

Ethology in Europe

M. Taborsky, University of Bern, Hinterkappelen, Switzerland

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

The Very Beginning

Like for other aspects in biology, Charles Darwin can be safely viewed as the great grandfather of ethology. In his endeavor to understand the continuity between biological traits across different taxa, including humans, he realized that behavior was an important component of his evidence for biological evolution. He devoted a whole chapter of *On the Origin of Species* to the study of instinct, and in *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and the Animals*, Darwin observed: “With mankind some expressions, such as bristling of the hair under the influence of extreme terror, or the uncovering of the teeth under that of furious rage, can hardly be understood, except on the belief that man once existed in a much lower and animal-like condition.”

Despite such precursors, the systematic study of animal behavior in Europe began with the work of Oskar Heinroth, director of Berlin Zoo and Aquarium from 1913 to 1945. The term ‘ethology’ was coined in America by the zoologist Morton Wheeler in 1902, and the eminent American biologist Charles Otis Whitman, and his student Wallace Craig, had already gained significant insights into the behavior of animals by their systematic and comparative studies of pigeons. In Europe, Heinroth published his *Beiträge zur Biologie, namentlich Ethologie und Psychologie der Anatiden* (contributions to biology, especially ethology and psychology of the anatids) in the *Verhandlungen des 5. Internationalen Ornithologen-Kongresses in Berlin* in 1910, which might be considered as the first substantial ‘ethological’ publication. Oskar Heinroth was particularly interested in the behavioral displays, social signals, and rituals among conspecifics. In good Darwinian tradition and using ducks, swans, and geese, he argued that species-specific instinctive behavior, such as morphology, could be used to determine the genetic affinities of different taxa, a view he shared with C.O. Whitman from Chicago. Together with his wife Magdalena, Heinroth raised numerous young of a great variety of bird species in ‘Kaspar Hauser conditions,’ that is, in isolation from other birds, with the ambitious aim to systematically study the instinctive behavior of all the bird species of central Europe. This massive piece of work was published from 1924 to 1934 in the four-volume classic of *Die Vögel Mitteleuropas* (The Birds of Central Europe).

Development of Concepts

Heinroth’s work was influential to a number of naturalists, mostly ornithologists, who readily accepted his view that

behavior is a species-specific trait suited for comparative studies in order to reconstruct phylogeny. Most prominent among his disciples was to become the Austrian zoologist Konrad Lorenz, a zealous observer of behavior with an unrivalled intuitive knowledge of animals. Lorenz was strongly influenced by the idea that instinctive behavior patterns are innate and invariable, rendering them suitable to reconstruct phylogenies just like any other bodily structure. In this view, instincts are equivalent to organs. Lorenz regarded the concept of instinctive behavior patterns not as a hypothesis to be tested but as a fundamental assumption. Like his much-admired mentor Heinroth, Lorenz used mainly birds as model systems, particularly because of the opportunity to raise them by hand and due to their similarity to humans with regard to sensory biology, conditions greatly facilitating systematic study. Lorenz’ declared approach was to start with impartial observations devoid of any hypothesis. On the basis of these observations, he developed ideas and concepts, above all, the hypothesis of ‘innate releasing mechanisms.’ He also took up Heinroth’s concept of imprinting (which the latter had never called by this term) and elaborated it, first in his seminal paper on *Der Kumpan in der Umwelt des Vogels* (The companion in the bird’s world) that was published in German in 1935.

Interestingly, Lorenz and the other early ethologists in Europe focused on questions that had been of interest mainly to psychologists, despite their highly divergent approach. The emphasis was on internal states and environmental influences, but the ethologists’ concern extended beyond the question of immediate causation of behavior. Comparative Ethology was, thus, intended to be an alternative to (North American) behaviorism – being mainly a psychologists’ domain – and Pavlovian ‘reflexology.’ The European naturalists’ aim was to teach psychologists the comparative and evolutionary approach, and the necessity to understand the behavior of whole animals in their natural environment. The preeminent advocate of this approach was Niko Tinbergen, a Dutch naturalist, who turned out to become, besides Lorenz, the second founding father of ethology. Together, they developed the concept of instinct based on a hierarchical organization of drives, assuming as key categories of behavioral causality action-specific energy and consummatory acts, together with innate releasing mechanisms. These concepts were strongly shaped by an imagination of energy flow, but without assuming a material counterpart. The most conspicuous concepts of the day were Lorenz’ psycho-hydraulic model and Tinbergen’s hierarchical organization of drives.

The concepts of instinct, developed first and foremost by Lorenz and Tinbergen, were important sources of testable hypotheses enabling young researchers to scrutinize resulting predictions by experimental, physiological, and cybernetic approaches. It is important, however, to consider these developments in a historical context. In the end, the original concepts proved to be too simplistic and partly mistaken, and considered in retrospect, they seem to have lead nowhere. If the concepts of the 'classical' period of ethology might now be viewed as scientific dead ends, at the time they were immensely important for the emergence and development of a behavioral science. Researchers like Gerard Baerends at Groningen, Robert Hinde at Oxford, and the American comparative psychologists Theodore Schneirla and Daniel Lehrman, were sparked by early ethological theory and took it to its first acid test. The intense discussion that ensued proved to be as important to the field as was the preceding development of the theory.

Lorenz and Tinbergen

Despite their common interest and general agreement, the roles of that important, odd couple, Lorenz and Tinbergen, diverged greatly. Lorenz was mainly concerned with the causality of behavior as a result of the interaction of external stimuli and innate, pre-programmed action patterns. He was interested in imprinting as a mechanism causing long-lasting effects of early experience and in the origin and function of ritualized social interactions. His major tool was the handraising of birds, mainly ducks and geese, which enabled him to observe his study organisms at close hand and largely undisturbed. Lorenz was no keen systematic experimenter but had a rather philosophical interest in the mechanisms underlying behavior at any level. In contrast, Tinbergen loved the systematic experimental approach, which he preferably used under field conditions. He formalized the concept of instinct and strived for closer connections between the causal analysis of behavior and a physiological approach. Like Lorenz, he was a keen naturalist and an exceptionally gifted observer, but in addition, he was also an excellent experimenter.

Over several decades, the rise of ethology in Europe was firmly in the hands of these two characters. Even if Karl von Frisch shared the 1973 Nobel prize of medicine and physiology with them for establishing ethology as a scientific discipline, von Frisch's role in this endeavor was negligible. He was an outstanding experimenter and his research on the dance language of bees is a masterpiece, but he was not actively involved in the conceptual and practical establishment of ethology. In contrast, Lorenz and Tinbergen, in their own ways, strived for constructing the foundations for a scientific study of behavior. While Lorenz was the hyperactive motor developing and disseminating concepts of behavioral regulation, outspoken, self-confident, sometimes

dogmatic, but well connected among his colleagues, Tinbergen was more modest and careful in his attempt to gain attention for his ideas, and for the sake of ethology, always integrative in his actions and arguments, but nevertheless pushing hard towards the establishment of ethology as a biological science on an equal footing with, say morphology or physiology. Tinbergen realized that confining ethology to the study of causation would be too narrow a discipline. He wanted survival value and evolution incorporated in a systematic study of behavior, just as ontogeny and causation – the four 'Tinbergen questions' that today still serve as the undisputed guideline for the study of behavior.

Eventually, ethology gained momentum, and Lorenz and Tinbergen obtained prestigious positions with the Max-Planck Society and at the University of Oxford, respectively. Their continuous effort to establish this new discipline included the foundation of scientific journals, with *Ethology* being first in the field, cofounded by Lorenz under the name *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie* (*Journal for Animal Psychology*) in 1937. They organized international conferences that became increasingly popular, with the 1952 meeting at Lorenz' Max-Planck Institute in Buldern being the first of a series of 'International Ethological Conferences' (IECs) that still continue today, with biannual intervals. These activities spawned numerous disciples, and ethology groups emerged at various universities all over Europe. The most conspicuous centers of ethology in postwar Europe were the Max-Planck-Institute for Behavioural Physiology at Seewiesen, where Lorenz finally gained ground, and groups at the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Leiden, and Groningen. For several decades, Germany, Great Britain, and The Netherlands stood at the forefront of this new discipline. While the research directions pursued in German and British ethology diverged increasingly, ethology in the Netherlands kept its broad scope.

Regional Divergence

The policy of the German Max-Planck Society was to merge ethology with physiology, which defined the research activities at the Max-Planck-Institute for Behavioural Physiology at Seewiesen from the start (1958) right to its end (1999). This was an obvious combination, not only because, in essence, behavioral causation is a physiological problem, but also because of the strong position of physiology in biological science in Germany; its keen focus on sensory and neural physiology prepared the ground for the study of behavioral mechanisms at the level of organisms, organs, and cells. In Britain, on the other hand, where the tradition was strong in ecology and evolutionary thinking, the interest in the adaptive value of behavior gained momentum. While Tinbergen at Oxford strived to keep behavioral research in balance between the

ultimate and proximate levels of explanation, his successors abandoned three of the four legs of ethology and capitalized entirely on the adaptive value of behavior – giving birth to the most conspicuous subdiscipline of ethology called behavioral ecology.

Behavioral Ecology and Beyond

The onset and expansion of behavioral ecology may be seen as the second success story of ethology, after its hype in postwar Europe that followed the birth of the discipline. It is also worth noting that behavioral ecology brought about the unification of behavioral research in Europe and America, despite the divergent history of this science on these two continents. The consequent application of evolutionary theory to the study of behavior revolutionized not only ethology, but the whole of organismic and integrative biology. William D. Hamilton of University College, London, achieved a breakthrough with his theoretical model of *The genetical evolution of social behaviour* published in 1964, where he concluded that “Species following the model should tend to evolve behavior such that each organism appears to be attempting to maximize its inclusive fitness.” This caused a paradigm shift from the focus on the maximization of individual fitness to the inclusion of effects on kin, which helped to understand the evolution of altruistic behavior such as known from eusocial insects – a dodgy puzzle to Charles Darwin.

The other significant conceptual progress in the early days of behavioral ecology was its focus on the fitness effects of biological traits, which paved the way to the cost-and-benefit analysis of behavior. Role models of this development include John Krebs and Nicolas Davies from Oxford University, who developed elegant experimental tests of qualitative and quantitative predictions of foraging, aggressive, and reproductive behaviors. They spread the ideas and concepts of this new approach to the study of animal behavior by editing an influential series of books (*Behavioural Ecology: An Evolutionary Approach* I–IV, 1978–1997). John Maynard Smith from Sussex and Geoffrey Parker from Liverpool proposed a game theoretical approach to the study of behavioral decisions, which had been used already long before in economy and military strategy. At the Max-Planck-Institute in Seewiesen Lorenz’ successor, Wolfgang Wickler, pursued a strict functional approach to behavior that had lasting effects on the development of ethology in Europe by the dispersion of his disciples. In the Netherlands, behavioral research centers at the Universities of Groningen, Leiden, and Utrecht thrived with a balanced approach to behavior that, remarkably, was not as narrowly confined to the study of its adaptive value as was the custom at many other centers of ethology. Countries

in Scandinavia and Southern Europe developed their own strong research programs in behavioral ecology, which have contributed substantially to the progress in theoretical and empirical behavioral research in Europe.

Despite this positive development, the unfavorably narrow focus of behavioral ecology on the adaptive value of behavior proved to obstruct a comprehensive understanding. The study of the causation of behavior was largely left in the hands of specialists from other disciplines, such as neurophysiology, endocrinology, developmental biology, and experimental psychology. Despite the scientific progress in these fields, a synthetic view of the origin, causation, function, and evolution of behavior has been largely missing. It seems safe to conclude that in recent years, ethology in Europe has somewhat regained its balance. Behavioral development, causal mechanisms, adaptive value, and evolutionary patterns, all have their firm place in behavioral research and university curricula at literally hundreds of institutions distributed all over Europe. National and supranational behavioral societies thrive, small and large meetings on all aspects of behavioral research are popular, and the job market for young researchers in behavior shows promise for a bright future of this discipline. Ethology, or ‘behavioural biology’ as it is often called, seems to have come of age.

See *also*: Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology; Comparative Animal Behavior – 1920–1973; Darwin and Animal Behavior; Development, Evolution and Behavior; Future of Animal Behavior: Predicting Trends; Integration of Proximate and Ultimate Causes; Konrad Lorenz; Neuroethology: What is it?; Niko Tinbergen; Psychology of Animals; William Donald Hamilton.

Further Reading

- Bateson PPG and Klopfer PH (eds.) (1973–1995) *Perspectives in Ethology*, vols. 1–11. New York: Plenum Press.
- Burkhardt RW (2005) *Patterns of Behavior. Konrad Lorenz, Niko Tinbergen, and the Founding of Ethology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hamilton WD (1964) The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I and II. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 7: 295–311.
- Hinde RA (1966) *Animal Behaviour. A Synthesis of Ethology and Comparative Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kappeler P (ed.) (2010) *Animal Behaviour: Evolution and Mechanisms*. Berlin: Springer.
- Krebs JR and Davies NB (eds.) (1978–1997) *Behavioural Ecology: An Evolutionary Approach*, vol. 1–4. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Lorenz K (1950) The comparative method in studying innate behaviour patterns. *Symposia of the Society for Experimental Biology* 4: 221–268.
- Maynard-Smith J (1982) *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McFarland D (1985) *Animal Behaviour*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Tinbergen N (1963) On aims and methods of ethology. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie* 20: 410–433.