

HUMAN NATURE AND WAR

If wars are natural eruptions of instinctive hate, why look for other answers? If human nature leans toward collective killing of outsiders, how.

In: Neorealism and its Critics. Crisp and Meleady posit two systems which they believe now constitute human coalitional psychology. Since ETVOL will be featuring an interview with Scott Atran in the coming weeks, we postpone a discussion of this research until that time. The Vietnam Wars: " In: R. By Anthony Lopez June 6, One Comment Science recently published a Special Issue on Human Conflict that featured research on the dynamics of inter-group conflict, aggression, and war. Because so much is at stake, and implications are as far reaching as they are complex, readers should be wary of arguments that reduce the question of war or aggression to one side of a general dichotomy such as nature or nurture, good or bad, innate or learned. If war is not ingrained in human nature, that may help provide a basis for arguing against war as an option, he says. The answer is again found deeply embedded in one of the facets of man. Matt Finucane , Oct 31 , views This content was written by a student and assessed as part of a university degree. People might fight and sometimes kill for personal reasons, but homicide, he argues, is not war. In a study published in Scientific American, Ferguson argues that war may not be in our nature at all. This type of reasoning is about as popular as it is false, but unfortunately the articles by Douglas Fry and by Frans de Waal fall into this categorical trap. Huntington, S. In his research, Ferguson looked at cases reported as violent deaths throughout the prehistoric record. Survival, dependent first and foremost on the securing of these resources, and secondly on their protection, is integral to the causation of wars. This is a crucial fallacy that not only reveals an incomplete understanding of modern adaptationism, but also hinders useful research on warfare. Why John J. Conflict Management in Primates Chris Boehm, author of Hierarchy in the Forest , describes the similarities among and differences between humans, chimpanzees, and bonobos, and argues that humans have inherited evolved capacities for both conflict and peacemaking. Although not insoluble, it would have been useful for Bowles to address this issue, especially since his framing of reproductive leveling invokes a view of the mind as already capable of establishing the types of norms and institutions that reproductive leveling is meant to explain in the first place. If more people work for prevention, the eventual eradication of war is a definite theoretical possibility. In essence, Fry and de Waal believe that the capacity for peacemaking and the existence of peaceful societies disproves an evolutionary explanation for war. However, the psychological mechanisms they provide for arriving at this conclusion are unconvincing. Neorealism and its Critics. It is too great a task to identify a common cause of all wars, past and present, then attribute it responsibility for their commencing. Shorter Oxford English Dictionary. Evidence of this transition is found in peoples of sub-national, ethnic, and religious groups uniting in defiance of their state identity, for example in when the people of Sarajevo displayed the flags of Saudi Arabia and Turkey, showing solidarity with their fellow Muslims, not with their traditional western allies or state Huntington, , p. Rather, the question is: how can evolutionary theory explain the context-specificity of such decisions? Importantly, the false dichotomy between biology-as-inflexible and culture-as-conditional is now exposed, yet few are willing to see it. Hobbes, T. Careful examination of all evidence typically finds no strong indication of war in early remains, which changes to clear signs of war in later periods. Morgenthau, H. No, says R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Even bonobos, our most peaceful cousins, engage in complex coalitional maneuvers in order to undercut the efforts of dangerous individuals. He disputes the belief of many scholars that humans may have inherited their genetic makeup from their chimpanzee cousins millions of years ago. The Origins of the First World War. Thus, a better understanding of when these group identities motivate the behavior of individuals can help us to explain the patterns of various forms of inter-group conflict. War is fundamentally a collective action, and as such, it requires a substantial amount of within-group coordination, cooperation, and altruism. New York: Columbia University Press. The problem with this argument, as others have pointed out , is that reproductive leveling assumes the behavior it seeks to explain. According to Bowles, reproductive leveling is necessary for group selection to operate, and group selection is necessary to explain altruism. Crisp and Meleady take the analysis a step further by considering the evolutionary roots of human groupishness and its implications for life in modern multicultural nation-states.