

since the Unilateral Declaration of Independence has been orderly and tranquil. Mr. Reed cites a French journalist who stopped the first black man he saw in a Salisbury street and asked him whether he wanted the whites to stay or to leave. "To stay," the man replied. "Why?" demanded the Frenchman. "If you had been here last year you would not ask. We want them to protect us." The reference was to the murders and burnings in 1964 by Communist-trained outsiders. This was also the attitude of the six hundred tribal chiefs who met at Domboshawa for an indaba. The conclave lasted six days without interference by the government or the press; at the end the chiefs, remembering the snubs they had received at London and having lost all faith in Britain, agreed unanimously in favor of an independent Rhodesia.

Mr. Mtshali would have us believe that the Rhodesian declaration "aroused anger among American Negroes, who thereby expressed their bond with Africans in their struggle against white domination." How real and how close is this bond? In 1964 Mr. Harold R. Isaacs revealed that he had discussed the subject of Africa with a large number of prominent American Negroes, and here is a sample of what he was told:

The American Negroes in contemporary Africa undergo rapid disillusionment. They are appalled by the omnipresent stupidity, incompetence, theft of public funds on a gargantuan scale, the unjustified presumption of superiority, the fear of competition from colored Americans and the refusal of newly spawned African Negro states to consider Negro Americans acceptable ambassadors from the United States.

Mr. Reed is a former British journalist who as a correspondent for the *Times* of London witnessed the Nazi invasions of Austria and Czechoslovakia. In 1936 he incurred the anger of his editors and the Cliveden politicians by a book asserting that the appeasement of Hitler was inevitably leading to another world war. Since the

end of that war he has been living in Southern Africa close to the events he describes in the present book. Now he foresees a third world war brewing not in Southeast Asia but in Africa through the continual agitation of Western statesmen, the liberal news media and the liberal coterie which dominates American policy. He cites among other evidences the plan for the encirclement of South Africa prepared by the curiously named Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, the irresponsible behavior of such official personages as the former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mennen Williams, and Senator Robert Kennedy, and the menaces contained in the note of July 18, 1966, to an ostensibly friendly government. The danger, he thinks, was temporarily averted by the successful Rhodesian resistance to intimidation by blockade and propaganda and by the Hague tribunal's refusal—by one vote—to deliver South West Africa to the United Nations. But the end is not yet.

Reviewed by ALLEN T. BLOUNT

---

### *Is Aggression an Evil?*

**On Aggression**, by Konrad Lorenz; translated by Marjorie Kerr Wilson, *New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966. xiv + 306 pp. \$5.95.*

KONRAD LORENZ' book, *On Aggression (Das sogenannte Böse)*, represents the clear sound of a clarion in the present-day din of pseudo-scientific obscurantism. Professor Lorenz is well established and respected by the scientific community, even by behavioristic psychologists. He is the *doyen* of contemporary biological and ecological researchers. He has contributed much to our understanding of biological and psychological phenomena in the great scheme of life. Gifted with an ability to transmit complicated observations and

concepts in an elegant, non-jargonistic manner to all who have eyes and ears, Lorenz represents the true scientist in our chaotic era of scientism. He believes that truth is basically simple, if one has the intellectual courage to face it and examine it. This is the only axe he has to grind. I consider his book to be a major milestone in the history of science of the twentieth century. Why?

Because Konrad Lorenz has, in a quiet manner and with a wholesome sense of humor, taken the trouble to investigate the nature of aggression in an impeccably scientific manner, no holds barred. Lorenz, having spent a lifetime in researching animal behavior, did not stop at the point of just accumulating an impressive mountain of disparate facts, data, and fragmentary conclusions but he has, in a logical, consistent and objective manner pointed out the *great connections* between the separate entities, thus giving us much understanding of the wholeness and unity of the phenomenon we call Life. He has had the courage and the humility to draw a parallel between animal behavior and basic human drives, calling attention to our evolutionary heritage. At the same time, throughout his book, he emphasizes the differences in human beings and animals. Humans are *conscious* organisms, with a unique ability to manipulate symbols and abstractions, but with an animal (evolutionary) tradition, nevertheless.

Lorenz first defines aggression as "the fighting instinct in beast and man which is directed against members of the same species." Then he asks the question: "What is aggression good for?" Boldly proclaiming the necessity of functional teleology as opposed to mythical teleology, he demonstrates the *purpose* of the drive: aggression is necessary and is good for the survival and the flourishing of the individual of any species within territorial limitations. Aggression is more important than hunger or sexuality: without aggressive defense of territorial integrity the satisfaction of those two drives, also in the

service of survival and propagation, would be impossible and the whole species would die out. Lorenz is the first scientist to connect the phenomenon of aggression with the importance of territorial integrity and ownership. In all species, man included, aggression serves the purpose of guarding the minimum, but for a particular species optimum, of territorial security against invaders of the same species. Within this "privately owned" part of the common environment feeding, sheltering, and breeding potentials are preserved and the survival of the fittest guaranteed.

Does aggression always result in mutual or unilateral extinction? Does it always lead to violence and war? Not necessarily, says Lorenz. Ritualization of aggression is a peaceful resolution of a conflict. This ensures domestic prosperity and inter-territorial tranquillity, by mutual respect. Vivid descriptions of the various non-verbal communications between animals convey to the reader the essence of this ritualization. They can be regarded as the outward manifestations of built-in parallel inhibitory instincts that regulate the aggressive instinct proper and are strictly adhered to by all specimens in all species. In humans, for instance, the Sunday afternoon mayhem on the football field is such a ritualization, certainly more constructive than a civil war. Or the space-race between certain great powers is more salutary than a shooting war with nuclear weapons. Would somebody please translate Lorenz' book into Chinese, preferably in the *Mao-ese* dialect?

Once an intruder signals his intention of giving up, the attack on him ceases, killing is avoided. Males never attack females. The principle of "never hit a woman" seems to be taken seriously in the animal world. Even in the inter-tribal wars so common to brown rats, males bite males and females bite females. Naturally there is a great variety in the modes of ritualization in various species, especially in those forming hordes, herds, tribes or societies. In the chapter explaining this, Lorenz expos-

es the biological bases for morality and speaks of "the great parliament of instincts." He contrasts the anonymity of the flock and social organizations without love (mass-mindedness) with the concept of *the Bond* (Chap. XI) which is the most creative outcome of the ritual resolution of aggression, resulting in love. Thus, love evolves from the primal instinct of aggression since "intra-specific aggression is millions of years older than personal friendship and love" (p. 217); indeed Lorenz insists that there is no true friendship and love without aggression, and no hate without love. This thought is one of the two great contributions of Lorenz. We are not justified in calling aggression evil, unless we want to regard as evil human understanding, morality, love, and other values of high order.

The other great contribution of Lorenz, not so easily noticeable but quite clear to me, is that by establishing the importance (biological, economic, and psychological) of territorial ownership he clearly refutes the theories of Karl Marx which in essence state that private property and the idea of ownership are responsible for all social evils and upheavals, revolutions are justified to overthrow the system based on these principles. What Marx did *not* know about science in general and biology in particular could fill libraries. Lorenz' conclusions and thought on territorial priority have been reinforced and re-validated by the recent work of Robert Ardner, and his theory of the *territorial imperative*. These thoughts represent a major breakthrough in recent scientific endeavors, with far-reaching implications for psychology.

While Lorenz draws a disturbing parallel between mankind and rats concerning social behavior, over-aggressiveness, and so on, his final chapter is an "Avowal of Optimism" because he does not "consider in any way as utopian the possibility of conveying a sufficient knowledge of the essential biological facts to any sensible human being. They are indeed much easier

to understand than . . . integral calculus or the computing of compound interest." (p. 297). Man, the highest developed species, has one specifically human characteristic that represents a built-in device for checking irrational hypertrophy of aggression: humor. The ability to laugh at our own folly successfully curbs that inflation of the ego which invariably leads to destructive and suicidal over-aggression; humor reduces "*tierischer Ernst*," an ever-present symptom of megalomania, which has proved to be the undoing of many dictators who habitually take themselves too seriously. The humor of Lorenz makes his work a pleasure to read. Marjorie Kerr Wilson's English translation is excellent: the reader forgets that the original was written in German.

Lorenz points out the importance of man's reason as a power to exert a "selection pressure in the right direction" to ritualize (and not to eliminate) the raw energy of aggression. Reason, he believes, "in the not too distant future, will endow our descendants with the faculty of fulfilling the greatest and most beautiful of all

commandments." Some of us may not share this honest optimism of Lorenz. I, for one, am convinced that reason *alone* does not do the job. Unmitigated, undiluted, reason may lead to oppugnancy just as aggressive instinct will. The *hybris* of reason is that it may think itself exclusively omnipotent. I rather believe that it is the process of integration, of individuation: the reconciliation of the opposites, of thinking and sentiment, of cognitive and emotive, rational and irrational processes, of masculinity and femininity that in the long run, will accomplish the task in the service of humanity. That is why cognitive experience *alone* is not the best teacher. That is why "pure" reason habitually calls spontaneous instinctual forces, such as aggression, evil. Yet, well-developed healthy reason, in alliance with compassion, will be able to regulate even the wildest of our instincts by conscious moral choice. There is perhaps only one principle worth living for and it is this: never sacrifice a human being to an abstract principle, no matter how lofty it seems to be.

Reviewed by Z. JOHN LEVAY, M.D.