

NARRATIVE REVIEW AND ERIKSONIAN-SYNTHESIS OF LESSONS FROM ANIMALS: MUTUALITY OF RECOGNITION IN THE AGE OF THE PSEUDO SPECIES.

Nicola Wannenburg^{1*}, James Gasson¹, Roelf Van Niekerk²

¹Rhodes University Department of Psychology

²Industrial and Organizational Psychology Department at Nelson Mandela University

ABSTRACT.

Violence in society has become more pervasive in all facets of life and is often rationalized by the formation of 'unique identities'. Homes, communities, and places of education have all been implicated. On-going violence and destruction also lead to issues surrounding the sustainability of the environment and the potential long-term impact on humans and animals. Despite technological advancement making the world a smaller place, it has not necessarily brought people together. Increased alienation from the self as well as other people and nature has been associated with decreased stability and increased psychological distress. Post the Covid-19 pandemic there has been a call for greater focus on One Health, which views the health of humans, animals, and nature as interlinked. Animals as aids for healing is ever increasing in medical and therapeutic settings. Increased focus on retaining the healing aspects of nature and relationships with animals in an ever-changing society and technological world may assist a move to a holistic approach to living, education, and ethical treatment of others and the environment. Further research is needed on children's and adults' understanding of affective empathy and ethical action. Research as well as guidance on the ethical treatment of others may inform school curriculums and may encourage an ethical stance to policy development as well as implementation. An Eriksonian synthesis on lessons from animals regarding mutuality of recognition in an ecologically bound universe is offered as one lesson and philosophy that may facilitate ethical thinking and action.

Keywords: Reciprocity, Animals, Education, Non-violence, Erikson, One Health, Human-animal interaction

Submitted: 2024-03-10 Accepted: 2024-03-15

Corresponding author: Nicola Wannenburg

Email: n.wannenburg@ru.ac.za

Rhodes University Department of Psychology

INTRODUCTION.

We live in a world with an increased emphasis on education and education for all. However, access to education in the traditional sense is often not part of many individuals' reality. While many factors influence this imbalance in society such as gender norms of particular cultures and religions and socio-economic status, violence is also a contributing factor. Internationally this has included school children being kidnapped, schools being bombed, school children inflicting violence on one another and their educators, as well as violent protests at university campuses and in communities, to name but a few examples. The inter-relatedness of violence and education as well as lack of internal and external wellness does not merely involve the hindrances to education but also begs the question as to how this interrelatedness has come about on such a pervasive level internationally. Further questions also arise regarding the differing perceptions of the worth of education, what is considered valuable information when we are teaching and learning where ethical and peaceful interpersonal conduct fit in these paradigms, and from whom we expect to learn. On-

going violence and destruction also lead to issues surrounding the sustainability of the environment and the long-term impact this may have on both humans and animals. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted two issues (amongst many) that are pertinent to this paper and influenced the rationale behind it. The one being that despite an unprecedented international health crisis that included many hard lockdowns all over the world, violence and war did not abate (Bloem & Salemi, 2021; Elhadi & Msherghi, 2020; Usher et al., 2020). The second issue that has come to the fore internationally is that of One Health (Amuasi et al., 2020). At the heart and science of the matter, One Health (Amuasi et al., 2020; Woods et al., 2018) refers to the health of humans, animals, and the environment as interrelated. In the absence of a conclusive path leading to peace in society and places of education as well as sustainability of the environment, considering less obvious avenues for guidance regarding ethical action may be meaningful.

There is a belief that the ability of both humans and animals to treat others in a respectful, ethical, and healthy manner is associated with one's health or peace with oneself and the environment (Erikson, 1964a, 1969; Fine & Beck, 2015;

Grandin & Johnson, 2009; Levinson, 1972). The inner imbalance or psychological ill health that has occurred and fuels outer unhealthy and violent behaviors has been associated, by some, with technological advancement and changes in living patterns (Erikson, 1985; Twenge et al., 2019) that have caused an alienation both from oneself and others as a result of moving away from nature and healing relationships with animals (Erikson, 1964a, 1985; Fine & Beck, 2015; Levinson, 1972). The authors are not suggesting abandoning all technological advancement or viewing it in a disparaging light. However, a greater focus on retaining the healing aspects of nature and relationships with animals in an ever-changing society and technological world may assist a move to a holistic approach to living, education, and ethical treatment of others and the environment. With this in mind, following a brief history of animals' roles as healers, we provide a synthesis of Erik Erikson's work on the lessons that may be learned from animals and nature and their relation to health and peace, culminating in his interpretation of *Satyagraha*. As a developmental psychologist, Erikson's theory surrounding animals' roles in health is the lesser known of his repertoire. Nevertheless, his theory as well as insights on lessons that may be erudited from animals and nature, while at times simplistic at first view, provide a platform for learning through ethical action. This paper is not a critique of Erikson's theories on animals, but rather a synthesis of lessons (some more philosophical than others) based on ethical action that promotes mutuality of recognition and that is espoused through animals' relationships with one another and humans.

METHODOLOGY.

The overall purpose of this research was to provide a synthesis of the developmental psychologist Erik Erikson's work regarding lessons from animals and how this relates to ethical action. While there are more conventional narrative review components to this research, the purpose was to synthesize a specific area of Erikson's work spanning 1950-1985.

Research design, data collection, and collation.

Due to the narrative review element of this research and the synthesis of a bodywork, which is still mainly in hard copy form, the researchers all read and reviewed Erikson's books and collated findings relating to texts that may have been deemed 'lessons from animals' and 'ethical action'. In terms of articles that Erikson wrote, or others wrote about his work databases such as Google Scholar, EBSCOhost, Scopus, and PubMed were searched. Terms used for the search included: "Erik Erikson", "Erikson about"- "animals", "species",

"education", and "ethics". The researchers reviewed the findings and further separated them into sub-categories or themes. These findings were collated about the contextual narrative review of animals as healers and the growing necessity for ethical action in society.

DISCUSSION.

Humankind's Relationship with Animals and Their Roles as Healers.

"All history is animal history, in a sense."
(Etienne Benson, 2011, as cited in Woods et al., 2018).

There are many accounts in ancient history of the ways animals have acted as spiritual healers, allies in war and conquest, as well as providers of the many needs of humans (Fine & Beck, 2015; Fujimura & Nommensen, 2017; Grandin & Johnson, 2005, 2009; Stanley-Hermanns, & Miller, 2002; Serpell, 2015). Yet, despite this, in recent history there is a tendency to keep these domesticated allies and wild environmental maintainers in the shadows of our records, attributing the success of humans solely to *homo sapiens*. The symbolic meaning of animals in ancient history and some 'traditional' belief systems hints at an important aspect of the Human-Animal relationship. Serpell (2015) discusses that *Animism*, the belief that all living beings possess a soul or essence, is significant because, in many cultural contexts, this essence creates a strong degree of equality and respect towards all life. This perspective of the soul can be seen in most contexts as a way of contributing to an individual's well-being, where their actions towards other living beings could have an impact on this balance (Serpell, 2015). Often, the healing of the soul regarding these traditional practices is heavily imbued with animal symbolism, and traditional healers that negotiate these illnesses are known in these contexts by taking on the persona of an animal (Serpell, 2015). This belief has also been extended to invertebrate animals that are sometimes believed to hold magical powers for healing the ill and have been used in medicinal practices by traditional healers (Loko et al., 2019). However, even though this is still prominent in some parts of the world, the modernized world seems to have lost this important connection to animals and the idea of a spirit or essence that we share.

Serpell (2015) mentions that through great changes to dynamics in society in certain parts of the world throughout history, such as the influence of Christianity on ideas of these perspectives on animism and the human relationship with nature, a sort of dichotomy was created dividing the 'civilized' human from the 'wild animal'. Erikson (1969, p. 424) reminds us that it is "only in the post-Darwinian period... [that] mankind even began to confront the

shocking intelligence that he may be some special kind of mammal". In later centuries humans' relationships with animals changed again when the age of industrialization brought about variations in ideas of nature, and practices of pet-keeping became more common (Serpell, 2015). Serpell (2015) highlights a significant increase in interest in the ways animals could be used as agents of socialization for children and the mentally ill in certain institutions in Europe. These animals were not directly involved in the healing or rehabilitation process, but more actants in the background whose roles were to offer companionship to these individuals, as well as promote self-efficacy through the teaching of how to take care of these animals (Serpell, 2015). The presence of animals or small pets was identified by Florence Nightingale in *Notes on Nursing* (1880 as cited in Serpell, 2015) to be therapeutically beneficial for the chronically ill. However, Serpell (2015) states that as scientific medicine took large leaps into the field of disease the role of animals began to increasingly lose their significance in the medical field, other than as objects for conducting bio-medical research. However, the medical field too has seen development in its thinking and research involving the roles that animals may play in both biological processes relating to wellness (Odendaal, 2002) and disease (Braun et al., 2009; Ellse, 2020; Follansbee, 2007; Holtzman & Britz, 1986; Kirton et al., 2004).

Animals have been recognized in history to contribute effectively to the well-being of people, but more in the indirect role of a companion in the process of healing (Grandin & Johnson, 2009; McConnell, 2011; Serpell, 2015). From a mental health perspective, one of the initial emergences of animals being used in therapy is through their symbolic representation and significance according to Freud's ideas on psychotherapy (Serpell, 2015). Freud claimed that the image of animals, especially in dreams, could be analyzed as a representation of "animalistic" impulses that threaten the ego (Serpell, 2015, p. 17). One of the aims of psychotherapy for Freud was to reveal the meaning behind the symbolism present in dreams, such as impulses, and then by revealing them, the idea was to bring balance to them. As Serpell (2015) argues, this is somewhat representative of the Shamanic ideals of animism and its representation of the soul or spirit as mentioned previously. However, this is heavily emphasized by the symbolism of animals and their role in the understanding of individual cognition. Boris Levinson, one of the pioneers in the field of human-animal interaction therapy coined the concept of 'pet-facilitated therapy' (Odendaal, 2000; Serpell, 2015). Through acknowledging Freud's ideas of the psychotherapeutically significant representation of animals, Levinson proposed that a way to heal the connection with these unconscious, 'animalistic' impulses was through establishing a positive relationship with actual, real animals (Serpell, 2015). Levinson believed that there was a need to

"come to terms with [our] inner self and to harmonize culture with [our] membership of the world of nature", and that humans "need animals as allied to reinforce our inner selves" (Levinson 1972, p. 6). From a view that was resonated by Erikson (1964a, 1965, 1966a, 1969), Levinson was thus proposing that animals are more important than just their symbolic meaning, as Freud hypothesized, but also play an important role in human existence as a representation of the human relationship with nature, and in turn is essential to our well-being.

There is both an affirmation of the roles that animals play in healing and an irony when observing the extent to which animal-assisted therapy has grown globally. This includes animal-assisted activities, the new sub-field of animal-assisted play therapy, and animals as registered emotional companions. This is apparent in the ways that animals are assisting children exposed to trauma as well as war veterans with physical disabilities and post-traumatic stress disorder (LaFollette, Rodriguez, Ogata, & O'Haire, 2019; Tedeschi et al., 2015; Zilcha-Mano, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2012). If a disconnection from animals and nature has in any way influenced increased self-alienation, self-other dichotomies, and a generally more violent society, to the extent that animals have been 'recalled' for their roles as healers and essences of peace, but now in therapeutic and medical settings, then it is perhaps time to once again learn from animals and nature.

Erikson on Animals and Nature.

As with other concepts, Erikson developed his ideas regarding animals and nature over time and gathered his knowledge from a wide variety of sources. Erikson's views of the relationships between animals and humans were based on observations, discussions with ethologists and animal psychologists, as well as research (Erikson, 1964a, 1965, 1966a, 1969). Erikson's first presentation of his theory of the connection between animal rituals and the function such rituals may provide in human development was in 1965 (Coles, 1970; Erikson, 1965). According to Erikson (1966a), this was merely a preliminary report. Erikson built on his theory in the *Ontogeny of the Ritualization of Man* (1966a), *Gandhi's Truth* (1969), and *Toys and Reasons* (1977). Erikson's most profound application of his theory surrounding pacific ritualization in animals was his interpretation of Gandhi's Satyagraha or militant non-violence (Erikson, 1965, 1969). Ethical treatment of both humans and animals, the development of identity or loss thereof, as well as the potential destruction caused by the technological and nuclear age, was of particular concern to Erikson (1963, 1964a, 1969, 1977, 1985). He discussed these concerns about animals' use of ritualization as well as their ego coherence and integrity (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1965, 1966a, 1969). According to Erikson (1963, 1964a,

1969), many lessons can be learned from animals and the natural world.

Lessons from Animals.

For most of history, humans have had complex relationships with animals and nature (Erikson, 1964a). This has become more apparent and complicated in the last century (Erikson, 1964a). Animals have served as attachment figures and have been employed by humans for emotional, spiritual, and work purposes (Erikson, 1950/1973, 1964a, 1977). Despite humans' involvement with and reliance on animals, many humans have attempted to distinguish themselves from animals, both relationally and biologically (Erikson, 1964a, 1968, 1985). According to Erikson (1964a, 1968, 1969), Darwin inextricably linked the human species with other animal species on varying levels, despite resistance and uproar from some individuals. Even though people live in an "ecologically bound universe" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 101) they have become uprooted and separated from their own "animal nature" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 107). Technological 'advancement' has removed humans from the natural world (Erikson, 1964a, 1969). This has caused some consciences to be split and inner disturbances to occur, while animals retain their instincts as well as ego coherence (Erikson, 1964a, 1969, 1985). To feel un-rooted or estranged from the self creates either an unstable identity or a loss of identity (Erikson, 1964a). This up-rootedness and estrangement have also resulted in "man-made parenthood" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 107) as well as pseudo-identities (Erikson, 1985). These pseudo-identities are supported by selective similarities that enhance group cohesion and fuel the treatment of individuals viewed as other (through the focus on selective differences) as pseudo-species (Erikson, 1985). Through pseudospeciation, people not only distance themselves from animals but also dehumanize other people by ignoring the similarities they share with them, including inherent biological similarities (Erikson, 1985).

According to Erikson (1963, 1964a), humans have lost their roots through diaspora, the effects of wars, as well as forced and chosen migrations from natural, agricultural, and communal living. Technology has facilitated an expanded as well as smaller world and universe (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1977). However, fear of nuclear and biological war has caused unease (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1977, 1985). This unease as well as fear often supports the development of pseudo-identities or unique identities that view people not belonging to the selective group identity as being a threat (Erikson, 1985). Along with humans moving away from natural living and increased violence through us-them dichotomies, has come greater exploitation of animals and nature (Erikson, 1964a, 1985). Resonating with Levinson's (1972) sentiments, Erikson (1964a) notes that despite this

exploitation, humans still strive to integrate an element of their life cycles into a part of nature's cycle to feel a sense of belonging. This sense of belonging is also often mentioned as anecdotal evidence for the alleviation of feelings of depression and loneliness from people who live with companion animals.

The mechanized and technological world has not only encouraged an exploitation of nature but also an own species exploitation of other humans that is justified through pseudo-speciation (Erikson, 1964a, 1966b, 1977, 1985). Some people may identify with machines as if they are a "new totem animal" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 105). Up-rootedness is not only displayed and experienced through migration but also a loss of ego synthesis and psychosis (Erikson, 1963, 1964a). The first sense of rootedness or belonging is experienced from the recognition of the primary caregiver (Erikson, 1950/1973, 1964a, 1968). This mutuality of recognition also occurs in other animals on both an individual as well as species level (Erikson, 1964a). This can be observed between animal infants and their caregivers (Erikson, 1964a). Mutuality of recognition can also be viewed in the ceremonial dances of birds to display and establish their family as a species, as well as the biological predecessors of their offspring (Erikson, 1964a). To understand the human species and the psychic disturbances that have increased through "man-made parenthood" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 107) in the technological era, a tracing of roots needs to occur. This does not refer to tracing individuals' roots to mother-child relationships or the "somatic naval cord" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 106), but rather humans' beginnings in nature, and to a time when humans were at peace with and in nature.

Much pressure has been placed on the mother-child relationship and its influence on future stability and psychological health (Erikson, 1950/1973). This was reinforced by ecological comparisons of the mutuality of recognition relationship between mothers and infants (Erikson, 1964a). Such theories were mainly based on comparisons with birds in the nest who are dependent on their mothers for the species to survive (Erikson, 1964a). These views, both ecological and psychiatric, were exacerbated by the idea that the development of infant animals, as well as growing animals still being looked after by their parents or pack, were only comparable to the development of human infants (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1966a). Erikson (1964a, 1966a) maintained that this was an incorrect comparison and was not useful for understanding beneficial developmental aspects or the influence of rituals in both animal and human development (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1965, 1966a, 1969, 1977). According to Erikson (1964a, 1965, 1966a) the development of newborn animals and growing animals still being cared for by their parents or

pack should be viewed as a human development from infancy through to adolescence (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1966a). Such a developmental view allows for the examination of contributing factors such as environment as well as other humans and animals on the development of children or young animals (Erikson, 1964a, 1966a, 1969).

Mutuality of Recognition and the Development of Hope.

According to Erikson (1964a) in terms of an evolutionary or ecological comparison, hope enables humans to gain some sense of rootedness and belonging, which is possessed by animals and is established in the animal world. For young animals, like human infants, the responses and verification of caregivers, as well as the stability of the environment, enable hope as well as a sense of rootedness. In this sense, the human infant's caregiver "is nature" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 117). For Erikson, there was a strong connection between mutuality of recognition in relationships, the beginnings of playfulness, and developing hope. Furthermore, play as well as hope may be viewed as creativity as well as ethical conduct. Both growing children and animals play. Children's play may be more creative and intellectual than animal play (Erikson, 1964a). However, play provides both children and animals with a means to develop emotionally, cognitively, and physically, and to resolve developmental tasks (Erikson, 1964a, 1977). The beginnings of a young animal or infant's play may not be obvious (Erikson, 1950/1973). It is autocosmic and may not be recognized as play (Erikson, 1950/1973). Therefore, young creatures' (animals and infants) play initially centres on their bodies and senses (Erikson, 1950/1973). An example is infants playing with their toes or hands. Young humans and animals' experiment with their senses by looking at things, closing and opening their eyes, as well as making sounds (Erikson, 1950/1973). As infants and young animals grow, their play extends to the primary caregiver, other individuals, as well as objects in their environment (Erikson, 1950/1973). For example, an infant may tug on an adult's arm or clothes to see what the reaction will be, or a puppy may grab and pull his mother's tail. Infants and young animals' play is developed in the interplay with their primary caregivers as well as litter mates in the case of animals (Erikson, 1950/1973, 1977). In this regard, play enters the psychosocial arena as hope is formed by seeing and being seen, which establishes mutuality of recognition (Erikson, 1950/1973, 1964a, 1977). If play is not recognized, there is no interplay nor mutuality of recognition. This may result in infants and growing individuals either becoming violent to get a reaction and to be noticed or conversely withdrawn (Erikson, 1950/1973, 1977).

The play of young animals, like children's play, is mostly only possible, when the young are in a safe environment, protected and cared for by their parents (Erikson, 1964a). Animal and human play provide spaces and rituals in which to learn required behavior, how to contain certain emotions, and how to afford relief from overwhelming emotions (Erikson, 1977). Each species has its forms of play which are understood by the specific species. This understanding of 'how to play' in each species proposes a sense of order (Erikson, 1977). Young animals, like young humans, learn what type of play is fun and what type of play hurts or goes too far and will create a threatening response (Erikson, 1977). Such play encounters allow young animals and humans to learn to interact and practice interactions for future relationships and encounters (Erikson, 1977). These interactions and lessons on mutuality of recognition may also be extended to human children and animals playing with each other. The importance of safety in play cannot be emphasized enough. It is often this necessity that is lost in areas with high levels of violence, whether in the home or community.

The role of older members of a species in teaching mutuality of recognition and ethical conduct is also imperative. The human is a "teaching as well as learning animal" (Erikson 1968, p. 138). This statement is also applicable to animals in varying degrees, depending on the species (Erikson, 1964a, 1969). This form of teaching refers to being generative, caring for younger members of the species, and imparting necessary knowledge (Erikson, 1964a, 1968, 1969). This idea may also be extended to the human-animal relationship where bi-directional learning may occur. People's need to teach and be generative not only extends to other people but also to animals who are taught various lessons within homes as well as certain occupations and services (Erikson, 1964a, 1968). This human generativity is instinctive, just as animal generativity is instinctive (Erikson, 1964a). Animals also show younger animals how to do things and encourage the development of various capabilities at the necessary time (Erikson, 1964a). It is an essential etiological situation for both humans and animals that there is an interconnecting of life stages as well as generations. However, more emphasis is still placed on what animals can learn from humans instead of the converse.

Animal Nature and Adaptive Integrity.

Previously in psychoanalysis, the id was viewed as having total control over a human's "animal nature" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 147). In line with this view, the ego was seen as being inactive and ruled by the id and superego (Erikson, 1964a). This type of theorizing leads to a distorted as well as negative perception of human's "animal nature" (1964a, p. 147), as well as the relationship between animals and

nature (Erikson, 1963, 1964a). According to Erikson, in animal nature is the precursor to the human ego. Humans have been inclined to project their “id superego split” (Erikson, 1964a, p. 150) onto animals. These projections are at times contradictory. People’s undesirable vices are attributed to animals (Erikson, 1964a). For example, eating like a pig, being as vicious as a tiger, or being as silly as a goat. Conversely, people also project their strengths or virtues onto animals. For example, being as “courageous as lions” (Erikson, 1964a, p. 150) or as “meek as lambs” (Erikson, 1964a, p. 150), or perceiving beauty and mystery in certain animals and relating these to human qualities. According to Erikson (1964a) what people usually do not recognize in animals or are surprised by, is animals’ inner balance, “restraint and discipline” (p. 150) within their ecological environment. This inner regulator in animals is analogous to the human ego (Erikson, 1964a). Erikson (1964a) alleged that animals have more ego synthesis than humans and as such possess and display an ecological as well as “adaptive integrity” (p. 151). The ego coherence and integrity of animals encourage in them a sense of morality towards both other animals and humans (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1969). This is displayed by various species being able to live in the same environment without interfering with one another, unless necessary, and for the sake of survival (Erikson, 1964a). This is furthered by, for most animal species, there not being unnecessary carnage, rage, or immobilizing anxiety (Erikson, 1964a). The “mutual regulation” (Erikson, 1964a, p. 151) that animals possess, allows them to live in harmony with other members of their species as well as other species. Erikson (1964a) held the view that even though humans can only ever attempt to live up to animals’ sense of balance and integrity, they nevertheless should try. For people to reach the level of animals’ adaptive integrity, they would also require a mutual regulation of their inner processes about the intersections of their technological and societal processes, and interactions (Erikson, 1964a). For this to occur, humans will need to become more conscious of their intergenerational and psychosocial processes and mutuality of recognition (Erikson, 1964a, 1977) with themselves, each other, and the environment.

Ethics Relating to Research with Animals.

Erikson (1963, 1964a) held the *Golden Rule* as his “baseline” (1964b, p. 220) for ethics. In its most simple form, the Golden Rule implies that “one should do (or not do) to another what one wishes to be (or not to be) done by” (Erikson, 1964a, p. 220). While this account alone does not take more developed ideas surrounding cognitive and affective empathy into account, Erikson furthered this statement by suggesting “that (ethically speaking) a man should act in such a way that he actualizes both in himself

and in the other such forces as are ready for a heightened mutuality” (1969, p. 413). Various versions of the Golden Rule have been under scrutiny as well as debate (Erikson, 1963, 1964a). Nevertheless, Erikson (1963, 1964a, 1969) maintained that his interpretation of the Golden Rule holds ethical implications as well as insights that should be applied sensitively to particular situations. Individuals deny status as well as reciprocity of ethics to those they consider to be the ‘other’ or ‘outsiders’ (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1966b, 1985). In terms of the Golden Rule, animals may be viewed as creatures that are treated as being the ‘other’, both in scientific research and in society (Erikson, 1964a). According to Erikson (1964a), there are ethical implications for all scientific studies, even if they involve animals. Erikson (1964a) draws readers’ attention to Harlow’s (Harlow, 1961) experiments with attachment in monkeys. While some form of knowledge in an unnatural environment was obtained, the monkeys were observed to have become psychotic (Erikson, 1964a). Relating to such studies, Erikson stated that whether working with humans or animals, the “scientific approach toward living beings must be with concepts and methods adequate to study ongoing life, not of selective extinction” (1964a, p. 229). Erikson (1963, 1964a) thought that both animals and humans should not merely have things done to them to learn about their psychological and generational processes. Experiments as well as observations have revealed attachment and interactions within animal species, as well as inter-species between humans and animals (Erikson, 1964a). Nevertheless, the methods of study should be as natural as possible (Erikson, 1964a). Whether researchers want to learn about the transactions between animals or between humans and animals, testing and observation should occur in a natural environment (Erikson, 1964a). Such a natural environment will allow both humans and animals to “transmit life” to reveal their “socio-genetic evolution” (Erikson, 1964a, p. 229).

A naturalist investigation referred to as inter-living research (Erikson, 1964a), occurs when humans and animals live out their life cycles in the same environment. The choices made as well as relationships formed are observed. An example of this type of research occurred with Elsa the lioness who lived with the Adamson family in Kenya (Erikson, 1964a). Elsa developed a trusting relationship with her human foster parents and went to visit them even when she had a mate and cubs of her own (Erikson, 1964a). Elsa would take her cubs with her on such visits (Erikson, 1964a). Erikson (1964a) describes this as a moral response in Elsa as a result of her trust in her human foster family. Elsa’s trust and morality toward humans may have been possible as animals can learn human signs and understand human language and tone (Erikson, 1964a). Elsa was able to convey this trust as well as morality to her offspring regarding the humans she trusted

(Erikson, 1964a). Erikson (1964a) points out that this is only one story and occurrence among many that displays the relationships that humans and animals may share. The relationships humans share with animals, and humans' relation to their instinctive animal natures, may have been "highly distorted by thousands of years of superstition" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 230). This false notion has led to animals being treated as the 'other' or as pseudo species (Erikson, 1964b). This is a notion that some humans have extended to other humans that they view as being different from themselves in some way and have used to rationalize violent or unethical behavior. Erikson (1963, 1969) maintained that there may be "resources for peace" (1964a, p. 230) if humans learn to connect with and understand (a) their animal natures, as well as (b) relationships with animals and the natural world. Erikson furthered the latter idea by stating that if humans learn to "nurture nature" (Erikson, 1964a, p. 230), they will not only find resources for peace, but also for ego synthesis, and a shared communal understanding with animals as well as other humans.

Satyagraha and Pacific Ritualization.

According to Erikson (1969), no definition for Satyagraha may traverse all socio-historical contexts as an understanding of the term and philosophy will be influenced by the era and discipline of both the individuals applying it, as well as the interpreters. However, Erikson (1969) was of the view that Satyagraha held the fundamental principle of action based on 'truth' for Gandhi as well as those who used it as a tool in campaigns or social practice. While the particular 'truth' for each individual applying Satyagraha was relative and may have varied, there was generally, and particularly for Gandhi, a focus on truthful action that did not harm other individuals (Erikson, 1969; Jahanbegloo, 2016). Important to both Erikson and Gandhi was the underlying belief that, while intending not to do any physical harm to another (which may be impossible in the action of self-defense), individuals determine "not to violate another person's essence" (Erikson, 1969, p. 412; Jahanbegloo, 2016). The attitude and credence of Satyagraha may be viewed as Erikson's understanding of the Golden Rule (Erikson, 1963, 1964a, 1969). Erikson (1965, 1966a, 1969) maintained that Satyagraha as well as the Golden Rule held imperative principles, as well as possibilities, for how people should treat other people as well as animals. Erikson thought that these principles are important for everyday interaction. However, he felt that they are particularly important in the technological and nuclear age, an era dominated by the division of various groups into pseudospecies (Erikson, 1964a, 1966b, 1969, 1985). When individuals view other individuals or animals as pseudo species they take on a "righteousness" that implicates them

in unethical behavior and "undermines" (Erikson, 1969, p. 412) their psychological states.

According to Erikson (1969) based on what is known and observed in human behavior, the principles of Satyagraha and the ability to perform militant non-violence seem "alien" (p. 242) and unnatural to humans. For Erikson to develop an understanding and interpretation of the concept of Satyagraha, and Gandhi's application thereof, he needed to integrate psychoanalysis with animal psychology (Coles, 1970; Erikson, 1965, 1966a, 1969). In particular, he focused on animals' use of pacific ritualization and made the important distinction between instinctive and instinctual energy and behavior (Erikson, 1965, 1966a, 1969). Instinctive action is based on pattern, restrained, competent, and useful behaviors and energy which have adaptive qualities (Erikson, 1965, 1966a, 1969). Instinctual action, on the other hand, is influenced by "quantitative excess" (Erikson, 1966a, p. 340) of drives and energy which are rarely useful and adaptive, and more often may be destructive, uncontrolled, and unreasonable. Erikson (1965, 1966a, 1969) was of the view that the instinctive energy of animals far outweighs their instinctual energy and as a result have greater ego coherence and integrity. Conversely, instinctual energy has a greater influence on human behavior (Erikson, 1965, 1966a, 1969), especially about violence. However, human thought and action are not wholly determined by instinctual drives, and individuals may reach a more optimal psychosocial development through the employment of their instinctive energies and creative ritualization (Erikson, 1964a, 1965, 1966a, 1977). Importantly, Erikson (1966a) did not view ritual in the pathological sense, for example, in the case of an individual with obsessive-compulsive disorder being viewed as having a hand-washing ritual. Such clinical or pathological views of ritualized behavior may also be viewed in caged animals (Erikson, 1966a). Erikson refers to ritualization in the sense of "ceremonial acts" (Erikson, 1966a, p. 337) which may be observed in all social animals, humans included. The rituals Erikson (1965, 1966a, 1969, 1977) refers to are actions that establish and reveal the bonds that are developed through reciprocity and have adaptive as well as psychosocial significance.

Ritualization involves accepted or agreed-upon interactions of at least two individuals (animals or humans), which will be repeated meaningfully, and be beneficial to both (Erikson, 1966a, 1977). Relevant to Erikson's interpretation of Satyagraha, is animals' extension of general ritualized behavior (viewed within a family or pack) to pacific ritualization about possible conflict situations with other members of the same species as well as intra-species (Erikson, 1965, 1966a, 1969). As previously mentioned, most animals do not harm or kill other animals unnecessarily

or in excess (even when hunting for food), out of violent rage or for sport even if one views their skill for hunting or evading a larger opponent as a form of 'natural aggression' (Erikson, 1964a, 1969). It is about humans that we need to ask at what point this 'natural' aggression become[s] raving violence, and the instinctive technique of killing become[s] senseless murder" (Erikson, 1969, p. 425). There are many examples of pacific ritualization in animals (see Erikson, 1965, 1969). One example that is observed in wolves, whom Erikson notes are "capable of devoted friendship" (1969, p. 425), arises when there is a dispute between two individuals. At some point during the fight, the weaker wolf will bear its unprotected neck to its stronger opponent. Stronger wolves will not act out of instinctual aggression and bite or kill the weaker wolves but will restrain themselves, and use instinctive energy to leave their opponents (Erikson, 1969). An even more elaborate demonstration of pacific ritualization and mutuality of recognition can be viewed in the antler tournament of dam stags. During their parade, these animals will pace and clash horns as if in unison (Erikson, 1969). However, if one of the animals swerves too early and as a result may endanger his opponent by slashing his side or flank, he will stop himself, swerve away, and begin again once both animals are prepared. While unfortunate accidents do happen, the ritualized intention is "a full mutual confrontation and a powerful but harmless wrestling" (Erikson, 1969, p. 426) that will cease with a ritualized disengagement that will see the weaker of the two stags leave unharmed. Imperative to the mutuality of recognition in pacific ritualization and Satyagraha when facing an opponent or foe, is to never threaten the freedom of the other or punish through violence (Erikson, 1969). Therefore, ritualized (and timeous) disengagement as well as restraint of excessive instinctual energy, that may blind one to another's position or truth, are key tools to be used with insight during ethical action.

According to Erikson (1969), if humans enter animals' territory in a non-violent manner, animals will extend their pacific ritualization to humans, and not harm those they view as sharing a "joint universe" (Erikson, 1969, p. 426). Observations of animals' ritualized behavior in response to non-threatening humans reveal that the "aggressive or fearful behavior ascribed to animals is a response to man's prejudices, projections, and apprehensions" (Erikson, 1969, p. 426). According to Erikson (1969), people should be striving for a "new ethics" (p. 429). He said this in light of the pleasure that some humans take in "torturing and killing an enemy", treating people different from themselves as a pseudo species, and some supposed moral actions, which have become "a lethal element in the universe" (Erikson, 1969, p. 429). In these respects, civilized humans may be viewed as being beneath animals (Erikson, 1969). Pacific ritualization in animals helps to clarify positions, diffuse

potentially aggressive behaviors, and restore instinctive trust (Erikson, 1969). According to Erikson (1965, 1966a, 1969), the principles of pacific ritualization in animals explain how it may be possible for humans to perform Satyagraha or militant non-violence. A form of creative and formalized ritualization may enable people to co-exist and interact more peacefully with one another (Erikson, 1965, 1966a, 1969). See Erikson (1977) for a detailed description and explanation of creative ritualization about psychosocial development and political action. Erikson (1964a, 1969) was adamant that humans should extend this concept of non-violence and reciprocity to their treatment of, and interactions with animals from whom these very lessons regarding ethical action may be learned.

FUTURE RESEARCH AND POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR APPLICATION.

Erikson's interpretation of Satyagraha and how it relates to pacific ritualization may also be viewed as the application of ethical conduct. However, further application of ethical conduct and lessons in this regard may be incorporated in classes at schools when children are still developmentally young. Erikson (1950/1973) held the view that it is in childhood that a sense of morality is developed and in adulthood, this is transformed by a greater understanding of the self and community into a sense of ethics. If this is the case, then discussions around ethics and ethical action should not remain in limited spaces such as philosophy lectures at university or review boards for research.

This synthesis also highlights our place in an ecologically bound environment and that healthy practices with nature, our species, and other species may not always be taught or learned in conventional ways. Further research is needed into what is currently influencing children's moral and ethical development as well as adult's understanding of ethical action and its place in societies. Before policies may even be developed and implemented from an ethical stance, the very notion of ethical action, what it means to people, and how it may be learned needs to be further investigated.

CONCLUSION.

Neither Erikson nor the authors are oblivious to the fact that this hope for revolutionized ethical ritualization and mutuality of recognition based on ethological, instinctive, and creative principles is complicated to attain. However, "only faith gives back to man the dignity of nature" (Erikson, 1969, p. 435). It is through this faith or hope that begins in young humans and animals' play and is developed through inter-generational lessons and mutuality of recognition that humans can find the strength to persevere

both in dialogue and ethical action for both peace and One Health. Places of education should strive to become venues for such dialogue and empathetic ethical action as opposed to being sites for pseudospeciation and violence as they are in so many parts of the world. Sustainability of the environment can also only be addressed when humans act in such a manner that values animals and nature and acknowledges our shared existence and well-being. The interpretation of Satyagraha or militant non-violence through animals' use of pacific ritualization reiterates Erikson's notion that for individuals to attain peace within themselves, as well as with their fellow species, they should look outwardly to the examples set by animals and inwardly to their instinctive animal natures.

SOURCE OF FUNDING.

This research was not funded.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

REFERENCES.

1. Amuasi, J H., Walzer, C., Heymann, D., Carabin, H., Huong, L. T., Haines, A., & Winkler, A.S. (2020). Calling for a COVID-19 One Health research coalition. *Lancet*, 395(10236), 1543-1544.
2. Bloem, J. R., & Salemi, C. (2021). COVID-19 and Conflict. *World Development*, 140(105294). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105294>
3. Braun, C., Stangler, T., Narveson, J., & Pettingell, S. (2009). Animal-assisted therapy as a pain relief intervention for children. *Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice* 15(2), 105–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ctcp.2009.02.008>.
4. Coles, R. (1970). *Erik H. Erikson: The growth of his work*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
5. Elhadi, M, & Msherghi, A. (2020). COVID-19 and civil war in Libya: the current situation. *Pathogens and Global Health*, 114, 230-231.
6. Erikson, E. H. (1950/1973). *Childhood and Society*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
7. Erikson, E. H. (1963). The Golden Rule and the cycle of life. In R. W. White (Ed), *The Study of Lives*, (pp. 412-428). New York, NY: Atherton.
8. Erikson, E. H. (1964a). *Insight and Responsibility: Lectures on the Ethical Implications of Psychoanalytic Insight*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.
9. Erikson, E. H. (1964b). Inner and outer space: Reflections on womanhood. *Daedalus*, 93 (2), 582-606.
10. Erikson, E. H. (1965). Psychoanalysis and ongoing history: Problems of identity, hatred and non-violence. *Journal of the American Psychiatric Association*, 122, 241-250.
11. Erikson, E. H. (1966a). Ontogeny of ritualization in man. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 251(772), 337-349.
12. Erikson, E. H. (1966b). The concept of identity in race relations: Notes and queries. *Daedalus*, 95, 145-170.
13. Erikson, E. H. (1968a). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York, NY: Norton.
14. Erikson, E. H. (1969). *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence*. New York, NY: Norton.
15. Erikson, E. H. (1977). *Toys and Reasons*. New York, NY: Norton.
16. Erikson, E. H. (1985). Pseudospeciation in the nuclear age. *Political Psychology*, 6, 213-217.
17. Fine, A. H., & Beck, A. M. (2015). Understanding our kinship with animals: Input for health care professionals interested in the human–animal bond. In A.H., Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on Animal-Assisted Therapy* (4th ed), (pp. 3-10). Kidlington, Oxford: Elsevier.
18. Follansbee, S. (2007). Another cat story. *San Francisco Medicine*, 80(7).
19. Fujimura, C. K., & Nommensen, S. (2017). *Cultural Dimensions of Well-being: Therapy Animals as Healers*. London: Lexington Books.
20. Grandin, T., & Johnson, C. (2005). *Animals in translation: Using the Mysteries of Autism to Decode Animal Behaviour*. New York, NY: Scribner.
21. Grandin, T., & Johnson, C. (2009). *Animals Make Us Human: Creating the Best Life for Animals*. New York, NY: Mariner.
22. Holtzman, A. H., & Britz, W. (1986). Pet ownership and health status during bereavement. *Omega*, 17(21), 187–193.
23. Jahanbegloo, R. (2016). Satyagraha: The Gandhian way". *ANTYAJAA: Indian Journal of Women and Social Change*, 1(2), 191-204.
24. Kirton, A., Wirrell, E., Zhang, J., & Hamiwka, L. (2004). Seizure-alerting and -response behaviors in dogs living with epileptic children. *Neurology*, 62(12), 2303–2305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.62.12.2303>
25. LaFollette, M. R., Rodriguez, K. E., Ogata, N., & O'Haire, M. E. (2019). Military veterans and their PTSD service dogs: Associations between training

- methods, PTSD severity, dog behavior, and the human-animal bond. *Frontiers in veterinary science*, 6, 23.
26. Levinson, B. (1972). *Pets and Human Development*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
 27. Loko, L. E. Y., Fagla, M. F., Orobiyi, A., Glinma, B., Toffa, J., Koukoui, O., Djogbenou, L., & Gbaguidi, F. (2019). Traditional knowledge of invertebrates used for medicine and magical-religious purposes by traditional healers and indigenous populations in the Plateau Department, Republic of Benin. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine*, 15(1), 1-21.
 28. McConnell, A. R., Brown, C. M., Shoda, T. M., Stayton, L. E. & Martin, C. E. (2011). Friends with benefits: On the positive consequences of pet ownership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(6), 1239–1252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024506>.
 29. Odendaal J. S. J. (2000). Animal-assisted therapy – magic or medicine? *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 49, 275-280.
 30. Serpell, J. A. (2015). Animal-assisted interventions in historical perspective. In A.H., Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on Animal-Assisted Therapy* (4th ed), (pp. 11-20). Kidlington, Oxford: Elsevier.
 31. Stanley-Hermanns, M, & Miller, J. (2002). Animal-assisted therapy: Domestic animals aren't merely pets. To some, they can be healers. *AJN The American Journal of Nursing*, 102(10), 69-76.
 32. Twenge, J. M., Cooper, A. B., Joiner, T. E., Duffy, M. E., & Binau, S. G. (2019). Age, period, and cohort trends in mood disorder indicators and suicide-related outcomes in a nationally representative dataset, 2005-2017. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 128(3), 185-199. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000410>
 33. Tedeschi, P., Sisa, M.L., Olmert, L. D. Parish-Plass, N, & Yount, R. (2015). Treating human trauma with the help of animals: Trauma-informed intervention for child maltreatment and adult post-traumatic stress. In A.H., Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on Animal-Assisted Therapy* (4th ed), (pp. 305-319). Kidlington, Oxford: Elsevier.
 34. Usher, K., Bhullar, N., Durkin, J., Gyamfi, N., & Jackson, D. (2020). Family violence and COVID-19: Increased vulnerability and reduced options for support. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 29, 549-552.
 35. Woods, A., Bresalier, M., Cassidy, A., & Dentinger, R. M. (2018). *Animals and the Shaping of Modern Medicine: One Health and its Histories*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64337-3>
 36. Zilcha-Mano, S., Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2012). Pets as safe havens and secure bases: The moderating role of pet attachment orientations. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46, 571–580.

details.

SJC PUBLISHERS COMPANY LIMITED



Category: Non-Government & Non-profit Organisation

Contact: +256775434261(WhatsApp)

Email: admin@sjpublisher.org, info@sjpublisher.org or studentsjournal2020@gmail.com

Website: <https://sjpublisher.org>

Location: Wisdom Centre Annex, P.O. BOX. 113407 Wakiso, Uganda, East Africa.