NOTES

(1) Part of this study was presented as a discussion paper (*Doing Violence to ‘Aggression’; Problems in the definitions and concepts of aggression, violence, and related terms*) to the 1980 Biennial Meeting of the International Society for Research on Aggression (ISRA) at Haren, The Netherlands (July 11 – 13), and to the NATO Advanced Study Institute on ‘The Biology of Aggression’ (Chateau de Bonas, France; July 21-30, 1980), I am grateful to all who contributed to the discussion.

(2) Until World War I, according to Van Wynen Thomas & Thomas (1972), there was little dispute about an international legal meaning of aggression because early concepts of sovereignty assumed that war was an acceptable exercise of a nation’s inherent rights. “But the arrival of the mass army” and “continuing discovery of ever effective weapons” spurred efforts to “re-establish aggressive war as an illegal enterprise”. The first effort was the Covenant of the League of Nations which obliged members to act collectively to thwart ‘external aggression’ yet “aggression was nowhere defined in the Covenant”. In 1923 a commission of the League offered a draft treaty defining aggression, only to have it abandoned the next year. Likewise, the Geneva Protocol of 1924, the Treaty of Locarno of 1925, a League resolution in 1927, the Kellogg-Briand non-aggression pact of 1928 and a Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments in 1933, all failed to produce an internationally accepted definition of aggression.
In the United Nations era intensified efforts brought renewed failure. Drafters of the U.N. Charter debated definitions but, hopelessly at odds, decided to adopt none even though the term aggression appears repeatedly in the Charter. In the next 25 years, ‘discord prevailed’ as two attempts by the International Law Commission, three special committees on ‘The Question of the Definition of Aggression’ and three sessions of the General Assembly all ended in a morass of disagreement. The reasons for failure varied with the three types of definitions described by the authors: enumerative, abstract and mixed. Enumerative definitions, listing specific acts of aggression, were rejected as including either too much or too little. Abstract definitions dissatisfied those who thought ‘a general formula’ is ‘often circulatory and generally indeterminate’. Mixed definitions, combining enumeration and abstraction, also combined the defects of both approaches. Discord also stemmed from attempts to have acts of illegal force include both direct and indirect aggression and attempts to have aggression embrace economic and social attacks as well as military assaults. For example, those who profess belief in ‘wars of national liberation’ would not agree that foreign support of such wars is a form of indirect aggression. Nor would most of the developed nations agree with Latin Americans who defined some foreign investments as economic aggression. Finally, some international legal scholars made a convincing case against definitions of any kind. They argued that an imprecise definition is worse than none at all because it aggravates antagonism in deciding specific cases, and that a precise definition runs the risk of telling a potential aggressor “how it might safely proceed to circumvent the letter of definition”.
In 1974 The U.N. General Assembly finally adopted the following definition of aggression (from Röling, 1975):

Article I
Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this definition.

Explanatory note: In this definition the term ‘State’
a. is used without prejudice to questions of recognition or to whether a State is a Member of the United Nations, and
b. includes the concept of a ‘group of States’ where appropriate.

**Article 2**
The first use of armed force by a State in contravention of the Charter shall constitute prima facie evidence of an act of aggression although the Security Council may in conformity with the Charter conclude that a determination that an act of aggression has been committed would not be justified in the light of other relevant circumstances including the fact that the acts concerned or their consequences are not of sufficient gravity.

**Article 3**
Any of the following acts, regardless of a declaration of war, shall, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of article 2, qualify as an act of aggression:
a. The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof;
b. Bombardment by the armed forces of a State against the territory of another State or the use of any weapons by a State against the territory of another State;
c. The blockade of the ports or coasts of a State by the armed forces of another State;
d. An attack by the armed forces of a State on the land, sea or air forces, marine and air fleets of another State;
e. The use of armed forces of one State, which are within the territory of another State with the agreement of the receiving State, in contravention of the conditions provided for in agreement or any extension of their presence in such territory beyond the termination of the agreement;
f. The action of a State in allowing its territory, which it has placed at the disposal of another State, to be used by that other State for perpetrating an act of aggression against a third State;
g. The sending by or on behalf of a State of armed bands, groups, irregulars or mercenaries, which carry out acts of armed force against another State of such gravity as to amount to the acts listed above, or its substantial involvement therein.

**Article 4**
The acts enumerated above are not exhaustive and the Security Council may determine that other acts constitute aggression under the provisions of the Charter.

**Article 5**
No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression.
A war of aggression is a crime against international peace. Aggression gives rise to international responsibility.
No territorial acquisition or special advantage resulting from aggression are or shall be recognized as lawful.
Article 6
Nothing in this definition shall be construed as in any way enlarging or diminishing the scope of the Charter including its provisions concerning cases in which the use of force is lawful.

Article 7
Nothing in this definition, and in particular article 3, could in any way prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence, as derived from the Charter, of peoples forcibly deprived of that right and referred to in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly peoples under colonial and racist regimes or other forms of alien domination; nor the right of these peoples to struggle to that and to seek and receive support, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and in conformity with the above-mentioned Declaration.

Article 8
In their interpretation and application the above mentioned provisions are interrelated and each provision should be construed in the context of the other provisions.

(3) To date, most of the definitions of the term have been situational. “Included in such categorizations are situations as widely varied as predatory behaviour – one animal killing another for food -, dominance displays amongst rival males and defence of the young by the mother. Although all these situations can result in damage being inflicted upon one individual by another, this does not mean that their motivational backgrounds are at all similar. Here lies a problem of the confusion of phenomenology with causality” (Rasa, 1980).

(4) Feshbach (1964 et seq.) has pointed out that distinctions should be made between descriptive definitions of aggression and those based on some underlying process or theoretical construct.

(5) i.e. in terms of assertiveness or self-imposition.

(6) For ‘violence’ one may read ‘aggression’. Feshbach makes no rigorous distinction.

(7) Or, in general, negative affect as an instigator. See further Part III.

(8) “Behaviorists claim that their method is ‘scientific’ because they deal with what is visible, i.e. with overt behavior. But they do not recognize that ‘behavior’ itself, separated from the behaving person, cannot be adequately described. A man fires a gun and kills another person; the behavioral act in itself – firing the shot that kills the person – if isolated from the ‘aggressor’ means little, psychologically. In fact, a behavioristic statement would be adequate only about the gun; with regard to the motivation of the man who pulls the trigger is irrelevant. But his behavior can be fully understood only if we know the conscious and unconscious motivation moving him to pull the trigger. We do not find a single cause for his behavior, but we can discover the psychical structure inside this man – his character – and the many conscious and unconscious factors which at a certain point led to his firing the gun. We find that we can explain the impulse to fire the gun as being determined by many factors in his character system, but that his act of firing the gun is the most
contingent among all factors, and the least predictable one. It depends on many accidental elements in the situation, such as easy access to a gun, absence of other people, the degree of stress, and the conditions of his whole psychophysiological system at the moment. The behaviorist maxim that observable behavior is a scientifically reliable datum is simply not true. The fact is that the behavior itself is different depending on the motivating impulse, even though for superficial inspection this difference may not be visible” (Fromm, 1973).

(9) Psychoanalytically-oriented scientists are mostly inclined to deny the distinction between aggression and violence, and to see the two phenomena as a bipolar continuum; e.g. Halberstadt-Freud (1977) writes: “De diverse uitingen van agressiviteit kunnen opgevat worden als slechts gradeel van elkaar verschillend, vanaf het maken van een bijtende opmerking of het uitdelen van een welverdiende klap tot (massa) moord in fantasie of zelfs in werkelijkheid bedreven”. Others regard ‘aggression’ as the motivation underlying all violence. For instance Berkowitz (1962) reasoned that “Aggression stemming from frustration is the necessary condition of instrumental aggression” (= violence). Gurr’s (1970) ‘relative deprivation’ theory and the Feierabends (1966) concept of ‘systemic frustration’ try to establish, through the transposition of the F-A hypothesis to collectivities, a link between individual aggression and collective political violence. Also Persson (1980 pers. comm.) argued, in reply to my proposed distinction between violence and aggression, “where political violence is concerned, aggression is a necessary, and sometimes sufficient instigator of violence. Thus, while aggression may well be manifest in other ways – even sublimated beyond recognition – violence is always a consequence of aggression; either aggression pure and simple or in combination with other drives or with additional stimuli... Certainly fear or anger (or whatever) can trigger violence, but only if there is sufficient underlying aggression and a corresponding lack of inhibitors. I would argue that while aggression can result in violence without a trigger such as ‘fear’, violence can never be the result of fear (or any combination of emotive states) without the basic aggressive motivation. If you and I were accosted by an armed robber while walking together down an otherwise-deserted street, we may be similarly afraid: but our responses may be quite different, I may be paralysed into immobile submission, while you may react violently – perhaps lashing out at our prospective ‘mugger’ with a view to incapacitating him. In such an instance, I would argue, my fear has combined with other inhibitors to suppress my ‘normal’ aggressive instincts, whereas your fear has been the (perhaps necessary, but never ‘sufficient’) trigger which has enabled you to translate latent aggression into violent action”.

On the other hand, Firestone (1974), criticizing Gurr and his ‘relative deprivation’-‘violence’ relationship, more realistically argued that “actors may be predisposed to select violence as a strategy for coping behavior, even at low levels of discontent or dissatisfaction”. Furthermore, he points out: “If social actors are strongly motivated toward increased power and, at the same time, perceive that (a) fomenting violence will help them get it, and (b) the opportunity for collective violence is there; then the power incentive system of these actors, as distinct from the aggressive incentive system, will provide a potential for collective violence” (emphasis added).

(10) In colloquial Dutch, an implicit distinction between ‘aggression’ and ‘violence’ is manifest in the following sentences: “De demonstranten werden met geweld uit elkaar geslagen” (Which is an intelligible statement), and “De demonstranten werden met agressie uit elkaar geslagen” (which is not). Furthermore in Dutch, as in English, one can speak of the violence of nature (violent volcano
eruptions, violent tempests, violent earthquakes) but not of ‘the aggression of nature’. Probably because we do not attribute intent to nature.

(11) In relation to violence, Kelly (1977) writes: “Intention is a tricky business, not only because it is involved with the attempted enactment of envisaged outcomes, that is, what Weber would call ‘zweckrational’ action, but also because an intention to commit violence may crystallize with great purity in the violent act itself, becoming almost a case of ‘la violence pour la violence’”.

(12) “People ordinarily do not aggress in conspicuous and direct ways that carry high risks of retaliation. Instead, to protect against counterattack, they tend to hurt others in ways that diffuse or obscure responsibility for detrimental actions. The injurious consequences of major social concern are often caused remotely, circuitously, and impersonally... Social scientists have examined direct assaultive behavior in minute detail; but remote circuitous acts, which produce widespread injurious consequences, are seldom considered in analyses of aggression” (Bandura, 1976; 1978). In the process of development and socialization, human beings learn a great variety of ways of giving vent to anger and hostility other than in open and direct attack. Jersild (1946; 1965) mentions (in children): verbal aggression, teasing, swearing, expression of hostility in fantasy and play, displaced hostility, cruelty, prejudice, bullying, antisocial acts and ideals, self-inflicted punishment, psychosomatic mechanisms, externalization, grievances and feeling abused. Gardner (1949) and many other psychiatrists consider even stealing an essentially destructive act.

(13) This is in accordance with the principle of the multiple motivation of behavior (complemented by the principle of multiple action radius of basic motivations): e.g. sexual motivation may manifest or express itself in several behavioral modalities. On the other hand, purely ‘sexual’ activities such as copulation may be admixed with (fused with, comotivated by) quite other motives, e.g. curiosity, exploration, affection, need for self-assertion, transcendence, proof of virility, machismo, dominance, or even aggression in the urge to subdue, humiliate or desecrate the partner. These same principles apply to ‘aggression’ as a motivational construct and as a behavioral category.

(14) A person may kill (a) out of self-defense (b) to prove his masculinity (code of machismo) or to restore his self-esteem or hurt narcissism (c) to comply (or is forced to comply) with the obligations of the blood feud (d) because he may not acquire a bride before he has bloodied his spear (in many ‘primitive’ cultures) (e) because it is his duty to restore ‘law and order’ (policeman, soldier) (f) to eliminate the ‘enemy’ (which is not the same as wanting to hurt him) (g) out of fear and panic (h) for sheer power motives (i) out of paranoid ideation (or other pathological state) (j) in a suicide-pact (whether depressive or not), and (k) out of cold calculation for greed or material gain. To lump them all together in one undifferentiated category of ‘aggression’ is not very fruitful heuristically (to say the least).

(15) In other words, the overwhelming preponderance of forms, expressions and manifestations of human aggression is not at all similar to the kinds of arousal-type attack or fighting behaviors as studied in rats, cats, mice, etc.

(16) Koestler (1967) captures an aspect of the human protective, fraternal, altruistic need when he pinpoints man’s ‘integrative tendency’ – a self-transcending tendency – as the culprit. History’s
holocausts result from the activities of those who fight in the hope of bettering their group, their nation, or mankind. In Koestler’s words: “The crimes of violence committed for selfish, personal motives are historically insignificant compared to those committed ‘ad majorem gloriam Dei’, out of a self-sacrificing devotion to flag, a leader, a religious faith or a political conviction. Man has always been prepared not only to kill but also to die for good, bad or completely futile causes. And what can be a more valid proof of the reality of the self-transcending urge than this readiness to die for an ideal?”,

Another aspect is seen in the notion of righteous (or moral) indignation, a feeling of injustice, as a cause of violence highlighted by Banfield (1970) and Lupsha (1971), Cf. also Rummel (1977).

(17) Scherer, Abeles & Fischer (1975) also noted: “The invention of weapons was probably accompanied, if not preceded, by many other dramatic changes in human evolution, particularly the development of language and cognition. These capacities enabled human beings to transcend the here-and-now, to plan, to expect, to predict. Such abilities may have been much more influential in determining the nature and frequency of human aggression in the course of human evolution and may be primarily responsible for the differences between human and animal aggression”. Fromm (1973) particularly emphasizes this human capacity of anticipation as a major differentiating feature. What is more, man can not only anticipate real dangers but also imaginary (or illusory) ones. Also the range of man’s vital interests is much wider than that of the animal (at least most animals). Man must survive not only physically but also psychologically. Man’s vital interests include (a) retaining his frame of orientation (b) objects of devotion (c) a sense of freedom, dignity, self-esteem as well as group-belongingness.

(18) As Malinowski (1941) already observed: “Human beings never fight on an extensive scale under the direct influence of an aggressive impulse. They fight and organize for fighting because, through tribal tradition, through teachings of a religious system, or of an aggressive patriotism, they have been indoctrinated with certain cultural values which they are prepared to defend, and with certain collective hatreds on which they are ready to assault and kill”.

And Morris (1977) remarks about the alleged relationship between aggression and war: “If mankind does possess inborn aggressive urges, they are hardly going to explain the occurrence of modern wars. They may help us to understand why we go red in the face and shout and shake our fists at one another when we are angry, but they cannot possibly be used to explain the bombing of cities or the mass invasion of friendly neighbors by dictatorial warlords”.

“Veel menselijk geweld van tegenwoordig is geen echte dierlijke agressie, maar een ontaarde vorm van jagen waarbij het slachtoffer de prooi is geworden. Het slachtoffer van een lynchpartij is niet in een persoonlijke twist verwikkeld, en er is geen persoonlijk geschil tussen de piloot van het met raketten bewapende vliegtuig en de kleine stip op de grond die hij moet raken” (Morris, 1994).

(19) There is quaint paradox involved in the process of dehumanization, insofar that only human beings can dehumanize other human beings. In order to be dehumanized, the other human being first has to be recognized and acknowledged as human being.

(20) “When the dispensers of unwarranted aggression are sanctioned authorities, their injurious behavior is minimized as vigorous pursuit of duty; when unsanctioned individuals manifest the same behavior, they are apt to be judged as acting violently. In areas of social conflict, one person’s violence is another person’s social righteousness” (Bandura, 1978).
(21) Modern thinking in sociology treats violence as one particularly intense stage in a more general process of conflict. Conflict is more intense than competition in that one element damages the other directly (rather than indirectly, by depleting resources). Conflict becomes violence when physical damage is inflicted on one element by another. Competition and conflict between elements are functions of their degree of interdependence (Osman & Lee, 1978).

Appendix I  Definitions of Aggression

(1) Alcock (1972): “By aggression, we are speaking of the fighting instinct in animals, including man, which is directed against members of the same species”.
(2) Andy et al. (1973), Andy & Stephan (1974): “Aggressive behavior may be defined as a sensorimotor response integrated as an emotional drive to attack”.
(3) Andrew (1977): “Behaviour that serves to injure an opponent or a prey animal, or to cause an opponent to retreat, is usually considered aggressive. When considering human aggression, some psychiatrists consider any act that has destructive consequences (including suicide) to be aggressive... It is frequently assumed that a single motivational system (aggression) causes all recognizably aggressive behaviour in higher animals. This assumption is certainly invalid for invertebrates and for most higher vertebrates, in which a variety of motivational bases appear to exist. A motivational definition of aggression is thus difficult. The only possible rigorous approach is to list patterns of behaviour, usually held on both functional and causative grounds to be aggressive”.
(5) Archer (1976): “Aggression is a vague, imprecise, and inclusive term, which can refer either to an interpretation of intent (e.g. Moyer, 1973), or to a state of mind, or to a hypothetical motivational system; or it may merely be used in a descriptive sense to indicate forcefulness, ‘Fighting’ is a more operational term, describing the expression of aggression involving two or more animals (Kuo, 1960). It does, however, only refer to some of the situations where aggressive motivation may be inferred. For example, it would not include ‘threat’ which describes the symbolic expression of the intent to fight. A further term ‘dominance’, refers to the modification of behavior which occurs as a result of the outcome of aggressive encounters. Finally, ‘anger’ and ‘rage’ have been used to refer to the emotional state underlying aggressive behavior... The present paper is principally concerned with the causation of ‘attack’, a term referring to a rapid movement directed towards a localized stimulus, usually culminating in physical damage to that stimulus (e.g. by biting, kicking, pecking, wing flapping, or some other means, but excluding such movements where they are concerned with the acquisition of food). Thus we exclude ‘predation’, which is generally regarded as motivationally distinct from ‘aggression’, although it does involve many of the same motor components”.
(7) Bandura (1978): “Aggression is defined as behavior that results in personal injury and in destruction of property. The injury may take the forms of psychological devaluation and
degradation as well as physical harm. Although injury is the major defining property of aggression, it also entails social labeling processes that determine which injurious acts are likely to be judged aggressive. Destructive behavior may be labeled aggressive or not, depending on subjective judgments of whether it is intentional or accidental”.

(B) Barash (1977): “Aggression’ is the proximate mechanism of contest competition. It takes place when individuals interact with each other such that one of them is induced to surrender access to some resource important to its fitness. The exact forms of aggression vary widely, from intimidating displays and threats to actual fights. Just as animals ought to exert themselves to acquire important resources or enlarge their supply, thereby enhancing their fitness, they also ought to resist the loss of important resources, thereby avoiding decrements to their fitness. Accordingly, animals may respond to aggression by threatening back, fighting back, and, occasionally, signalling their submission and/or running away. All these encounter patterns are subsumed under the term ‘agonistic behavior’.

(9) Baron (1977): “Aggression is any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment”.


(1) Van den Berghe (1974): “aggression: physical assault or the threat thereof directed at a co-specific”.

(12) Berkowitz (1968): “Aggression... any behavior whose goal is the injury of some person or thing”.

(13) Boelkins & Heiser (1970): “agression: any kind of behavior that threatens to damage, attempts to damage, or in fact does damage another individual or his property”.

(14) Brosin (1967) conceives of aggression as a multifactor, multilevel concept covering a wide range of phenomena utilizing many instrumentalities of a culture, from tools and weapons to humor, art and scientific essays. Its motivating power is often mingled with those commonly called narcissism and eroticism, greed and fear, as well as the search for security, novelty, and creativity among others.

(15) Buss (1961): “The term aggression subsumes a large number of responses that vary in topography, energy expenditure, and consequences. All aggressive responses share two characteristics: (1) the delivery of noxious stimuli, and (2) an interpersonal context. Thus ‘aggression’ is defined as a response that delivers noxious stimuli to another organism. The term ‘attack’ will be used as a synonym”.

(16) Calhoun (1963, 1972): “An aggressive act is merely one in which an individual in a refractory state of either gratification or frustration behaves inappropriately with respect to the requirement of fulfilling the need for social intercourse felt by another. An individual thus frustrated in his attempts at effective social intercourse is frustrated simply in the sense of failing to have his behavior rewarded. An aggressive act becomes synonymous with a negative sanction. An aggressive act may assume the form of violent action but it is just as effective in a more mild and
sublimated form, so long as the individual in the social need state recognizes the behavior of the one with whom he sought interaction as being inappropriate to the fulfillment of his own needs”.

(17) Carp (1967) defines aggression as “self-manifestation” and destructive aggressivity as “la peur en avant” (anticipated anguish).

(18) Carpenter (1974) considers aggressiveness to be “a quality of many modalities of behavior”.

(19) Carthy & Ebling (1964): “An animal acts aggressively when it inflicts, attempts to inflict, or threatens to inflict damage on another animal. The act is accompanied by recognizable behavioral symptoms and definable physiological changes”.

(20) Coe (1964) defines aggression as “any activity intentionally designed to injure the agent or agent-surrogate of frustration and result in the acquiescence or compliance of the agent”.

(21) Daniels, Gilula & Ochberg (1970): “Aggression is defined here as the entire spectrum of assertive, intrusive and attacking behaviors. Aggression thus includes both overt and covert attacks, self-directed attacks, dominance behavior, such defamatory acts as sarcasm, and such assertive behaviors as forceful and determined attempts to master a task or accomplish an act. Violence is destructive aggression and involves inflicting damage on persons or property (since humans so often symbolically equate property with the self). Violent inflicting of damage is often intense, uncontrolled, excessive, furious, sudden, or seemingly purposeless. Furthermore, violence may be collective or individual, intentional or unintentional, apparently just or unjust. Some extend the concept of violence to include inflicting psychological damage and infringing on human rights (Wheeler, 1968). Violence, as a specialized subform of aggression, is accompanied by the emotion of anger or hostility and anger occurs when a plan of action interrupted by an interference specific enough to expected rewards for attack override other outcomes”.

(22) Delgado (1971): “Human aggressiveness is a behavioral response characterized by the exercise of force in an attempt to inflict injury or damage to persons or property. This phenomenon may be analyzed in its three components (a) environmental circumstances including economic, ideological, political, social, and familial factors acting upon the individual; (b) reception of this information from the environment through sensory pathways, and its interpretation by cerebral mechanisms which trigger emotional feelings and behavioral responses; (c) performance of individual and social responses which constitute the observable manifestations of violence. The phenomena of violence involve wilful destruction of life or property without the direct fulfillment of a basic personal need and are contrary to the general social welfare. Violence is a product of cultural environment and is an extreme form of aggression, distinct from the modes of self expression required for survival and development under normal conditions”.

(23) Dollard et al. (1939): define aggression as “an act whose goal response is injury to an organism (or organism surrogate)... Aggression and antagonism are synonymous terms”.

(24) Dimond (1970) “Aggression: a form of behavior having the characteristics of threat, hostility and attack”.

(25) Dougherty & Pfaltzgraff (1971): “a behavioral impulse directed toward the injury of some human or nonhuman object”.

(26) Durham (1976): “Aggression may be defined as behavior by an individual or a group designed to threaten or actually depress the inclusive fitness of at least one other individual (of the same or different species). Aggressive behavior can be indirect when the fitness consequences are mediated through resources or inanimate objects, or direct if other organisms are physically harmed by the activity. Direct forms of aggressive behavior can be very costly to the individual aggressor, as well, in terms of time, energy, and risk of disease, injury, or death... In theory, direct forms of aggressive behavior have evolved in nonhuman organisms only where the aggressor’s inclusive fitness
benefits are more than enough to compensate for the inherent costs... direct intergroup aggression would likewise exist as a cultural tradition only when the participating individuals each derive net intrademic fitness advantages”.

(27) Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1971, 1974, 1975) defines aggression as “any act that leads to spacing or subordination, even a display (threat)”. 

(28) Fawcett (1971) defines ‘violent aggression’ as “aggression distorted pathologically into violence, a destructive, sometimes lethal mutation of a normally constructive human trait”. 

(29) Fenichel (1945): “aggression is a way of doing things rather than an activity in its own right”. 

(30) Feshbach (1971) uses the terms aggression and violence similarly, violence being reserved for the more severe forms of physical aggression. “At a descriptive level, the label aggression might be applied to any behavioral sequence that results in injury to or destruction of an animal, human or inanimate object. At the level of construct, or mediating process, this definition is much too broad”. 

(31) Fox (1968): “Agonistic behavior consists of fighting, escape, passivity and defensive posture. Essentially, it is competitive interaction between two or more animals, with or without vocalization or body contact, characterized by certain body postures, movements and positioning or display of certain structures specifically developed for this purpose”. 

(32) Freud (1905) defined aggression as “ein solches triebhaftes Geschehen eines Verhaltens, das hervorgebracht wird von der psychischen Representanz einer kontinuierlich fließenden innersomatischen Reizquelle”, 

(33) Galtung (1964): “We use aggression somewhat in the sense of ‘self-assertion’, but only insofar as this self-assertion implies an effort to change social relations, i.e., no longer to comply with existing conditions”. 

(34) Goldstein (1975) defines aggression as “behavior whose intent is the physical or psychological injury of another person... While it is possible to make a distinction between violence (the physical injury of others) and aggression (the psychological injury of others), the two terms are used interchangeably here... Aggression might best be viewed as a continuum...” 

(35) Groen (1972): “Aggression is a form of communicative behavior between individuals and groups (normally of the same species) that is directed at causing the flight or submission of the other, or, if this does not happen, the other’s injury or death”. 

(36) Gurr (1968):”Aggression is behavior designed to injure, physically or otherwise, those toward whom it is directed”.


(38) Hauber (1978): “agressie is gedrag of de intentie tot gedrag, waarvan de dader meent dat daardoor bij het slachtoffer schade teweeg wordt gebracht, terwijl deze dat ook als zodanig ervaart” 

(39) Hinde (1971) defines aggression as “behaviour directed towards causing physical injury to others, which as an incidental consequence may result in settling status or access to some object or space but which does not vary in a way which maximizes such consequences”. This behavior is contrasted with ‘instrumental aggression’, which is, according to Hinde, “...behaviour, likewise directed towards causing physical injury to others, variations in whose occurrence or nature are
such as to maximize access to some object or space. Such instrumental aggression may form part of a sequence of behaviour directed towards an end quite other than physical injury”.

(40) Holloway (1968): “Aggression may be defined as the imposition of the self (either individual or group identity) or any definition of the self, on another (individual, group, object, abstraction)”.

(41) Horn (1972) regards as ‘aggressive’ those “Objektbeziehungen die auf der entscheidend und spezifisch geminderten, zugleich triebhaft und gesellschaftlich vermittelten Symbolisierungsfähigkeit eines Subjektes beruhen. Indem so Aggression als eine Funktion der Objektbeziehungen, das heisst der Beziehungen zwischen innerer Naturhaftigkeit und der realen und symbolischen Bedeutung der Objekte und dem sich in diesem Interaktionsprozess herauskristallisierenden Ich als dem symbolischen und realen Ort des Niederschlage dieser Beziehung begriffen wird, ist die Hypostasierung der Aggression als unmittelbarer und ausschliesslicher Grund von Verhalten überwunden, ohne den ‘Drang’ des Triebes zu eskamotieren”.

(42) Howell (1975): aggression is “movement against another with a readiness to injure”.

(43) Izard (1975) defines aggression in relation to hostility: “Hostility is a complex affective concept. It consists of a variable set of interacting emotions and drives. The emotions most prominent in the pattern of hostility are anger, disgust, and contempt. Hostility also involves drive states, cognition and various affect interactions. Hostility has both experiential and expressive components. The affects in hostility influence perceptual processes and tend to foster cognitive processes consonant with the underlying affect... aggression is defined as hostile behavior. Thus aggression is a physical act instigated and maintained in part by one or more of the emotions in the hostility pattern and intended to harm the object. The term physical act includes speech as well as other physical actions. The harm may be psychological or biological, a blow to the body, or to the self-concept. Thus the hurt caused by aggression may be from genuine pain, negative emotions, or both. In general, aggression follows from the hostility affects and the associated imagery and ideas. However, aggressive action can influence the ongoing hostility. Thus hostility is considered as the complex motivational condition and aggression the subsequent behavior”.

(44) Jaynes & Bressler (1971): “Aggression’, a concept that has been used so blithely by writers of many persuasions, is an especially slippery term. It is doubtless a variform universal comprising a remarkably large repertory of behavioral items, particularly in humans. Everything from punching and kicking to pulling a trigger or verbal vituperation might be included. But it is not clear that the concept can be stretched to embrace teasing, aggressive humor, and so cooperative and ‘rational’ an enterprise as war”.

(45) R.N. Johnson (1972): “Aggression may be applied to a specific response such as killing. It may be used to refer to a host of emotional and attitudinal states such as anger or hate. It may be conceived of as a personality trait, a learned habit, a stereotyped reflex, or an underlying biological process. It may refer to motivation or intention without regard to consequences, or to the consequences (e.g. injury) without regard to motivation. In addition to all of these, there is the usual dictionary definition which is concerned mainly with the moral justification or legitimation of an act”.

(46) Joseph (1973) defines aggression as “all forceful behavior and activities that involve approaches to or going toward an object”.

(47) Kagan (1974): “Aggression: any action whose intention, conscious or unconscious, is to inflict psychic or physical harm on another. We call that motivational intention hostility”.

(48) Kahn & Kirk (1968): “Aggressive drive is an inborn, biologically rooted, directionally oriented energizer of behavior that is elicited by frustration of other drives and needs necessary to
the survival of the species and the individual or organism. Aggressive drive functions to serve, support and insure success of these other drives and needs by assertive means up to destructive force”.

(49) Karpman (1950): “Aggression is defined as an attempt to assault, subdue, control or extract something from the environment for its own purposes. Aggression, therefore, is not merely necessary to life; it is coeval with life, indeed it is life itself”.

(50) Kaufman & Rosenblum (1966) define ‘agonistic behavior’ as consisting of “those activities directed against another animal which cause physical insult, effect withdrawal, or otherwise intimidate the other... and... behavior which communicates or demonstrates an acknowledgement of acceptance of another animal’s dominance”.

(51) Kaufmann (1965): “.. the term aggression will be used to denote behaviors which (a) are transitive, that is are directed against some object, (b) have a subjective probability > 0 – on the part of the attacker – of reaching that object, and either removing it from the attacker’s goal path, or imparting a noxious stimulus to it, or both”.

(52) King (1973): “Aggression: any combative behavior involving a struggle or contest among individuals of the same species. Aggression refers to the initiation and attack phases of the agonistic encounter”.

(53) Kling (1975): “Aggression: a physical attack or threat to attack by one or more subjects on another (or more) who is a conspecific and a member of its natural or artificially composed social group”.

(54) Krakauer (1975): “Overt aggression is not a thing apart, as so many writers have assumed. It is one manifestation of the aggressive instinctual drive, the most extreme expression of a continuum that includes the impulsion to act, aggressivity, and dominance, Disproportionate aggression, like disproportionate motivation, occurs so commonly because instinctual drives are necessarily intense unconscious motivators, the control of which is not by instincts, but by learning which is often weak or erratic”.

(55) Krech & Crutchfield (1962) define aggression as: “Attack upon an obstacle or barrier to goal-attainment, or upon an object to which the aggression is displaced. Aggression may take many forms – physical and verbal; real and fantasied”.

(56) Von Kries (1969) defines aggression as: “expression of structural disintegration of an action”.

(57) Laborit (1978) defines aggression as “the quantity or kinetic energy capable of accelerating a given system’s tendency towards entropy or thermodynamic equalization: that is, towards more or less total destructuralization. If structure is defined as the sum total of relationships existing between elements comprising a whole, then aggressiveness is the quality that characterizes those agents capable of bringing this energy to bear on an organized whole, thus creating increasing disorder within it and diminishing its information content, or structuralization”.

(58) Lambo (1971): “By aggression we mean... an attack on a person, object or self (which may or may not be violent, destructive), resulting in ‘pain’ to the object upon which the attack is made”.

(59) LeVine (1961) defines aggression as “interpersonal behavior consciously directed toward injuring a person (or group) or interfering with his attainment of goals”.

(60) Lorenz (1966) defines aggression as “the fighting instinct in beast and man, which is directed against members of the same species”. And he adds: “Aggression... is one of those driving powers which students of behavior call ‘motivation’; it lies behind behavior patterns that outwardly have nothing to do with aggression, and even appear to be its very opposite”.

(61) Marcovitz (1973) views aggression as an umbrella term covering a hierarchy of behavior in relation to objects, specifically to other persons. First, alertness, curiosity, and the activities of
attention and exploration; second, self-assertion; third, the assertion of dominance – the
establishment of position in a hierarchical system; fourth, exploitation; fifth, hostility or intention to
hurt”.

(62) McNeil (1965): “Theorists are in general agreement that aggression is a fundamental
characteristic of existence. There are positive values of aggressiveness that are more than just
derivatives or by-products of the more malignant qualities of aggression”.

(63) Menninger (1967): “The essence of aggression is the infliction of injury or at least pain.
Aggression does not mean assertiveness, liveliness, or energetic pushing; it means the naked use of
fang and claw. It means acts intended to injure or hurt some feature of the environment, usually
intentionally, often, but not always, with premeditation and malice aforethought, and usually, but
not always, with conscious feelings of anger, hate, or fear”.

(64) Michaelis (1974) defines aggression as “ein Verhalten zum Erhalten oder Herstellung einer
Homöostase auf Kosten und gegen den Widerstand eines anderen Organismus, wobei mit
Homöostase das subjektive Wohlbefinden gemeint ist”

(65) Midgley (1978): “Recent discussion of this topic have been sidetracked by the suggestion that
the word ‘aggression’ properly has only a political sense, that it means only official formalized
warfare. This seems quite out of accord with usage. It has been in common use throughout this
century as the name of a motive, that is, of the wish or tendency to attack – privately or publicly,
physically or emotionally, literally or metaphorically (He is chockfull of aggression). Wilson (1975)
suggests reserving the name ‘aggression’ for the act (‘an abridgement of the rights of another’),
while calling the motive aggressiveness. This will not work because (a) without the motive, an
injurious act is not a piece of aggression at all (it might be, for instance, an accident or a piece of
self-defense), and (b) if the motive is there, we can still show aggression by gestures and so on,
even if we do no damage”.

(66) Mitra (1971): “an act of aggression can be identified by the intention of the agent and the
consequence of the act to the recipient, that is, the liability to the social contacts is the main
consideration”.

(67) Moyer (1975, 1976): “Aggression is overt behavior involving intent to inflict noxious
stimulation or to behave destructively toward another organism. Aggressive behavior may be direct
or indirect. Under conditions of aversive stimulation or frustration, aggressive, destructive behavior
may be directed toward inanimate objects. The important variable is the intent or the perceived
intent of the behaving individual. Assertiveness, that is, the positive statement or affirmation of a
point of view, is not considered aggressive unless an intent to demean or otherwise hurt another
person is involved... Aggressiveness/aggressivity ... refer to a relatively enduring state of the
organism that reflects the ease with which aggression can be elicited... Anger is an aroused state
involving particular autonomic and muscle tone patterns. During anger the individual’s threshold
for aggression is lowered”.

(68) Lois Murphy (1962): “aggression is... almost anything from hostility to the vigor with which
either constructive or destructive acts are carried out”.

(69) Nagel & Kummer (1974): “Aggression is a massive impact of one’s own or another’s strength
against a conspecific, with the function of removing him from a place or detaining him from an
object, from a social partner, or from an activity. The term ‘threat’ will be used to indicate
noncontact behavior which is correlated in time with aggressive behavior and releases in the
threatened animal the same, though less intense, responses as aggression. Aggression and threat
together will be called agonistic behavior.
Olweus (1973, 1974): “An aggressive response is defined as any act or behavior that involves, might involve and/or to some extent can be considered as aiming at the infliction of injury or discomfort; also manifestations of inner reactions such as feelings or thoughts that can be conceived to have such an aim are regarded as aggressive responses”.

Osman & Lee (1978): “By aggression we mean behavior that violates the personal rights of others, with an emphasis on physical violence or the threat thereof”.

Parsons (1947) defines aggression as “the disposition on the part of an individual or a collectivity to orient its actions to goals which include a conscious or unconscious intention illegitimately to injure the interests of other individuals or collectivities in the same system. The term ‘illegitimately’ deliberately implies that the individual or collectivity in question is integrated, however imperfectly, in a moral order which defines reciprocal rights and obligations”.

Patterson, Littman & Bricker (1967): “Aggressive behaviors are treated as relatively rare, high amplitude responses that are a subclass of a broader class of assertive behaviors”.

Pear (1964): “Aggression, in its most general usage, stemming from its basic meaning (the act of stepping toward or approaching) has reference to the initiation of physical assault or offensive action. While violence is an act that causes damage, often to a person, sometimes only to property, aggression, which may lead to violence, includes overt and covert acts, or assertive, attacking and intrusive behaviors: for example, sarcasm, dominance and the like (Haer, 1968; Etzioni, 1971; Kagan & Havemann, 1972; Bardis, 1973). We must distinguish between violence and aggression”.

Plotnik (1974) defines aggression as “the presenting or attempting to present noxious stimuli to another of the same species. Whether the stimuli are ‘noxious’ is determined by the animal’s reaction to these stimuli”.

Prosterman (1972): “Aggression is conduct whose deliberate end is to kill or cause serious injury to another human being”.

Rasa (1971): “The term ‘ritualized’ aggressive encounters is used here to describe all encounters between individuals the object of which is to achieve dominance over the antagonist. In nearly all species of animals, these types of encounter are associated with a set pattern of behaviors which vary from group to group but whose purpose is to intimidate the rival and are rarely associated with the infliction of damage”.

Redlich & Freedman (1966): “The word aggression has many meanings; it denotes destructive or hostile behavior, a disposition of anger, but also, simply, a very active and vital personality who is more prone to approach, attack, and pursue than to avoid, retreat and defend”. ‘Aggression’ refers to attack behavior, but it can refer also to the intensity and style of approach to persons and tasks and to assertiveness. Destructiveness and hostility are specific aspects of aggression. ‘Anger’ or ‘rage’ is the affect concomitant with aggression.

Rule (1974): “Aggression is defined as a response resulting in injury”.

Rummel (1977): “...aggression is ontologically a manner or style of becoming – it is disposed to be, becoming, or being offensive; that is, a disposition, power, or manifestation characterized by assault, attack, invasion. The core notion is of a forceful setting upon, either as tendency or behavior. The antonym of aggression is defensiveness, which is being protective and reactive. To assault or attack does not necessarily mean to engage in physical or violent action, for we can cast an aggressive eye at a party, invade a person’s quiet, or attack another verbally without threatening or inflicting physical harm or injury. Aggression... can mean causing another injury or creating destruction, attacking another, or simply engaging in fighting. It can refer to strong, assertive behavior (an aggressive lover), or an offensive-besetting manner (an aggressive salesman). It can refer to a disposition (an aggressive personality) or an action. It can mean an emotional state (anger...}
Aggression, in short, is many things. It is, like so many of our crucial social concepts, a dialectical term to be contextually worked, a sense to be created within a perspective... In sum, aggression is a style, an offensive manifesting or manifestation of power. It is inseparably linked to and takes on the form of power”.

(81) Rycroft (1969): “The almost universal tendency of analysts to equate aggression with hate, destructiveness, and sadism runs counter to both its etymology (ad-gredior: I move forwards) and to its traditional meaning of dynamism, self-assertiveness, expansiveness, drive”,

(82) Schilder (1964): “It is difficult to distinguish between activity, which is a general characteristic of life, and aggressiveness... This activity in aggressiveness has a close relation to motor drives and to instincts in general. It doubtless has its foundations in the organic structure, and its variations are in close relation to the child’s constitution”.

(83) Schuster (1978): “Aggression is a direct form of competition where individuals confront each other in threatening or fighting behavior and where one of the contestants tries to prevail over others. When the winner gains preferential access to resources or mates, aggression is adaptive”.

(84) Scott (1958) defines aggression as “fighting and the act of initiating attack”.

(85) Scott & Fredericson (1951), Scott (1966 et seq.) define ‘agonistic behavior’ as “a behavioral system composed of behavior patterns having the common function of adaptation to situations involving physical conflict between members of the same species. It includes offensive fighting, defensive posture, fleeing (escape), threat, display, submission, freezing (passivity), ambivalent and conflict behaviors”.

(86) Sinha (1968) defines aggression as the expression of a particular type of wish or combination of wishes, directed either to destroy an S or to thwart any particular tendency in an S by force, or to modify or try to bring a situation under control by use of physical or mental force, e.g. physical punishment or mental disapproval of a child for his actions. Methods used to gain certain ends may be aggressive, even though the purpose of the acts is beneficial”.

(87) M. Smith (in Fairchild, 1967): “Aggression is action directed toward controlling the person, action or possessions of one or more others against their will, for the primary benefit of the controlling agent, but also with the purpose or producing suffering or discontent on the part of those controlled”.

(88) M.E. Smith (1975) defines aggression as “a unilateral show of hostility and violence, and ‘violence’ as an intense form of hostility”.

(89) Southwick (1972): “Like many basic concepts, aggression is moderately easy to recognize but hard to define”.

(90) Steadman (1976) defines aggression as “assertive behavior”.

(91) Stokes & Cox (1970): “Aggression refers to actual or symbolic attack upon another individual and therefore includes all behavior that is more likely to lead to attack than to retreat... aggressive behavior includes anything that establishes or reinforces an individual’s social position”.

(92) Storr (1968): “Aggression is a portmanteau term which is fairly bursting at the seams”.

(93) Sussman & Richard (1974) refer to as aggression or agonistic behavior those interactions which tend to increase the distance between conspecific individuals or groups and which may lead to the infliction of physical harm on one or more of the participants”.

(94) Spitz (1953, 1969) compares aggression to the “Trägerwelle der Radiosendung”.

(95) Thiessen (1976): “We are forced to view aggression in more subtle terms and cannot restrict its definition to overt acts. More broadly, we must define aggression as any behavior which has
evolved to enhance competitive ability. This definition allows us to consider abilities to use available food, shelter and space as equally important as overt aggression... Overt aggression is only one means for competition, and a very extreme one at that. Moreover, it is wasteful of energy and time and will normally be used sparingly”.

(96) C.M. Thompson (1964), Dixon (1976): “Aggression is not necessarily destructive at all. It springs from an innate tendency to grow and master life which seems to be characteristic of all living matter. Exploration, independence, self-assertion, the overcoming of obstacles and the domination component of male sexuality depend upon the positive aspects of this most fundamental drive”.

(97) Tiger (1969) defines aggression as a process of conscious coercion against the physical environment, other animals, or humans by an individual or a group of people. ‘Violence’ describes an event which is only one possible outcome of the aggressive process.

(98) Tinbergen (1968): “In terms of actual behavior, aggression involves approaching an opponent, and, when within reach, pushing him away, inflicting damage of some kind, or at least forcing stimuli upon him that subdue him”.

(99) Tolsma (1953): “By aggression we understand the more or less conscious desire to encroach on another living space, to expand one’s own sphere at the other’s expense, or, in other words, the more or less deliberate injury to the welfare of the opponent (Welfare is here a psycho-physical totality striving toward integration)... Aggression is an attempt at self-preservation, or to expand one’s own sphere at the other’s expense”.

(100) Valzelli (1967, 1974): “The term aggressiveness should be used to indicate a particular, oriented behavior, directed toward removing or overcoming whatever is menacing to the physical or psychological integrity of the living organism. However, aggressiveness may or may not explode into actual fighting, depending upon the emotional level reached by the competitors”.

(101) Vowles (1970): “… it is difficult, if not impossible to define aggression. There have been many attempts to do this, which fall broadly into two categories. The first would define behavior as aggressive when it inflicts damage upon another individual. Indeed many workers nowadays have abandoned the use of the word aggression and talk only of violence – as if by restricting the field of inquiry they have solved a problem. A primary difficulty with this sort of definition arises in cases where violence may be accidental, or planned but somehow prevented. To meet this difficulty, many psychologists have introduced the concept of intent – and define aggressive behavior as that which is intended to inflict damage upon another individual. It is perhaps paradoxical that this notion of intent has been much used by psychologists of the Behaviorist school, which was founded to avoid precisely such problems of mentalistic explanations – Watson would shudder reflexly in his grave. Leaving aside the real difficulties of identifying or measuring intent, both definitions include the phrase ‘inflicting damage on another individual’. This raises further questions – what is damage? Does it include verbal abuse, business competition, the withdrawal of love? Does it cover a deterrent threat, or any threat where no violence subsequently occurs? Does it include biting by a terrified but cornered rat? Does it extend to interspecific behavior such as the killing of prey by a predator, or the extermination of other species by man to make way for farms and cities? Does it include suicide? When so many questions can be raised, one suspects not only that no single definition of aggression could be satisfactory, but also that the idea that there is a single unitary factor called aggression which underlies such a wide range of phenomena is a misconception which will prove abortive”.

(102) Webster’s Third New International Dictionary (1971) defines aggression as: 1a: An offensive action or procedure; especially a culpable unprovoked overt hostile attack. 1b: The practice of
making attacks or encroachments: offensive tactics. 2: The action of a nation in violating the rights, especially the territorial rights, of another nation (as by unprovoked attack, invasion or other unfriendly military action or sometimes by serious threat of or preparation for such action). 3: A form of psychobiologic energy, either innate or arising in response to or intensified by frustration, which may be manifested by (1) overt destruction, fighting, infliction of pain, sexual attack, or forcible seizure, (2) covert hostile attitudes, covetousness, or greed, (3) introjection into one’s self (as self-hate or masochism), (4) sublimation into play or sports, or (5) healthy self-assertiveness or a drive to accomplishment or to mastery, especially of skills. ‘Aggressive’ may apply either to zealous loyalty to causes or to personal ambitions and aims; it suggests forceful and confident procedures and attitudes, sometimes truculent contentiousness or cavalier treatment of others”.

(103) E.O. Wilson (1975): “What is aggression? In ordinary English usage it means an abridgment of the rights of another, forcing him to surrender something he owns or might otherwise have attained, either by a physical act or by the threat of action”.

(104) E.O. Wilson (1978): “any physical act or threat of action by one individual that reduces the freedom or genetic fitness of another”.

(105) Wolff (1969): “Aggression in man can be and is, of course, often used constructively in many fields, including self-preservation, the defense of basic physical needs, sexual conquest and experience, as well as for other, predominantly psychological purposes such as competition, the defense of one’s rights as an individual or those of one’s family or the group one belongs to, the struggle for the development of one’s identity, the maintenance of value systems and ideals, and especially for creative purposes of all kinds, an area which is most highly developed, if not confined to the human species. On the other hand, the very drive which is so essential for the survival and progress of each individual and of mankind can, because it often involves the necessity to fight, attack or even to kill, be used in a destructive manner against other human beings or against oneself”.

(106) Zillmann (1978) proposed to restrict the use of the term ‘aggression’ to attempts to produce bodily or physical injury to others.

Appendix II  Definitions of Violence

(1) Audi (1971): Violence is “vigorous physical or psychological attack upon, or abuse of, a person, animal or property”.

(2) Ball-Rokeach (1972) defines violence as “the threat or exertion of physical force which could cause bodily injury”.

(3) Bay (1971) defines violence analogous to Galtung’s (q.v.) ‘extended definition’ as “any cause of any needless reduction in basic freedoms for any human being”.

(4) Beck (1956): Violence is “violation of the victim’s rights of person”.

(5) Bogaards & Steenstra (1972), Steenstra & Bogaards (1978): “Geweld... alle uitingen van agressie waarbij schade wordt toegebracht aan personen of goederen... en ‘agressie’... uitingen waarbij de intentie tot of waarschijnlijkheid van schade aanwezig was”.

(6) Bondurant (1958): “Violence is the willful application of force in such a way that it is intentionally injurious to the persons or groups to whom it is applied”.

(7) Cancro & Baccus (1972), Cancro (1975): “Individual violence is a form of intraspecies aggression in which destructive physical behavior is directed at the person of another human or its symbolic representation, e.g. property, accompanied by intense negative affects”.
(8) Chandler (1973) defines violence as “any nonlegitimized application of force”.
(9) Cooperman (1954) defines violence as destructive harm not to persons but to boundaries of action.
(10) Coser (1967) finds that violence in its occurrence and form is socially structured as part of human communication. He regards as its social functions: an area of achievement, a danger signal and a catalyst.
(11) Davies (1970): “Violence is an act done with the intent to injure a person or damage property; aggression is the same thing; aggressiveness is the tendency to commit aggression, the tendency to do injury or damage”.
(12) DeRosis (1971): “Violence refers to the use of force with destructive intent... includes warfare, bombings and murder at one extreme and street or family brawls on the other. However, violence would also seem to include language forms filled with fury and passion, designed to be destructive... The concept of violence may also be associated with feelings which give rise to thoughts of annihilation”.
(13) Detre, Kupfer & Staub (1975) wonder about violence “Should the definition be so broad as to include all violations of human dignity and pride or to be restricted to acts which have as their intent to inflict physical damage on a person or property?”.
(14) Esser (1975) defines violence as “any destructive action resorted to when attempts at constructive acknowledgement of the aggressive intent have failed. In its ultimate form, violence leads to death, and it is implicit that the behavioral expression failed the original CNS intent. In violence we are willing to forego acknowledgement whether this comes from the other (homicide) or the self (suicide). Once the group (or the culture) accepts violence as the systematic solution to conflict, whenever the stranger (or the barbarian) does not respond appropriately, i.e. shows behavior expected in its own context, it institutes war as derailment of intergroup aggression”.
(15) Galtung (1969) distinguishes between physical, psychological and structural violence. Physical violence is directed to hurt human beings somatically, to the point of killing. Psychological violence is violence inflicted on the human psyche. He mentions “lies, brainwashing, indoctrination of various kinds, threats, etc.”. Kabwegyere (1972) adds “cultural decomposition aimed at producing a colonial subject”. I propose the term ‘menticide’ for this category. Structural violence is present, according to Galtung, “when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations... Violence is here defined as the cause of the difference between the potential and the actual”.
(16) Garver (1968) defines violence as “action infringing upon an individual’s autonomy and dignity”.
(17) Gelles & Straus (1979) define violence as “an act carried out with the intention or perceived intention of physically hurting another person. The ‘physical hurt’ can range from slight pain, as in a slap, to murder... First, the definition includes acts which are not normally considered violent (and certainly not abusive), such as spanking a child. Our definition viewed spankings as violent for two reasons. First, a spanking is an act intended to cause physical pain. Second, a spanking administered to someone who is not a family member, would be viewed as assault in the eyes of the law. A second problem was that our definition of violence did not take into account whether an injury is produced by the violent act. Many definitions of child abuse view an act as abuse only if it produces some harm or injury. However, harm or injury often depends on events or contingencies which are external to the behavior (e.g. aim, size, and strength of actor and intended victim, luck, availability of weapons, etc.)”. 

(18) Gerbner (1972) defines violence as “the overt expression of physical force... or the compelling of action against one’s own will under pain of being hurt or killed... physical or psychological injury, hurt or death addressed to living things”.
(19) Graham & Gurr (1969) define violence as “behavior designed to inflict physical injury to persons or damage to property”.
(20) Gurr (1973): “By violence I mean deliberate use of force to injure or destroy physically, not some more general category of coercive actions or politics, and not institutional arrangements that demean or frustrate their members. This definition is independent of agents, objects, or contexts of violence... There is an element of self-assertion in almost all acts of violence: a desire to satisfy anger, obtain revenge, assert pride, create fear in others”.
(21) Hook (1945) defines violence as “illegal methods of physical coercion to achieve personal or group ends”.
(22) Chalmers Johnson (1964): Violence is “anti-social action”.
(23) Chalmers Johnson (1966): Violence is “action that deliberately or unintentionally disorients the behavior of others”.
(24) Jongman (1978): “Geweld(gebruik) is een uiterlijk waarneembare gedragsvorm, de term agressie verwijst impliciet naar een veronderstelde gemoedstoestand”.
(25) Langness (1972) defines violence as “the use of forcible means to attain goals”.
(26) Lief (1963): “‘Violence’ and ‘force’ are extremes of a continuum of ‘aggression in which ‘force’ is instrumental to some end and ‘violence’ is simply intended to harm”.
(27) Lowry & Rankin (1972) define violence as “extreme aggression aimed at the serious injury or destruction of persons, objects or organizations and involving characteristics of explosiveness”.
(28) R.B. Miller (1971): “An act of violence is any act taken by A that involves great force, is in itself capable of injuring, damaging, or destroying, and is done with the intent of injuring, damaging, or destroying B (a being) or O (an inanimate object), when the latter is not done with the intention of doing something of value for the object’s owner”.
(29) Moyer (1976) defines violence as “a form of human aggression that involves inflicting physical damage on persons or property. Violent behavior is frequently intense, uncontrolled, excessive, furious, sudden, and at times seemingly purposeless”.
(30) Nahrendorf (1970) defines violence as “the abuse of strength in an attack on that which is protected by social control”.
(31) Nieburg (1963, 1969) defines violence as “direct or indirect action applied to restrain, injure, or destroy persons or property”. ‘Political’ violence is defined as “acts of disruption, destruction, injury whose purpose, choice of targets or victims, surrounding circumstances, implementation, and/or effects have political significance, that is, tend to modify the behavior of others in a bargaining situation that has consequences for the social system”.
(32) The Oxford English Dictionary defines violence as “the exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury on, or cause damage to persons or property”.
(33) Palmer (1972): “Violence is... severe frustration, physical or psychological, or death inflicted by one or more individuals upon others or themselves that is not accidental”.
(34) Persson (1980): “Violence can be viewed as the transformation of aggression into actuality: ‘aggression in action’. He also proposes as an axiologically neutral definition of violence: “That mode or manifestation of force which brings about abrupt or radical change within a compressed time-span”.
(35) Pontara (1978): “An action, a, performed by an agent P (person or group) as part of a method of struggle M in a situation of conflict S, is an act of violence if 1) there is at least one human...
being, Q, such that (i) P’s performance of a, in S as part of M, causes that Q dies, suffers or is
injured, and (ii) it is in S against Q’s will to be killed or made to suffer; and 2) P, in S, believes 1)
to be the case”.
(36) Riga (1969): “Violence at its root definition is any violation of the basic human rights of the
person. These violations can be social, economic, moral, and political”.
(37) Rubin (1975): “Violence is a form of social interaction in which some sort of damage is
inflicted on a party by another”.
(38) Runkle (1976): An act of violence is “an act in which a person employs physical force directly
against a living being for the purpose of harming him”.
(39) Scott (1975) defines violence as “behavior that results in serious injury or death to another
member of the same species”.
(40) J.E. Smith (1969): “Violent action is to begin with immediate physical action – occupying
buildings, beating opponents, burning property – which always involves a constraint on the person,
and ultimately the rights of another”.
(41) Spiegel (1969): “Violence lies at the extreme end of a spectrum of aggressive behavior. It is
characterized by acts of physical force aimed at the severe injury or destruction of persons, objects
or organizations”.
(42) Walter (1964): “The term violence will be restricted to the sense of destructive harm; hence, a
destructive kind of force. As a general term, it would include not only physical assaults that cause
damage to the person, but also magic, sorcery, and the many techniques of inflicting harm by
mental or emotional means. It includes psychic and spiritual as well as physical damage, and one
may turn to anthropological literature for accounts of magical and spiritual terrorism practiced by
shamans, magicians, and priests”.
(43) Webster’s Third New International Dictionary (1971) defines violence as: 1a. Exertion of any
physical force so as to injure or abuse (as in warfare or in effecting an entrance into a house). 1b.
An instance of violent treatment or procedure. 2. Injury in the form of revoking, repudiation,
distortion, infringement, or irreverence to a thing, notion, or quality fitly valued or observed. 3a.
Intense, turbulent or furious action, force, or feeling often destructive. 3b. Vehement feeling or
expression: fervor, passion, fury. 3c. An instance or show of such action or feeling: a tendency to
violent action. 3d. Clashing, jarring, discordant, or abrupt quality. 4. Undue alteration of wording or
sense (as in editing or interpreting a text)”.
(44) Wolff (1969) defines violence as “the illegitimate or unauthorized use of force to effect
decisions against the will or desire of others”.
(45) Wolfgang (1975): “Violence can be viewed as physical injury to persons and damage or
destruction of property, and abstractly is neither legitimate nor illegitimate. Judgment of legitimacy
is based on the agent, the target, the ends sought and the context in which violence occurs.
(46) Wolman (1978): “Violence is an act that aims at the destruction of a person, an animal, or an
object”,
(47) Q.Wright (1965): Violence implies “any event accompanied by rapid destruction of
structures”.
(48) Zinam (1978): “Violence is defined... as an illegitimate use of force. This distinction between
force and violence is stressed by Holmes (1971) who decries ‘the tacit assumption that force and
violence are the same’. ‘While violence typically involves the use of force’, he said, ‘and we often
use ‘force’ and ‘violence’ interchangeably, the two cannot be equated. We can use force... without
in any way involving violence’. Gray (1970) emphatically supports the distinction between force
and violence. ‘It is important’, he wrote, ‘to keep the meaning of the word violence distinct from
terms like power, force, strength, and authority’, and adds, ‘it is a sad commentary on our muddled minds that they today are frequently used synonymous’. Pareto (1966) clearly distinguishes force from violence and states that force is a prerequisite for governing and ‘the foundation of all social organization’. For him, use of violence is impractical, foolish, and weakens social order. However, numerous authorities in the field do not distinguish between the terms force and violence. They define it as ‘behavior designed to inflict physical injury on people or damage to property’ (Graham & Gurr, 1969), or ‘unmeasured or exaggerated harm to individuals, either not socially prescribed at all or else beyond established limits’ (Walter, 1969), or ‘the display of behavior which inflicts physical injury’ (Wolfgang, 1966), or ‘the most direct and severe form of physical power’ (Nieburg, 1969), Most of these, and other writers as well, while agreeing with this definition, proceed to distinguish between the legitimate and illegitimate use of violence. A good example of a most complete definition of violence as indistinguishable from force is given by Van den Haag (1972). For him, violence is ‘physical force used by a person, directly or through a weapon, to hurt, destroy, or control another, or to damage, destroy, or control an object’. He prefers to use violence as a synonym for ‘physical force’ and when necessary to qualify it as legitimate or illegitimate”.

Social Destructiveness

In Sanctions for Evil Sanford & Comstock (1971) observed that “Most of the large-scale destructiveness is done by people who feel they have received some kind of permission for what they do – as we call it, a sanction for evil... In defining social destructiveness, we distinguish this process from such behaviors as ‘violence’ and such motives as ‘aggression’... not all social destructiveness is violent in the ordinary sense, nor is a given act which contributes to it necessarily motivated by aggression. The motive, for example, may be simply the fear of disobeying a superior, and the harm may be a violation of human dignity accomplished without intent to inflict physical injury to people or to damage property”.

Appendix III Typologies of Aggression and Violence

Historically, there have been three bases which have led scholars to categorize aggressive and/or violent acts into subtypes: theoretical, empirical, and legal. American and English law make distinctions between kinds and degrees of violence. Some violence is perfectly legal, but legal violence has its bounds. While it is legal to physically punish a child, it is illegal to batter a child. The distinction is only one of degree, and the law is not very precise on the dividing line. Illegal acts of violence may be categorized on the basis of victim, forethought, intentionality, means, or age of the aggressor. Aggressive acts committed by juveniles are distinguished from those committed by adults; acts involving a law enforcement officer or federal agents as victims are often distinguished from those involving private citizens; acts which are premeditated are legally distinct from those which are ‘spontaneous’; acts committed while engaged in another crime, such as a felony, are seen as legally distinct from those not so committed; and violence which is intentional is legally different from that which is accidental. The law also allows for acts committed while the actor was in some way unable to exert cognitive, rational control over his or her own behavior, such as violence committed in the heat of passion (cf. ‘crime passionel’) or while ‘temporarily insane’ (Goldstein, 1975).
Theoretical bases for dividing aggression and/or violence into various types generally stem from the fact that different theories are capable of explaining and predicting only limited instances of aggression, and so theorists have divided aggression into types depending on their ease of explanation. Empirical bases for categorizing aggression stem from the fact that different acts of aggression have, or seem to have, either different antecedent conditions or different amounts of force, premeditation, or emotional arousal involved. Thus, distinctions are often made by social psychologists between ‘angry’ aggression (or ‘arousal’ aggression), which assumes the actor to be emotionally excited immediately prior to his aggressive act, and ‘nonangry’ (or ‘instrumental’) aggressive behavior (e.g. Berkowitz, 1962). The target of aggression has also been used as a basis for distinguishing types of aggression and/or violence (According to the Frustration-Aggression theory, aggression can be ‘displaced’ or ‘direct’). The means and amount of activity involved in an act have been used by Buss (1961; 1971) to categorize aggression. He presented three dichotomies of aggressive behavior: physical-verbal; active-passive; direct-indirect; thus yielding the following types of aggression:

1. physical-active-direct: stabbing, punching, or shooting another person.
2. physical-active-indirect: setting a booby trap for another person; hiring an assassin to kill an enemy.
3. physical-passive-direct: physically preventing another person from obtaining a desired goal or performing a desired act.
4. physical-passive-indirect: refusing to perform necessary tasks.
5. verbal-active-direct: insulting or derogating another person.
6. verbal-active-indirect: spreading malicious rumors or gossip about another individual.
7. verbal-passive-direct: refusing to speak to another person, to answer questions.
8. verbal-passive-indirect: failing to make specific verbal comments (e.g. failing to speak up in another person’s defense when he or she is unfairly criticized).

Cawley (1969) presents the following vocabulary of human aggression: 1. aggression expressed in behavior: (a) open aggression (b) disguised aggression; 2. aggression expressed in attitudes: (a) open aggression/hostility (b) disguised aggression/hostility 3. direction of aggression: (a) towards others responsible for frustration (b) towards non-aggressors (c) towards self; 4. mechanisms of aggression: (a) physiological (normal and pathological) (b) psychodynamic (c) psychosocial; 5. outcome of aggression (effects on recipient): (a) death or immediate bodily harm (b) somatic dysfunction (c) deprivation (d) social devaluation (e) altered attitude to donor.

Cawley adds: “Perhaps we should also define other dimensions such as (among others) the more fundamental causes, the situational and sociocultural context, the stimuli initiating the aggressive response, and purposive or teleological aspects”.

Dollard et al. (1939) and M. May (1943) distinguish: Individual direct overt physical aggression; Individual direct overt verbal aggression; Individual indirect non-overt verbal (displaced) aggression; Individual indirect non-overt non-verbal aggression; unconscious aggression; auto-aggression; and Collective aggression (same types).

According to Groen (1974), the following forms are operationally discernible in interhuman aggressive behavior: (1) interindividual vs intercollective (intergroup aggression) (2) instinctive (‘innate’) vs prepared (‘learned’) (3) violent vs nonviolent (4) armed vs unarmed (5) direct-contact
vs remote (6) active (offensive) vs passive (defensive) (7) verbal vs nonverbal (8) overt (manifest) vs covert (latent, substituted, sublimated, concealed, inhibited, controlled, masked) (9) culturally sanctioned (normal) vs abnormal (pathological, criminal) (10) aggressive play vs full-blown (adult) aggressive behavior.


Werbik (1971) distinguished intentional and ‘objective’ definitions of aggression. He proposed to eliminate the ambiguous concept of ‘aggressive intention’ from scientific idiom and substitute (1) explicitly destructive in intent; (2) explicitly negative in intent (3) implicitly destructive in intent (4) implicitly negative in intent.

Rummel (1977) distinguishes (1) identive aggression (2) assertive aggression (3) forceful aggression (4) coercive aggression (5) aggressive bargaining (6) intellectual aggression (7) authoritative aggression (8) altruistic aggression (9) manipulative aggression. Rummel relates aggression to 9 similar types of power.

Deutsch & Senghaas (1971) propose as possible instruments for the analysis of aggression, first the distinction between the ‘modi operandi’ of approach behaviors, each with its own operative purposes and consequences. An additional instrument is the distinction, developed in modern information-theory, between primarily matter- and primarily energy-related processes on the one hand, and predominantly information-oriented processes on the other hand. A third instrument is the distinction, derived from communication- and control-theory, between primarily autonomous self-directed systems on the one hand, and primarily non-autonomous, outer-directed and past-determined systems on the other hand. With these distinctions it is possible to establish a typology of at least six operationally distinguishable modes of approach behavior: (1) Elimination or destruction (2) Exploitation and compellence (3) Information acquisition (4) Assistance to autonomy (5) Demand for response; and (6) Information imposition.

Angenent (1974; 1975; 1978) makes a formal distinction between overt aggression (motor vs verbal) and covert aggression (indirect vs fantasied); and a motivational distinction between defensive aggression and destructive aggression (hostile vs impulsive aggression).

Carp (1967) distinguishes between aggression as self-manifestation, and aggressivity which may be terror-induced, destructiveness, and distortion based on defective self-manifestation.

Van Meursen (1955) distinguishes infantile vs integrated aggression (in the context of combat motivation of infantry soldiers).

Lantos (1958) distinguishes ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ aggression.

Feshbach (1964) distinguishes ‘instrumental’ and ‘hostile’ aggression versus non-intentional aggression.

Greenwald (1959); Meerloo (1968) and Allen (1972) distinguish self-assertive realistic (‘normal’) aggression and neurotic pseudo-aggression.

Rasa (1976; 1980) distinguishes self-defense (fear-motivated and damage-inflicting) versus ‘property-protective’ aggression (ritualized competition for resources). Rasa’s typology applies mainly to animals, It is not clear whether it applies to humans as well.
Carpenter (1974) has argued that aggressivity is a quality of many modalities of behavior; and numerous other authors that aggression refers to the vigor, vehemence or ferocity of behaviors. Thus their typology of aggression would coincide with a typology of behaviors in general.

Fromm (1973) has argued that we must distinguish in man two entirely different kinds of aggression. The first, which man shares with all animals, is a phylogenetically programmed impulse to attack (or to flee) when vital interests are threatened. This ‘defensive’, ‘benign’ aggression is in the service of the survival of the individual and the species, is biologically adaptive, and ceases when the threat has ceased to exist. The other type, ‘malignant’ aggression, i.e. destructiveness and cruelty, is specific to the human species and virtually absent in most mammals; it is not phylogenetically programmed and not biologically adaptive; it has no purpose, and its satisfaction is lustful. Most previous discussion of the subject has been vitiated by the failure to distinguish between these two kinds of aggression, each of which has different sources and different qualities.

Man’s ‘hyperaggression’ or destructive aggression is “not due to a greater aggressive potential but to the fact that aggression-producing conditions are much more frequent for humans than for animals living in their natural habitat”, Thus, “man’s destructiveness and cruelty cannot be explained in terms of animal heredity or in terms of a destructive instinct, but must be understood on the basis of those factors by which man differs from his animal ancestors. The problem is to examine in what manner and to what degree the specific conditions of human existence are responsible for the quality and intensity of man’s lust for killing and torturing”. Fromm thus takes a position in direct contradiction to Freud’s theory of a ‘death instinct’ to explain destructive activity in man.

Fromm goes on to detail a number of varieties of what he refers to as ‘pseudoaggression’ – “aggressive acts that may cause harm, but are not intended to do so”. Among these are ‘accidental aggression’, ‘playful aggression’ and ‘self-assertive aggression’. He also discusses ‘conformist aggression’, acts of aggression that are performed not because the aggressor is driven by the desire to destroy, but because he is told to do so and considers it his duty to obey orders; and ‘instrumental aggression’, which has the aim of obtaining that which is necessary or desirable. He regards war as the most important example of instrumental aggression. In his view, war is caused not by innate human destructiveness but “by instrumental aggression of the military and political elites” (Fromm does not conceptually dissociate ‘aggression’ from ‘violence’), Fromm believes that cruelty and destructiveness are manifestations of malignant aggression peculiar to man. He postulates two forms of destructiveness: spontaneous destructiveness and destructiveness that is bound in the character structure. Examples of spontaneous destructiveness are vengeful destructiveness and ecstatic destructiveness. Vengeful destructiveness is a spontaneous reaction to intense and unjustified suffering inflicted upon a person or the members of the group with which he is identified. It differs from normal defensive aggression in two ways: (1) it occurs after the damage has been done and hence is not a defense against a threatening danger; (2) it is of much greater intensity and is often cruel, lustful, and insatiable. Ecstatic destructiveness occurs in ritualistic, primitive orgies or states of trance organized around rage and destructiveness. Examples of cruelty and destructiveness woven into the character structure are sadism and necrophilia (These last two categories are more fully discussed in the text).

Typologies of animal aggression have tended to diverge from typologies of exclusively human aggression.
Moyer (1968 et seq.) distinguishes predatory aggression, intermale aggression, fear-induced aggression, maternal aggression, sex-related aggression, irritable aggression, instrumental aggression, and territorial aggression (the latter category being deleted in later works).

Wilson (1975) distinguishes territorial aggression, dominance aggression, sexual aggression, parental disciplinary aggression, weaning aggression, moralistic aggression, predatory aggression, and antipredatory aggression.

Van Sommers (1972) suggests the following categories of animal aggressive behavior:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive behavior</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interspecific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antipredator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group (mobbing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– maternal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiscriminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear-induced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group (mobbing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– maternal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraspecific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>territorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group (mobbing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– maternal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual rivalry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance and separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typologies of Violence

LeVine (1961) distinguishes the following structural levels in the analysis of violence: (1) intra-family (2) intracommunity (3) intercommunity (4) intercultural. The following five categories are culturally patterned forms of violent/aggressive behavior: (1) physical aggression: warfare, feuding, homicide, brawls, dueling, property destruction (arson, theft) (2) public verbal dispute: public insult, litigation, humiliation (3) covert verbal aggression: malicious gossip, witchcraft, sorcery, malevolent magic (4) breach of expectation (5) avoidance and separation.

Derriennic (1972) argues that the following three dimensions are useful in analyzing violence: (1) the distinction between direct vs indirect violence; (2) organized vs unorganized violence, and (3) actual vs potential violence. These are not dichotomous but continuous dimensions.

Passmore (1971) presents six dichotomies of violence: (1) physical vs psychological harm (2) intended vs unintended harm (3) person vs property harmed (4) social action vs structural process (5) manifest vs latent action (6) concentrated vs pervasive action.

According to Bardis (1973) violence may be (1) physical or verbal (2) directed against the self or against others (3) aimed at property damage or at personal injury (4) individual, small group, or collective (5) overt or covert (6) institutionalized or non-institutionalized, and (7) meaningful or irrational.

Yablonsky (1967) distinguished three factors of violence – legal, sanctioned, rational – yielding four types or patterns of violence:

(1) violence that is legal, sanctioned and rational (police duty, soldier)
(2) violence that is illegal, sanctioned and rational (some subcultures)
(3) violence that is illegal, nonsanctioned, rational (assault involved in a robbery)
(4) violence that is illegal, nonsanctioned, and irrational (many instances described in Yablonsky, 1962).

Zinam (1978) takes the criteria of legality and legitimacy as distinctive characteristics. This enables him to define three cases:
(1) the boundaries of legality and legitimacy coincide. In such a case violence is committed by individuals and groups if they violate formal law or the ethical standards of the community. State authorities can also commit violence if they overstep the legitimate and legal use of force to attain compliance with the law. (2) the area of legally permissible use of force extends beyond the limits of legitimacy. In this case one can speak of legalized violence by individuals and social groups as well as of legalized violence by the state. (3) the area of legitimacy extends beyond the area of legality. This leads to both legitimate but extralegal actions by individuals and groups and legitimate yet extralegal actions by state authorities.


Rivera argues that knowledge and science have their own forms of violence in sustaining and contributing to genocide, ecocide, and menticide. He outlines 12 types of such ‘violence of knowledge’.

Galtung (1965) distinguished (1) violence as biological incapacitation; (2) violence as reduction of action space; (3) violence as negative influence approach; and (4) violence as influence.

After the introduction of the concept of ‘structural violence’ Galtung (1969) presented the following typology of violence: (1) physical vs psychological (2) negative vs positive approach to influence (3) whether or not there is an object that is hurt (4) whether or not there is a subject (person) who acts (5) violence that is intended vs unintended (6) manifest vs latent violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>intended</th>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>manifest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not intended</td>
<td>latent</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical psychological without objects</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with objects</td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gurr & Bishop (1976) present the following, empirically derived, typology of political violence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his discussion of ‘Violence in America’, R.M. Brown (1969) presented the following classification: (1) Criminal violence and gang warfare; (2) Feud violence (3) Lynch-mob violence; (4) The violence of racial, ethnic and religious prejudice; (5) Urban riots (6) Freelance multiple murder (7) Political assassination; (8) Police violence; (9) Revolutionary Violence; (10) Civil war violence; (11) Indian wars; (12) Vigilante violence; (13) Agrarian risings; and (14) Labor violence.

Other typologies and classifications of aggression and/or violence are discussed in the text.