

The Seville Statement on Violence

“Believing that it is our responsibility to address from our particular disciplines the most dangerous and destructive activities of our species, violence and war; recognizing that science is [a] human cultural product which cannot be definitive or all-encompassing; and gratefully acknowledging the support of the authorities of Seville and representatives of the Spanish UNESCO; we, the undersigned scholars from around the world and from relevant sciences, have met and arrived at the following Statement on Violence. In it, we challenge a number of alleged biological findings that have been used by some in our disciplines, to justify violence and war. Because the alleged findings have contributed to an atmosphere of pessimism in our time, we submit that the open, considered rejection of these mis-statements can contribute significantly to the International Year of Peace.

Misuse of scientific theories and data to justify violence and war is not new but has been made since the advent of modern science. For example, the theory of evolution has been used to justify not only war, but also genocide, colonialism, and suppression of the weak.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors. Although fighting occurs widely throughout animal species, only a few cases of destructive intra-species fighting between organized groups have ever been reported among naturally living species, and none of these involve the use of tools designed to be weapons. Normal predatory feeding upon other species cannot be equated with intra-species violence. Warfare is a peculiarly human phenomenon and does not occur in other animals.

The fact that warfare has changed so rapidly over time indicates that it is a product of culture. Its biological connection is primarily through language which makes possible the coordination of groups, the transmission of technology, and the use of tools. War is biologically possible, but not inevitable, as evidenced by its variation in occurrence and nature over time and space. There are cultures which have not engaged in war for centuries, and there are cultures which have engaged in war frequently at some times and not at others.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war or any other violent be-

havior is genetically programmed into our human nature. While genes are involved at all levels of our nervous system function, they provide a developmental potential that can be actualized only in conjunction with the ecological and social environment. While individuals vary in their predispositions to be effected by their experience, it is the interaction between their genetic endowment and conditions of nurturance, that determines their personalities. Except for rare pathologies, the genes do not produce individuals necessarily predisposed to violence. Neither do they determine the opposite. While genes are co-involved in establishing our behavioral capacities, they do not by themselves specify the outcome.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that in the course of human evolution there has been a selection for aggressive behavior more than for other kinds of behavior. In all well-studied species, status within the group is achieved by the ability to cooperate and to fulfill social functions relevant to the structure of that group. 'Dominance' involves social bondings and affiliations; it is not simply a matter of the possession and use of superior physical power, although it does involve aggressive behaviors. Where genetic selection for aggressive behavior has been artificially instituted in animals, it has rapidly succeeded in producing hyper-aggressive individuals; this indicates that aggression was not maximally selected under natural conditions. When such experimentally-created hyper-aggressive [animals] are present in a social group they either disrupt its social structure or are driven out. Violence is neither in our evolutionary legacy nor in our genes.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that humans have a 'violent brain'. While we do have a neural apparatus to act violently, it is not automatically activated by internal or external stimuli. Like higher primates and unlike other animals, our higher neural processes filter such stimuli before they can be acted upon. How we act is shaped by how we have been conditioned and socialized. There is nothing in our neurophysiology that compels us to act violently.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war is caused by 'instinct' or any single motivation. The emergence of modern warfare has been a journey from the primacy of emotional and motivational factors, sometimes called 'instincts,' to the primacy of cognitive factors. Modern war involves institutional use of personal characteristics such as obedience, suggestibility, and idealism, social skills such as language, and rational considerations such as cost calcula-

tion, planning, and information processing. The technology has exaggerated traits associated with violence both in training of actual combatants and in the preparation of support for war in the general population. As a result of this exaggeration, such traits are often mistaken for the causes rather than the consequences of the process.

We conclude that biology does not condemn humanity to war, and that humanity can be freed from the bondage of biological pessimism and empowered with confidence to undertake the transformative tasks needed in this International Year of Peace and in the years to come. Although these tasks are mainly institutional and collective, they also rest upon the consciousness of individual participants for whom pessimism and optimism are crucial factors. Just as ‘wars begin in the minds of men,’ peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace. The responsibility lies with each of us.”

Seville, 16 May 1986

Signatories: David Adams, Psychology, Wesleyan University, Middletown (CT) USA; S. A. Barnett, Ethology, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia; N. P. Bechtereva, Neuro-physiology, Institute for Experimental Medicine of Academy of Medical Sciences of USSR, Leningrad, USSR; Bonnie Frank Carter, Psychology, Albert Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia (PA) USA; José M. Rodríguez Delgado, Neurophysiology, Centro de Estudios Neurobiológicos, Madrid, Spain; José Luis Díaz, Ethology, Instituto Mexicano de Psiquiatría, Mexico D.F., Mexico; Andrzej Elias, Individual Differences Psychology, Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw, Poland; Santiago Genovés, Biological Anthropology, Instituto de Estudios Antropológicos, Mexico D.F., Mexico; Benson E. Ginsberg, Behavior Genetics, University of Connecticut, Storrs (CT) USA; Jo Groebel, Social Psychology, Erziehungswissenschaftliche Hochschule, Landau, Federal Republic of Germany; Samir-Kumar Ghosh, Sociology, Indian Institute of Human Sciences, Calcutta, India; Robert Hinde, Psychology, Cambridge University, UK; Richard E. Leakey, Physical Anthropology National Museum of Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya; Taka M. Malasi, Psychiatry, Kuwait University, Kuwait; J. Martín Ramírez, Psychobiology, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain; Frederico Mayor Zaragoza, Biochemistry, Universidad Autónoma, Madrid, Spain; Diana, L. Mendoza, Ethology, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain; Ashis Nandy, Political Psychology, Center for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi, India; John Paul Scott, Animal Behavior, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green (OH) USA; Riitta Wahlström, Psychology, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

Organizational endorsements

American Anthropological Association (Annual Meeting, 1986); American Orthopsychiatric Association (1988); American Psychological Association (Board of Scientific Affairs, Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology, Board of Directors, and Council, 1987); Americans for the Universality of UNESCO (1986); Canadian Psycholo-

gists for Social Responsibility; Czechoslovak UNESCO Commission (1986); Danish Psychological Association (1988); International Council of Psychologists (Board of Directors, 1987); Mexican Association for Biological Anthropology (1986); Polish Academy of Sciences (1987); Psychologists for Social Responsibility (US 1986); Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (US 1987); Spanish UNESCO Commission (1986/ 1987); World Federalist Association (US National Board 1987).

Ref. Adams, D. et al. (1992). The Seville statement on violence. *Peace Review* 4(3), 20–22.