

# Re: Origins of Human Violence

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-10/msg00156.html>

---

- *From:* "Entertained by my own EIMC" <[licenced.to.be.AEVASIVE@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:licenced.to.be.AEVASIVE@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 17 Oct 2006 16:53:23 -0400 (EDT)
- 

"Passer By" <[sender@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:sender@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:eh0fh1\\$2erg\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:eh0fh1$2erg$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"ta" <[padlnc@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:padlnc@xxxxxxxxxx)> writes:

How did violence and aggression evolve in human beings, and what evidence would you supply to support your position?

Did the earliest humans employ violence against one another, or was the behaviour learned out of necessity?

It was likely born out of the pressures of sexual selection. Women tend to be more attractive to aggressive men.

Or, more generally, typical women tends to be more attracted to typical males.

Surprise, surprise! ;-)

The aggression should

[if to have the best chance of being adaptive]

be directed toward other "tribes," but they should be compassionate to there wife and children.

[paragraph split by me, Peter]

Women also tend to become pregnant more often

## Re: Origins of Human Violence

from any given act of rape vs any give act of consensual sex, thus there are "genes" for rape in humans.

Are you sure?

Your philosophical perception of rape might be too out of (or may never have been in) focus.

If so, then maybe a few concEPTual lenses could correct for this philosophical flaw. :-)

Here goes:

The character of the evolutionary patterning that led to sexual, or sexualized, aggression (such as what e.g. rape exemplifies) is most definitely understandable in an EPT way; That is, it is approximately understandable by help of the concEPT of "ambiadvantageously evolved" traits, or, ambiadvantageously evolved veritable "attention selecting systems" incorporating – amongst much else but very instructively – various endorphins. ["Endorphins" was here used in place of opioids.]

AEVASIVE is (to me) an allusively characterizing tool for heuristic thought, or a system of lenses for by which to with perversely pert poignancy and pretentious omniscience overview, mainly human brain functions/behaviors/personalities/cultures and the intrinsic and extrinsic or environmental [that's an inevitable dichotomy] "pressures" behind the human phenotype.

I use "pressures" mainly but not only in the sense of forces/factors/features specific to phylogeny (or patterns of interactions that most directly explains the emergence of phenotypes) since there is a sense in which evolutionary (as in complexifying) pressures can also be seen to have caused quantum–cosmological evolution (as if in a condensation–style the emergence of increasingly complex patterns of energy and, thereof, of matter).

For an ultimately general expression using involving this this metaphorical word (i.e. pressures), there is the possibility of thinking in terms of the "evolutionary pressure (or patterning) totality".

By thinking about this totality from ontop an explanatory platform–terminology, it is possible to pragmatically – and always from a generically individual perspective – perceive (or philosophically portion into ephemeral cognitive existence) two "topmost" categories of force–like "evolution producing tendencies":

One that is typically directly, primarily, and predominantly, pattern producing/adding and constructively evolution furthering (rather than devolution furthering) forces and factorial "EPT features", and the other

## Re: Origins of Human Violence

that is fundamentally secondary and negative (destructive and primarily 'naturally pruning').

(If seen as potentials, both positive and negative evolutionary pressures can also be thought of as "given by the not quite infinite features of this universe's configuration space".)

More specifically, AEVASIVE is a concePTual tool for grasping that the aspect of our genotype that underlies rape and many more (or even \*less\*) peaceful preoccupations.

AEVASIVE acronymically implies the in the phylogeny of fauna obviously significantly frequent overlap between 1. within individual lifetimes sometimes taken phylogenetic opportunities, and 2. with significant frequency ended up in SHITS–type ordeals (or ditto adversities) that became "conditioned–in" and as if converted (via plasticities in the functioning and formation of neural signal pathways) into "chronically unconsciously reverberating circuits, effecting symptoms" (or CURSES).

Here is what I mean by the concePT that stands for what CURSES (–type memories or imprints) are conditioned–in by:

SHITS are lethal–or–not predicaments of (most of all) mobile neuromuscular individuals.

SHITS covers situations (or stressors or "environmental sources of sensory motivational stimulation") that are from slowly and trivially, to rapidly and dramatically, impacting but that in any case are as if imploring of "synaptic hibernation" (or "synaptic hibernation imploring"); In other words, SHITS are predicaments such that if they are to be survived require inhibitory self–regulatory preemption or deactivation of distress or of flight–fight type defenses (or of "sympathetic nervous system reactivity").

SHITS are predicaments that (hence) are either lethally or not lethally \*traumatizing\* since if they would be consciously processed and paid direct or immediate defensive 'attention' to, this processing attending (or pain/stressful preoccupation or focus of attention) would be done in a \*self–defeating\* fashion.

In other words, SHITS does by definition stand for predicaments that if not neurologically suppressed will – no excEPTions! ;–) – give rise to overwhelming distress or a maladaptive distractedness (by distracting from the taking of direct or indirect lifetime opportunities to reproduce).

Most minds around here a too faint–hearted to fathom that they evolved to have a uniquely huge capacity and tendency to "be AEVASIVE". The closest some I have gotten to understand, in an EPT way, What Is going on, has come as a result of me proposition the same things but with help of the notion of that there is are commonly occurring ordeals calls for an ability to behaviorally (and attentionally) "freeze".

## Re: Origins of Human Violence

What it seems that people can't take in is the significance of that some situations demands a situation-specific circumscription of consciousness, and a reactivity preempting state involving a correspondingly specific neurophysiological inhibition; that is NOT an effect of neural/hormonal inhibition as general, or generally behavior blocking and metabolisms muting, as what is the conventional meaning of "hibernation" (or by "aestivation", for this matter).

Occasionally, men may have to defended themselves from wild animals, but this was probably less common than man-to-man combat. Again along the lines of sexual selection men would hunt very large animals mostly to impress women (small game gives more steady energy supply, but isn't as impressive).

As John Edser might say:

"It is important to be aware the phylogenetic fact that sexual selection is both secondary to and nested within the process of natural selection." [N.B. This was not an actual quote!]

However, unfortunately for me, John does also refuse to accEPT (and of course inEPTly so) that Darwinian selection pressures can very well be seen to have operated on NOT JUST ALREADY FERTILE individuals, but on all potentially reproductively viable individual members of ancestral populations.

Peter

.