

1: Natural born killers: humans predisposed to murder, study suggests | Science | The Guardian

The war of ideas over violence and human nature has raged since the 17th century, when philosopher Thomas Hobbes first speculated that the "natural condition of mankind" was one of violence and conflict. In the 18th century, Jean-Jacques Rousseau saw things differently.

But genes also predispose humans to cooperation and altruism. The idea that human behavior is driven by genes makes many people uncomfortable, and nowhere is the dispute more bitter than when discussing the biological underpinnings of violence. The war of ideas over violence and human nature has raged since the 17th century, when philosopher Thomas Hobbes first speculated that the "natural condition of mankind" was one of violence and conflict. In the 18th century, Jean-Jacques Rousseau saw things differently. Enthralled with accounts of the New World, he argued that civilization, not nature, shaped the human propensity for violence. Social scientists have spent the last three centuries embroiled in debate over the degree to which human nature and culture are responsible for war. In recent decades, biology has entered the fray. Over the last few years, scientists have converged on something of a consensus: The human propensity for lethal violence against "out-group" members has deep evolutionary roots. Today the basis for out-groups can take any form, including nationality, religious sect, ethnic background or political affiliation, none of which were important in our evolutionary history. Although our peaceful cousins the bonobos are sometimes trumpeted as an example of an alternative evolutionary lineage, their more amicable relationships are not surprising from an evolutionary perspective. Biologists believe that early humans as well as chimpanzees faced resource competition, whereas bonobos had less resource scarcity, which allowed a species-specific capacity for peaceful intergroup relations to evolve. Archaeology provides an important means to examine violence prior to European contact or colonization. Skeletal injuries such as cranial fractures, parry wounds and dismemberment suggest lethal violence was common. Coalitionary aggression can be inferred from the many examples of multiple traumas to a single individual, and from mass graves that often include women and children. Such burial sites have been found across the globe, including the notoriously grisly 14th century Crow Creek massacre in South Dakota, where the remains of nearly 100 bodies have been recovered. Given the scarcity of paleo-archaeological human remains, the fact that we have found so much evidence of violent conflict is telling about the nature of intergroup relationships in pre-history. Anthropologists believe that warfare was common among many hunter-gatherers, though the exact nature and frequency continues to be the subject of debate. Groups that are sometimes cited as examples of peaceful societies today, such as the Hadza of Tanzania, had violent intergroup conflict in their recent past. Oral histories gathered to document pre-contact customs in traditional societies often contain accounts of terrible violence. As one Inuit elder related to the anthropologist Franz Boas: Some of the most riveting research on the subject has involved collaborations between economists, anthropologists and theoretical biologists, who have developed quantitative models and computer simulations. At the same time, social psychologists have documented what seems to be an innate disposition of humans to classify individuals into in-group and out-group members that can form the foundation for divisions leading to conflict. Taken together the evidence points to an evolutionary basis for violent conflict. But fortunately, the story does not stop there. Warfare is only one part of our evolutionary legacy. The other is that humans evolved to be highly cooperative and responsive to cultural norms, including those that promote peaceful relationships. Human cooperation, even more necessary than war for survival, has evolutionary roots as deep as those of human conflict. Just as groups may fight because of environmental pressures or resource scarcity, they may also have strong incentives to expand trade relations and build alliances that benefit both parties. The capacity for peaceful and cooperative relationships was surely more essential for the survival and success of the species than bellicosity. What does all this mean for a future without war? Environmental pressures, resource competition and population density certainly influenced human evolution, predisposing us to competition and violence. But those same pressures can predispose us to cooperation as well. Whether our genes lead us to war or peace depends on the particular social environment in which we live. For that we need culture too. Luke Glowacki is a doctoral candidate in human evolutionary biology at Harvard University.

2: Nature or nurture: is violence in our genes?

Human nature can help in acting as an instrument to carry out violence but in itself human nature does not determine violence hence it cannot explain violence. The origin of violence cannot be found in human nature.

Dear readers, what is your answer? Mine can be found in this article. War I define violence, organized or unorganized, as any violent action causing injury or death. War is a form of organized violence. War is any form of organized violence as opposed to unorganized, individualized violence perpetrated by politicians usually in concert with powerful economic and ideological interests to gain control over the resources and people of another state, territory or any opposition to such control. Be that as it may, war however defined has been a staple of human endeavors for at least 14, years. Other Forms of Organized Violence Other forms of organized violence that come to mind are sacrificial rites, massacres, covert military operations read CIA , torture by a group or agency, lynchings before an assembled mass audience, slavery, and capital punishment. The origins and incidence of these down through the centuries I am not going to bother researching. What they all have in common is violent actions by a group or organization Just Human Nature? I will first use my case to explain my answer and then generalize it. I was born and reared a pacifist Quaker. While no longer religious I still hate war, have never joined a violent group, never owned a gun or shot one, never got involved in fisticuffs. Organized or unorganized violence is clearly not part of my human nature. In general, neither organized nor unorganized killing of other human beings is not just human nature or even may not be instinctive human nature at all. The learning and influence occur in group or organized settings. Human beings never do anything in isolation. We are always interacting with our settings, or circumstances and situations. A morally upright person, for example, will tend to avoid or successfully resist circumstances or situations favoring violence. They order the killing. They do not do the actual killing. We have to go down to the bottom of the echelon to find the underlings who activate the deadly weapons aimed at other human beings. That takes us, for example, inside boot camp where these underlings are taught and then ordered to kill because it is unnatural for human beings to kill other human beings on a massive scale. Were it natural our species would either be extinct by now or substantially depleted. Were it natural there would be no skyrocketing cases of post traumatic syndrome or suicides among soldiers. Here is what a former Army ranger had to say about the crucial role of military training in learning to kill: In Closing In closing I want to quote David Swanson, director of World Beyond War, activist and prolific author, who wrote the foreword to my book mentioned above, and who was a nominee for the Nobel peace prize, a prize that has gone to the international war criminals Henry Kissinger and Barack Obama: Thank you, David Swanson. His most recent book is Corporate Reckoning Ahead. This article was posted on Sunday, July 3rd, at 6:

3: Nature, Nurture and Violence | HowStuffWorks

The Human Nature of Violence – By Robin Fox Part 1. (This paper was originally presented at an international conference on Drinking and Public Disorder, organised by MCM Research, to a largely non-academic audience.).

From domestic violence within the home to globe-spanning wars, humans have a habit of acting on aggression. Where does this violent behavior come from? Are we hardwired with it, or do we learn this behavior? And is there any way to move beyond being a violent creature? Most animals use aggressive displays to ward off competitors for food or mates without the intention of causing serious injury or death. Predators kill primarily for sustenance -- preying upon species other than their own. Two notable exceptions to this general rule are humans and chimpanzees [source: Wrangham and Peterson]. Like early humans, chimpanzees form small groups in which individuals depend upon one another. Chimps from one group may leave and join another or form their own. And chimps that grew up playing together may one day face each other in a fight to the death. Scientists have observed chimps forming raiding parties along the borders of their own territories. A group of male chimps will patrol, searching for members of neighboring groups. If they find one, they may attack with violent ferocity, injuring or even killing their victim. Interestingly, in chimpanzee society, the males are usually the violent gender. The same is true in human society -- studies show men are involved in more violent crimes than women. Interestingly, the chimpanzee is the animal most closely related to the human. Humans and chimps descended from a common ancestor around five million years ago [source: Is it possible our violent nature comes from this mysterious ancestor? Evolutionary psychologists might say that our prehistoric ancestors passed down a tendency toward violent behavior, particularly among males. But even if this is true, the full explanation is far more complicated. While violence may be part of our genetic history, so is contemplation.

4: Are people violent by nature? Probably. - latimes

Violence and Human Nature Essay Sample. Zinn's point of his writing in chapter 3 is that human 'violent nature' is usually by the upbringing of the individual.

Not everyone exhibits violent behavior. Are our violent natures buried deep within us, waiting for the right set of circumstances to come to the surface? Or do we need to learn violent behaviors from others? Do our social groups restrict our violent tendencies, or do they foster them? Psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and ethologists -- scientists who study behaviors -- struggle to answer these questions. Humans can plan and reflect upon our deeds. While we may all have the capacity to be violent, we may only exercise violence under certain circumstances. In the second scenario, the families within the community lack stability. It would be almost impossible and certainly unethical to perform such an experiment. But crime statistics seem to indicate that communities that lack stable family units produce more crime -- particularly violent crime. Cultural values and beliefs can also play an important role. Social interaction is marked with affection. But the homicide rate among the Gebusi is one of the highest in the world. One reason is that the Gebusi believe in sorcery and witchcraft -- killing someone believed to be practicing lethal witchcraft is permissible within their culture [source: There are other elements that can influence us to make us violent. Mental disorders or brain damage can affect judgment and perception. Within a population, certain traits may make particular subsections more violent. In a study of aggressive behaviors within a college community, researchers discovered that males with low levels of fluctuating asymmetry FA admitted to being in fights more than those with high FA. Fluctuating asymmetry is a deviation from perfect bilateral symmetry, and is the product of environmental and developmental stresses. The study suggests males who have greater symmetry -- and presumably fewer mutations than those with less symmetry -- are more violent [source: In other words, violence may be simply a part of human nature. Our personalities are the products of thousands of influences. Some are biological and date back to before humans even existed as a species. Others develop as part of our social and cultural practices. We may never have the complete answer to what makes us a violent species. But we should always ask ourselves these questions -- if nothing else, we may find the secret to reducing violent conflict. For more on violence and other related topics, punch on over to the next page.

5: Why are we violent? | HowStuffWorks

*In *The Better Angels of Our Nature*, Pinker elegantly charts what he sees as a decline in violence, from the frightening 15 percent of violent deaths in nonstate societies down to 3 percent of deaths attributed to war, genocide, and other human-made disasters in the 20th century—a period that includes two world wars.*

Get Full Essay Get access to this section to get all help you need with your essay and educational issues. Are we supposed to blame war on human nature? Is the government the be-all-end-all when it comes to how humans react and act during war? Those are some extremely well thought out questions that Zinn brought up multiple times. History is the one thing that Einstein, Freud and many other intellectual people have pointed back to the reason why some people would become hostile. Milgram experiment can really put some perspective on how it affects humans with how close they are when it comes to inflicting pain, or making a situation worse, for another individual. When those people saw wrong answers, they were supposed to hit a button to inflict an electric buzz. When the study examined when someone was put closer to the person, they were more likely to exit the experiment. If they were placed further away with less conflict of interest, they were less inclined to leave the experiment. We as humans, almost always, assume that our political leaders know best. There were multiple stories in there of men that were not proud of what they did but just simply put that they were doing what they were told to do. They are outcasted as cowards and usually put into jail. When it comes to war, those people are just really doing what they are told to do because they believe it is in their best interest, and their countries. The response to his theories and beliefs would be almost completely on point with what he stated in his reasoning. There is always an exception when it comes to people being violent when it comes to war. The story about how those men in Vietnam were ordered to kill everything, then burn it, in that small village was outrageous. Some people actually went through with those orders, and rightfully so. They were just looking out for themselves, which is obvious human nature especially when it comes to war. I am not a violent person but if I were put in that particular situation, I would have shamefully acted the exact same way and do what I was told to do. The picture that I chose to use is your typical World War 2 propaganda. It is displaying Uncle Sam pointing at the individual basically saying: We, as Americans, need your help taking out all of the bad guys overseas. As you can tell by the picture, he is very intense and confident. The picture leaves very little doubt that you going to the military forces of the United States of America will result in a bad ending. The finger point just says it all. More essays like this:

6: Los Angeles Times - We are currently unavailable in your region

The victims of a massacre 10, years ago show the human tendency toward aggression. The work we have done since shows how that tendency isn't destiny.

Sussman Are human beings forever doomed to be violent? Is aggression fixed within our genetic code, an inborn action pattern that threatens to destroy us? Apes and the Origins of Human Violence, can we get beyond our genes, beyond our essential "human nature"? The authors argue that years ago most scholars believed human aggression was unique. Research at that time had shown great apes to be basically non-aggressive gentle creatures. Furthermore, the separation of humans from our ape ancestors was thought to have occurred million years ago Mya. Wilson and others had argued through much of the 20th century that hunting, killing, and extreme aggressive behaviors were biological traits inherited from our earliest hominid hunting ancestors, many anthro-pologists still believed that patterns of aggression were environmentally determined and culturally learned behaviors, not inherited characteristics. *Demonic Males* discusses new evidence that killer instincts are not unique to humans, but rather shared with our nearest the common chimpanzee. The authors argue that it is this inherited propensity for killing that allows hominids and chimps to be such good hunters. According to Wrangham and Peterson, the split between humans and the common chimpanzee was only Mya. Furthermore, humans may have split from the chimpanzee-bonobo line after gorillas, with bonobos pygmy chimps separating from chimps only 2. Because chimpanzees may be the modern ancestor of all these forms, and because the earliest australopithecines were quite chimpanzee-like, Wrangham speculates in a separate article that "chimpanzees are a conservative species and an amazingly good model for the ancestor of hominids" , reprinted in Sussman If modern chimpanzees and modern humans share certain behavioral traits, these traits have "long evolutionary roots" and are likely to be fixed, biologically inherited parts of our basic human nature and not culturally determined. Wrangham argues that chimpanzees are almost on the brink of humanness: Nut-smashing, root-eating, savannah-using chimpanzees, resembling our ancestors, and capable by the way of extensive bipedalism. Using ant-wands, and sandals, and bowls, meat-sharing, hunting cooperatively. Wrangham and Peterson Does this mean chimpanzees are naturally violent? In this cultural species, it may turn out that one of the least variable of all chimpanzee behaviors is the intense competition between males, the violent aggression they use against strangers, and their willingness to maim and kill those that frustrate their goals As the picture of chimpanzee society settles into focus, it now includes infanticide, rape and regular battering of females by males Since humans and chimpanzees share these violent urges, the implication is that human violence has long evolutionary roots. The coincidence of demonic aggression in ourselves and our closest kin bespeaks its antiquity" This view continues to pervade modern "scientific" interpretations of the evolution of human behavior. By the early s, large numbers of australopithecine fossils and the discovery that the large-brained "fossil" ancestor from Piltdown, in England, was a fraud, led to the realization that our earliest ancestors were more like apes than like modern humans. Accordingly, our earliest ancestors must have behaved much like other non-human primates. This, in turn, led to a great interest in using primate behavior to understand human evolution and the evolutionary basis of human nature. The subdiscipline of primatology was born. Raymond Dart, discoverer of the first australopithecine fossil some thirty years earlier, was also developing a different view of our earliest ancestors. At first Dart believed that australopithecines were scavengers barely eking out an existence in the harsh savanna environment. But from the fragmented and damaged bones found with the australopithecines, together with dents and holes in these early hominid skulls, Dart eventually concluded that this species had used bone, tooth and antler tools to kill, butcher and eat their prey, as well as to kill one another. This hunting hypothesis Cartmill Cartmill, in a recent book , shows that this interpretation of early human morality is reminiscent of earlier Greek and Christian views. Ardrey believed it was the human competitive and killer instinct, acted out in warfare, that made humans what they are today. Dreams may have inspired our love of freedom, but only war and weapons have made it ours" *Man the Hunter* In the volume *Man the Hunter*, Sherwood Washburn and Chet Lancaster presented a theory of "The evolution of hunting," emphasizing that it

is this behavior that shaped human nature and separated early humans from their primate relatives. To assert the biological unity of mankind is to affirm the importance of the hunting way of life. However, much conditions and customs may have varied locally, the main selection pressures that forged the species were the same. The biology, psychology and customs that separate us from the apes. Rather than amassing evidence from modern hunters and gatherers to prove their theory, Washburn and Lancaster. Men enjoy hunting and killing, and these activities are continued in sports even when they are no longer economically necessary. If a behavior is important to the survival of a species. Man the Hunter. Using a similar logic for the survival of ancient "learned and pleasurable" behaviors, perhaps it could easily have been our propensity for dancing rather than our desire to hunt that can explain much of human behavior. After all, men and women love to dance; it is a behavior found in all cultures but has even less obvious function today than hunting. Our love of movement and dance might explain, for example, our propensity for face-to-face sex, and even the evolution of bipedalism and the movement of humans out of trees and onto the ground. Could the first tool have been a stick to beat a dance drum, and the ancient Laetoli footprints evidence of two individuals going out to dance the "Afarensis shuffle"? Although it takes only two to tango, a variety of social interactions and systems might have been encouraged by the complex social dances known in human societies around the globe. Wilson. In the mid-1970s, E. O. Wilson and others described a number of traits as genetically based and therefore human universals, including territoriality, male-female bonds, male dominance over females, and extended maternal care leading to matrilineality. Wilson argued that the genetic basis of these traits was indicated by their relative constancy among our primate relatives and by their persistence throughout human evolution and in human societies. Elsewhere, I have shown that these characteristics are neither general primate traits nor human universals. Sussman. Wilson, however, argued that these were a product of our evolutionary hunting past. For at least a million years--probably more--Man engaged in a hunting way of life, giving up the practice a mere 10,000 years ago. Our innate social responses have been fashioned through this life style. With caution, we can compare the most widespread hunter-gatherer qualities with similar behavior displayed by some of the non-human primates that are closely related to Man. Where the same pattern of traits occurs in Wilson, in Sussman. To sociobiologists, evolutionary morality is based on an unconscious need to multiply our own genes, to build group cohesion in order to win wars. We should not look down on our warlike, cruel nature but rather understand its success when coupled with "making nice" with some other individuals or groups. The genetically driven "making nice" is the basis of human ethics and morality. Throughout recorded history the conduct of war has been common. Not only are modern gatherer-hunters and most apes remarkably non-aggressive, but in the 1970s and 1980s studies of fossil bones and artifacts have shown that early humans were not hunters, and that weapons were a later addition to the human repertoire. Australopithecines apparently were the hunted, not the hunters. Cartmill, 1982. The authors ask the critical question: Are we doomed to be violent forever because this pattern is fixed within our genetic code or can we go beyond our past? The authors believe that we can look to the bonobo or pygmy chimpanzee as one potential savior, metaphorically speaking. Bonobos, although even more closely related to the common chimpanzee than humans, have become a peace-loving, love-making alternative to chimpanzee-human violence. How did this happen? In chimpanzees and humans, females of the species select partners that are violent. However, among pygmy chimpanzees females form alliances and have chosen to mate with less aggressive males. So, after all, it is not violent males that have caused humans and chimpanzees to be their inborn, immoral, dehumanized selves, it is rather, poor choices by human and chimpanzee females. Like Dart, Washburn, and Wilson before them, Wrangham and Peterson believe that killing and violence is inherited from our ancient relatives of the past. However, unlike these earlier theorists, Wrangham and Peterson argue this is not a trait unique to hominids, nor is it a by-product of hunting. In fact, it is just this violent nature and a natural "blood lust" that makes both humans and chimpanzees such good hunters. It is the bonobos that help the authors come to this conclusion. Because bonobos have lost the desire to kill, they also have lost the desire to hunt. The strongest hypothesis at the moment is that bonobos came from a chimpanzee-like ancestor that hunted monkeys and hunted one another. As they evolved into bonobos, males lost their demonism, becoming less aggressive to each other. In so doing they lost their lust for hunting monkeys, too. Murder and hunting may be more closely tied together than we

are used to thinking Wrangham and Peterson. This lust to kill is based upon the sociobiological tenet of the selfish gene. As with many of the new sociobiological or evolutionary anthropology theories, I find problems with both the theory itself and with the evidence used to support it. Two arguments that humans and chimpanzees share biologically fixed behaviors are: The first of these statements is still hotly debated and, using various genetic evidence, the chimp-gorilla-human triage is so close that it is difficult to tell exact divergence time or pattern among the three. The second statement is just not true. Chimpanzees have been evolving for as long as humans and gorillas, and there is no reason to believe ancestral chimps were similar to present-day chimps. The fossil evidence for the last million years is extremely sparse, and it is likely that many forms of apes have become extinct just as have many hominids. Furthermore, even if the chimpanzee were a good model for the ancestral hominid, and was a conservative representative of this phylogenetic group, this would not mean that humans would necessarily share specific behavioral traits. As even Wrangham and Peterson emphasize, chimps, gorillas, and bonobos all behave very differently from one another in their social behavior and in their willingness to kill conspecifics. Evidence Against "Demonic Males" The proof of the "Demonic Male" theory does not rest on any theoretical grounds but must rest solely on the evidence that violence and killing in chimpanzees and in humans are behaviors that are similar in pattern; have ancient, shared evolutionary roots; and are inherited. Besides killing of conspecifics, Wrangham "includes infanticide, rape, and regular battering of females by males" as a part of this inherited legacy of violent behaviors shared by humans and chimpanzees. Wrangham and Peterson state: However, as Wrangham points out there are exceptions, such as lions, wolves, spotted hyenas, and I would add a number of other predators. In fact, most species do not have the weapons to kill one another as adults. Just how common is conspecific killing in chimpanzees? This is where the real controversy may lie. Jane Goodall described the chimpanzee as a peaceful, non-aggressive species during the first 24 years of study at Gombe. During one year of concentrated study, Goodall observed agonistic encounters: Other attacks consisted merely of brief pounding, hitting or rolling of the individual, after which the aggressor often touched or embraced the other immediately. Chimpanzee aggression before was considered no different from patterns of aggression seen in many other primate species.

7: SIRC - The Human Nature of Violence 1

The Human Nature of Violence By Robin Fox (This paper was originally presented at an international conference on Drinking and Public Disorder, organised by MCM Research, to a largely.

Barash says, not necessarily. Few people “ and probably no philosophers “ would disagree with this. It is also unarguably true that not all ideas are equally consequential. Man remains what he has always been. Before Copernicus, Galileo and Kepler, although many serious thinkers believed the Ptolemaic model of a geocentric universe, their error did not alter the astrodynamics of the solar system, which was then and has continued to be heliocentric, regardless of what theories people have had about it. Similarly for gravity before and after Newton, space-time before and after Einstein, and so forth. Strictly speaking, the same applies to theories of human nature too: Consider for instance militarists in country A, who are convinced that inhabitants of country B are caught in the grip of an unshakeable instinct-driven warproneness. As a result, A refuses to engage in serious negotiations, preferring to arm itself. Each side points to the other as justifying its own bellicosity, at the same time confirming their often unspoken assumption that war is both natural and inevitable. The danger, in short, of assuming that Homo sapiens has a natural instinct for war is that it can become a highly destructive self-fulfilling prophecy, not only closing off possible avenues of peaceful conflict resolution, but actually making war more likely. The late Carl Sagan famously pointed out that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. I believe that we should extend this dictum to say that claims with potentially destructive social consequences also require extraordinary evidence. This makes it especially regrettable that a substantial current of recent academic writing “ much of it given the apparent imprimatur of evolutionary science “ has suggested that Homo sapiens is inherently violent and warlike. It is war and the instinct for territory that has led to the great accomplishments of Western Man. Dreams may have inspired our love of freedom, but only war and weapons have made it ours. I know Professor Chagnon, and have great respect for his courage “ intellectual as well as physical “ and high regard for his science; I am also convinced that he has been grossly abused by much of the anthropological establishment, by being accused of misdeeds of which he was entirely innocent “ in large part because his findings that the Yanomamo are belligerent and warlike went against the ideological preferences of many of his colleagues. Herein lies an important tale, fit perhaps for another account: Thus, many biologists and more than a few social scientists have extrapolated from the Yanomamo to Homo sapiens generally, arguing that what holds for the former is therefore true for the latter as well. A similar logical error is regularly made when it comes to extrapolating innate human violence from the observed behavior of a limited number of nonhuman primate species. Savannah baboons from East Africa were among the first free-living nonhuman primates to be studied, and, just by chance, they are also among the most aggressive and violent. Not surprisingly, this research has led to the generalization that human beings have inherited the baboon and chimp proclivity for group-oriented violence, not only analogous to warfare, but presumably homologous to it. There are, however, several major problems with this presumption. For one, human beings did not evolve from either baboons or chimps. Neither species is ancestral to Homo sapiens; rather, we share common ancestors with both. Moreover, there are other nonhuman primates, including mountain and lowland gorillas, as well as bonobos previously called pygmy chimpanzees that are notably nonviolent; and bonobos are no less closely related to human beings than are chimpanzees. Choosing either species as a model for natural human behavior says more about the ideology of the person doing the choosing than about the biology of human beings. The role of predation on other species in forming the human psyche is similarly an open question. Chimpanzees occasionally hunt and kill other primates; bonobos do not. Either way, it is important to distinguish between interspecies predation and intraspecies aggression. Although the former is certainly violent, predatory species such as for example lions employ entirely different behavior patterns when obtaining their prey compared to when engaging in violent competition with other lions. Allegory of Peace and Justice by Corrado Giaquinto, Ambiguous Tendencies

What, then, is the biological state of Homo sapiens when it comes to violence and war? Unfortunately for those who like their answers simple, reality is ambiguous, or rather, ambidextrous, in that it tends to point in

two conflicting directions. Our species is certainly capable of violence at both the individual level e. But a capacity is a far cry from a necessity “ which would imply a predisposition simmering just below the surface, urgently seeking opportunities to burst out. Yet there is no evidence whatever that human beings who have lived a consistently nonviolent life eventually feel an need to commit mayhem at the behest of their frustrated genes. By the same token, there is abundant evidence that at the level of societies, people are quite capable of renouncing war, since numerous societies have done just this. Nonetheless, it is equally evident that natural selection has equipped our species with a predilection for violence under certain circumstances. These include situations in which resource competition is high: An identifiable subset of humanity “ young adult males “ is especially vulnerable to such pressures. Moreover, it must be emphasized that whereas interpersonal violence is directly associated with relatively simple neurobiological influences, involving readily identifiable brain regions such as the limbic system, and particular transmitter hormones, war is a quite different phenomenon, typically involving elaborate cognitive processes, extensive planning, and ironically, perhaps substantial social cooperation, at least among those on the same side. Although there is substantial reason to believe that natural selection has directly equipped human beings with mechanisms that readily lead to individual violence, there is no evidence that warfare as such has been part of the biological bequeathal to us as hominids. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that war is a comparatively recent cultural addition to the human repertoire, acquired within the last 10, years or so as a result of several factors, including the invention of agriculture “ resulting in the accumulation of valuable material resources that lend themselves to being stolen as well as defended, along with enabling the construction of elaborate social hierarchies “ plus increasingly effective technologies for communication, coordination and killing. The evidence for the recent emergence of war is persuasively reviewed and summarized in *War, Peace, and Human Nature*: Even as human evolution has permitted and in some cases even encouraged the elaboration of violent behaviors, it has also promoted constructive social activities and inclinations, including, but not limited to, altruism, empathy, and numerous aspects of social coordination for learning, handicrafts and tool-making, constructing homes, animal enclosures, food storage systems, crop-raising, as well as animal domestication, organizing daily as well as migratory movements of people, and so forth. An increasingly viable hypothesis identifies the elaborate intellectual prerequisites for success in a highly social and co-operative species such as ours as having exerted substantial selection pressure leading to the evolution of the uniquely high level of human intelligence. At the same time, such high intelligence has also set the stage for developing more elaborate techniques of warfare. After all, the invention of nuclear weapons is itself a triumph of the human intellect, as well as an ironic manifestation of our capacity for cooperation. Similarly, our Janus-faced biological heritage can predispose human beings toward either violence or peace, depending on the circumstances. And despite being an evolutionary biologist myself, I am also enough of an optimist as well as a believer in the power of human cultural self-direction to espouse not only the desirability of peace but also its feasibility. A prerequisite, however, is that people free themselves from the cynical, self-deceiving, and indeed scientifically unsupportable presumption that our species is biologically doomed to unceasing violence. There is a story, said to be of Cherokee origin, that speaks to this matter, and to our shared responsibility. A young girl was troubled by a recurring dream in which two wolves fought viciously with each other. When she recounted the dream to her grandfather, a village elder renowned for his wisdom, he explained that there are two wolves inside everyone, one peaceful and the other warlike. At this, the girl was even more upset, and asked which one wins. Barash David P. Barash is an evolutionary biologist and professor of psychology at the University of Washington, whose most recent book is *Buddhist Biology*:

8: Are Human Beings Naturally Violent And Warlike? | Issue | Philosophy Now

In other words, violence may be simply a part of human nature. Our personalities are the products of thousands of influences. Some are biological and date back to before humans even existed as a species.

The End of War is a compact, yet compelling, read by John Horgan that provides the reasons behind conflict amongst human beings. His main arguments can be divided into three over-arching categories. First, Horgan points out that human genes overlap more with bonobos than chimpanzees. This can be backed up by the finding that the origins of warfare only date back by years. We make it happen. What are your reasons to support this argument? Horgan mainly disagrees with the Malthusian theory - the idea that population density, resource depletion, and scarcity can lead to conflict. Instead of ascribing reasons behind warfare to Malthusian theory alone, Horgan argues that there are varying, overlapping, and sometimes even conflicting reasons for modern international warfare. In order to fully understand the limitations of his theory, I will divide the counter-arguments into three broad categories. Firstly, history provides us with statistics illustrating that over the last two centuries, the per-capita income has increased 1 nine-fold whereas the population has shown a rise by six-fold. Today one-sixth of the world population lies below the poverty line " which is still quite high " but nevertheless lower than the poverty line in the 18 th century. Secondly, even if we analyze the Malthusian theory in terms of other vital resources other than simply food, such as water scarcity or fossil fuels, it still seems just as flawed. For example the river Nile has been a prominent source of sustenance for over 10 countries in Africa. With the population anticipated to virtually double in the next two decades and global warming being an existential threat, Malthusian theory should predict wars being waged in the region. The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time. Accessed 7th October has brought nations together due to greater inter-dependence and co-operation. If we shed light on the contentious topic of fossil fuels, history still does not provide evidence for warfare resulting out of simply the scarcity of fossil fuels. However, this gap has been filled through imports rather than war for resource accumulation. The Upside of Down: Catastrophe, Creativity, and the Renewal of Civilization. Accessed 7th October 6 7 is a primary motive to engage in war. I have several reasons to ridicule this idea. First of all, this idea seems unrealistic because of its ridiculously one-sided emphasis on the role of free volition in decision making. It completely rules out the possibility of external factors having an impact on our decisions. One example to back up my claim will be the experiment conducted by Stanley Milgram that concluded that people can forego their own rational thought to some extent in order 8 to act obedient out of fear or for co-operation in the face of authority. Horgan will be quick to combat this argument by saying that the Samuel Marshall experiment 6 Ember, C. A cross cultural study. Engaging in warfare results in draining resources that only worsens the problem of scarcity and exacerbates the problem of aggression and violence. Based on common interest, the boys decided that consensus will be more useful than conflict. Collective action on a global scale, whether its war or climate change, cannot be viewed through an individualistic lens. It has to be seen through the universalistic lens noting that the issue is dispersed across nations, races, ethnicities and cultures. They were instead manipulated in order to further his own agenda. Accessed 7th October 10 Page The Social Conquest of Earth. Third, is Horgan right that humans are free to choose peace over war? Horgan believes that humans are free to choose peace over war under any circumstances. Unfortunately, this is a blatantly oversimplified statement for a professor of his stature. Having made a career out of this topic, the minimum one can expect from his side is to realize that such claims are easier stated than materialized. There are several reasons behind this claim. Firstly, Horgan compares war with slavery, cannibalism, corporal punishment and so on. He states that just like a revolution in our morals allowed us to realize how dysfunctional these acts were, the same needs to be done for war. A nation-state cannot completely disarm itself simply based on its unilateral authority " it has to take in to account the decisions of its neighboring states. For example, if China decides to curtail its military budget, it 11 Page 87, Jamieson, Dale. Reason in a Dark Time: This is because when a nation disarms itself and is defended by a stronger one, it is at the mercy of its guardian. This can prove to be extremely risky for the whole nation in case of any foreign affair inconsistencies and contentions. Therefore, adopting pacifism is

more of an illusion even if aggression or violence is not innate or biologically programmed within us. Moreover, the argument that democracy and peace are directly related cannot be blindly accepted. Ancient history provides us the example of the Greeks, who despite incorporating democracy in their political system, waged many wars. A modern example can be that of the United States, that despite various protests ¹³ against the decision of waging war in Vietnam, went along with it. This proves that a rise in liberal democracies does not necessarily mean the decline of international warfare. Therefore, I believe that peace is not the by-product of free will or democracy. Violence may not be innate within humans beings but self- interest it, and as long as there is a conflict of interest, there is potential for individuals or nations to engage in warfare. Accessed 7th October 13 [http:](#) Accessed 7th October Word Count: Accessed 7th October 4. Accessed 7th October 5. Accessed 7th October 6. Accessed 7th October 7. Accessed 7th October 8. Accessed 7th October 9.

9: War, Other Organized Violence and Human Nature | Dissident Voice

negative view of human nature, especially for classical realists. The opposing view sees war as a culturally learned practice, a form of collective violence rather than a manifestation of an.

Princess dracula john patrick kennedy Transformation of the European defense industry Great sermons on Christ Marketing Selling Professional Services Handbook of the classical collection Evaluation of cultural action Exploring psychology in modules State, labor, and the transition to a market economy Build Your Own Army of Web Bots Within 24 Hours (Army of Web Bots Series, 1) Pitched from the past Financial Accounting International Standards (CIMA Official Study System) Free college resource book Professional ASP.NET Web Services with VB.NET How truth thought / The way of tradition Writing about cool Religious diversity and multiculturalism in Southern Europe : the Italian mosque debate Anna Triandafylli Wipe Clean Flash Cards ABC (Wipe Clean) Moores archaeology full report at pine island guntersville basin Reformation And Modern Rituals And Theologies of Baptism The perfection of true womanhood Journey to the west anthony yu Lord, Give Me Eternal Life Why no gospels in Talmudic Judaism? Rock Revival Songbook An enchanted modern The Critical Response to Gertrude Stein Frommers Ireland from 50 a day Commonsense Gardener The Beginnings Of Faith 74 Celts and Stonehenge Moderno manual de etiqueta y protocolo Art and times of the guitar Brain lock Agent provocateur Liz Maverick Immortalia Volume Three Electron energy-loss spectroscopy as a tool for elemental analysis in biological specimens Nadine Kapp . Defenses in actions against broker-dealers 1]. Vocational and skill-training Bill and the Ghost of Grimley Grange