (violence) meets reaction. In contrast to the Newton's law the reaction is not always directed straight to the source of the action (violence), and it is not necessarily equal to the action (violence) quantitatively, and the time between action (violence) and reaction is uncertain. The differences stem from the fact that in social relations the human mind is between action and reaction, which comprehends an action and initiates reaction. The first difference, as it was mentioned above, for the most part is explained by imperfection of human mind. Apparently this is the reason of the second difference. Besides if reaction would be strictly equal to action the level of violence in society would be constant. However, for example, Steven Pinker [2011] believes that the level of violence in society has historically reduced. The same conclusion can be made on the base of discovered regularity which forces a society to refuse from violence. As for the third difference, there are a lot of examples in history and in literature and, I am sure, in life of everybody.

Nevertheless, the very meaning of the established regularity that every action meets a counteraction, repeats the meaning of Newton's Third Law. This allows calling the regularity by analogy as Newton's Third Law in social relations. Awareness of this regularity gives a new approach to many issues of life of individuals and society as a whole, in particular regarding to the choice issues, since the solution of such questions is associated with the choice between the different alternatives as a rule. One can exclude in advance from consideration those alternatives that involve violence.
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