THE SEVILLE STATEMENT

On behalf of the many who drafted and signed the Seville Statement on Violence, and the many people who are disseminating it throughout the world, I wish to call the Statement to the attention of your readers. We hope that your readers can use it in the service of peace.

By publishing the Statement, you will take part in a process that extends worldwide. The text of the Statement is being published in scientific and popular journals from Australia to the USSR. It is being formally endorsed and disseminated by professional scientific organizations. It is being adopted in teaching curricula at the secondary school and university level. It is being discussed and circulated by the peace movements of various countries. We hope that it will eventually be adopted by UNESCO for dissemination, and we would appreciate the help of your readers to ask their National UNESCO Commissions to support us.

As indicated in the Statement, there is much more that can be said. We have not said the last word, but taken a first step. We hope that your readers will agree and will carry the process forward. Yours, in the Struggle for Peace,

David Adams
Professor of Psychology
Wesleyan University
Middletown, Connecticut
Psychological Laboratory
U.S.A.

APPENDIX P

VII.1

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 defined as self-evident, and gratefully acknowledging the support of the authorship of Seville and representatives of the Spanish invasion; 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, even by some of 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 overt, considered rejection of these misstatements can contribute significantly to the International Year of Peace.

Misses of scientific theories and data to justify violence and war in yet 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.

We state our position in the form of five propositions. We are aware that there are many other issues about violence and war that are important to us, but we are concerned with these propositions that we write them as important first steps.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT TO SAY WE HAVE INHERITED A
IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war or any other vio-
 lent behavior is genetically programmed into our human nature. While
genes are involved at all levels of nervous system function, they provide a develop-
mental potential that can be actualized only in conjunction with the ecological and
social conditions of our species. The environments in which we live provide the
conditions that determine genetic potential.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCOR-
RECT to say that aggression is caused
by "instinct" or by "instinctive" motiva-
tions. The modern view of modern warfare has been derived from the primary of emotional
and motivational forces, sometimes
called "instincts," to the primacy of
social cognitive forces. Modern war involves institutional use of personal characterisa-
tions such as obedience, suggestibility, and
ideological social controls such as gen-
colomization, in which war is used to
support and reinforce social structures.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCOR-
RECT to say that war is caused by "instinct"
or by "instinctive" motivations. The
emergence of modern warfare has been
derived from the primary of emotional
and motivational forces, sometimes
called "instincts," to the primacy of
social cognitive forces. Modern war involves institutional use of personal characterisa-
tions such as obedience, suggestibility, and
ideological social controls such as gen-
colomization, in which war is used to
support and reinforce social structures.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCOR-
RECT to say that war is caused by "instinct"
or by "instinctive" motivations. The
emergence of modern warfare has been
derived from the primary of emotional
and motivational forces, sometimes
called "instincts," to the primacy of
social cognitive forces. Modern war involves institutional use of personal characterisa-
tions such as obedience, suggestibility, and
ideological social controls such as gen-
colomization, in which war is used to
support and reinforce social structures.
TOPICS AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN DRAFTING A STATEMENT ON VIOLENCE AND WAR

Based on suggestions of Seville participants that were received as of April 11, and supplemented by excerpts from published writings of several other Seville participants and by three of the UNESCO Statements on Race - prepared by J.P. Scott and D.B. Adams on behalf of the U.S. participants (Scott, Adams, J.M. Grinstein, and G.E. Ginsburg)


II. Biological Bases of Peace and War.

A. The role of genetic variation as influencing variation among individuals and populations (Mayor, 1986; Scott, 1986).


C. Interaction of genetic and cultural factors in the determination of sex differences in individual aggression and in participation in war (Adams, 1984, 1986).

D. Physiological-emotional bases of war.


3) War as an outlet for individual aggressive behavior. Catharsis theory contradicted by data such as cross-cultural analysis of sports and war (Adams, 1986; Leakey, 1978).


1) War, as practiced by humans, does not occur in non-human animals (Barnett, 1986; Leakey, 1978; Scott, 1985).

2) Cultural variation in the occurrence of war and peace among human populations

   a) Historical change (Genoves, 1986; Scott, 1985).

   b) Archeological (prehistoric) evidence (Genoves, 1986; Leakey, 1978).

   c) Variation among contemporary cultures (Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1979; Genoves, 1984; Leakey, 1978).

F. Role of fear and helplessness in preventing action for peace (Bechtereva, 1984; Wahlstrom, 1986).
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