### Violence Paper

The reason the scientists in the articles are disagreeing is because the evidence to support any conclusion is weak. For example, one of the disagreements in the article was whether the human fist evolved for fist fighting. The evidence for this claim is that a buttressed fist protects the bones in our hands during a fist fight. Another researcher rightfully rebutted with the claim that in traditional societies rebutted with the fact that warring tribes would use weapons not fists. This means that there would be no reason to evolve our fists for combat if they aren’t actually used for that purpose, due to concept of natural selection (Gabbattiss, 2017). The data the scientists are reviewing is the product of hundreds of thousands of years of evolution, so to trying and draw a direct cause and effect relationship from humans distant past for any single trait when there are an uncountable number of factors contributing to them is futile.

The most compelling argument against violence being an intrinsic part of the human experience is that not all traditional cultures have violent tendencies. The article states that the Martu of Australia tribes language lacks words for “feud” or “warfare” (Gabbattiss, 2017). The reason this is shows a lack of violent tendencies is because language is a method of communicating useful ideas, so when a language lacks a word it means that the idea that it communicates is not useful. ln this case its communicating about conflict among the Martu of Australia. While this doesn’t conclusively prove that violence is a product of culture, it does strongly suggest it is. The counter argument to this would be that the vast majority of small-scale societies would wage war with each other through the prehistoric period (Brian Ferguson, 2018). I argue that these wars were not out of some innate propensity to violence but out necessity for resources. By virtue of scarcity there is not always enough resources to go around with compromise, so the only way to resolve the issue for them would be to volunteer to die, or fight.

One thing that I have observed in my own life that makes me think humans do not have a propensity for violence is the tendency to share within my family. In my family all resources are shared equally to who ever needs them. There is rarely conflict because we make compromises with each other. This highlights the central point that humans tend cooperate with each other instead of fighting.

The data that I would want to collect to confirm my belief that humans are not naturally violent is to run an experiment with traditional tribes in a post scarcity society. If the tribes would still war with each other despite having an abundance of resources it would convince me that humans are prone to be violent. If the tribes do not war with each other and possibly even cooperate it would convince me that humans are not prone to violence.
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