When Peace is a Need

Laura Caprarola and Judy Lombardi Fall 2001

For a long time I have been conditioned to believe that one could achieve peace through a variety of methods. I was taught that agreeing with someone in order to avoid conflict is one way of achieving peace. Another way would be to respect others' cultures as too often we hear of conflicts arising as a result of ethnocentricity.

While looking at peace as something we aim to achieve, I became very discouraged, as I thought that it would never be attainable. Then I took Dr. Lombardi's Humanities class at Villa Julie College.

After September 11, 2001, our class began its semester long discussion of peace. At the beginning, like myself, everyone had been conditioned to believe that peace is something that you aim to achieve. We believed that peace would be necessary in order to end all <u>wars</u>. In fact, up to that point many of us believed that human beings live primarily in the biology of aggression.

As humans we use aggression in order to survive as illustrated in the film "2001 A Space Odyssey." Aggression has been thought and professed to be the fundamental emotion for survival. Life is about "survival of the fittest" as people "do what it takes" to survive. Whether it harms others is not always a consideration. Yet shouldn't it be?

Late in the semester, our class was introduced to a new point of view that suggests that the biology of aggression is not our fundamental way of being. Instead our fundamental way of being is living in the biology of love. Which led us to question when is the biology of love and what does the biology of love suggest about peace?

Rather than using aggression and illegitimizing the other in times of conflict, humans living in the biology of love would legitimize the other in coexistence with oneself, thus conflict would be more apt to be resolved *peacefully*.

However, living in the biology of love is not simple. All people in the conflict must be willing to embrace **peace as a need** thus living in social relations in order to resolve the conflict peacefully.

Social relations invite awareness of one's self and self-awareness invites awareness of others in one's environment. And when one is aware of self and his or her environment, he or she is more likely to be in tune with the feelings of others and behave accordingly.

When one acts in dissocial relations which provokes meanness and thus lack of self awareness, he or she does not legitimize the other. In effect, she or he is living in the biology of aggression and violence, rather than, peace is more likely.

In addition to living fundamentally in the biology of love, what if peace as a need is our starting point rather than peace being something to achieve?

Many say that conflict illustrates that we are not living in the biology of love. Since one looks at peace as something to be achieve. Then, conflict is viewed essentially as something that "pushes us back" in our struggles to achieve peace.

However as suggested by Herbert_Brün, when *peace is a need,* peace becomes a necessary aspect of living. Just like food and water, peace becomes an essential element to our survival - without the "fittest."

What if we were to think that peace is a need as Brün suggested? If thirst is met by drink, hunger is met by food and tiredness is met by sleep, conflict, a part of being human like thirst, hunger and sleep, is met by peace.

Rather than preventing peace, conflict becomes the essential element that "pushes us forward" and invites us to generate peace by embracing our conflicts and living in social relations. This is not easy.

In class we discussed the importance of language and that a language nested in the biology of love is a key element to resolving our conflicts for peace as a need. Because when peace is a need we embrace our conflicts and socially *agree* to live in the biology of love in order meet the need for peace.

From this point of view our conflicts are merely a reminder that we live in the biology of love much of the time and that we can live in the biology of love when in conflict and thus peace. After all, violence, the biology of aggression, does not lead to peace, it prevents it.

If every human being languages that peace is a need, peace would be the prevailing consequence when having our conflicts. <u>Conflicts</u> would still occur, since they are part of being human, yet settled via peaceful disagreement when living in social relations through the biology of love.

So lets have peace and understanding.