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Abstract

Parallels of Love and Hate Defined by Attachments

by

Nicole Spann

Advisor name: Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis

The assertion, “It’s a thin line between love and hate,” is often referenced to express the relative ease of a sole emotion morphing from one extreme to next. Both love and hate generate the same physiological fluctuations which include, but are not limited to, a racing pulse, sweaty palms, releasing of hormones, and some degree of excitability. While physiologically the responses are the same, psychologically and philosophically they are considered opposites. In the sphere of psychology, it is going from what is considered normal behavior or a normal response to abnormal behavior or an abnormal response (McKay, 2016). For this research a systematic review of the literature was conducted to accomplish three tasks. First, define love and hate and their interactions with the body/mind through the lens of key philosophers, psychologists, and biological scientists. Second, how love and hate are intimately associated within the human psyche and formed through attachments is explored. Third, how two opposing feelings travel on the same emotional circuit is examined. Emotions and feelings of love and hate are powerful, dynamic, and in constant flux. They process an aesthetic value, which inspires us to great heights and lures us to the lowest depths of the human condition. Hence, they are a fascinating phenomenon fitting and worthy of exploration.
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Emotions play out in the theater of the body.
Feelings play out in the theater of the mind.
-Dr. Sarah McCay, Neuroscientist and Author.

Some say the world will end in fire, / Some say in ice. / From what I’ve tasted of desire / I hold with those who favor fire. / But if it had to perish twice, / I think I know enough of hate / To say that for destruction ice / Is also great / And would suffice –Robert Frost.

**Introduction**

“It’s a thin line between love and hate,” an aesthetic expression made famous as the title of a 1971 R&B song by a New York City-based vocal group The Persuaders, delimits a persistent contradiction—the relative ease of a single, yet seeming opposite, emotion transmuting from one extreme to next. Both love and hate generate the same physiological changes which include, but are not limited to, a racing pulse, sweaty palms, releasing of hormones, and some degree of excitability. Nevertheless, it is noted as a contraction because colloquially love and hate are often understood as two opposite emotions; or at best opposing ends of a spectrum. In the sphere of psychology, it is known as going from what is considered normal behavior or a normal response to abnormal behavior or an abnormal response (McKay, 2016). Hence, physiologically, the responses are grossly similar, psychologically, philosophically, and colloquially, however, they are often considered opposites.
Problem

The primary challenge of this research is to delineate how the pedestrian view, held in the hearts and minds of most individuals and the body social, is often misguided or misplaced. The use of the term pedestrian here refers to the notion that love and hate are two very different emotional objects. It is an earnest hope that a more accurate perspective on the interstices of love and hate as co-aesthetic experiences will go a long way in addressing some of the inter/extra personal relationship challenges all too often faced by individuals, communities, and greater society. At a minimum, however, this research is put forward as a way of keeping the importance of the aesthetic ideas concerning feeling, emotions, and identity alive in the academic world and perhaps furthering the discourse.

Identity plays a vital role in the realm of love and hate. In the end, it is possibly the most important reasons to pursue this discourse. Identity informs and thereby directs behavior; i.e., one performs certain behaviors based on what or who they think they are and who they believe others to be. If one believes oneself to be the object of either love or hate, this information delineates a particular set of behaviors. Discovering or exploring one's identity regarding love and hate is an aesthetic experience, especially in the formative years. Human beings are storytellers of how they see themselves in relation to the world around them. Arguably, the primary trait that separates humans from the rest of existence is that—we are in fact, aesthetic creatures. All of these stories that relate our aesthetic experiences, no matter what medium or form (literature, theater, poetry, film dance, etc.), have unique symbology that describes who we are and what we believe about ourselves and others.

Whether we see ourselves or others as objects of love or hate, the aesthetic value we
assign to ourselves and others often determines how we treat ourselves and others (Campbell, 1972). In addition, aesthetic judgment goes hand in hand with aesthetic values, what we believe to be beautiful often corresponds to values and behaviors of the good and the true confirmed or denied by our personal, social, and cultural experiences; whereas hate receives the opposite. If we understand love and hate to be the same, or at least two sides of the same coin so to speak, then as we see the beauty in love we may learn to see the beauty in hate. Whereas we often respond to experiences of love with love, we may learn to respond to experiences of hate with love (Llosa, 2001). This slight adjustment of aesthetic perspective may produce a different set of behaviors when faced with a moment of hate and perhaps more valuable ones. In the end, understanding our aesthetic experience will help us re-examine these parental or socially passed along values on love and hate, helping us form our own identity and nurturing the power of the imagination (Burton, 1988). For the imagination is the tool that helps us interpret our aesthetic experiences and corresponding aesthetic identities.

Many have suggested that the imagination is one of the most important parts of our being and yet in our dominant culture, the building up of the imagination has become the most malnourished and least developed. There seems to be a trend in society, which is reflected in our media, politics, and educational systems, where instead of viewing the world in complex interactive ways we view things at face value and reduce ideas, e.g. ideas of love and hate, good and evil, to their bare bone experiences. To combat this pattern, aesthetics education can help us view our lives as projects that are constantly evolving, and our only limits are how far our imagination can take us (Burton, 1988).
Purpose

While feelings and emotions are often used interchangeably, their roles are quite different. Emotions deal with the body and feelings deal with the mind (McKay, 2016). Love, joy, sadness, grief, anger, and hate are just a few of many reactions that have strong effects on a person physically (emotions) and mentally (feelings) (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, 1978). The constructs of love and hate are fluid and constantly changing. They both bring on the same physiological changes; racing pulses, in some, sweaty palms in others, the releasing of hormones in all, and some degree of excitability. Mentally, however, the responses to love and hate vary vastly depending on the person and their life’s or aesthetic experiences. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to conduct a systematic review of relevant literature to accomplish three tasks: a) define love and hate and their interactions with the body/mind through the lens of critical philosophers, psychologists, and biological scientists; b) explore how love and hate are intimately associated within the human psyche and formed through attachments; c) explain how two opposing feelings travel on the same emotional circuit.

Method

This is a qualitative study drawing on relevant primary and secondary sources from appropriate databases in the form of periodicals reports, academic journals, and books. Not all research requires the collection of new data. Sometimes researchers use existing data sources, such as research and data collected by others. Data most widely used by researchers is gathered by government agencies such as the U.S. Census Bureau, State Agencies and local units of governments. For this research, a systematic review of the existing literature on the topic was conducted using peer reviewed journals found in academic databases such as JSTOR,
EBSCOhost, and LexisNexis. This approach saves time and money and is fitting for this initial or exploratory study and appropriate for the research question. Based on research findings, additional research can be conducted to extend this work by deploying some of the other research methods commonly used by social scientists such as surveys and interviews. Emotions and feelings of love and hate are powerful, dynamic, and in constant flux. They inspire us to great heights and lure us to the lowest depths of the human condition. Hence, they are a fitting and fascinating phenomenon worthy of exploration.

**Literature Review**

The ancient philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus (530-470 BC) reminds us that existence is dynamic, fluid, and constantly in flux. Indeed, the sole consistency of existence is change. This observation, sentiment, or philosophical perspective, most would agree, is never truer than when applied to the case of feelings and emotions. Emotions are the body’s physical responses to situational stimuli a person may experience; they are the reasons that explain the fight or flight quick responses that aids in the survival the human species (Cannon, 1932). How the body responds to dangerous situations, funny situations, erotic situations, etc., are all triggered by the emotions that one experiences in each. Emotional responses are quick, instinctive, and objective; one does not usually have the time to think about the appropriate reaction (McKay, 2016). Feelings, on the other hand, are subjective and are often influenced by personal experiences, beliefs, and even memories (McKay, 2016). When dealing with feelings, responses to threatening, humorous, sexually stimulating, etc. situations can vary from person to person depending on their life’s experiences past and present and their mind’s analysis of the situation (Bretherton, 1992). For instance, an individual who has experienced severe trauma driving a car
will not feel excited or enthused at the thought of playing bumper cars with their family. They instead may feel anxiety and, as a result emotionally can display physical reactions of sweaty palms, upset stomach, abdominal pains and the like. On the contrary, one who did not experience such traumatic events could look forward to the experience and would be excited at the thought of creating a new memory with their family members.

**History of Biological Process of Emotions**

In 1878 French neurologist Paul Broca published *Comparative Anatomy of The Cerebral Circumvolutions: The Great Limbic Lobe and The Limbic Fissure in The Mammalian Series*. In his research Broca (1878) unearthed the fact that on the medial surface of the mammalian brain, underneath the cortex there were several neurons which denominated the limbic lobe (Pessoa and Hof, 2015). Broca (1878) systematically studied the “medial surface concerning the overall organization of the hemispheres” of different “mammalian species” (Pessoa and Hof, 2015). He set out by working through 30 different mammals and subdividing “the cortical hemispheres into two components: 1) the great limbic lobe, comprising the bulk of the medial surface of the cortex and demarcated by the limbic fissure and 2) the mass of the convolutions which form the rest of the mantle” (Pessoa and Hof, 2015). His purpose for examining them in this fashion is to determine if there was any connection between the hemispheres. The left and right hemispheres govern emotions and rational thoughts. Most mammals have a similar structure in their brains. Most notable is in Dolphins and Chimpanzees (Burkhardt, 2005).

Broca (1878) wanted to see if there was a connection between mammalian behavior and the structure of the brain. Next, Broca focused on the cortical hemispheres of the primate brain in which he observed the following distinctions: “1) the olfactory lobe was rudimentary and
reduced to a small bulb; 2) the cingulate gyrus (Broca’s lobe of the corpus callosum) was atrophied in its anterior part but in its posterior portion and 3) the enormous development of the frontal lobe” (Pessoa and Hof, 2015). The comparisons found between the mammalian brain and primate brain were critical to Broca because it showed a “true correlation exists between the enlargement of the frontal lobe in primates and the inverse evolution of the great limbic lobe” (Pessoa and Hof, 2015). In conclusion, Broca (1878) discovered “varying degrees of distinctness, size, and completion” in the mammal's brain (Pessoa and Hof, 2015). Broca’s (1878) study was one of the first to examine the link between animal behavior and mammal brain development. James Papez would later use Paul Broca’s studies on animals to perform further research in human brain behavior and development.

The first thorough study of the brain and emotion was done by Cornell anatomist James Papez in 1937 (as cited in Johnston and Olson, 2015). He proposed “an entire network or circuit for emotion, a circuit that would integrate emotional experience and emotional expression as well as allow feeling and thinking to interact by linking the cortex to the hypothalamus” (as cited in Johnston and Olson, 2015). Papez’s (1937) theory of emotions was pivotal in the psychological world. It was based on the earlier. Papez’s (1937) theory was developed from critiques of the James-Lange theory. According to Papez, the emotional circuit involved sensory areas of the thalamus and cortex, the hypothalamus, anterior thalamus, cingulate cortex, and hippocampus. This came from Papez (1937) reviewing reports about monkeys with similar structures in their brain and damage or trauma in that area resulted in a lack of emotional intelligence. These studies helped Papez (1937) conclude that emotions arise either from cognitive activity entering the circuit through the hippocampus or from visceral and somatic perceptions entering the circuit through the hippocampus (Catani, Dell’Acqua, and De Schotten,
2013). He introduced “a circuit that would integrate emotional experience and emotional expression as well as allow feeling and thinking to interact by linking the cortex to the hypothalamus” (Johnston and Olson, 2015).

Papez (1937) suggests” this circuit provides the mechanism for the integration of emotional and cognitive functions” (as cited in Johnston and Olson, 2015). Papez (1937) proposed three streams of processing that start with the receptor organs and then split at the level of the thalamus into the “stream of movement,” the “stream of thought,” and the “stream of feeling” (Catani, Dell"Acqua, and De Schotten, 2013). This finding influenced the work of many researchers in subsequent years including the work of Paul Yakovlev and Paul MacLean. Paul Yakovlev a decade later when he proposed the orbitofrontal cortex, insula, amygdala, and anterior temporal lobe formed a network underlying emotion and motivation. (Catani, Dell"Acqua, and De Schotten, 2013). Yakovlev (1948) proposed Yakovlev's circuit in the control of emotion involving the orbitofrontal, insular and anterior temporal lobe cortex, the amygdala and the dorsomedial nucleus of the thalamus. Yakovlev (1948) was then able to integrate his theory with Papez’s (1937) work and develop the Limbic System known today.

“Psychosomatic Disease and the Visceral Brain: Recent Developments Bearing on the Papez Theory of Emotion” is the title of a paper delivered to staff at a meeting of the Psychiatric Service of Massachusetts General Hospital. It was the first paper of Paul MacLean (1949) where he first coined the term limbic system. Maclean (1949) connected Papez’s theory on emotional circuitry to the autonomic disruption seen in psychosomatic diseases (as cited in Johnson and Olson, 2015). MacLean (1949) details “an emotional circuit” in which he describes it “tour de force” relating this concept to observations of epileptic patients he has worked with (as cited in Johnston & Olson, 2015). Using Papez’s (1937) circuit as the foundational lens of his
observations, MacLean (1949) observed that emotional states provoked by seizures in his patients were often accompanied by a variety of visceral events (as cited in Johnston & Olson, 2015). Known to be essential for the expression of emotion, MacLean’s (1949) observations were recording of the bioelectrical activity of structures at the base of the brain that possibly fed into the hypothalamus.

MacLean (1949), in reference to epilepsy, devised improved nasopharyngeal electrodes that could be slipped easily through each side of the nose and lie comfortably in the posterolateral part of the nasopharynx on each side (Davidson, Ekman, Saron, Senulis, and Friesen, 1990). The neurologist Robert Schwab influenced much of his research. MacLean (1949) research on the Papez (1937) circuit was revolutionary at the time. The hippocampus processes visual, kinesthetic and auditory inputs; the emotional processing power of the hippocampus is often underestimated.

The hippocampus processes visual, kinesthetic, and auditory inputs. In his writing, MacLean (1949) suggests when an emotion or disturbance occurs in the hippocampus it performs physical symptoms or manifestations. For example, in his writing, he noted a visceral event was a sense of hunger or some distress after a patient had a seizure (as cited in Johnston and Olson, 2015). MacLean (1949) suggests, like Yakovlev (1948), that other brain functions, including the amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, and insula, where the brain performs unconscious functions necessary for survival, were possibly also involved in functions in the autonomic regulation system (as cited in Johnston and Olson, 2015). In layman terms, people do not think about breathing, the beating of the heart, or digesting food.

The amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, and possibly the insula are Paul MacLean’s (1949)
model of the limbic system includes “the orbitofrontal and medial frontal cortices which are in the prefrontal area, the parahippocampal gyrus and important subcortical gray matter of the amygdala, the medial thalamic nucleus, the septal area, prosencephalic basal nuclei which are in the most anterior area of the brain” (Heinzel and Northoff, 2009). While the limbic system is made of many integral parts, the center of the emotional processing is the amygdala. The amygdala consists of almond-shaped groups of neurons tightly clustered together in our brain. It is involved in recognition of facial expressions that are consciously and unconsciously experienced (Heinzel and Northoff, 2009). The anterior cingulate cortex, which is also part of the amygdala, is involved in cognitive tasks while the more rostral-ventral affective division serves an emotional function in the activation of perigenual anterior that helps with encoding and recalling emotions (Heinzel and Northoff, 2009). “The insula, especially the anterior part, is related to olfactory and gustatory sensations induced by gustatory stimulation; it transforms unpleasant sensory into visceromotor reactions” (Heinzel and Northoff, 2009).

Lastly, the dorsomedial thalamus and the periaqueductal gray have been related to the human sadness system that also includes the anterior cingulate and insula (Heinzel and Northoff, 2009) (Figure 1). MacLean (1949) came to these conclusions through empirical data and used both a naturalistic and laboratory approach to find the solution. Various neural connections make it possible for the amygdala to play its role in the mediation of love, friendship, affection, sexual drive, expression of a mood of fear, rage, and aggression. The function of emotions serves as an evolved response to animalistic instincts. Over the years, the evolution of the amygdala has developed to process complex emotions.
Functions of Emotions.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines emotions as an agitation of mind and an excited mental state. It goes on to further state emotion is any strong mental or instinctive feeling as pleasure, grief, hope, fear, etc. deriving from one’s circumstances mood, or relationship with others (emotion, n., n.d.). In the scientific community there are many different theories of emotions, i.e. psychoevolotionary, social cultural, and process/cognitive just to name a few; however, they all share the ideas of emotions as programs that guide cognitive, physiological, behavioral, and cognitive processes when faced with a specific types of problems or stimuli (Solomon, 2003).

Based on the scientific research of Broca (1878), Papez (1937), Yakovlev (1948), MacLean (1949), and researchers now understand that emotions begin as brain activity in the amygdala and manifest through particular feelings. Ekman and Scherer’s (1984) research and
methodology dealt primarily with emotions. According to their research, upon an organism’s evaluation of a situation at hand, the amygdala, which mediates our emotions, focuses its “attention to salient or relevant stimuli in the environment so they can be prioritized for processing” (Johnston and Olson, 2015).

In Approaches To Emotion, Paul Ekman and Klaus R. Scherer (1984) broadly define emotions as an “inferred complex sequence of reaction to a stimulus, and includes cognitive evaluations, subjective changes, autonomic and neural arousal, impulse to action and behavior designed to have an effect upon the stimulus that initiated the complex sequence” (Ekman and Scherer, 1984). More precisely, these complex reactions are a result of “the interface between an organism, and its environment mediating between constantly changing situations and events and the individual’s behavioral responses” (Ekman and Scherer, 1984). This process happens as follows: “First, evaluation of the relevance of environmental stimuli or events for the organism’s needs, plans or preferences in specific situations; second, the preparation of actions, both physiological and psychological, appropriate for dealing with these stimuli; and finally the communication of reactions, states, and intentions by the organism to the social surround” (Ekman and Scherer, 1984). These series of events proceed in the following order:

1. The amygdala decides if the situation is dangerous or not,
2. Alerts the brain on the next steps to take in a particular situation (i.e. when a person is in love, they may react physically by being intimate with their partner.),
3. The body exhibits a physical reaction to the situation (i.e. the actual act of physical intimacy with partner), and
4. The person expresses and communicates their reaction through feelings (i.e. verbal expressions of I love you and want to be with you.)

As mentioned in the steps above, emotions attach themselves to an object or a person.
Emotions are “always felt towards a goal” or an object, which is the lover (Oatley and Jenkins, 1996). Oatley and Jenkins maintain that,

In psychological terms [emotions] are said to have objects. The object of emotions of love and rejection is a person. The reason for thinking that there is a mental intermediate between our feeling and the relevant person in the world is that all these emotions can be elicited not just by the person but by the mere idea. (Oatley and Jenkins, 1996)

As presented in *What is this Thing Called “Love”?* Bernson (1991) claims that there are several characteristics of emotions and the object or the lover desired:

1. That emotion characteristically is about something; love being an emotion, must necessarily have an object.
2. That emotion involves belief about their objects. I love this person because they are kind, and they will make a good mate.
3. That objects of emotions can be shown to be appropriate or inappropriate or mistaken. This criterion arises from how one acts towards another or how one responds and what one fails to do.
4. That as a result of feeling an emotion, I will have certain wants and consequently tendencies to behave in certain ways towards love (Berenson, *What is this Thing Called ‘Love’?*, 1991).

**Love**

Love can rarely be defined as one particular feeling or experience because we all experience it differently. The Oxford English Dictionary describes love as a feeling or disposition of deep affection or fondness for someone, typically arising from the recognition of attractive qualities. It also goes on to state that love is an emotional attachment that goes toward an object. Classical Greek writings are immersed with words that describe what love and different types of affection mean.
In *Colors of Love an Exploration of the Ways of Loving*, John Allen Lee (1973) incorporates the Ancient Greek definitions of love with his take on romantic loving styles. Lee (1973) discusses several different types of love: Mania, Eros, Ludus, Storge, Agape, and Pragma. One thing that they all have in common is that love is involuntary and given freely. It is a strong desire for a relationship or union with someone else.

1. Mania love is an ancient Greek term for a kind of love which is irrational, extremely jealous, obsessive and often unhappy.

2. Eros love is the ancient Greek term for love fascinated by ideal images of beauty.

3. Ludus love is a playful love. Ludus the root of the Latin term used by Ovid in the first century to describe love as a game, Amor Ludens.

4. Storge love is what the Greeks use to describe a natural affection of the kind which one may feel for a close brother or sister.

5. Agape love is sacrificial and places the loved person’s welfare above one’s own. It is selfless and unconditional. Sometimes even called a spiritual love as with God and His creation.

6. Pragma love is a practical love because its most salient characteristic is a rational circulation of a successful affiliative love relationship within a sociological context (Lee, 1973).

Lee’s theory and concepts of love are constructed from literary source with his adaptations.

A mania lover is “anxious to fall in love, yet expects love to be difficult and probably painful” (Lee, 1973). Other qualities include periodically experiences a loss of control over their feeling and the direction of the relationship (Lee, 1973). These types of lovers seem to lack self-confidence and are not sure what to expect from a relationship. An Eros lover “is ready for love and for the risks it will involve, but is not anxiously searching” they are quite confident (Lee, 1973). They also seek “a deep, pervasive rapport with the partner as quickly as possible and is open and honest” (Lee, 1973). They search for the ideal partner and look for the beauty within.
Ludus love is “not ready to commit himself to anyone in a love relationship” and “avoids seeing his partner too often and may use formal means to avoid getting too involved” (Lee, 1973). This type of lover is very aloof, playful and noncommittal. They avoid commitments because they do not want to become too attached to one person but want to have fun.

Storge love “does not become preoccupied with the beloved, but begins to enjoy their common activities more” and “prefers to talk about and do things they share as interest, rather than to express direct feeling for each other. He also avoids conscious manipulation of the partners’ feeling” (Lee, 1973).

Agape is a “gift love without ulterior motives and with no strings attached” (Lee, 1973). According to the Bible, Saint Paul wrote a letter to the church of Corinthian telling them to love one another and “that love is patient and kind, not jealous or boastful, and endures all things” (I Corinthians 13:4, New International Version). Agape is a Greek derived term for love “that implies a duty or obligation to care about the other person, whether you want to care or not, and whether the love is deserved or not” (Lee, 1973). This type of love is also the universal term used in Christianity.

Pragma love believes “a loving mate-relationship is desirable for a happy life, but not essential, and no particular love partner is worth sacrificing too much for” (Lee, 1973). “The pragmatic lover is self-controlled, as conscious of the sustainability of love partners, as deliberate in love” they “want to settle down in a single, satisfying love relationship rather than to keep moving from one to another” (Lee, 1973).

Eros (or the Greek sense of romantic love) is the most common understanding of love narratives mythological or religious and are perhaps best captured in poetry or art. In such case,
as with the expression, “it’s a thin line between love and hate,” we are presented with both sides of love—transformation and destruction. Arguably, the most famous of these stories is the case of Apollo and Daphne.

Francesco Albani’s painting “Daphne! I love you!” “Leave me ALONE!” (c. 1615-1625) (Figure 2) appears to speak to this idea of transformation visually. We notice that Apollo is wearing a red cape and Daphne is in blue. “Blue is the color of the sky and sea. It is often associated with depth and stability. It symbolizes trust, loyalty, wisdom, confidence, intelligence, faith, truth, and heaven” (Color Wheel Pro, 2015). Hence, the color blue represents a transition, at least for Daphne, but perhaps for all begins driven by passion, to depth and stability. This, however, is not the only interpretation of Ovid's mythology, and indeed not most religions.

![Figure 2. “Daphne! I love you!” “Leave me ALONE!” Painting by Francesco Albani, c. 1615-1625. (Matyszak, 2010).](image)

Robert Lefèvre’s painting Apollo and Daphne (c. 1810 1810), interpretation of Ovid’s Apollo and Daphne is more of the apocalyptic annihilation type that we expect from warrior-god-king mythologies (Figure 3). In Lefèvre’s depiction of Apollo and Daphne, we get both
beings wrapped in all red “Red is the color of fire and blood, so it is associated with energy, war, danger, strength, power, determination as well as passion, desire, and love” (Color Wheel Pro, 2015).

Figure 3. “Apollo and Daphne” Painting by Robert Lefèvre, c. 1810 (Matyszak, 2010).

In Lefèvre’s depiction of Ovid’s Apollo and Daphne, cupid causes the words most famous “almost lovers” uncertain ruin (the hate side of the thin line). Their fate may not be apparent in the depiction, however, the red suggest destruction to all who would dare pursuit life or love. Lefèvre’s, case is the outside argument; most artists make a case for transformation or at least harmony between blue stability and red destruction (See John William Waterhouse, 1908 and 15th-century artist Antonio del Pollaiuolo, the late 1400s, both put Apollo in red and Daphne in blue). In terms of color theory, “harmonious color combinations use any two colors opposite each other on the color wheel, any three colors equally spaced around the color wheel forming a
triangle, or any four colors forming a rectangle (actually, two pairs of colors opposite each other)” (Color Wheel Pro, 2015). It is unlikely that artist such as Albani, Lefèvre, del Pollaiuolo are unaware of color wheel juxtaposition, and much more likely that they each were very aware of presenting certain aesthetic archetypes of love.

**Love and Attachment**

The attachment styles of love or avoidance of love, which may manifest in what can be described as hate, both have their roots in early childhood. Both are developed or forge in the crucible of care giving or lack thereof. They are core behaviors based on life experience—particularly the experience of the formative years.

Out of the many principles put forth by attachment theorist the models of Erik Erickson, John Bowlby, and Mary Ainsworth are considered academic pillars—as they are trailblazers and founders of the fundamentals. In the revolutionary book *Childhood and Society* Erik Erickson’s (1963) research on human development expanded upon Sigmund Freud’s psychosexual theories and placed a much greater emphasis on the social context of development. Erickson recognized the impact of society, history, and culture on personality development and was interested in learning how humans socialize within these spheres and how they affect one’s sense of self; and how this ultimately determines their evolution throughout the entire lifespan (Erikson, 1963).

Erickson’s theory has eight distinct stages, each with two possible outcomes. According to the theory, successful completion of each stage results in a healthy person and successful interactions with others. Failure to successfully complete a stage can result in a reduced ability to complete further stages and therefore a more unhealthy personality and sense of self. However,
these conflicts can always be resolved successfully later on in life. Erickson’s most profound contribution to human development is the concept of the “identity crisis” which he describes in his fifth stage of human development identity versus role confusion. If one is suffering from identity crisis, it is often the result of the unsuccessful completion of a key developmental stage, and unsuccessful development state completion can often be traced back to attachment.

According to Erik Erickson’s theory, the attachment is embedded in basic trust versus mistrust (Berk, 2014). He also believed that nature and experiences after birth play an important role in a child’s personality and behavior during childhood. The first two years of a child’s life is when they are aware of their surroundings and discover their body parts it’s also the time when they became self-conscious, beginning of autonomy (Erikson, 1963). Caregiving is vital in human development because unlike various other organisms in the animal kingdom humans are born defenseless and require protection. To survive, we require intensive care over at least the span of a decade and a half. Attachment from an evolutionary standpoint is to ensure the survival of genes.

Attachment comes about because of the infant’s relationship with the parent. Over time, an affectionate bond is formed, supported by new cognitive and emotional relationships, and ongoing stimulation of love and trust. This is how Erickson’s psychosocial conflicts theory, i.e., basic trust versus mistrust, is resolved in a positive way. Erikson accepted Freud’s emphasis on the importance of the parent-infant relationship during feeding, but he expanded and enriched Freud in his theory of psychological perspective. A healthy outcome during infancy, Erikson believed, the infant needs, keeping him/her secure in your arms while waiting patiently and making sure that they have enough milk (etc.).
The trusting infant expects the world to be secure, good gratifying and feel confident to explore. The bond between the infant and the primary caregiver is tied to how much ability the primary caregiver has to recognize and respond adequately to his/her emotional needs and demands. Operant conditioning teaches the infant about pleasurable feedback, which triggers positive responsiveness. Facial expressions, face to face interactions, the tone of voice, communication these are all patterns on how infants start being aware and build a foundation of bond understanding toward others and vice versa. The attachment between infant and caregiver should always be a prompt, positive and understanding response.

John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth were colleagues, and both studied bonding methods as it relates to their attachment theories. Bowlby, a child psychiatrist, and psychoanalyst is generally regarded as the founder attachment. Bowlby focused on infants and their mothers demonstrating how patterns of behavior form attachment bonds placing emphasis on “the importance of the infant’s confidence in his mother’s accessibility and responsiveness” (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, 1978). In regards to the infant-caregiver bond, Bowlby’s theory (1969), explained the psychoanalytic idea that quality of attachment to the caregiver has implications for the child’s feelings of security and the ability to build a trusting relationships; the theory of attachment, which recognizes the infant’s emotional bond to the primary caregiver as the most evolving feedback loop that helps the survival instinct.

The theme of attachment theory is that if mothers are available and responsive to their infant's needs, the infant, in turn, will establish a sense of security; which will lead to the child growing up with a sense of security towards the world. When a child feels safe, they are able to explore the world around them. Bowlby highlighted the details of this theory in his trilogy of *Attachment and Loss* volumes I, II, and III, written in 1969, 1973, and 1980 respectively.
Bowlby outlined attachment theory as it relates to the human motivation for attachment with the rudimentary core determinant of human psychology as the success or failure of human interpersonal relationships (Schwartz, 2015).

Bowlby claimed that the nearly universal sequence of emotional and behavioral reactions that follow separation which is protest, despair, and detachment, reflects the operation of intimate attachment system that evolved to promote close physical proximity between weak, vulnerable infants and their stronger, wiser caregivers. (Simpson, 1999)

Bowlby’s (1980) Ethological Theory of Attachment takes notice of an infant’s emotional tie to the caregiver as an evolved response that promotes survival (Schaffer and Emerson, 1964). Bowlby (1958) applied this idea to infant-caregiver bond.

There are four phases of attachment development: Reattachment, “Attachment in Making,” “Clear Cut” Attachment, and Formation of Reciprocal Relationship (Bowlby, Separation of mother and child, 1958). The first phase, birth to 6 months in age, Bowlby (1958) notes that in the first phase crying, babbling and facial expressions are all biological responses to garner adult attention; however, infants are not attached to their mother yet, but they recognize the mother’s scent and voice. The second phase 6-8 months is when an infant starts to cling to the primary caregiver. They will smile to the primary caregiver and start to feel some level of stranger anxiety to others or non-caregivers.

Separation anxiety kicks in during the third phase, which is within 6-15 months of an infant’s life. During this time it is important to be sensitive to the infant’s needs to lower the
distress the infant feels. The final phase beginning at 18 months-2 years, is also the most
dynamic phase. During this time language acquisition takes place and the infant is most
dependent on the caregiver. Opposed to Sigmund Freud (c.1895), who thought that physical
comfort was a caregiver’s primary concern, Bowlby (1958) suggested that emotional care was at
least equally important. Emotional depth is how we relate to others. Since the maternal
attachment is as essential for healthy psychological development as minerals are for physical
health.

A single caregiver is vital for development regardless of sex, i.e., male or female. There
are several periods of attachment, and if any deprivation or lack of a warm intimate and
continuing relationship with a mother figure occurs below age four, it will have lasting
permanent damage. This development model was from Bowlby looking into the backgrounds of
children in his psychiatric clinic. A lot of his patients, despite their age, had criminal
backgrounds, demonstrated a correlation between lack of affection and lack of responsibility.
This was usually due to early separation from their mother and was from irresponsible foster
homes or hospitals, which provided low-level care.

In 1949, the World Health Organization became concerned about the number of homeless
children, or children who were growing up in institutions as a result of the war years (Bowlby,
1980). Bowlby was commissioned to look into the matter and to theorize the after effects of war
on childhood development. In addition, Mary Ainsworth entered the scene and quickly began to
gain notoriety for her research studies in Uganda and Baltimore.

In the arena of development psychology the educated public is familiar with scholars and
theories such as Erik Erickson’s (1963) research on human development that expanded upon
Freud’s psychosexual principles and placed a much greater emphasis on the social context of development; Robert Kegan (1982) theory of how people progressively reorganize their experiences to create new meanings consistently throughout their entire life span; or Lawrence Kohlberg’s (1971) theory of moral development expanding upon Jean Piaget’s work concerning cognitive reasoning and presents three levels of moral development: pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional, to measure the level at which persons are operating morally.

A portrait of a lesser known but crucial member of the developmental psychology community is Mary Dinsmore Salter Ainsworth (1913-1999); it can be argued that Ainsworth is perhaps lesser know because she was a woman in a male-dominated field, which makes more than a hint of sense considering her accomplishments in the field—especially in the area of attachment theory—were monumental.

Ainsworth became a lecturer and researcher after completing her doctorate teaching and doing studies at various institutions such as the University of Toronto, Bowlby’s research group at the Tavistock Institute, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Virginia. Over the course of her long career, she undertook many projects, most notably devising the 20-min assessment branded the “Strange Situation” (Bretherton and Main, 2000). The evaluation was a laboratory procedure involving two brief separations and reunions infant and caregiver. From this experiment, three primary behavior patterns were noticed: Secure, avoidant, and ambivalent (Bretherton and Main, 2000).

Ainsworth traveled to Africa and during this period aboard she worked as a research psychologist at the East African Institute of Social Research in Kampala, Uganda. This was a big
step because here “she was able to conduct a short-term, longitudinal, naturalistic study of the mother-infant relationship and would later publish the results of that research” (Held, 2010).

After Uganda, it was off to Baltimore, Maryland and a lecture position at Johns Hopkins University. At this post, she focuses on clinical instruction and supervision. In addition to her duties at John Hopkins, Ainsworth set up a private practice devoted to the help of children.

This was the capstone of her research:

Ainsworth and her colleagues identified three attachment styles: secure, anxious-ambivalent insecure, and anxious-avoidant insecure. Children best thrive with secure attachments, while anxious attachments can portend later problems. She recommended the much-debated advice that feeding infants on demand fostered more secure attachments than adhering to a strict schedule—advice which changed doctors' recommendations to mothers dramatically. (Held, 2010)

Ainsworth was prominently active in many organizations, such as being president of the Society for Research in Child Development (SCRD) and received various awards like the American Psychological Foundation’s Gold Medal for life achievement (Although science was her focus, Ainsworth is also remembered for hosting lively parties and often winning challenging board games (Bretherton and Main, 2000). She was well for being quite a competitive spirit.).

Ainsworth’s methodological innovations, the Strange Situation Procedures, developed from 1971 through 1978 explained, confirmed, validated, and affirmed Bowlby’s research. Thus, in 1990, Ainsworth became known as the co-founder of the attachment theory (Rosmalen, et al. 2016). Her studies examined the attachment styles between a mother and her infant. The Uganda study from 1954 to 1955 consisted of twenty-eight unwanted babies and their mothers from

Ainsworth data collection was incorporated in with Bowlby’s ideas “hence the first study of infant mother attachment from an ethological perspective was undertaken several years before the publication of the three seminal papers in which Bowlby laid out his attachment theory” (Bretherton, 1992). Mary Ainsworth presented her finding from the Uganda study to Bowlby at the Tavistock Study Group organized by him (Bretherton, 1992). In which he used her findings work in his writing *Attachment and Loss. Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation* (1978) is a 1963 longitudinal study, documented the observations of twenty-six white middle-class families in the Baltimore area (Bretherton, 1992).

Mary Ainsworth’s attachment theory is that secure attachment such as feeding, caring, nurturing, emotional, social and societal development leads to a better chance for good relationships from beginning to the end of life. According to Ainsworth (1970), all family-reared babies become attached to a familiar caregiver by the second year, Mary Ainsworth’s theory the strange situation when infants and toddlers use parents as a base for a secure attachment to explore a new playroom, but the result of this relationship could be different. Some infants appear to be safe and comfortable with the caregiver they can rely on him or her to feel safe and protected. That experiment for assessing the quality of attachment from 1 and 2 years of age. Ainsworth and her colleagues reasoned that an unfamiliar adult should be less comforting than the caregiver. The Strange Situation takes the baby through eight short episodes in which brief separations from and reunions with the parent (Bowlby and Robertson, 1952). The focus was on the mother and child relationship.

“The 26 participating families were recruited prenatally, with 18 home visits beginning
in the first month and ending at 54 weeks. Each visit lasted 4 hours to make sure that mothers would feel comfortable enough to follow their normal routine, resulting in approximately 72 hours of data collection per family” (Bretherton, 1992). It is through the Baltimore study Ainsworth further develops the types of attachment. Using the data collected and observations she “categorized patterns of attachment into three major groups: secure, anxious-avoidant and anxious-ambivalent” (Fridman et al.). Secure attachment as described by Ainsworth mother being the secure base in which the child explores their surrounding (Ainsworth et al., 1978). The “young child who had gained security in his relationship with his parents was emboldened thereby to strike out to explore the world, willing to risk the insecurity initially implicit in learning situation because he could rely on his parent to be available, responsive, protective and reassuring” (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

If a child felt comfortable to explore the room while away from the mother that meant a secure attachment was formed. Whereas if the infant is insecure they are anxious-avoidant; the authors describe this as supposing the child's “adventure is evoked undue anxiety, the child could easily return to home base in the expectation that his parents would provide the reassurance he needed. If on the other hand, his relationship with his parents was insecure, then he might not dare to leave them to explore, not trusting them to remain available to him if he left or to be responsive when he needed them” (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

The last attachment style is anxious-ambivalent is described as when the caregiver leaves and upon the infant notice that the caregiver is gone becomes distressed. The distressed child who was secure now is anxiously attached and tends to remain close to the mother when she returns “perhaps clinging to her and exploring little or not at all” (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Attachment is vital to developing minds and for an affectionate relationship between two people.
Overall attachment is most evident in the relationship between a baby and its mother. Attachment theory is a psychological concept describing the warm and affectionate bond between an infant and its primary caregiver as the foundation for various stages of a child’s cognitive, emotional and psychological development (Ainsworth, 1991). Though many mental disorders are congenital, early childhood trauma can lead to brain damage, specifically in an adult who did not receive good care. The process of childhood attachment experiences manifest in later life (Prior and Glaser, 2006). What you experience tends to be what you normalize, which influence the view of your world and your self-esteem. These views and thoughts are essential because we base as essential in all of our conscious thoughts and behaviors.

There are three measures to various experiments on attachment theory stranger anxiety, separation anxiety, and social referencing (Berk, 2014). Stranger anxiety is something innate to humans as it is normal to be adverse to someone you are not familiar with or do not know. In the context of attachment theory, it is a gauge on whether the attachment is secure or not. Fear is related to stranger anxiety, which is connected to differences in ethnic and cultural backgrounds. For example, Kibbutz infants are more averse to strangers than Efe infants. The cultural context Kibbutzim are small close knit agricultural communities; similar to small towns and rural farms where everyone knows each other. In a Kibbutz, the mentality is us versus them due to the hostility of neighboring Palestine forces. While an Efe a child is raised communally and passed around from one parent to another. Separation anxiety is the level of emotional discomfort the child goes through when the primary caregiver is not present. Social Referencing is related to stranger anxiety and how they respond to new environmental stimuli.

Again, the overall goal is that attachment between infant and caregiver should always be a prompt, positive and understanding response. The attachment mission is different in each part
of the child’s life. The attachment experience is different during the stages of infancy, the developing child, the adolescent; the young adult and the older adult all have different attachment goals.

During infancy, the mom is at home for a certain period of time with the child. The mom and child are bonding with one another learning each other. In “Development through the Lifespan” Laura E. Berk gave an example of children going through two different experiences related to attachment. In the scenario, both babies Caitlin and Timmy began to develop a wariness of strangers. So when other people they did not know enter the room, they went to their caregiver; there is a crucial period from 8 months to 1 year when Caitlin and Timmy’s parents noticed that the child became more fearful when they were left alone with caregivers, such as a babysitter, they did not know, which was also observed in Mary Ainsworth studies. Babies tend to gravitate to who they know and believe they would be cared for in such circumstances. Erik Erikson’s psychosocial theory identifies eight stages of personality development through infancy to late adulthood.

According to the definition of Erikson’s theory a healthy individual should pass the eight stages which would mean they receive an attachment from their caregiver. The first stage “Basic Trust versus Mistrust,” the caregiver should give a balance of tender loving care. It allows the infant to expect the world to be good and satisfying. The infant will want to explore. If the baby is mistrustful, it lacks that exploring nature, kindness, and attachment. Instead, the baby becomes reserved. Stage two “Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt,” caregivers must provide the child with suitable guidance and reasonable choices. The child wants that sense of selfhood. In this stage, caregivers should let the child develop this selfhood. The caregiver lets the child learn the world around her. The infant develops their emotions from their caregivers and the world around
them. The baby ends up developing emotions based on the experience.

According to “Developing Emotions,” the baby expresses positive emotions such as a joyful expression if something is good. If something is bad, they will cry. The attachment between the caregivers and the child comes from emotions too. The babies learn to make a broad grin, smiles, and so forth. Babies develop a sensation of laughter around 3-4 months. The first laughs come from active stimuli such as the parent saying playfully “I’m gonna get you,” and kissing the baby’s tummy.

Caregivers are considered as a secure base by the babies. This is the case because the babies know their caregiver. The infant is provided the opportunity to explore the environment and then coming back for emotional support. You know if a baby is at this stage because you will see them wander off especially in public but then cry and get scared of something in the world around them. The baby had enough exploration and wanted to return to his base.

As children get older and hit puberty. It is common for things like kids who receive inconsistent care to have anxious style attachment as teens or young adults. As such the attachment style applies to both their platonic and romantic relationships. In other words, if your mother never gave you one of the basic needs of life like food, comfort or etc. you will grow up believing everyone will treat you that way. The various attachment styles tend to change, however, people tend to be complacent.

“Attachment styles are important for individuals in shaping their beliefs and attitudes toward close relationships and enabling them to expect and explain partner’s behavior and relationship outcomes” (Heaven et al., 2004). Phillip R. Shaver and Cindy Hazan developed adult attachment styles through their studies about love. Their romantic attachment styles are
secure, avoidant and anxious-ambivalent. In secure attachment couples, they have a positive association with each other and are confident in their relationship and “don't worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close” (Shaver and Hazan, 1988). Secure persons “describe their most important love relationships in terms of friendship, trust, and happiness” (Shaver and Hazan 1988). Avoidant individuals are “uncomfortable being close to others” and find it difficult to allow themselves to be completely open to trusting anyone (Shaver and Hazan, 1988). Avoidant persons prefer not to be intimate with anyone and get “nervous when anyone gets too close,” and when a lover wants an avoidant type to be more intimate than they feel comfortable with, they pull away by becoming physically and emotionally unavailable (Shaver and Hazan, 1988). The last romantic attachment style is anxious/ambivalent. It is characterized as a person being “reluctant to get too close” and often worries their significant other doesn't really love them or won’t desire to stay with them (Shaver and Hazan, 1988). Shaver and Hazan (1988) also point out avoidant types “describe their most important love relationship in terms of jealousy, desire for reciprocation, emotional highs and lows, and intense sexual desire” (1988). According to the article, avoidant type individuals fear intimacy and sometimes scare their partners away. These attachment styles developed by Ainsworth and her associates were initially directed at infant studies but as Shaver and Hazan (1999) have demonstrated this theory are useful in understanding attachments in romantic relationships as well.

Hate

The Oxford English Dictionary defines hate as to dislike greatly; to be extremely adverse. Similarly engaging, powerful, and impactful, and both born of biopsychosocial attachment, hate is the complex counterpart of love. Robert J. Sternberg’s “The Duplex Theory of Hate”
describes three fundamental attributes of hate that will be incorporated in this paper.

1. Hate is very closely related psychologically to love.

2. Hate is neither the opposite of love nor the absence of love. Their relationship is structurally complex.

3. Hate like love has its origins in stories that characterize the target of the emotion. (Sternberg, 2005).

Along with these attributes, hate encompasses three main characteristics according to Let me count the ways: An integrative theory of love and hate by John K. Rempel and Christopher T. Burris: stability, hard to define, and motivational.

First, hate is relatively stable and straightforward (Rempel and Burris 2005). Second, hate is an emotion that can sometimes be hard to define; some researchers, “conceptualize hate as a global, negative evaluation often contrasted with love” (Rempel & Burris, 2005). Others “regard hate as similar enough to the cluster of anger-related emotions” that are “a composite of anger and fear, or of anger, disgust, and contempt” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The third characteristic describes hate as being motivational or having motivational implications. Hate is a motivational “force that focuses the individual” and can sometimes be “self-directed” but is “often interpersonal and relational” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Most importantly, Rempel and Burris state the motivational implications of hate are associated with the desire to hurt or destroy the well-being of the object of hate by devaluing the object or individual (2005). They go on to state “that intended harm directed toward the other can function either as an end in itself or as a means to some other end” or “in formal motivation language, as an ultimate or instrumental goal” (Rempel and Sutherland, 2016).

There are six different types of hate common understood in psycho/social/emotion
research circles. Rempel and Burris introduce the different types of hate as the following: Sadism, Mutiny, Tethering, Denigration, Redress and Nihilistic. Sadism is described by the authors as pleasure, excitement, and thrill-seeking (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Sadism is associated with the desire to for intimacy with a lover, or other “intense rewards and pleasures may be experienced in relation to the actual interaction provided that the interaction causes the hated other to suffer” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The ultimate goal for this type of hate is to be pleasured at someone else's expense.

Mutiny is described as resentment, feeling trapped and it can foster an obsessive, clinging preoccupation with the other (Rempel and Burris, 2005). It provokes a “desire to harm the other as in caregiving situations with a little respite that episodically evokes a sense of being trapped” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The ultimate goal in this situation would be asserting one's autonomy or distancing oneself from the relationship with the other before the devaluing of the other can happen.

Tethering can be described as fear, loss, and abandonment in a relationship. In this type relationship, tethering is meant to keep the other close because the individual is afraid of loss and abandonment or to keep the other person from betraying them, so the ultimate goal here is to be in or stay in a secure relationship. “This form of often involves a partner controlling the other by “limiting contact with family and friends, insisting on knowing where the partner is at all times” this is all done in “order to physically, emotionally, economically, or socially disable the partner’s capacity to act independently” (Rempel and Sutherland, 2016). Rempel and Burris give an example of this type of relationship as domestic violence or stalking. Due to the perpetrator fear of losing the other, they will try and devalue them or and destroy their well-being.
Denigrations is a type of hate that is described as envy and contempt. “Designation does not assume a prior interaction context involving dependence, but one in which there is perceived competition for the desired outcome that is scared or exclusive such as romantic exclusivity or social status” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The article gives an example of this type of hate as stating “male superiority combined with being unemployed or feeling shown up by one's partner has been shown to predict domestic violence” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The ultimate goal would be to self-evaluate before the other person in the relationship gets hurt.

Redress hate is when anger and disgust emerge due to the imbalances of life. An example, “When bad things do happen to those perceived as undeserving (especially oneself), anger and a sense of injustice result, along with the desire to punish or exact revenge upon the perpetrators” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Another example of redress would be if a partner cheated on the other and due to this betrayal, it elicited anger and disgust. The goal in this type of relationship would be for Redress to “restore order, whether by balancing the scales of justice or by cleansing a personal world that has become impure” before this hate can devalue the other (Rempel and Burris, 2005).

The last type of hate the authors discuss is Nihilistic. Nihilistic hate is a loathing that seeks to destroy or diminish the other’s well-being, and that is its’ only goal. The authors suggest this type of hate is “overkill” with deadly consequences. An illustration of this hate in a relationship context is a “jilted lover who murders an estranged partner and their shared children” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The ultimate goal, in this case, has been meeting which ends in the destroying of the other.
Paralleled Dynamics of Love and Hate

According to the German philosopher Franz Brentano theories, love and hate are mental states that impose their feelings on their object. Franz Brentano, born on January 16, 1838, in Marienbad am Rhein, Germany was a German philosopher who had a huge role in the process of psychology becoming an independent science and is generally regarded as the founder of the act psychology or the notion of intentionality (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). His theory of “introspection” was “doing psychology from an empirical standpoint to describe what one directly experiences in inner perception, from a first person point of view” (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Brentano’s mission was to lay out the framework for the science of mental phenomena in which he defines as these criteria: mental phenomena are exclusive object of inner perception; they always appear as a unity, and they are always intentionally directed towards an object (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy).

Brentano wrote one of the most distinguished and renowned works titled *Psychologie Vom Empirischen Standpunkt* which is about the mental phenomena from the physical phenomena to explain intentionality or the mental (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Intentionality is described as “singular thought, namely those true thoughts that are directed towards concrete individuals or particulars that exist in space and time.

A “singular thought is such that it would not be available it could not be entertained unless the concrete individual that is the target of the thought existed”(Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). The German philosopher further defines intentionality for his theory as the acts of the mind instead of with the contents of the mind because “mental states such as thoughts, memories, and emotions are intentionally directed upon objects of thought and emotions”
Brentano was “concerned with mental processes or acts, he revived and modernized the scholastic philosophical theory of intentional existence or, as he called it, immanent objectivity in psychical phenomena, he held, there is a direction of the mind to an object” (Greenwood, 2015). The object seen is said to “inexist” within the act of seeing or to have “immanent objectivity” (Greenwood, 2015). He suggests fundamentally the mind can refer to objects by perception and ideation. This includes sensing and imagining by judgment and acknowledging, rejection, and recalling love or hate which takes into account desires, intentions, wishes, and feelings” (Encyclopedia Britannica). Using Brentano’s criteria for mental phenomena, love and hate appear in unity.

D. W. Hamlyn (1978) essay, *The Phenomena of Love and Hate*, discusses Franz Brentano’s mental act or activity of the phenomena of love and hate. The author uses the philosopher's theory that “all emotions involve love and hate” and “both feeling and will unite the phenomena of the role of love and hate in providing the focus for whatever else is involved” (Hamlyn, 1978). This unity, in turn, is the phenomena of love and hate that focuses on an object or the individual.

Love is in that respect a kind of positive feeling towards an object which is ipso facto through the desire that it involves an aspect of the will. The converse is true of hate. If there are other features in any given emotion one or other of love and hate provides a focus for that emotion. So far, then, from love and hate not being emotions, they are the central core of all emotions; or at least one or the other is. (Hamlyn, 1978)

These emotions then take “objects not just in a sense there is some actual object to which the emotion is directed” but can also be considered an object of the emotion (Hamlyn, 1978).
Are love and hate really different or are they one in the same? Rempel and Burris (2005) put forward a definition of love. First, they describe love as being a “multifaceted construct with multiple meanings, diverse targets and varied expressions” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). It is formed through multiple attachment styles such as the secure attachments defined by Bowlby and Ainsworth and the romantic attachment style by Shaver and Hazan (1988). Rempel and Burris (2005) go on to describe what love is believed to be as it pertains to the object:

1. Love has an object; it is something that moves out from us toward something, typically someone else
2. Love has value; love has something to do with the process of valuing the love object
3. Love is drawn; the lover is drawn or inclined toward the love object. Thus there is a motivation component to love
4. Love is affective; the lover must feel something for or with the love object

Based on these characteristics, the researchers conclude love to be a “motivational state in which the goal is to preserve and promote the well-being of the valued object” or the loved one (Rempel and Burris, 2015). Concluding that love is motive based on the valuing of the object or lover one must assume hate is also motive based but devalues the other by destroying the partner's well-being. The article explains this theory once the researchers define hate.

Rempel and Burris (2005) describe hate as being an emotion but unclear of its precise nature because nature can be varied and sometimes contradictory. They maintain hate is so varied that it can be characterized as “chronic and stable” or “persistent and enduring” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). One thing the authors do agree on is hate has motivational implications that relate to the desire to hurt or destroy the other (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The writers suggest they are parallels between the two. “Love is linked to valuing the other; hate is linked to devaluing the other” they are both linked to the object (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Devaluing the
loved person is crucial because it gives seed for hate to grow. The devaluation associated with the feeling that makes it “satisfying to have the hated other suffer, experience loss and be harmed” (Staub, 2005). If love has value and the motive is associated with the goal of preserving the objects well-being then hate is devaluing and must have an associated goal of destroying the object’s well-being (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The researchers go on to discuss how love and hate can be understood through goal application.

Rempel and Burris (2005) describe three types of goals to regarding hate. These goals are identified as goal attainment, goal substitution, and goal interruption. Of the three the authors chose to use the principle of goal interruption to explain why hate has to be characterized as stable rather than fleeting because “love and hate can both be transient if adequately behaviorally discharged through goal attainment or goal substitution” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Whereas “given that preserving and promoting the other’s well-being is an ongoing task, love has no practical end point; hate, in contrast, may have a definable end point; in some instances the total annihilation of the other” (Rempel and Burris, 2005).

Next, the authors turn to discussing the different forms of love and hate to demonstrate how love can morph into hate by eliciting experiences and examples that are associated with the goals described above. A table is taken from Let Me Count the Ways demonstrates how specific forms of love and hate correlate (Figure 4). Erotic love is similar to Sadism. The writers state erotic love is driven by arousal, and excitement whereas sadism desires intense rewards and pleasures may be experienced in relations to anticipated or actual interaction with the hated other (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The ultimate goal of erotic love is a desired union while sadism is the ultimate goal is to seek pleasure.
Dependence is a type of love that has insecurities and deficiencies; it has an ultimate goal to be nurtured. In a dependent relationship “closeness and the desire to preserve the other often assume the form of demanding, clinging urgency” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Dependence is compared to Mutiny. A strong feeling of dependence or need can foster an obsession with the object, hence, enforced dependency creates resentment to harm the other causing mutiny (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Mutiny wants autonomy and feels trapped by Dependence love. Mutiny’s goal is to assert autonomy.

Enrichment parallels tethering. Enrichment love is secure, comfortable and self-expansive; while tethering is fearful and has an ultimate goal of security. Enrichment gives
emotional security to those involved in the relationship and tethering harbors a fear of loss causing it to keep the other close.

Companionate love coincides with denigration. Compassionate love also considered to be Storge love is the most commonly known love that involves close relationships without the sexual aspect. This type of love includes friends, parent-child relationships, and close couples. It is considered the “ultimate goal the maintenance and promotion of a cooperative and mutually rewarding relationship” (Rempel and Burris, 2005). Companionate love is full of enjoyment and shared activities; while the counterpart Denigration is envious and full of contempt. Denigration gives rise to the breaking down of compassionate love when envy or contempt arises.

Regard and redress are also counterparts. Regard is defined in the context of a close relationship that stems from the constellation of eliciting experiences linked to the observed positive qualities in a loved or admired one (Rempel and Burris, 2005). The authors use admiration and approval to define regard (2005). Redress happens when the regarded one who is admired has angered or betrays the person who holds them in such high regard. The reading gives an example stating “when bad things do happen to those perceived as undeserving (especially oneself) anger and a sense of injustice result, along with the desire to punish” in order to restore order which is the ultimate goal of redress (Rempel and Burris, 2005).

Lastly, altruistic love and nihilistic form a potent pair; altruistic love is also called Agape love which is pure, selfless, empathetic, caring and responsive. It is associated with the benefit of others well-being; whereas nihilistic loathes the loved one and has the ultimate goal of destroying the other's well-being (Rempel and Burris, 2005).
Linking Love and Hate through Scientific Study. In 2008 a study conducted by Professor Semir Zeki and Professor John Paul Romaya, which revealed the emotions of love and hate were activated by some of the same areas in the brain. In this study, they explored how the neural correlates, parts of the nervous system, of hate is directed against groups of people or individuals. They picked the participants for their test groups by having them complete questionnaires which allowed the researchers to “correlate the declared subjective experiences with changes in the blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) signal” (Zeki and Romaya, 2008). Zeki and Romaya began conducting their experiment with 10 male and 7 female volunteers who expressed a strong hatred for an individual. Two weeks before scanning the volunteer's brain, each volunteer had to provide a picture of someone they hated. The researchers also had them complete another questionnaire called the Passionate Hate Scale (PHS) to assess how the participants felt about the hated individual and to “obtain a hate score which could subsequently be used as a covariate in the second level of analysis” (Zeki and Romaya, 2008).

The questionnaire revolved around three areas of hate: 1) Negation of intimacy, when an individual seeks a distance from the hated person because the hated person arouses feeling of revulsion and disgust, exactly the opposite of the desire for greater intimacy in the context of love; 2) Passion, expressing itself in intense anger at, and fear of, the hated person; 3) Devaluation of the hated person through expression of contempt. The scores on this questionnaire can range from 0 being the minimum hate level to 72 which is the maximum hate level.

Next, the researchers used an MRI scanner “fitted with a head volume coil to which an angled mirror was attached, allowing subject to view a screen onto which stimuli were projected using an LCD projector” (Zeki and Romaya, 2008). The participants were shown four faces,
three faces that were neutral subjects and one which was of the hated individual. At the end of the scanning session, the projector held a blank screen to catch the brain scan of the decreasing (BOLD) blood oxygen level dependent. The results showed viewing the hated individual activated areas of the brain that the Zeki and Romaya identified as the “hate circuit.”

**Conclusion: Myth, Imagination, and Aesthetic Education**

By way of conclusion we enter the land of Myth; for what is love or hate if not more than a narrative of our most stubborn mythologies concerning existence. No matter how persistent, however, the myths guide our beliefs on matters of difference between the two (love and hate). It’s only through the world of the aesthetic that we can manage or even change our beliefs concerning the notion of love/hate. In Myths to Live By, Joseph Campbell describes the importance of a person’s capability to invent stories around their lives as a method to understand one’s own identity. He addresses this by stressing that ever since the origins of humans we have created “myths” as expressions of what it means to be alive. These myths help us feel safe in a chaotic world; give meaning to our lives and sustain our faith so our spirit can prevail. When applying this idea to the visual Campbell continues, “They are telling us in picture language of powers of the psyche to be recognized and integrated into our lives, powers that have been common to the human spirit forever, and which represent that wisdom of the species by which man has weathered the millennia” (Campbell, 1972, p. 14). As individuals, I believe many of us learn to cultivate a reflective and meaningful picture language in our own lives, and they possess unique aesthetic qualities that help us gain an understanding of our own identity and our larger society. This is equally as true for understanding notions of love and hate, which construct our reality and by extension vary our identity.
Discovering one's identity is why the aesthetic experience, especially in the developmental years, is imperative to formal education. As artists or aesthetic travelers on any level, we become storytellers of how we see ourselves in relation to the world around us. All of these expressions, no matter what medium or form, all have unique symbology that describes who we are and what we believe. In addition, aesthetic judgment goes hand in hand with aesthetic values, what we believe to be beautiful often corresponds to values of the good and the true passed down to us from our parents; and then confirmed or denied by our social and cultural experience. In the end, an aesthetic experience will help us re-examine these parental or socially passed along values, helping us form our own identity and nurturing the power of the imagination.

Many have suggested that the imagination is one of the most important parts of our being and yet in our dominant culture, the building up of the imagination has become the most malnourished and least developed. There seems to be a trend in society, which is reflected in our media, politics, and educational systems, where instead of viewing the world in complex interactive ways we view things at face value and reduce ideas to their bare bone experiences. To combat this pattern, aesthetics in education can help us view our lives as projects that are constantly evolving, and our only limits are how far our imagination can take us.

In her article, “What Happened to Imagination,” Maxine Greene explains how aesthetic experiences have the ability to free us from the confinements of everyday life and explore the infinite possibilities of perception. As creatures of habit, we allow ourselves to get locked into our own life experiences and therefore education in learning to treat one’s self as an aesthetic project, can show us the way out. Greene maintains, “this is what imagination can do: create new domains, new vistas, and expansions of ordinary awareness” (47). Therefore imagination
and the creative process is the passion for possibility where there is no definite end.

John Guare, in his play *Six Degrees of Separation*, posits the imagination and its inherent possibilities as he writes “the imagination, it's there to sort out your nightmare, to show you the exit from the maze of your nightmare, to transform the nightmare into dreams that become your bedrock. If we do not listen to that voice, it dies, it shrivels, it vanishes. The imagination is not our escape. On the contrary, the imagination is the place we are all trying to get to.” aesthetic experience has the ability to defamiliarize and make us look at the world like you’ve never seen it before.

For instance, I submit, how can we read Jose Saramago’s, “Blindness,” without instantly thinking of how we ourselves, would react in that horrific world. Would we be able to withstand such a situation? How would we respond? In order to ask these questions we must suspend our belief systems and imagine what it would be like to experience this world—and art has the power to educate us in doing this. This is the same type of thing that is evoked when reading Swift’s *A Tale of a Tub* and the way it helps the reader reflect on Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan* and Descartes’s *Meditations* or mathematical philosophy and other supports of the Christian/religious/apocalyptic mindset.

In *Why Literature?* Mario Vargas Llosa agrees that Literature has been, and will continue to be, as long as it exists, one of the common denominators of human experience through which human beings may recognize themselves and converse with each other, no matter how different their professions, their life plans, their geographical and cultural locations, their personal circumstances” (Llosa, 2001, p. 4). Art then, allows us to see the world from another’s perspective, and in so doing increase our ability to express and understand ourselves and our
community.

John Berger describes just how difficult it is to adequately express our experience in the world around us in his book *Ways of Seeing*. “It is seeing which establishes our place in the surrounding world; we explain that world with words, but words can never undo the fact that we are surrounded by it. The relation between what we see and what we know is never settled” (Berger, 1972, p. 7). My argument in this paper is that we must learn to see love and hate for what it truly is—love/hate—or two binary sides of the same aesthetic system. For this task education of the imagination is key.

Education is integral; it is only through education that one can achieve a culture of human rights and dignity (i.e. a society where we do not necessarily have to rely on laws to safeguard general welfare). In her article, Felisa Tibbites is concerned with the “complex role of education in supporting social change and human rights development in education and society as a whole (Tibbitts, Understanding what we do: Emerging Models for human rights education, 2002). As such, she presents three approaches to contemporary human rights educational models and practices: 1) Values and Awareness, 2) Accountability and 3) Transformational. Tibbites suggests that each model, which is associated with a particular target group, contents, and strategies, can lead to theory development and research in a new emerging educational field (Tibbitts, Understanding what we do: Emerging Models for human rights education, 2002). Tibbitts notes human rights education can be strengthened through the use of learning theory, the setting of standards for teacher preparation and program content, evaluating programs in terms of reaching learner goals, and contributions to social change (Tibbitts, Understanding what we do: Emerging Models for human rights education, 2002).
Tibbitts’ compilation of typologies attempts to present the relation to and impact of school-based programs following the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) “learning to live together” principled curriculum and research on outcomes. She writes, “The concept of “learning to live together” entails the capacity to develop one’s own potential while learning successfully to manage relationships with others” and “is one of UNESCO’s four pillars of knowledge or fundamental types of learning essential to full personal and social development in the 21st century” (Tibbitts, Literature review on outcomes of school-based programs related to "Learning to Live Together", 2005). Learning to know, learning to do, and learning to be are the other three pillars. Central to the development of consideration, understanding, and respect for others beliefs, values, and cultures, the concept of learning to live together is considered to provide the basis for the avoidance of conflicts or their non-violent resolution and for ongoing peaceful coexistence (Tibbitts, Literature review on outcomes of school-based programs related to "Learning to Live Together", 2005).

Judith Burton in her article Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice examines the necessary role of aesthetic judgment (Burton, 1988). Burton’s primary concern here is nurturing and developing the imagination in the youth through the practice of aesthetic education. Burton makes the case that new connections can be made between thoughts in our head and concrete world. She does this by first exploring the interface of the sensory-affective dynamics of the imagination and then links its uses with the concrete aesthetic world and illustrates how experience in the art can inform aesthetic judgment. Again, aesthetic judgment is a value judgment, which leads to moral judgment. It can be argued that proper moral judgments will digress apocalyptic thought—and the ugly side love/hate. The importance of this research shows how children can go beyond visual basics and help them understand and value the very
meaning by which they make sense of and link themselves to their worlds. In this way, we can
dissuade young minds of apocalyptical thinking and possible the behavior that follows.

In my personal aesthetic education, I have found it imperative that a person is able to
understand one’s self. Through understanding first ourselves, we learn to trust ourselves and
realize that as we change, we grow, and what a life of ongoing development entails. It is through
this knowledge of one’s self that a person then is capable of being able to reflect on their life and
see themselves in relation to other individuals and groups of people. This is how we bind
ourselves with the rest of humanity and history—a history of love and hate.

Since the day we are born we experience love; love from our parents, relatives, and
siblings. Often this love is unconditional love. When we became adults, we experience another
type love, but this love is different, it is love that we had never felt before, a kind of love that can
make us blind—emotional, romantic, passionate love. This love can be the most beautiful thing
for some, but it also can be the most burning or destructive love—a love that resembles hate.
Hence, as the songwriter wrote, “it’s a thin line between love and hate.” “True love” By Wislawa
Szymborska is a poem that represents the positive and negative feeling of love (Szymborska,
1995). At some point the author made us believe that love is the most beautiful feeling a human
can feel; then she goes to a negative feeling, telling us the reader that we should try to ignore
love or our feeling. Many who love will experience the other side of love—note, not the
opposite of love—hate.

In the wake of this experience, some people decide to ignore their feelings; some try to
deny that any type of loves exist or they just do not want to fall in love. In Szymborska’s poem,
the speaker is mocking those who do not believe in true love. It could be because she has never
known love herself, or it could be because she is telling her readers that love is the most beautiful thing in the whole world; in Szymborska’s work puts forth some negative and positive concepts concerning love; or of love/hate.

The speaker notes, “true love” is it normal, is it serious, is it practical / what does the world get from two people / who exist in a world of their own?” (1-4). Szymborska is telling the whole world that we all should fall in love because love is the most beautiful thing a human can feel. Love is something all should desire. Love should be blind; love should be black and white. True love, real love is put as such significance, and that is why all people will desire true love.

Szymborska goes from love being a positive feeling to a negative sense, telling her readers that we should try to fake love, try to hide love. She writes, "look at the happy couple / couldn't they at least try to hide it / fake a little depression for their friends.' sake!’" (14-16). Is there a change of heart or has Szymborska has had her feelings hurt?

Why is Szymborska first telling her readers that we all should experience the love, that loves is the most beautiful thing a human can experience; but then she tells her readers, that we should do the opposite. It could be because someone hurt her, or it could be because she wants her life with no stress—or maybe it is because she hasn’t experienced love too deep. It is like she is saying “can you try to hide your happiness,” and not make misery to those who haven’t yet experienced love. Just hide it do not make your friends or the people around you suffer. Hide your feelings, hide your happiness, fake it all, so we can all be happy. Szymborska writes, “Listen to their laugh it’s an insult.” why would a happy couple make another person uncomfortable.

Szymborska goes from love being a positive feeling to a negative, but at the end of the
poem she goes back to love being a positive sense, “Let the people who never find true love / keep saying that there’s no such thing / their faith will make it easier for them to live and die” (33-35). Szymborska is saying that the people that don't believe in love let them believe that love does not exist, or if love exists we can just ignore it, we can just keep saying that love does not exist. Either way, if we are in love or we are not we are going to live and then die.

Plato was a brilliant philosopher who spent his entire life in the pursuit of knowledge and wisdom, as well as figuring out the role that a philosopher has when it comes to teaching other members of society to apply true and reason in how we think. However, what many misses is that Plato understanding of philosophy is rooted in love. In *The Allegory of the Cave*, Plato described a scene of men chained by their necks in a cave, only being able to see silhouettes in front of them. This was the only world they knew. The shadows have a symbolic meaning to reality.

Eventually, a prisoner is released and experiences the real world, a world different from what he ever thought could exist. This prisoner represents the philosopher, because he is seeking knowledge outside of what he already “knows” to be true – outside of his comfort zone. Knowledge comes from having the desire to question and learn the world that is around. The other prisoners do not react kindly when the released prisoner returns to tell them about the true form of these objects. The prisoners are created to symbolize them being the opinion makers of our society. They would rather kill him than hear another word about their world is different from what they “know” to be true.

In *The Symposium*, Plato answers this question with love (or Eros). Love is the force that pulls us out of the cave and into the pursuit of wisdom. Love is what draws us to another person,
or in Plato’s case, to knowledge. In these ideas expressed in this paper the knowledge here is that love and hate are virtually the same force, and once this is understood, love/hate becomes a lot more manageable.

In *The Symposium*, Plato talks about Eros, who, according to the Greek myths, is something of a demi-god (half man, half god). Plato likens Eros to being an intermediate state, and with “love” (Eros) being a mediator between the perfect and the imperfect, a comparison can be made between knowledge and ignorance. For Plato, love is the force that drives us to leave the cave, in order to seek fulfillment, in the “One.” Because we are attracted to what is truly beautiful, we need to look beyond what is simply beautiful, which in essence is Plato’s process of self-transformation.

What is often missing in the discourse about love and hate is that they work in unity—pushing and pulling us to self-transformation. Much the like, the dip and dry process transforms white cloth to the most amazing deep colors or like heating and cooling transformers steal, love and hate will transform the human soul—creating more wisdom depth and possibility. “The only thing I say I know is the art of love” is a line from *The Symposium*, and I think that is a bold statement that helps explain Plato’s ideas on love and philosophy even further (Plato, *The Symposium*, 2008). Would if we were all Plato’s and knew love—or its corollary—love/hate.
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