

Philosophy Ripped From The Headlines!



Issue #16, 1 (January 2019)
Compiled & Edited by *Philosophy Without Borders*

Philosophy Ripped From The Headlines! is delivered online in (occasionally discontinuous) weekly installments, month by month.

Its aim is to inspire critical, reflective, synoptic thinking and discussion about contemporary issues--in short, *public philosophizing* in the broadest possible, everyday sense.

Every installment contains (1) excerpts from one or more articles, or one or more complete articles, that recently appeared in online public media, (2) some follow-up thoughts for further reflection or discussion, and (3) a link or links for supplementary reading.

1. “The Bad News on Human Nature, in 10 Findings from Psychology”

By Christian Jarrett

Aeon, 5 DECEMBER 2018

Full article available at URL = <https://aeon.co/ideas/the-bad-news-on-human-nature-in-10-findings-from-psychology>



“Work Disgraces” by George Scholz (1921)

It's a question that's reverberated through the ages – are humans, though imperfect, essentially kind, sensible, good-natured creatures? Or are we, deep down, wired to be bad, blinkered, idle, vain, vengeful and selfish? There are no easy answers, and there's clearly a lot of variation between individuals, but here we shine some evidence-based light on the matter through 10 dispiriting findings that reveal the darker and less impressive aspects of human nature:

We view minorities and the vulnerable as less than human. One striking example of this blatant dehumanisation came from a brain-scan [study](#) that found a small group of students exhibited less neural activity associated with thinking about people when they looked at pictures of the homeless or of drug addicts, as compared with higher-status individuals. Another study showed that people who are opposed to Arab immigration tended to rate Arabs and Muslims as literally [less evolved](#) than average. Among other examples, there's also evidence that young people dehumanise [older people](#); and that men and women alike dehumanise [drunk women](#). What's more, the inclination to dehumanise starts [early](#) – children as young as five view out-group faces (of people from a different city or a different gender to the child) as less human than in-group faces.

We experience *Schadenfreude* (pleasure at another person's distress) by the age of four, according to a [study](#) from 2013. That sense is heightened if the child perceives that the person deserves the distress. A more recent [study](#) found that, by age six, children will pay to watch an antisocial puppet being hit, rather than spending the money on stickers.

We believe in karma – assuming that the downtrodden of the world deserve their fate. The unfortunate consequences of such beliefs were first demonstrated in the now classic [research](#) from 1966 by the American psychologists Melvin Lerner and Carolyn Simmons. In their experiment, in which a female learner was punished with electric shocks for wrong answers, women participants subsequently rated her as less likeable and admirable when they heard that they would be seeing her suffer again, and especially if they felt powerless to minimise this suffering. Since then, [research](#) has shown our willingness to blame the poor, rape victims, AIDS patients and others for their fate, so as to preserve our belief in a just world. By extension, the same or similar processes are likely responsible for our subconscious rose-tinted view of [rich people](#).

We are blinkered and dogmatic. If people were rational and open-minded, then the straightforward way to correct someone's false beliefs would be to present them with some relevant facts. However a classic [study](#) from 1979 showed the futility of this approach – participants who believed strongly for or against the death penalty completely ignored facts that undermined their position, actually doubling-down on their initial view. This seems to occur in part because we see opposing facts as undermining our sense of [identity](#). It doesn't help that many of us are [overconfident](#) about how much we understand things and that, when we believe our opinions are superior to others, this [deters us](#) from seeking out further relevant knowledge.

We would rather electrocute ourselves than spend time in our own thoughts. This was demonstrated in a controversial 2014 [study](#) in which 67 per cent of male participants and 25 per

cent of female participants opted to give themselves unpleasant electric shocks rather than spend 15 minutes in peaceful contemplation.

We are vain and overconfident. Our irrationality and dogmatism might not be so bad were they married to some humility and self-insight, but most of us walk about with inflated views of our abilities and qualities, such as our driving skills, [intelligence](#) and attractiveness – a phenomenon that’s been dubbed the Lake Wobegon Effect after the fictional town where ‘all the women are strong, all the men are good-looking, and all the children are above average’. Ironically, the least skilled among us are the most prone to overconfidence (the so-called Dunning-Kruger [effect](#)). This vain self-enhancement seems to be most extreme and irrational in the case of our [morality](#), such as in how principled and fair we think we are. In fact, even jailed [criminals](#) think they are kinder, more trustworthy and honest than the average member of the public.

We are moral hypocrites. It pays to be wary of those who are the quickest and loudest in condemning the moral failings of others – the chances are that moral preachers are as guilty themselves, but take a far lighter view of their own transgressions. In one [study](#), researchers found that people rated the exact same selfish behaviour (giving themselves the quicker and easier of two experimental tasks on offer) as being far less fair when perpetuated by others. Similarly, there is a long-studied phenomenon known as actor-observer asymmetry, which in part describes our [tendency](#) to attribute other people’s bad deeds, such as our partner’s [infidelities](#), to their character, while attributing the same deeds performed by ourselves to the situation at hand. These self-serving double standards could even explain the common feeling that incivility is on the increase – recent [research](#) shows that we view the same acts of rudeness far more harshly when they are committed by strangers than by our friends or ourselves.

We are all potential trolls. As anyone who has found themselves in a spat on Twitter will attest, social media might be magnifying some of the worst aspects of human nature, in part due to the online [disinhibition](#) effect, and the fact that [anonymity](#) (easy to achieve online) is known to increase our inclinations for immorality. While research has suggested that people who are prone to [everyday sadism](#) (a worryingly high proportion of us) are especially [inclined](#) to online trolling, a [study](#) published last year revealed how being in a bad mood, and being exposed to trolling by others, double the likelihood of a person engaging in trolling themselves. In fact, initial trolling by a few can cause a snowball of increasing negativity, which is exactly what researchers found when they studied reader discussion on CNN.com, with the ‘proportion of flagged posts and proportion of users with flagged posts ... rising over time’.

We favour ineffective leaders with psychopathic traits. The American personality psychologist Dan McAdams recently [concluded](#) that the US President Donald Trump’s overt aggression and insults have a ‘primal appeal’, and that his ‘incendiary Tweets’ are like the ‘charging displays’ of an alpha male chimp, ‘designed to intimidate’. If McAdams’s assessment is true, it would fit into a wider pattern – the finding that psychopathic traits are more common than average among leaders. Take the [survey](#) of financial leaders in New York that found they scored highly on psychopathic traits but lower than average in emotional intelligence. A [meta-analysis](#) published this summer concluded that there is indeed a modest but significant link

between higher trait psychopathy and gaining leadership positions, which is important since psychopathy also correlates with poorer leadership.

We are sexually attracted to people with dark personality traits. Not only do we elect people with psychopathic traits to become our leaders, [evidence suggests](#) that men and women are sexually attracted, at least in the short term, to people displaying the so-called ‘dark triad’ of traits – narcissism, psychopathy and Machiavellianism – thus risking further propagating these traits. One [study](#) found that a man’s physical attractiveness to women was increased when he was described as self-interested, manipulative and insensitive. One theory is that the dark traits successfully communicate ‘mate quality’ in terms of confidence and the willingness to take risks. Does this matter for the future of our species? Perhaps it does – another [paper](#), from 2016, found that those women who were more strongly attracted to narcissistic men’s faces tended to have more children.

Don’t get too down – these findings say nothing of the success that some of us have had in overcoming our baser instincts. In fact, it is arguably by acknowledging and understanding our shortcomings that we can more successfully overcome them, and so cultivate the better angels of our nature.

2. Some Follow-Up Thoughts For Further Reflection and Discussion:

Is the following argument sound? If so, why? If not, why not?

1. *Human nature* is a fixed set of strictly universal, innate characteristics or dispositions of human *persons*, not (merely) a fixed set of biologically universal characteristics or dispositions of human *animals*, even though, obviously, all human persons are *also* human animals.
2. Therefore, it’s a fallacy to infer directly from *biological* findings about human animals to *philosophical* conclusions about human nature.
3. Moreover, if a psychological or cognitive-scientific study is designed, under highly controlled experimental conditions, to elicit responses from many or even most people that would be generally deemed or judged morally bad or wrong by contemporary social standards, then that study presupposes, without argument, not only (i) that we already adequately understand the rational and causal grounds of those responses and of those moral judgments and social standards, but also (ii) that no response manifested by people *outside* those highly controlled conditions is relevant to the results of that study.

4. For example, it may well be that although under highly controlled experimental conditions, many or even most people will manifest what would be generally deemed or judged to be an egoistic or socially antagonistic response, nevertheless, under significantly different conditions—say, in experimental conditions designed to elicit responses that would be generally deemed or judged to be morally good or right; under relaxed debriefing after the actual experiment; or in everyday life—their responses would be saliently different.
5. It also needs to be asked whether, in view of the twofold fact (i) that all neoliberal nation-States justify their coercive authoritarianism by citing the supposedly self-evident “truth” that human nature is fundamentally egoistic and socially antagonistic, and (ii) that all psychological and cognitive studies are heavily funded either by the governments of neoliberal nation-States or by the military-industrial-university-digital complex that controls the governments of neoliberal nation-States, then (iii) it’s extremely likely to be a predetermined outcome that psychological and cognitive-scientific studies will obediently support the thesis that human nature is fundamentally egoistic and socially antagonistic.
6. Therefore, conclusions about human nature drawn from psychological and cognitive-scientific studies are extremely likely not only to be factually mistaken, but also to be morally and politically questionable, and should be regarded with a high level of rational and philosophical skepticism.

3. One Link For Supplementary Reading:

[An Anthropologist Investigates How We Think About How We Think](#)

BACK ISSUES

ISSUE #15, 3 (December 2018):

- MONETIZING MORALITY

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue15-3 dec18](#)

ISSUE #15, 2 (December 2018):

- THE DIGNITARIAN CASE AGAINST CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue15-2 dec18](#)

ISSUE #15, 1 (December 2018):

- WHY WE SHOULD SUBVERT AND DISMANTLE SOCIAL MEDIA

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue15-1 dec18](#)

ISSUE #14, 3 (November 2018):

- WHY YOU SHOULD EXIT THE PROFESSIONAL ACADEMY

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue14-3 nov18](#)

ISSUE #14, 2 (November 2018):

- BULLETS, CORPSES, DOCTORS, & THE NRA

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue14-2 nov18](#)

ISSUE #14, 1 (November 2018):

- CRIME-&-PUNISHMENT INC, USA

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue14-1 nov18](#)

ISSUE #13, 2 (September 2018):

- **ABOLISH ICE!, AND HUNGARY'S STARVATION TACTICS**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue13-2 sept18](#)

ISSUE #13, 1 (September 2018):

- **UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AND THE FUTURE OF POINTLESS WORK**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue13-1 aug18](#)

ISSUE #12, 3 (AUGUST 2018):

- **THE TRUTH ABOUT INCOME INEQUALITY, IN SIX AMAZING CHARTS**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue12-3 aug18](#)

ISSUE #12, 2 (AUGUST 2018):

- **EPISTOCRACY, NOT DEMOCRACY?**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue12-2 aug18](#)

ISSUE #12, 1 (AUGUST 2018):

- **THE QUANTIFIED HEART**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue12-1 aug18](#)

ISSUE #11, JULY 2018:

- **RESISTING IMMIGRATION & CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT (ICE), AUTHENTICITY, RECIPROCITY VS. TOLERANCE, HOMELESSNESS-&-US, & FREE SPEECH VS. JUST ACCESS**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue11 july18](#)

ISSUE #10, June 2018:

- **JOBS-&-HAPPINESS, UBI IN FINLAND, THE SOCIAL VALUE OF ENVY, THE EDUCATED ELITE'S STRANGE FAILURE, & ARE WE JUST OUR BRAINS?**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue10 june18](#)

ISSUE #9, May 2018:

- **DEFENDING LECTURING, CITIZENS OF THE WORLD, HYPER-LIBERALISM, NEO-ROMANTICISM, & PHYSICS-WITHOUT-TIME?**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue9 may18](#)

ISSUE #8, APRIL 2018:

- **CONSCIOUSNESS-DENIAL, MINDS-&-SMARTPHONES, THE MORALITY OF ADDICTION, & RADICAL GUN REFORM**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue8 apr18](#)

ISSUE #7, MARCH 2018:

- **THE MEANING OF LIFE & THE MORALITY OF DEATH**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue7 mar18](#)

ISSUE #6, FEBRUARY 2018:

- **POVERTY IN THE USA, MARX REDUX, & THE SCOPE OF MINDEDNESS**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue6 feb18](#)

ISSUE #5, JANUARY 2018:

- **BAKERS, BUDDHISTS, PLANT MINDS, & TOTAL WORK**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue5 jan18](#)

ISSUE #4, DECEMBER 2017:

- **US POLITICS, ANIMAL MINDS, & REFUGEES**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue4 dec17](#)

ISSUE #3, NOVEMBER 2017:

- **GUN VIOLENCE**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue3 nov17](#)

ISSUE #2, OCTOBER 2017:

- **FREE SPEECH WARS**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue2 oct17](#)

ISSUE #1, SEPTEMBER 2017:

- **BORDERS AND IMMIGRATION, CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, & CULTURAL CONFLICT**

HERE: [PWB philosophy ripped from the headlines issue1 sept17](#)

Philosophy Ripped From The Headlines! is a sub-project of the online mega-project [Philosophy Without Borders](#), which is home-based on Patreon [here](#).

Please consider becoming a patron!

