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Abstract

Social psychologist Morton Deutsch, a founding father of the conflict resolution field, wrote in 1973: “In a cooperative situation the goals are so linked that everybody ‘sinks or swims’ together, while in the competitive situation if one swims, the other must sink.”

At present, global society has not yet learned to swim together, and thus risks sinking together. Global society’s psychological, social, and societal cohesion still fails to match the requirements for cooperation that it faces. Human-made concepts, practices, and institutions still have to live up to the reality of their own embeddedness in nature, as well as the fact that in an interdependent world, local conflicts diffuse and affect everyone. It is of utmost importance that the global community learns to cooperate, so as to create a worthwhile future for the next generation.

The emergence of the imagery and reality of One World represents a historic window of opportunity that must be actively seized.

In a brochure by the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, we read that the following values are common to all Turkish people: “Belief in the integrity of the family, loyalty and obligation to the country and community, fairness in dealing with other human beings, hospitality, compassion, and respect for tradition.”

For a worthwhile future for humankind, the loyalty that is at the core of Turkish values needs to be extended to all of the human family (“peace in the world”), and respect must be extended to all those traditions that include all human beings and their home planet.

In former times, fear reigned in a fragmented world, rivals, competitors, and enemies were subdued and dominated by humiliating them with “shock and awe.” Victory and power over one’s opponents was the aim.

In One World, space opens for love, humility, and for awe for a universe too large for us to fathom. Partners join hands to create a sustainable social and ecological future for all of humankind. No longer do superiors humiliate opponents into submission. In One World, partners respect each other as equals in dignity.

Contents
Introduction

When I wrote my last book, on gender, humiliation and global security,¹ the publisher asked me to make a list of “factoids,” examples of pieces of information that illustrate the message of the book. A list of some of the factoids that I collected is presented in this paper. They illustrate the transitional processes that characterize human history at the current point in time.

I would like to invite the reader into this paper by asking a few questions, illustrated with the help of brief vignettes from my own experience.

I am writing these lines in the canton of Vaud, which is located in the French part of Switzerland. On weekends, I explore the vicinity of my writing place to understand its history. I must admit that I am shocked when I see how, in the sixteenth century, the Bernese burnt down virtually each and every of those beautiful castles I see in Vaud. Bern invaded and conquered Aargau in 1415 and Vaud in 1536, as well as other smaller territories, in this way pushing out the influence of Savoy and becoming the largest city-state north of the Alps. Today, Bern is the Swiss capital.

I ask: How come? Should not Bern be the arch-enemy of all its neighbors? After all, the Bernese have burnt down almost all their castles? How come that Bern’s neighbors seemingly have “embraced defeat”? Embracing Defeat was the title of a book written by historian John W. Dower.² It explains how Japan embraced defeat after World War II.
As it appears, defeat can be embraced. However, we may ask, why is it sometimes not embraced? In the 1980s, I spent some time in Bavaria, in the south of Germany. I was flabbergasted at the feelings of hostility I witnessed there towards the rest of Germany, particularly towards Prussia. Some of my Bavarian friends dreamt of an Alp Republic together with Austria and the German part of Switzerland, eager to turn their backs on a Germany they did not love. I was shocked at the depth of the aversion felt. I had not been aware of this state-of-affairs before actually spending time in Bavaria. When the German reunification came in 1990, my friends accepted Berlin as Germany’s capital, however, as it is the Prussian city per definition, they accepted it only with the fist in their pockets. Prussians, from their point of view, are unbearably arrogant, always putting new fuel on their age-old humiliation campaign against Bavaria, from the times when Bavaria was defeated in the 1866 Austro-Prussian War. I was utterly unaware of these historical facts, and if I had been aware of them, I would not have believed that they could still be relevant for modern-day identity formation of people living in Germany.

Not all leave their fists in their pockets. Around the world, movements abound which openly seek to change their status. Some fight for independence from, or more autonomy within their host countries, others wish to become part of other countries. Some engage in violent struggles, while yet others use nonviolent political means. In Europe, for instance, the Basques regularly make headlines with violent attacks, while some Northern Irishlanders, though they have renounced violence, still wish to be part of the Republic of Ireland. Other regions, for example, Savoy, which is now part of the Rhône-Alpes region of modern France, has developed a peaceful separatist movement. Also the rest of the world is fraught with similarly protracted struggles, the Middle East providing one of the starkest cases.

Let us ask: Why do the Swiss accept Bern as their capital? Why do Germans no longer die violent deaths in the battle ground? Why is it that for the citizens of Bayern, elections suffice as a means to protect their identity and express their grievances? Why does it suffice that they have a party of their own, the Christian Social Union of Bavaria?

What we learn is that rifts stemming from past and even from present dynamics of humiliation can be harnessed in less than openly violent ways.

Indeed, the example of Bavaria mirrors the European Union, a peace project that draws admiration from around the world. Like the German federal state, also the European Union places layers of cooperation over the myriad reasons for hatred that linger on from historical cycles of humiliation and are refueled with more recent humiliations. In an interview, Kishore Mahbubani, Dean of the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore, praised the European Union for what it has achieved inside its borders (less so outside of its borders, where, Mahbubani reckons, ASEAN does a better job). Mahbubani believes that the rest of the world will follow suite and that the end game will be democracy, everywhere on the globe. Only the path to democracy will be different, producing a “multiverse of democracies.”

What do we learn? The world will most probably never be a place where everybody loves and forgives everybody else. But humankind does not have to reach maximal goals to survive. It must simply avoid pushing the planet over the edge, both socially and ecologically. This is the mandatory minimum requirement. In many countries, parents increasingly receive joint custody for their children after divorce. For humankind, this arrangement is compulsory. Global challenges must be tackled jointly even in the face of
mutual antipathy. The example of Bayern demonstrates how even deeply engrained hatred, not just of the past but also of the present, is not necessarily a problem as long as cooperation on vital tasks continues. What is needed is sufficient common ground for cooperation, even in the face of animosity and hostility.

This paper begins by laying out the large-scale geohistorical frame into which present-day human activities are inscribed. It then lists evidence that shows to what extent strategies of the past increasingly lose feasibility. Then, some examples are enumerated that illustrate the historical transition of present times. Subsequently, new approaches are proposed, approaches that discuss questions such as: How can cooperation be achieved, even in the face of hatred? How can this goal be connected with the aim to protect the socio- and biosphere? How can both spheres be made sustainable?

The Large-Scale Geohistorical Transitions of Homo Sapiens

It is accepted archaeological and anthropological knowledge that humans evolved in Africa, first colonizing Africa and then the rest of the world (except for the Americas, which came much later). The ancestral human population is very small—perhaps as little as 2,000 or even 1,000 breeding pairs. Humankind once came close to extinction—according to the latest genetic research, the number of humans in Saharan Africa dropped, and all of *homo sapiens sapiens* may even have descended from a single tribe in the Kalahari of Africa circa 60,000 years ago, even though this view is being debated. Whatever the dispute, what is accepted knowledge is that contemporary humans are all descendents of a rather small population, despite any apparent variation.

For the first ninety percent of human history, humankind populated the planet, or at least its easily reachable areas, always wandering off to the next valley of untouched abundance, living in small bands of a few hundred hunter-gatherers who enjoyed a remarkably high quality of life.

Then, about 10,000 years ago, a deep shift occurred. Planet Earth’s surface is finite, and humankind increasingly met what anthropologists call *circumscription*—the next valley was no longer untouched but already populated with other humans. No longer was the pie of resources expandable through merely wandering further. One had to make do with the land under one’s feet. Human kind’s response was *intensification* (in anthropological terms), which meant, among others, the emergence of *complex agriculture* followed by *state formation*. With this shift, the overall frame of the human condition transmuted from a rather benign win-win frame to a much more malign win-lose situation.

Under the conditions of circumscription and agriculturalism, the *security dilemma* raised its head. It held humankind in its stranglehold throughout the past 10,000 years. The security dilemma is built on fear and fosters fear: “I fear you but will defend my land against you! Fear me!”

Riane Eisler, social scientist and social activist, has developed a cultural transformation theory, where she describes how, during the past millennia, otherwise widely divergent societies followed what she calls a “dominator model,” rather than a “partnership model.” From the samurai of Japan to the Aztecs of Meso-America, all were characterized by very similar hierarchies of domination and a rigidly male-dominant
“strong-man” rule, both in the family and state. Hierarchies of domination were maintained by a high degree of institutionalized and socially-accepted violence, ranging from wife- and child beating within the family to aggressive warfare on the larger tribal or national level.

In this context, humiliation was regarded as a legitimate tool for masters to keep underlings docile. Also love fell prey to this malignant context. It was commodified in the service of the fear that flows from the security dilemma. The security dilemma is a tragic dilemma; it tragically trumped and mutilated spontaneous authentic love. Instead, a maimed concept of love emerged (which still holds sway in many walks of life today). Ruling elites defined love as a feeling, a feeling to be felt qua duty, a feeling opposite to hatred. Ruling elites coerced underlings to extend love and hatred “spontaneously” to the “correct” objects: one had to love one’s in-group and hate one’s out-groups, one had to love one’s designated superiors, be faithful and loyal to them or be chastised. This system was enforced by way of obligatory fear of and love for God, and any lack of such fearful love was punished with the harshest of penalties.

Anthropologist William Ury drew up what he calls a simplified depiction of history, whose core elements are widely accepted by the academic community. He pulled together elements from anthropology, game theory and conflict studies to describe three major types of society: (1) simple hunter-gatherers, (2) complex agriculturists, and (3) knowledge society.

In Ury’s system, prior to 10,000 years ago, simple hunter-gatherers lived in a world of coexistence and open networks, within which conflicts were negotiated rather than subjected to coercion. The abundance of wild food represented an expandable pie of resources that did not force opponents into win-lose paradigms. If we calculate that Homo sapiens first appeared in the Middle Paleolithic about 200,000 BP, this period stands for the first five percent of human history. (A caveat: The situation of hunter-gatherers prior to 10,000 ago cannot be equated with present-day hunter-gatherer cultures, which almost all were affected by the security dilemma as much as all other cultures on the globe. Archaeological evidence suggests, for instance, the absence of systemic warfare prior to 10,000 ago, indicating that early hunter-gatherer may indeed have enjoyed rather peaceful relationships.)

Complex agriculturalism, in contrast, pushed its players into a world of coercion. Agriculturalists led their lives within closed hierarchical pyramids of power on land that represented a fixed pie—land is either mine or yours—a set of conditions that represented a malign win-lose situation. This period represents the last five percent of human history.

Then, a couple of hundred years ago, another transition began, as deep a transition as the one from hunting-gathering to agriculture. The presently unfolding transition turns squarely against the culture of the past 10,000 years: everybody is to be equal in dignity, no longer ranked. The French revolution’s slogan is liberté, égalité, fraternité (today, we would say brotherhood and sisterhood). Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) reflects this motto in its first sentences: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.”

A progressively more interdependent world, increasingly basing itself on knowledge and not land as a resource for livelihood (Ury’s stage three), is now pushing towards one
single global village, undermining the fault lines that formerly pitted the many
densely hierarchically organized local villages against each other in reciprocal fear and hostility.
Knowledge as a resource replaces the old win-lose frame with a win-win frame, and in
tact with increasing global connectedness, the security dilemma weakens. This is oxygen
for the human rights ideal that all human are equal in dignity. Principles such as unity in
diversity receive a chance to gain significance.

In a globally connected knowledge society, space opens for a new approach to
everything (to adopt the linguistics of the “theory of everything”), an approach that posits
a new kind of love at its core. A globally interdependent knowledge society with a
weakening security dilemma removes the need to instrumentalize love and hatred as
commodified tools. Space opens for agape, philia, and metta to thrive, for the divinity of
Martin Buber’s’ loving I-Thou relationships of mutual respect for equal dignity to rise.
Humiliation loses its legitimacy and transmutes into a violation of dignity.19

In my work, I build on Ury’s model. I am aware that the conceptualization of history
as historic stages has been criticized. One of the accusations is that it smacks of arrogant
ranking, history supposedly evolving from “primitive” toward “less primitive.”20 I
believe, however, that suppressing the fact of long-term global change, even if to avoid
the allegation of arrogance, does neither serve its aim nor the search for truth.

I call the first 9five percent of human history (1) the period of pristine pride. Then,
humankind lived through its first decisive turning point. Pristine pride was transformed
into ranked honor. This practice lasted for the past 10,000 years, (2) the period of
collectivist ranked honor, humankind’s second large-scale historical era. The human
rights vision for the future, the promise of equal dignity for all, is the third era (3), not yet
realized. At the current historic point in time, we live in a transitional phase, with
humankind struggling at the cusp of the tipping point between the traditional order of
ranked honor and an envisaged future of equal dignity for all. We live in the midst of the
second large-scale historical turning point that humankind has ever lived through, as stark
a turning point as 10,000 years ago. And survival is at stake. Either humankind turns and
rises to a new level of adaptation, or it risks extinction.

Love and humiliation are being played out in different ways in each era. Prior to
10,000 years ago, the overall context did not lend itself to deep institutional
hierarchization, so we can suppose, and archaeological evidence supports this
assumption, that untouched pride and authentic love could thrive, at least to a certain
extent. Then, 10,000 years of bondage descended upon humankind, bondage due to the
tragic security dilemma. It turned humiliation into a routinely applied tool, with love as
its saddest victim. Emotions moved into the background.21 Masculinity became equated
with domination and conquest—be it of women, other men or nature. To maintain this
type of society, boys were systematically socialized for domination and violence. Sex
became an act of male conquest, sexuality was played out on a battle field of “scoring,”
and families were ruled by men, served by women, and children learned to acquiesce.
Male anger was honored as “rational” investment into Realpolitik, while female emotion
was derided as “emotionality.”22

Today, the vision of a future world of equal dignity for everybody entails the promise
that love can be freed again from commodification. Clearly, this potential can only be
fulfilled if we, as humankind, take it seriously, and put all our bets on it. If we realize this
potential, then love can flourish as authentically self-chosen feeling and guiding
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principle, no longer mutilated and enslaved for other purposes. Luckily, this is not impossible. We mistake the past 10,000 years for representing all of human history only because it is the most recent period in our history and we are most familiar with it. Yet, 10,000 years are only a small fraction of the entirety of human history. Their malign lessons can be unlearned. And, fortunately, also the prosocial nature of humans seems to have survived 10,000 years of onslaught, even if only “under cover” in certain niches of society, undervalued, and in a dire state.

In the course of the current transition, also humiliation transmutes. Today, humiliation changes from being regarded as “prosocial honorable lesson” to “the most painful exclusion from humanity imaginable.” In the past, humiliation was equated with love in the spirit of “you beat whom you love,” in a human rights context, humiliation is defined as the opposite of love: “you do not beat whom you love.” “Domestic chastisement” transmutes into “domestic violence.” Consequently, being exposed to the old concept of love humiliates those who have adopted the new way. What hurts most is betrayed love, a betrayal that is brought to the fore particularly in times of transition. When a person extends love in the new way, only to detect that she is loved back in the old way, she may feel deeply hurt. The new way calls for self-chosen love that is embedded into mutuality informed by equal dignity between lovers, while the old way binds love in the old prison of commodification.

This was a short version of humankind’s large-scale geohistorical historical journey. In the following section, the lens is turned towards humankind’s situation as it presents itself at the current transitional point in history.

**The Strategies of the Past That No Longer Work**

This section offers a list of the warning signs that throw into stark relief the present need for deep pro-active and systemic change.

**The Core Crisis**

At macro levels, the failing of past strategies is being demonstrated by a combined climate and economic crisis. The loss from environmental degradation is estimated to be higher than the loss from the banking crisis that broke in 2008—a study puts the annual cost of forest loss at between $2 trillion and $5 trillion. All crises combine to a global crisis which “is to strike by 2030,” warns John Beddington, UK government chief scientist, at the Sustainable Development UK 09 conference in March 2009: water shortages are predicted across large parts of Africa, Europe and Asia, and growing world population will cause a “perfect storm” of food, energy and water shortages by 2030. As it stands now, human demands on the world’s natural resources reach nearly a third more than earth can sustain.

With respect to possible solutions, the most significant problem, at present, is the lack of global leadership. On September 23, 2008, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon addressed the 63rd session of the General Assembly and made a list of the world’s perils: “We face a global financial crisis. A global energy crisis. A global food crisis.
Trade talks have collapsed, yet again. We have seen new outbreaks of war and violence, new rhetoric of confrontation. Climate change ever more clearly threatens our planet.” The biggest crisis, he said, is the lack of global leadership. His speech was entitled “A Call to Global Leadership.”

**Various Manifestations of the Core Crisis**

- The economic crisis that broke in 2008 has many labels, ranging from “subprime crisis” to “credit crunch,” to a “financial tsunami” or “economic Armageddon,” preceded by an “Enron crisis,” possibly leading up to a “credit default swap crisis.” Despite of the many names, the crisis brings home one insight, namely, that self-interest (if narrowly defined) is not sufficient a guarantee for the protection of common interest. Former Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan stated that he was “in a state of shocked disbelief” and had been wrong in thinking that relying on banks to use their self-interest would be enough to protect shareholders and their equity. At present, banks serve the wrong constituency—they serve their shareholders first, while they should serve society’s common good. Worse even, some bankers placed their personal self-interest not only above common interest but also above the interest of their own bank employers.

- In an interconnected world, protectionism no longer protects but harms everybody. “My import is your export and vice versa,” explains Pascal Lamy, Director General of the World Trade Organization. Also EU Trade Commissioner Catherine Ashton warns that there is a significant difference between protectionism and protection—only truly free and fair trade is the way forward in an interdependent world. In an interconnected world, violent conflicts which formerly may have stayed local, rapidly become global, diffusing insecurity in an unprecedented manner. Traditional power-over strategies aiming at victory over enemies risk creating backlashes and fuelling protracted conflicts. Regions such as the Middle East, Afghanistan, or Iraq demonstrate those outfalls.

- Also at meso and micro levels, the inadequacy of old approaches becomes apparent, for instance, with respect to quality of life and happiness curves. Happiness, for example, does not increase with having more money, on the contrary, as the Western world has become wealthier, clinical or major depression has been growing. Research shows that even though richer countries do tend to have happier citizens than poor ones, still, once people have a home, food, and clothes, extra money does not make them happier. A formula was developed, with which to measure the monetary equivalence of friendship—£50,000 would be needed to compensate for not having friends.

- The National Bureau of Economic Research in the U.S. has just published data from a new survey showing that although many objective measures of the lives of women in the United States have improved over the past 35 years, measures of subjective well-being have declined both absolutely and relative to men. This result is found across various datasets, measures of subjective well-being, and is pervasive across demographic groups and industrialized countries. A new gender gap is emerging, with
higher subjective well-being for men, replacing the gap of the 1970s when women reported higher subjective well-being than did men.

- Women represent 70 percent of the more than one billion people living in poverty worldwide, with single mothers being particularly exposed to poverty.\textsuperscript{35}
- Often, it is difficult to connect small-scale problems with the failings at large-scale levels, and the situation is further obfuscated when systemic failings are individualized. The slogan “the private is political” has not lost its validity.
- Examples for “the private is political” abound. The roots of most crises are more complex and systemic than one-dimensional and personal. As to the economic crisis, for instance, it would be a mistake to individualize it, thus depriving it of its paradigm shifting potential. Overly risk-happy or fraudulent bankers and naïve consumers, while responsible, do not explain the entirety of the situation. Bank employees are under pressure to maximize profit, and managers report that they lose their jobs if they do not place shareholder value first.
- The strategies of individualization are often very hidden. Many women are not aware of them until they get pregnant. Only at that point, many painfully realize that a responsibility is being individualized that ought to be carried by more shoulders than only hers. As a clinical psychologist, I witnessed this dynamic in many shades and variations. Susanne (the name is anonymized) had been the girlfriend of a Wall Street financier, Jim, who owned several sports cars, a luxury flat, and had her as a trophy companion. He did not wish to get married nor have children. When she got pregnant, he explained to her that she was free to do what she wanted with the child, abort it, have it, and care for it, but she should refrain from bothering him. They had had lots of fun together, he explained her, and she knew he did not want children—the accounts where settled and he owed her nothing. She was shocked. She accused him of never having been open to her about that. He, on his side, insisted that she should have known. In other words, when his girl friend got pregnant, Jim failed to make the transition from what Alan Page Fiske calls equality matching to communal sharing.\textsuperscript{36} This is not to say that men should always say yes to children, or that it is morally acceptable for women to trick men into commitment by having children. The point is that communities endanger their own survival when they permit a cultural atmosphere to become dominant that pushes for narrow immediate self-interest. The term commitment phobia encapsulates the core failing of a strategy that gives primacy to narrowly defined self-interest.
- Commitment phobia, at the level of community and culture, is the failure to commit to human family’s shared responsibility for its common interest.

The Present Transition and Its Markers

At the present point in time, humankind lives through a deep historical transition. It is the transition from a traditional collectivist culture of ranked honor or the “dominator model” (Eisler), which was prevalent in almost all world regions throughout the past ten millennia, to a culture of human rights with its emphasis on unranked equal dignity for each individual, or what Eisler calls the “partnership model.
Many markers highlight this transition both synchronically and diachronically. Let me report on some of those markers, particularly on those that relate to the topic of gender.

- Admittedly, nowhere do women still bind their daughters’ feet to turn them into humble eligible brides. However, veiling women and confining them to the house may hurt them no less. And even in the most privileged Western setting, women still struggle, even if only with bound psyches. Jane Fonda, in her speech at the National Women’s Leadership Summit in Washington D.C., on December 2, 2003, said:

Before I turned sixty I thought I was a feminist. I was in a way, I worked to register women to vote, I supported women getting elected. I brought gender issues into my movie roles, I encouraged women to get strong and healthy, I read the books we’ve all read. I had it in my head and partly in my heart, yet I didn’t fully get it. See, although I’ve always been financially independent, and professionally and socially successful, behind the closed doors of my personal life I was still turning myself in a pretzel so I’d be loved by an alpha male. I thought if I didn’t become whatever he wanted me to be, I’d be alone, and then, I wouldn’t exist.37

- Through my work and biographical background, I am particularly familiar (among others) with Egypt, Germany, and Norway, countries at the bottom, the middle, and the top of the Gender-related Development Index (GDI).38 I was born and grew up in Germany, I worked as a clinical psychologist in Cairo, Egypt, for seven years, and Norway provides one of the strongest platforms for my life and work since several decades. In the course of my involvement, I gained deep insight into the details of the differences measured by the GDI, how these differences are expressed in many walks of life, and how they illustrate the transition from ranked honor to equal dignity.

- Egypt is located toward the bottom of the GDI of 2007/2008, on place 112 out of 177. This rather weak position is being expressed in many facts of life and the attitudes that support them. For instance, eighty six per cent of Egyptian women surveyed in 1995 thought that husbands are justified in hitting their wives at certain occasions.39

- Germany finds itself on place 22 of the GDI of 2007/2008, and at the bottom of the European Union with respect to equal pay for men and women (it takes the third place from the bottom of 27 EU members; the salary gap between men and women who perform the same jobs is only worse in Estonia and Cyprus).40 Women in Germany earn nearly a quarter less than men, compared to an average of 17.4 percent across Europe. (In some EU member states the gap is currently widening rather than closing, and the European Commission has launched a campaign to raise public awareness of the gender pay gap and to explain how it can be tackled.41)

- Norway takes the second place on the GDI of 2007/2008, after Iceland. According to the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Report 2008, Norway even takes the first place.42 Norway was a country of scarcity until oil was found. It has a proud Viking tradition of mobility. Unlike Somalia, where this culture’s inherent pride destroys its very fabric, Norwegians have also learned the value of humility (also many Somali women exhibit a similar mixture of pride and humility). This gives Norwegian culture a unique position in the world. Its past has equipped it with assets that the rest of the world may be interested in drawing on in times when the security dilemma weakens and space opens up for a new world culture of liberté, égalité, and

© Evelin Lindner, 2009
fraternité. The Nobel Peace Prize is well based in Norway. Norwegian women therefore have a significant advantage. They have less of a subaltern mind to undo than women in other parts of the world. Their souls and minds have not been cowed to the degree this happened elsewhere. And, not surprisingly, Norwegian women have the courage to implement laws that are still unthinkable in other countries. In 2004, Norwegian women pressed for a law that stipulated that women had to fill 40 percent of the country’s corporate board seats by 2008. "The Rise of the Valkyries," is the evocative title of an article in the international press that summarizes the Norwegian experience as it stood by November 2008.

- Female subservience and male dominance are not innate. Female lack of pride and male lack of humility are learned. They can thus be unlearned. Today, in the wake of the coming-together of humankind, space opens for more peaceful societies of more gender equity and less authoritarian hierarchy, societies that are more suitable to drive present transition efforts. Today, space opens for men to reject their stereotypical "masculine" roles—they can, for instance, redefine fathering in the more caring and nurturing way once stereotypically associated only with mothering (Eisler). Space opens also for women to become more visible and develop their potential for being leaders and innovators. More even, women can be called on to use the wisdom that is entailed in traditional female role templates, for instance their emphasis on nurturing and balancing, to define leadership and innovation in new and more holistic ways.

- To make use of the space that opens and dignify the world, women and men need to learn how to combine pride and humility. To use the traffic metaphor, they must be proud and courageous enough to create traffic regulations that serve the common good of a global community, and then humble enough to stop in front of red lights and only proceed when the light is green. Subalterns risk failing on the side of pride and courage, while supremacists tend to implement traffic regulations that give them green light by default.

The following paragraphs present concrete examples to illustrate how both women and the female role description have recently risen to the fore. Myriad of transitions currently unfold all around the world:

- On December 2, 2008, I enjoyed the opera Tristan und Isolde by Richard Wagner at the Metropolitan Opera in New York. I usually take an inexpensive seat under the roof, and sit there through the pause, reading the program:

  It is no wonder that a fanatic international cult of sensuality grew up around Tristan und Isolde, coloring a generation of Western thought, even while a late-Victorian society was clinging to sexual repression in hopes of preserving an order that the new spirit of liberation was ripping apart. With Tristan, the world turned a corner that brought the future into direct view: the psychology of Freud, the French slide from hyper-realism into surrealism, the sex-driven women of Ibsen and Strindberg, and the atonality of Schoenberg. Nothing has been quite the same since.

- Ashis Nandy, social, cultural and political critic born in Bengal, tells the story of satī, where a recently-widowed woman would immolate herself on her husband’s funeral pyre. Satī has now been outlawed.
The World on a Trajectory from Humiliation to Dignity: A List of “Factoids”

- The practice called vani in Pakistan, a tribal custom in which blood feuds are settled with forced marriages, was made illegal in 2005.
- Honor killing, usually the killing of a girl who brought “shame” upon the family to protect family honor from humiliation, until recently accepted as cultural tradition, is increasingly being seen as a violation that compounds humiliation rather than remedying it. Syria has just scrapped a law that limits the length of sentences handed down to men convicted of killing female relatives they suspect of having had illicit sex.
- Domestic chastisement, once a duty, currently transmutes into domestic violence in many cultural contexts.
- Divorce rates in Indonesia have risen dramatically over the past decade. Women want love, not oppression.
- In the past, women, since they were not part of the public sphere, were not given visibility even if they performed acts that would have merited public attention. At present, this is in the process of changing. Ever more female leaders, formerly obfuscated by a male focus, are being lifted into visibility. The trend of bringing women from inside out into the limelight currently makes possible the publications of a large body of literature, from which I have drawn much inspiration. Virginia Woolf and Eleanor Roosevelt are two early iconic names. A recent article in the Journal of International Women’s Studies documents the contribution of three Young Women’s Christian Association (YMCA) leaders who chaired the non-governmental organization forum planning committees during the UN Decade for Women (1975-1985). I was impressed, to give just one other example, when meeting Hilary N. Summy in Brisbane and reading her book on peace activist Margaret Thorp (1892–1978). Earlier examples point at women who were public figures through presenting themselves as males, because, usually, throughout the past 10,000 years, until very recently, women could become leaders in the public sphere only if they filled the male role template. Remember, for example, Hatchepsut, the fifth pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty of Ancient Egypt (circa 1479–1458 BC), who had power in spite of being a woman. She played the role of a man and let herself be depicted as a male pharaoh. Also Amanitore (c. 50 AD), a Nubian Candace, a queen of the ancient Kushitic Kingdom of Meroë, was a manly warrior queen who led forces in battle. Remember also Queen Nzingha “Queen of Ndongo” (1582–1663). The list is very long.
- In resonance with the transition of the world toward one single global inside sphere that must be policed, soldiering currently acquires ever more more police-like characteristics and more of a social-control character. Women are increasingly accepted as members in the military. Since about 20 years, in Sweden, female and male soldiers even share rooms; Norway is currently following suit.
- Even backlashes signal change. The sudden popularity of figures such as cyborgs, bodybuilders, and vampires, represents an attempt to restore the traditional paternal metaphor in times when it is under threat.
- Similarly, often the first sign of improvement and progress is the call for abuse to be exposed and no longer covered up. Sexism in the military, for instance, is increasingly uncovered nowadays. On March 20, 2009, female war veterans at a Gender panel during the Winter Soldier hearings outside Washington, D.C., decried
institutional sexism in military, and called the sexist power dynamic in the military “the big pink elephant in the room.”

- While I was living in Japan (2004–2007), I followed the struggle to be heard of the so-called “comfort women,” or sex slaves in the Japanese military during World War II, mostly from Korea. Also in the U.S.-Korea relations, military prostitution played a role.

- Another very recent example of past abuse being exposed is that of tyskertøs. A tyskertøs was a Norwegian woman who had fallen in love with the enemy, namely, a soldier of the Germany army that held Norway occupied during World War II from 1940 to 1945. She was cruelly humiliated after the war within her community, and many children born to tyskertøs still feel deeply traumatized until today. The topic is still an extremely sore one. A woman simply did not have the right to put love for a man before her love for her country. An enemy was no fellow human being. Claudia Lenz works at the Center for Interdisciplinary Memory Research in the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities in Essen, Germany. I met her at the Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Norway in 2008. She is among the few who researches the fate of tyskertøs and calls for a liberation of love from politics.

- It is not necessarily women as people who rise to more visibility, but the female role description of care and maintenance. The man Barack Obama, for instance, stands for this script more than Sarah Palin, a woman. What makes Barack Obama’s script so “female” is his emphasis on relationship—listening and dialogue—and housekeeping—creating opportunity in society through good housekeeping rather than competition. And even though Michelle Obama is a home-maker, she combines traditional male and female scripts in more future-oriented ways than Sarah Palin, who is a governor. Sarah Palin resembles the traditional male leader of Realpolitik both with regard to the socio- and biosphere—she is a conventional Real-politician and combines this with a conservative home-maker approach. Michelle Obama, in contrast, brings together future-oriented male and female scripts by emphasizing relationship-building in her human rights advocacy and her homemaking.

- Georgina Beyer is the first transsexual woman in the world to be elected as a member of parliament. In an interview with Michael Peschardt, she explained with great honesty her personal struggle and the extraordinary transformation which took her from being a sex worker in Sydney, having sexual reassignment surgery, to being elected as an MP in what has traditionally been a socially conservative area of New Zealand.

- Riane Eisler’s partner David Loye wrote 3,000 Years of Love, a book that presents their dual-biography and travels to Minoan Crete, Greece, Italy, Germany, and Africa. It is a guide to Eisler and Loye’s work as writers and global activists for women, human rights, civil rights, progressive evolution, and partnership movements. Eisler found evidence of a gender-holistic perspective in contemporary Scandinavian nations as well as in prehistoric, historic, and anthropological data of, for instance, the BaMbuti or Tiruray. Eisler’s data and conclusions dovetail with “Living Well,” a label for a social system that focuses on reciprocity, reciprocity between people, and reciprocity with the Earth that was endorsed on June 5, 2008, when more than one
thousand representatives from indigenous communities across the Americas gathered in Lima, Peru.  

- Not least academic research itself is inscribed into the same transitional processes. Through his work on language, emotions, love, and shame, emotion, researcher Tony Webb highlights how already the language that is being used in the field of emotion research is littered with confusion. The English language turns verbs into nouns, almost as badly as German, he explains: “The result has been described by Illich (1970) as a “commoditization” of language: I don’t education myself, I get an education; I don’t house myself, I get accommodation; I don’t employ myself, I get a job; I lose sight of loving (an activity) as I try to unravel the phenomenon of love as an entity, or as “a feeling” or “an emotion.”  

For Webb, the label “emotion” should be reserved for the cognitive evaluation (based on our past experience and memory of this experience) of how we perceive the situation, including what we think (cognitive), what we do (behavioral), and what we sense in our body and what we feel (affective). “‘Feeling’ might then usefully be reserved for the awareness we have of the affect—the body sensations and body language” he writes. Love, according to Webb, is a composite, as much thought as feeling, therefore a cognate rather than a feeling. Webb calls for making it a norm for culture to teach how to better understand and use emotions, both cognitively and intuitively.

The Role of Humiliation: From Good Versus Evil to Pride and Humility

This section presents some markers that highlight the role played by humiliation throughout the various transitions that punctuated human history. With my colleagues, I am currently building a theory of humiliation that is transcultural and transdisciplinary, entailing elements from anthropology, history, social philosophy, social psychology, sociology, and political science.  

- As reported earlier, hunter-gatherers, prior to 10,000 years ago, enjoyed untouched pristine pride. Roughly 10,000 years ago, a deep transition occurred. Resources were becoming limited and complex agriculturalism emerged, fuelling the security dilemma. Hierarchically structured societies arose. The majority of people became subaltern underlings. They transmuted into tools in the hands of small master elites and were subjected to routine humiliation, or honor humiliation. This kind of humiliation was regarded as legitimate and underlings had to endure it submissively. Only equals within elites were entitled to duel-like responses to defend their honor against humiliation. Subaltern underlings were taught shame and helplessness by overt brute force and/or by covert manipulation.

Article 1 of the of the Human Rights Declaration, contradicts 10,000 years of such moral frames when it states that every human being is born with equal rights and dignity that ought not be humiliated. Human rights introduce a new kind of humiliation, namely, dignity humiliation: when respect for equal dignity fails, this is perceived as illegitimate humiliation. In this way, the historical transition proceeded from a traditional collectivist culture of ranked honor, or the “dominator model” (Eisler), which was prevalent throughout almost all world regions during the past.
10,000 years, to a culture of human rights, which emphasises unranked and equal dignity for each individual, or the “partnership model.”

- The core tipping point of this transition—the shift from ranking human worthiness to unranking it—is marked by a change in the meaning of the word humiliation. In the English language, the connotations of the verbs *to humiliate* and *to humble* parted in 1757, moving into opposite directions. Until that time, the verb *to humiliate* did not signify the violation of dignity. *To humiliate* meant merely *to lower* or *to humble* (“to remind underlings of their due place”), an activity that was widely regarded as prosocial. William Ian Miller, scholar of law with a wide interest in Icelandic sagas, medieval history, social and political theory, emotions, and vices and virtues, explains that “the earliest recorded use of *to humiliate* meaning to mortify or to lower or to depress the dignity or self-respect of someone does not occur until 1757.”

- It is important for human rights defenders to be aware that the increase of feelings of humiliation is among the most notable psychological effects of human rights advocacy. From the perspective of a culture of ranked honor, living in a world of masters and underlings is normal, with masters typically being male and underlings being female. The human rights message squarely opposes this “normality” and redefines the lowliness of underlings. What was normal before, transmutes into a humiliating violation of their dignity.

In other words, as a consequence of the human rights movement, feelings of humiliation become more intense. At present, indeed, millions of people learn to feel humiliated as they become aware of the human rights message. And since feelings of humiliation carry the potential to be translated into acts of violence—they represent the nuclear bomb of the emotions (Lindner)—human rights advocacy must do more than simply elicit those feelings: it must help guide them into Mandela-like constructive systemic change. Hitler engaged in humiliation-entrepreneurship to remedy past national humiliation, and he perpetrated genocide to prevent future humiliation from what he thought was an upcoming World Jewry. Similarly, in Rwanda, the former subalterns, the Hutu (*hutu* signifies “servant”), unleashed genocide on their former Tutsi elite to prevent future humiliation, reminiscent of past humiliation. The white elite in South Africa, in contrast, was not subjected to genocide. On the contrary, the white elite was invited, by Mandela, to participate and contribute to the joint dismantling of Apartheid.

The latter way of translating feelings of humiliation into action must serve as the template for the human rights movement at large, not the first, if it wishes to be true to its message. Anger-entrepreneurship in the name of human rights is not only dangerous, but also profoundly inconsistent with its very core ideals.

- The human rights message introduces two transformations, or one two-tiered transformation: (1) deposing oppressors and (2) dismantling, in addition, oppressive systems and their ways of defining human conduct, including authoritarian behavioral and psychological scripts.

In former times only (1) was carried out, not (2)—underlings rose up, instated themselves in the place of their former dominators, and kept the system in place. Human rights defenders betray and undermine their own mission if they follow this script and translate feelings of humiliation into nothing but tit-for-tat humiliation-entrepreneurship (1), while failing to walk their talk (2). Therefore, it is inherently
inconsistent and self-contradictory to try to force human rights in ways that have humiliating effects.

- In the course of the transition toward the human rights ideal of equality in rights and dignity, what formerly was called “traditional cultural practices” transmute into violations that humiliates and violates dignity. The Indian caste system, for instance, once “respected” as cultural idiosyncrasy, is now condemned as “Indian Apartheid.” Examples abound and some are enumerated above.

- Female genital cutting (FGC), the surgical mutilation of female genital organs, can serve as another example. *Ntanira Na Mugambo*, also known as “circumcision by words,” has been developed in rural areas of Kenya by local and international women’s health organizations. A week-long program of community education about the negative effects of female genital mutilation, culminates in a coming-of-age ceremony for young women. In Senegal, also the *Tostan-UNICEF program* employs a participatory approach based on dialogue to help end female genital cutting, meaning that those who support the practice are not confronted in an alienating way but respectfully invited into a dialogue on new awareness. The Imam of Salémata praises this approach: “The Tostan approach is the best way to proceed, contrary to the approach of the Government which almost created a reaction of resistance and defiance. Dialogue is more effective than force.” Senegal has banned female circumcision in 1998, making it punishable by one to five years in prison. In 2007, also Egypt has announced that it is imposing a complete ban on female circumcision. The Grand Mufti and the head of the Coptic Church declared that female circumcision has no basis in the Koran or in the Bible. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) was adopted in 1979 by the UN General Assembly; consisting of a preamble and thirty articles, it defines what constitutes discrimination against women and sets up an agenda for national action to end such discrimination.

- It is important to note that aggressive cycles of humiliation, when set in motion by individuals or groups, are not perpetrated due to nature but due to culture. Human nature is not aggressive per se, and humans are not naturally inclined to degrade and humiliate others. For instance, there is no archeological evidence for systematic war prior to 10,000 years ago. There is no archeological proof of organized fighting among early hunter-gatherers: “The Hobbesian view of humans in a constant state of ‘Warre’ is simply not supported by the archaeological record.” Systematic warfare has been an inherent part of human culture only throughout the period of complex agriculturalism that only represents the last five percent of human history.

- The human brain “is hard-wired for connections.” During the past ten millennia, the human readiness to connect with fellow humans has been channeled into hierarchical relationships of domination/submission, first into traditional societies of ranked honor and, more recently, into cultures that emphasize the might-is-right philosophy of what I call ruthless individualism. In such contexts, humbling and humiliating inferiors is regarded as a prosocial tool that subalterns have to endure quietly (honor humiliation). In a culture of human rights, in contrast, lack of respect for equal dignity is seen as an antisocial violation, and the hard-wired human readiness for connection finds space to be translated into relationships defined by mutuality. Feelings of humiliation arise when respect for equal dignity is failing (dignity humiliation).
• New research on mirror neurons offers important insights. Mirror neurons are significant in many ways, among others for the evolution of social cohesion, empathy, and learning. Social emotions like guilt, shame, pride, embarrassment, disgust, or also lust are based on a uniquely human mirror neuron system found in a part of the brain called the insula. Neuroscientist Vilayanur Ramachandran gives mirror neurons credit for causing the big bang of human development. Mirror neurons allow for imitation, for reading others’ intentions and thereby learning from each other. “Mirror neurons will do for psychology what DNA did for biology… They will provide a unifying framework and help explain a host of mental abilities that have hitherto remained mysterious and inaccessible to experiments.” While many researchers believe that Ramachandran may go too far with his claims, ever more researchers begin to investigate their potential. Mirror neurons “are a mechanism of connecting me with you, one person with another, and therefore may play a vital role in communication and social interaction,” explains cognitive neuroscientist Sarah-Jayne Blakemore. The human ability to mirror the actions of others, may even have caused hominids branching off from apes. Monkeys and apes also have mirror neurons but, so claim the theories, the humanoid brain capitalized on them in ways that allowed them to move beyond simple imitation to more complex imitation, and that this in turn stimulated language formation, music, art, tool-making and even empathy. Indeed, mirror neurons make the learning of culture and empathy through imitation possible. Mirror neurons process social pain like physical pain. Studies carried out by neuroscientist António Rosa Damásio and his colleagues show that even though witnessing another person’s physical pain registers more quickly in the brain than compassion for social or psychological pain, the latter leaves a longer-lasting impression.

With respect to humiliation, research on mirror neurons suggests that one can feel as humiliated on behalf of a victim of humiliation one identifies with, as if one were to suffer this victim’s pain oneself. And this phenomenon is magnified when media give access to the suffering of people in far-flung places. Through modern media, feelings of humiliation can be felt by people far away from the location where these feelings were first elicited. These feelings can then be translated into acts of violence, acts that would be unintelligible without knowledge of the strength of empathy. Young men in London, for instance, have prepared to become suicide bombers in far away Middle East. Until his imprisonment in 2004, in front of north London’s Finsbury Park mosque, cleric Abu Hamza al- Masri preached the message of honorable death in response to humiliation. He thus capitalized on the capacity of mirror neurons to express empathy and then channeled this empathy into a narrative of humiliation that supposedly “required” violent responses. The first British citizens to become suicide bombers were Asif Hanif and Omar Sharif. These two young men had lived most of their lives far removed from the Middle East. On April 30, 2003, 21 years old Asif Hanif blew himself up outside the Mike’s Place pub on the Tel Aviv promenade, killing three people and injuring 55. With him was Omar Sharif, 27, who ran away after his bomb belt failed to detonate. Research on mirror neurons is thus important for the field of humiliation studies and connects it with themes such as global terrorism and the regional and global diffusion of ideas.
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of insecurity.⁹⁶

The New Approaches That Are Called for

This section looks at the future. It explains why ideas need to be developed for how the human condition may be organized in novel and innovative ways in the future, so as to ensure long-term social and ecological sustainability.

The Need for Systemic Change⁹⁷

The historical situation of humankind, as it presents itself at the current point in time, could be summarized, in a starkly simplified form, as follows: After the demise of the Soviet Block, we now witness the demise of the West as it was known. The Soviet Block abused the idea of communism for oppression, while the West abused the idea of freedom. Also freedom, if understood as might is right, entails the potential to lead to oppressive outcomes. In both cases, citizens were co-opted into supporting their own oppression. In the case of communism, submission was achieved through the promise that self-effacing uniformity would lead to material and psychological well-being for all. In the case of the West, submission was attained with the promise that self-enhancing difference—operationalized by the primacy of the profit motive (Adam Smith’s invisible hand⁹⁸)—would provide material and psychological well-being to all. In both cases, ruling elites succeeded in securing the support of broad masses. In both systems, they defended their power with power-over strategies informed by traditional honor codes, even though they no longer applied the brute and overt oppression known from past history but depicted domination as caring patronage informed by Enlightenment values and human rights. In other words, elites have learned to acknowledge the role of underlings as potential supporters of their domination, while in former times, the broad masses were regarded to be so inferior that they were not worth being spoken to, let alone convinced or co-opted.

At the present point in time, the next step in the paradigm shift informed by Enlightenment values and human rights needs to be embarked upon: not only are subalterns valuable as co-opted inferiors, they are worth more, they are worth receiving space to be true equals. Enlightenment values and human rights ideals can and should no longer serve as rhetorical shield for covert domination.

The reason for why a next step is necessary at the current point in time, is not only moral one, but also a very pragmatic one. Global interdependence represents the ultimate deterrent for power-over strategies. Nobody can win durable “victories” over others in an interdependent world, everybody is vulnerable. Global interdependence also represents the ultimate deterrent to the idea that in a world that depends on ecological homeostasis, the maximization of single elements (for instance, profit), is feasible. In this situation, profound transformation is called for, tinkering with symptoms is insufficient. Systemic change is overdue, locally, but, particularly, globally.⁹⁹

This call dovetails with the message of peace psychology. Daniel J. Christie lays out the contemporary scope of peace psychology: “In particular, three themes are emerging in
post-Cold War peace psychology: (1) greater sensitivity to geohistorical context, (2) a more differentiated perspective on the meanings and types of violence and peace, and (3) a systems view of the nature of violence and peace.\textsuperscript{100}

What is needed is a panoply of new strategies. To briefly enumerate, as new philosophical foundation, the nondualistic principle of \textit{unity in diversity} presents itself as helpful if deep change is to be achieved, no longer oppressive \textit{uniformity}, nor unrestricted freedom for \textit{difference},\textsuperscript{101} thus capitalizing on the lesson from past hyperpowers, namely that the inclusivity of “tolerance” is a superior strategy.\textsuperscript{102} As to core guidelines and definitions, \textit{interest} rather than \textit{position}, and \textit{output} rather than \textit{input} must be foregrounded.\textsuperscript{103} As to cultural and social practices and institutions, \textit{communal sharing} needs to be given priority.\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Subsidiarity} is the suitable guideline for forging complex syntheses that can express unity in diversity—the European Union uses the \textit{subsidiarity principle}.\textsuperscript{105} For instance, a subsidiarity approach can help combine communal sharing with elements of market economy into new layers of local and global institutions. To bring about these changes and grasp the opportunities that typically are entailed in crisis, \textit{women and men} are called on to recalibrate their contributions to society.\textsuperscript{106}

\textbf{Discarding Old Dichotomies}

Global crises call for new frames for local and global cultures, frames which give preeminence to optimizing and maintaining homeostatic balances rather than maximizing singular elements such as narrowly defined self-interest or profit.

Jean Baker Miller calls for the creation of alternative arrangements rather than accepting false choices.\textsuperscript{107} Riane Eisler asks for new social categories that go beyond conventional dichotomies such as religious versus secular, right versus left, capitalist versus communist, Eastern versus Western, or industrial versus pre- or post-industrial. Other dichotomies can join this list of false choices: realism versus idealism, hatred versus love, altruism versus egoism, self-interest versus common interest, collectivist versus individualist, big versus small government, visible hand versus invisible hand,\textsuperscript{108} private versus the state, isolationist versus internationalism, globalization versus localization\textsuperscript{109} and so forth.

All these dichotomies must be embedded into complex layers rather than pitted against each other. Subsidiarity has been mentioned above as the suitable guideline for forging complex syntheses that can express unity in diversity. For instance, communal sharing can be combined with elements of market economy into new layers of local and global institutions. The same goal, namely that of replacing dichotomies with layers, is achieved by conceptualizing holons and holarchies,\textsuperscript{110} or regulatory pyramids,\textsuperscript{111} as well as by using the Weberian ideal-type approach to analysis\textsuperscript{112} and the reflective equilibrium as epistemological frame.\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{Emancipation from Bondage}

In Rome, \textit{pater familias} had the power to kill or sell into slavery those he had “under his hand,” \textit{sub manu}. \textit{Emancipation} is the deliverance out of the hand of \textit{pater familias}.\textsuperscript{114}
In Norway, at the top of the Gender-related Development Index (GDI), emancipation is a rather neutral and descriptive word, also in the gender context.

In Germany, which holds place 22 on the 2007/8 GDI, in contrast, the word is often used derogatively. “Germany’s Failed Emancipation” is the title of an article that illustrates the situation. A woman who tries to gain emancipation is “eine Emanze,” a woman, who betrays her womanly essence and duties in exchange for selfish Selbstverwirklichung (“realization of her potential as an individual”). “Eine Emanze” is a disparaging label few women in Germany carry with pride. Wherever I turn, and I try to spend some time in Germany every year, German women begin a discourse about her wish to become more visible in the public realm and have a better work-life balance, with a placating “first I want to declare that I am not eine Emanze!” A minority of German women would find it flattering to be compared with Alice Schwarzer, the most prominent contemporary German feminist, who is being perceived by many to be too aggressive and off-putting. As a result, those, who openly identify with feminism in Germany, often do not appear relaxed, but rather somewhat tense, displaying a provocative edginess carved into their body language. This edginess seems to disseminate the somewhat defensive message of “I know you don’t like me, but don’t even think you can intimidate me.” The mainstream middle class women I meet in well-established German neighborhoods, in contrast, have yet to understand that it is not a personal vice to want to realize your potential. They still inscribe gender into the realm of individual choice or decision. They say to me: “Since my husband earned more money when our children were born, it was my free decision to become a housewife.” They do not see that society at large may need to create a context where both men and women are enabled to contribute with their potential to their communities in general.

In other words, in line with their place at the top of the GDI, in Norway, the topic of the emancipation of women is handled in a much more relaxed and straightforward way, while there is a deep division in Germany, with bitterness and hostility on one side, and a placating “Ich bin keine Emanze!” on the other.

In France, another culture that I often experience when in Europe, the situation is slightly different. France recently came down from place 7 on the GDI in 2005 to place 10 in 2007/8, but is still recognized for making it possible for women to combine career and home. What is different in France, compared to elsewhere, is that sex plays an particularly interesting role. Sex is less taboo and handled with more ease in the public sphere—cinq à sept is a phrase that could not be understood in many other cultures: “In the days of Maupassant, mustaches and mistresses, the affluent Frenchman could not do without his cinq a sept—the 5-to-7 p.m. evening liaison with his paramour. Then he dashed home for a 7:30 dinner with his wife.” France is the home of the historically most recent elite culture, the court of Versailles, which is still the blueprint for many status-conscious cultural expressions around the world—”international hotels” usually imitate Versailles, wealthy Chinese as much as rich Americans build French style chateaus also nowadays, and not without reason is haute couture a French phrase. Refined sexuality is part of this haute culture.

Women from Norway, with its rather egalitarian traditional background, are decades ahead of the rest of the world, while emancipation is much more difficult to achieve for French women, whose participation in turning their bodies into decorative images is part of an elite culture that otherwise gives high status. Unsurprisingly, French women, in
spite of being the slimmest in Europe, are the least satisfied with their weight and body (they are under an intense pressure from their men to be slim, in contrast to the British women in the survey, who have the highest body mass index (BMI) in Europe, but are the ones most satisfied with their bodies\textsuperscript{126}). Also women in traditionally hierarchical societies such as Germany have a longer distance to cover, even though they are all part of Western culture. Women in traditional honor cultures, particularly where poverty prevails and education lacks, even if they may enjoy the social cohesion and warmth that these cultures sometimes provide, often pay with being mutilated psychologically and often also physically if they dare to think of emancipation.

Due to the starkness of the situation in honor societies, only very courageous people become defenders of human rights, including women’s rights. The ones I met, often had strong support from their fathers, who gave them the courage and confidence to take their lives into their own hands and supported them in doing so. Nawal el-Sadaawi in Egypt, or Edna Adan in Somalia, to name just two of those extraordinary women, both had strong support from their fathers. In their case, pater familias no longer held his daughter sub manu so to speak, but removed his hands from the top of her head to place them under her to lift her up, nurture and enable her.

The last paragraph highlights how emancipation is not only for women. It is equally for men. Morton Deutsch points out the advantages of leaving the distorted selves of the past behind—dominators must withdraw from processes of domination and re-own and resolve their feelings of vulnerability, guilt, self-hatred, rage and terror, and undo the projection of these feelings onto the oppressed, while, so Morton Deutsch expounds, “psychologists, in their roles as psychotherapists, marriage counselors, organizational consultants, and educators have a role to play in demystifying the psychological processes involved in the dominators. So too… do the oppressed, by not accepting their distorted roles in the distorted relationship of the oppressor and the oppressed.”\textsuperscript{121f}

In this way, men profit from emancipation as much as women, both with respect to their own malehood, but also with respect to their women’s femalehood. As the examples of Edna Adan and Nawal el-Sadaawi illustrate, fathers carry a particular responsibility. If they give their daughters the same support that traditionally is conferred on sons, they can give their daughters a tremendous gift. My own father belongs in this list and, even though he will never be able to read this paper, he deserves special appreciation and recognition here. Women and men, mothers and fathers, together, must bring about emancipation. Women and men must emancipate themselves and each other.

Respecting the Individual, Rejecting the Culture\textsuperscript{122}

In order to own the historical transition of our time, we need emancipation also from misunderstanding human rights. Human rights defenders believe that cultural differences ought to be respected. But where does cultural differences come from?

Not all cultural differences are benign, some are toxic. What is toxic for underlings is often painted as beneficial by their superiors. Chinese women, for example, endured the toxicity of the practice of foot binding for one thousand years, because it was regarded as beneficial in the context of hierarchical patriarchal society.
Philosopher, sociologist, and social anthropologist Ernest André Gellner (1925–1995) in his book *Nations and Nationalism*, argues that culture can be a tactic, an instrument, rather than a primary cause. According to Gellner, the social chasms of early industrialism brought national cultures and nationalism to the fore. The way to address such conflicts, says Gellner, is to focus not on the culture, but on the socioeconomic circumstances that gave rise to it. Political scientist, sociologist and social anthropologist Liah Greenfeld uses the example of Ethiopia and Eritrea and suggests that resentment plays a central role in nation building. Also philosopher and historian of ideas Isaiah Berlin argues that nationalism often is motivated by some form of collective humiliation.

Indeed, intricate configurations of oppressors and victims unfold in front of the eyes of third party observers of “other cultures.” Women may be the victims of oppression perpetrated by their families, who are victims of oppression perpetrated by their national rulers, who are victims of oppression perpetrated by other states. Many victims will claim to have a different culture from their oppressors and ask third parties to recognize and respect *our* culture, while the oppressors will vehemently urge third parties to keep quiet and not interfere in what they regard as *our* culture.

Let me share a story that illustrates my point.

Orakwue Arinze, a spokesman for the Nigerian National Agency for Prohibition of Traffic in Persons (NAPTIP), told the BBC that vulnerable girls between the ages of 12 and 18 were being targeted in Nigeria. “Some of the victims of broken families... Some of them come from communities who have branded them as witches,” he said. “So they have been thrown out of their homes and abandoned by their families.” Mr. Arinze said the girls were promised a new life in Europe and told that they would easily get a well-paid job or get married. Before they left home, the traffickers forced the girls to swear an oath, he added. “The girl is taken to a shrine or a cemetery in the middle of the night, her finger nails are cut off, her pubic hair is shaved, a menstrual pad containing her blood is taken away, and then a piece of her clothing is removed,” he said. “These are deposited in a shrine with wicked incantations that this girl should die and her family be wiped out in the event that she runs away or [exposes] these criminal practices,” he added. Mr. Arinze said that such was the strength of the girls’ belief in the oath, that even if they were presented with the opportunity to escape from prostitution once in Europe, hardly any would dare. “These girls sleep with as many as 30 men a day because when they get to the destination countries, the madams make them understand... that the earlier she pays back the money, the better for her.”

“Respecting” these girls’ belief system and “accepting” their loyalty to it, would simply be identical with humiliating them. Freeing them, even from their own belief system, is the only expression of true respect. This message is valid for cultural differences within nations, between men and women (*Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus* was the title of a book that focused on cultural gender scripts), between the generations, and—very importantly, since it is much more difficult to differentiate—also between different voices within one’s own psyche.
Forging a Sunflower Identity

*Who Am I - and If Yes, How Many?* is an evocative book title by essayist Richard David Precht that illustrates the multitude of voices that may speak in a self.

Also the self-concept or self identity benefits from being built according to the principle of subsidiarity. The image of a sunflower offers an illustration for how the different voices and aspects of a person’s identity can be constructed in ways that respect its unity in diversity through subsidiarity, and how this means creating layers. Through layering, the inner identity structure can both be stabilized and brought to scale with the challenges of the world.

Let me take my own identity as an example. The core of the sunflower that describes my identity represents my essence as a human being. Three layers of petals illustrate various secondary layers of identification: my fond connections to (1) the people I love, including my love for humanity in general, to (2) all benign cultural practices around the world that I cherish, and to (3) all those geographical places around the world that give me joy.

As soon as differences have been recognized, they can be ranked with respect to their scope. In that way, a sunflower identity allows for de-emphasizing toxic practices and beliefs without disrespecting the core of humanity, both one’s own and that of others. Practices such as foot binding, honor killing or female genital mutilation, for instance, are better left behind, however, not with spite but respectfully. Through using a sunflower identity, it is possible, for example, to reject one’s mother’s beliefs in female subservience without disrespecting her, both when speaking with her, but, even more importantly, when conversing with the inner voice within one’s own psyche that represents the mother.

Humankind needs to reach a new level of consciousness, *unity consciousness*, if it wishes to build more constructive institutional frames, which, in turn, can stimulate new consciousness at a systems level. Also here a sunflower identity can be of help. The new consciousness that is needed, in every human being, means linking up with our core experience of our shared humanity, without letting secondary layers impede this experience.

Reaching a new level of consciousness requires an existential ontological shift, or a “spontaneous recognition” as taught by the Pratyabhijña school in Kashmir. Zen master Dennis Genpo Merzel calls it the shift to “big mind and big heart.” He explains how this can be brought about without rigidifying in ever new “paths,” and without misappropriating it for reifying or aggrandizing one’s own limited egocentricity (what Carl Jung calls “psychic inflation”). Also Harold W. Becker, the founder of The Love Foundation, underlines the importance of an innate awareness of the oneness of all of us.

In the metaphor of the sunflower, the ontological shift that humankind needs to embark on can be described as foregrounding the core, and relegating the periphery to a secondary place, thus giving primacy to unity and embedding diversity into it. This does not mean undermining or negating the importance of diversity—on the contrary, diversity needs to be celebrated and protected—it means protecting unity from division.
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Embracing Humility

When the norms of human rights prevail, the wounds that were caused by humiliation may be healed by humility if it is shared, inclusive, and embedded in relationships that respect each other’s strengths and accept each other’s weaknesses. That may sound unduly optimistic, but Nelson Mandela was able to unite South Africa, one of the most bitterly divided nations on Earth, by the example of his own humility and humanity towards his vanquished enemies.

Humility is sometimes avoided due to shame. A person with an ego orientation, for instance, may be caught in shame when failing a task or a role script, and may choose to bypass this shame rather than acknowledge it. For scholar of the sociology of emotions Thomas J. Scheff, bypassed shame—shame that is not acknowledged—is the motor of all violence and the source of humiliated fury (a term coined by psychologist Helen Block Lewis). Shame is a powerful and prevalent emotion. In Western culture, it is often regarded as a pathogenic emotion. In Asian cultures, this is different. Even though shame in Chinese culture is an emotion of disgrace, as in most cultures, it is also a moral discretion and sensibility that people desire to develop. Shame and guilt shade into each other in Asia. Both emotions “direct people into self-examination in social situations in order to recognize their own wrong doings, as well as to motivate people to improve themselves.”

In other words, shame can be directed to positive and negative ends. The ability to feel shame and humiliation is not just something to be avoided, but represents an asset that society needs for conscientization, and the creation and maintenance of cooperative societies, or what in Asia is called a harmony, and in Europe social cohesion.

To conclude, in traditional honor societies, the practice of saving face typically serves domination, submission, or, in the best case, covert resistance to domination. Human rights advocate a salutogenic view of shame rather than pathogenic view, with shame and face saving informing humility and serving the ideal of equality in dignity rather than submission/domination.

What is needed, is a Moratorium on Humiliation, and an Endorsement of Humility, both with respect to how people treat other people, and how humans treat their biosphere.

Tapping the Power of Love

The story of Paul Rusesabagina demonstrates the force of a loving approach to humanity. Paul Rusesabagina became known to the world through the film Hotel Rwanda. He managed to shelter more than 1,200 Tutsi and moderate Hutu while killers raged outside his hotel with machetes. On May 24, 2007, in an interview, he explained his strategy: He would find what he called the “soft spot” in perpetrators. “Nobody is totally good or totally evil,” he said. In the interview, he describes one particular situation where his approach became live-saving: He once traveled from his house to the hotel, together with his family and a group of people who had sought refuge in his home. At a road block, he was stopped, given a gun, and ordered to kill his family and all others in his following, before to be killed himself. He looked into the eyes of the
man who gave these orders, while this man went about overseeing the killing of other victims at the roadblock. Rusesabagina looked at the killer and kept up his gaze for a long while, something like five minutes, very calmly, only briefly explaining that he was not able to handle a gun. He noticed how the killer could not stand his gaze. It seemed that Rusesabagina was touching something in the killer. The result was that Rusesabagina, together his family and friends, was allowed to leave without anybody being killed.

Philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas (1906–1995) worked on dialogue and caring. Lévinas’s first magnum opus, *Totality and Infinity* analyzes the face-to-face relationship with the other, the fellow human being. Lévinas characterized most of philosophy as “egology” and argued, instead, for “love of wisdom,” and “wisdom of love.” For Lévinas the “space of love” is the space of ambivalence(s), the space of otherness(es). To be ethical, one must be willing to enter this space. Communication is more than the exchange of information, it is the very vulnerability of myself that I bring.

The past 10,000 years saw a fragmented world being caught in a win-lose frame and security dilemma that forced everybody into cynical and dehumanizing Manichaean dualism. Love was instrumentalized by labeling it as a feeling opposite to hatred, and superiors coerced their subalterns to extend devoted love and fearful hatred “spontaneously” to the “correct” targets: superiors had to be venerated, in-group members were to be regarded as friends, while out-group members were potential or actual enemies. Religion was called on to legitimize such practices. Humiliating underlings was not yet defined as illegitimate violation. During the contemporary transition toward human rights, such traditional scripts are increasingly regarded as obscene violations. Space opens for loving I-Thou relationships of equal dignity. Our vision for the future is one of win-win frames and nondualistic unity in diversity in a globally united community, where cynical dehumanization is opposed, love freed as authentic self-chosen feeling, and relational skills taught that nurture and protect it.

Near-death experiences can produce significant leaps in consciousness—the neuroanatomist Jill B. Taylor, for example, attained deep change in her outlook on life and the world through a brain injury. What is needed today is the deep transformation that near-death experiences can cause in individuals, this time for all of humankind.

Teacher and theorist W. Barnett Pearce wrote a paper entitled “Serenity in the time of polysemy.” He begins this paper as follows: “My title alludes to Gabriel Garcia Marquez’ novel, *Love in the Time of Cholera.* Like the novel, it is intended to evoke a sense of the frictions between stability and change; permanence and decay; and life and death. Is it possible to pledge “undying love” while in a mortal body subject to lethal disease spread by acts of love? What is the shape of “honor” in a world of shifting allegiances and perceptions?”

**Going Far Enough**

The relational theory model (RTM) that was introduced by anthropologist Alan Page Fiske, postulates four elementary and universal forms of social relations: (1) Communal sharing (CS) means that people regard each other as “all the same.” This is how family members often treat each other. (2) Authority ranking (AR) involves asymmetry among people who are linearly ordered along hierarchical social dimensions.
(3) Equality matching (EM) implies a model of balance as in turn taking. Examples would be car pools or a babysitting cooperative. (4) Market pricing (MP) builds on a model of proportionality, and relationships are organized with respect to ratios and rates.

In traditional collectivist ranked honor societies, authority ranking is dominant and typically entails overt oppression which maintains a gradient between elites and underlings. Commitment means subservience to one’s masters, either grudgingly, or through penetration—penetration meaning the “implanting the topdog inside the underdog.” Subalterns identify with their oppressors by alleviating cognitive dissonance through adopting their masters’ belief system rather than merely adapting to it pragmatically.

Throughout the past millennia, domination was achieved overtly, often through brute oppression. Yet, over time, domination was achieved more covertly. In recent centuries, particularly throughout the past decades of ruthless individualism, the top-down power gradient was maintained (and the wealth gap even widened) by unfettered market pricing (MP). In other words, penetration was achieved through covert manipulation, through advocating a might-is-right worldview, or, even more covertly, through instilling confidence in Adam Smith’s invisible hand and its ability to bring about equitable distributions of wealth. During the past decades, in all contexts where profit maximization was given priority, politically, culturally, and morally, it became acceptable or even one’s duty, to commit to the ruthless individualism of maximization of narrow self-interest.

At the current point in history, a more responsible individualism is called for. This means committing to mutuality and respect for equal dignity rather than committing to overt or covert submission/domination. For responsible individualism to become Zeitgeist, the maintenance template entailed in communal sharing and in the female role script offers itself for emulation. This template merits being elevated to serve as leading paradigm. Authority ranking is best be relegated to a supportive role. The appropriate place for market pricing and equality matching is as special sub-cases in this context—market pricing only works constructively when embedded into global communal sharing, with equality matching as a special case of market pricing.

The template of communal sharing entails an element of care, which merits particular attention. In the course of the past decades, care and nurturing has been devalued in accordance with process of market pricing taking over. The element of care survived only in pockets, for instance, in families, in some segments of traditional collectivist societies, or in the expectations of migrants and refugees, namely, that they ought to be taken care of.

In the course of my international life, for instance, I have often been approached as a caretaking patron who should facilitate, for instance, scholarships in Western countries. In her article “Asylum Seekers / Patron Seekers,” the anthropologist Diane E. King demonstrates how patronage and clientage constitute an interpretive frame for migration by Kurdish people. Kurdish migrants look to the West and Westerners as potential patrons and are encouraged to migrate by their conceptualizations of patronage and clientage roles. Kurdish experiences of patron-client relationships (mostly in the form of clientage) influence their normative ideas about migration and resettlement processes. Participants in the Iraqi Kurdish body politic define themselves as clients and formulate the norms of the migration process by drawing on their experience as a part of a
hierarchical society structured “primordially,” encompassing a variety of roles ranging from household to tribe to state.

The caring element in the communal sharing template currently moves into the limelight and is taken more seriously, however, it needs to be prioritized more, and more systemically. The global village is acquiring a life of its own, beyond McLuhan’s initial connotations, but this process needs to be guided proactively.

Not Going Too Far

Traditional collectivist honor culture entails all of Fiske’s four elementary forms of human relations. Protest movements risk going too far when they discard the useful aspects entailed in these four forms in their wish to leave behind their oppressive elements. All four elementary forms of human relations entail elements that merit being held onto and nurtured. People, for instance, who, by trying to escape oppression, also avoid human relationships and love, go too far. The Wall Street financier introduced earlier, who eschews the burden of having a family, goes too far. “Wer zweimal mit derselben pennt, gehört schon zum Establishment” (“having sex with the same woman more than twice, means being part of the establishment”), a slogan of the student protest movement in Germany also called 68er-Bewegung (movement of 1968), went too far. Commitment phobia merely displaces oppression with anomic, replacing a too-much with a too-little.

During my time as clinical psychologist in Egypt, I learned to appreciate the element of caring and togetherness in traditional collectivist society. Naama (her name is anonymized) came to me as a client, crying. Her sister had gotten married. What made Naama sad was the fact that she now had the room for herself that she used to share with her sister during all her life. She could not bear the thought of having to fall asleep alone at night. From the point of view of Western individualistic culture, she should have rejoiced—finally my own room! As it seems, collectivist culture values togetherness more than Western culture does.

Indeed, while a family is a closely knit unit in a collectivist culture, with separating lines demarcating the borders to whomever they define as out-groups, in Western culture, the separating lines have moved closer to the individual. In Western cultures, each individual effectively forms a separate unit with everybody else as “out-group.” On a beach in Egypt, with only one family having settled down, one typically can guess the cultural background of a newly arriving family: Egyptian families will putting their towels alongside the first family, while Westerners will walk to the other end of the beach in order to be on their own.

For a person embedded into Western culture, the advantages of collectivist culture are often incomprehensible. The following example may help bridge the gap of non-understanding. Swimming with dolphins is a highlight for holiday makers in the Caribbean. It costs more to swim with dolphins than to swim alone. Togetherness is valued higher than aloneness in that case. In contrast, with respect to hotels for tourists, it costs more to be alone. Dormitories are cheap, while having “one’s own room” is more costly. In extension, owning one’s own home is regarded as a high value in Western cultures. What is overlooked is that being alone in one’s own home may carry a high
psychological price. In other words, in the West, the value of possession has successfully trumped the value of togetherness, and the resulting problem, namely loneliness and depression, is individualized, left to psychotherapy and psychopharmacology.\textsuperscript{161}

As a result, during my seven years as a clinical psychologist in Egypt, I never met the degree of anomie and loneliness there that I saw in my European clients. In Egypt, psychological difficulties were mainly connected with malign outfalls of hierarchical social structures. Among my Western clients, in contrast, suffering was often associated with feelings of forlornness, unconnectedness, and feeling insignificant. In other words, the foregrounding of individualism and possession in Western culture goes too far.

Going too far is also the problem of “anti-“ movements, such as anti-capitalism, anti-communism, or anti-establishment. Such movements risk intensifying not only the commoditization of language,\textsuperscript{162} but also inducing unnecessarily polarizing rigidity and malign biases into political, cultural, social and psychological fault lines.\textsuperscript{163}

While clarity of standpoint is important, it can be achieved without fighting “against” and “anti,” without risking the creation of new malignancies. Intercultural research indicates that creativity is enhanced through interactions of mutually contradictory but equally compelling forces.\textsuperscript{164} Disorienting dilemmas, those that unsettle our fundamental beliefs and call our values into question, can bring about transformative learning.\textsuperscript{165} When cultural assumptions are called into question, a “stress-adaptation-growth” process unfolds.\textsuperscript{166}

This paper is written just after the 13th Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies “World Peace through Humiliation-Free Global Human Interactions” in Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2009. This conference was hosted by Dharm P. S. Bhawuk, Professor of Management and Culture and Community Psychology at Shidler College of Business, University of Hawai‘i, Manoa. He addressed related themes in his work.\textsuperscript{167}

The lesson to be learned from intercultural research is that, rather than espousing plain antagonist stances, liberation is achieved more appropriately through transcending antagonisms by inviting complexity into new multilayered syntheses guided by the subsidiarity principle, Weberian ideal-type approaches and the reflective equilibrium.\textsuperscript{168} This reflects also the two-tiered character of the human rights revolution and satisfies nondualistic unity in diversity.\textsuperscript{169}
Assuming Social and Societal Responsibility

Creating a decent community of I-Thou relationships is a social and societal necessity, not just an individual responsibility. Both oppressive authority ranking and exploitative market pricing use human beings as means rather than as ends. They systemically foster what Martin Buber calls I-It relationships rather than I-Thou relationships. In traditional honor societies, for instance, women are exchanged in marriage similar to exchange of commodities, including forced marriages. The victims’ suffering usually stays covert, quiet, and unexpressed, since their pain is not acknowledged as antisocial pain by society, on the contrary, people are expected to quietly accept it. This dynamic pertains also to the current economic structures; they individualize systemic failure by blaming the victim and labeling their pain as a personal self-inflicted problem that can largely be overlooked by society.

This pain rises to the view of the public eye (including to the awareness of the victims themselves) usually only in transitional contexts when victims can escape and find audiences with open ears to hear the story and attest that this pain merits being seen as unjustly inflicted pain. The pain that is accepted as normal in traditional honor societies, for example, can fully emerge and be acknowledged as unjustly inflicted systemic pain only in cultural environments informed by human rights. Women, who escape forced marriages and honor killings can speak up and be heard. In the case of the economy, economic crisis opens space for similar transitions toward new paradigms, which, in turn, then unmask the systemic nature of individual pain and bestow legitimacy to the label “unjustly caused pain.”

Also the case of Josef Fritzl in Austria has illustrated the suffering of victims in social environments of total domination, and how this suffering receives space to rise to public awareness when times change. Fritzl was both a victim and a perpetrator in a culture of brutal subjugation. He was regularly beaten and humiliated by his mother, and later he enslaved his daughter for 24 years. He was sentenced to life on March 19, 2009. He changed his pleas to guilty on all charges after having heard the video-taped witness account of his daughter the day before. During 24 years, he did not grasp the extent of his deeds. He acknowledged the pain of his daughter only when forced to face it by society.

Domestic violence in society at large mirrors Fritzl’s case, only less starkly. It is increasingly unmasked as unjustly inflicted violence in contexts of human rights, rather than dubbed as well-deserved domestic chastisement. Domestic violence is particularly virulent in military families, since the military has its roots in the honor culture that emerged in response to the security dilemma that dominated human history for the past 10,000 years.

It is important that society provides the space for pain to be shared and acknowledged, and that society stimulates the creation of new, less hurtful ways of designing social relations. The pain encapsulated in domestic violence, for example, needs to find an echo in the wider society, an echo that stimulates the emergence of conscientization and social change, rather than being denied, disavowed, or dismissed as individual aberration.

Society will only open space for new paradigms if a critical mass of its citizens demands it. John W. Dower, in his book Embracing Defeat, describes the Japanese struggle for genuine shutaisei—true subjectivity or autonomy at the individual level—to

© Evelin Lindner, 2009
resist the indoctrinating power of the state. Dower documents how Natsume Soseki (1867–1916), one of the premier philosophers and novelists of modern Japan, called for a spirit of individualism vis-à-vis the state. Also the novelist and essayist Sakaguchi Anjo (1906–1955) affirmed the need for genuine shutaisei. For Sakaguchi, each individual needs to create his or her own “samurai ethic,” his or her own “emperor system.”

The call for true subjectivity or autonomy dovetails with John Dewey’s call for critical thinking to make democracy viable. Postconventional moral reasoning is a related concept. Paulo Freire calls for critical consciousness. Elena Mustakova-Possardt, in building on Freire’s work, proposes a life span developmental model of mature critical moral consciousness, achievable by a deepening lifelong integration of moral motivation, agency and critical discernment. Soseki’s call for shutaisei also echoes W. Barnett Pearce’s concept of Robert Kegan’s equilibrium stages, the neo-Kohlbergian postconventional moral reasoning and Ervin Staub’s call to stand up and not by in the face of injustice and atrocities. Staub argues that the significant element in the atrocities perpetrated by Hitler’s Germany was that bystanders stood idly by instead of standing up and getting involved. Emancipation, civil disobedience, Mündigkeit, are related terms. Philosopher Immanuel Kant made maturity (Mündigkeit) a conditio sine qua non of the Enlightenment, which he defined as the emergence from self-imposed immaturity and dependence. One becomes mature in breaking with relations of dependence and in accepting responsibility for one’s own fate. One is oneself responsible for this immaturity if its cause lies, not in a lack of intelligence, but a lack of determination and courage to use one’s own intellect freely and independently, without the direction of another. Kant summed up this idea in the famous Enlightenment slogan: Sapere aude! “Dare to know! Dare to think independently!”

Creating Mutuality and Embedding It into Respect for Equal Dignity

Five core strategies are on offer if one wishes to avoid feeling humiliated in the face of oppression: (1) accepting oppression through apathetic numbness, learned helplessness, wise surrender, or psychological disconnection, (2) incorporating oppression through penetration through adopting oppressive worldviews, incorporating them into Obrigkeitsdenken, (3) replacing the oppressors in revolutions or coups, (4) exiting into flight, emigration, exile, or similar distancing moves, including “inner emigration” into “commitment phobia,” (5) systemic change toward institutions of mutuality in respect for equal dignity.

As to (1), in traditional collectivist honor societies, many underlings, throughout history, have tried to survive oppression by accepting it. In other words, they attempted changing their feelings, rather than changing their circumstances. This strategy has even become hard-wired. Women, for instance, react with a “tend and befriend” reaction to stress, rather than “fight or flight” as their male counterparts. Throughout history, while men were killed, women were often captured alive when communities were invaded and conquered; they may have adapted to this situation by developing the tend-and-befriend reaction to stress. Humor is another effective coping strategy for living with difficult circumstances, humor as individual strategy and humor as part of a culture. Czech Good Soldier Schweik (a figure created by Jaroslav Hasek, 1983-1923), epitomizes
subtle resistance that, in spite of its deep sincerity, is extremely witty. Egyptian humor is similar. It may stem from tackling millennia of oppression, oppression that incepted after Pharaonic greatness succumbed to Greek, Roman, Arab, French and at last British domination. Their humor gives Egyptians their reputation as the “Czechs” of the Middle East. Also specific “slave cultures” have carved out niches of livability for their members.\textsuperscript{190}

Others bought into oppression (2). They identified with their oppressors and developed what is called \textit{Obrigkeitsdenken} in Prussian Germany, or “blind trust in superiors, voluntary submission, and voluntary support for superiors’ orders.” Through Obrigkeitsdenken, inferiors can pretend to participate in their superiors’ superiority\textsuperscript{191} (evidently, this can never surpass a fake sense of superiority, achieved through self-humiliation). Also this strategy means attending to one’s feelings rather than to one’s circumstances.

Victims of oppression also have the option to turn the tables and become oppressors themselves (3). This strategy amounts to changing one’s circumstances to change one’s feelings. During the past millennia, repeatedly, uprisings succeeded in overturning and displacing existing regimes. Many such uprisings began with a call for equality, however, revolutionaries, typically, behaved like their forerunners once they had won. Dictatorial communist regimes or protest movements such as the Red Army Faction or RAF (German Rote Armee Fraktion), postwar West Germany’s most violent and prominent militant left-wing terrorist group, can serve as examples. “Anti-“ movements often unwittingly replicate what they wish to dismantle. They tend to take only the first step in the two-tiered human rights revolution.\textsuperscript{192}

Strategies such as wife beating and other cruelties are typically used to keep power gradients in place under (2) and (3): “I beat you because I am told to do so by my superiors” (2), and, “I subjugate you because I want to have total control over you” (3). The latter was the solution sought, for instance, by Joseph Fritzl.

Keeping away from close social relationships in order to steer clear of oppression (4) may be labeled as ruthless individualism, \textit{Entsolidarisierung} (de-solidarization, a term used in Germany),\textsuperscript{193} or as culturally legitimized “commitment phobia.” This strategy tackles feelings and circumstances through avoidance. Commitment phobia plays out at macro, meso and micro levels. At macro levels, isolationism in the spirit of “national interest first” could serve as an example. At meso levels, cultures of narrow self-interest à la, “I like fast cars and the rainforest in Brazil does not concern me,” or “tax havens,” that disregard the interest of their neighbors represent equivalents. The current economic crisis has brought this strategy to the fore and turned it sour—countries such as Switzerland, for instance, face strong criticism for their lack of commitment to the overall common good and have to cave in.\textsuperscript{194} Bankers who engaged in global gambling and helped cause a global economic meltdown, face outrage. At micro levels, it is called commitment phobia when men and women avoid commitment to partners and other social relations and instead seek satisfaction in more “impersonal” strategies, shortcutting access to happiness by developing addictions to endogenous and/or exogenous substances. Some addicts only damage their own health and quality of life. Others endanger society at large, such as bankers who use risk-taking as psychological stimulus.\textsuperscript{195}
All above mentioned strategies trade one evil for another. They pay with humiliation of others \((2 + 3)\) or oneself \((1 + 2)\), and third party neglect (particularly 4). For a society who wishes to transcend humiliation and dignify its dealings with itself and its ecological environment, none of the first solutions solves the problems they set out to solve. Both individuals and societies do not serve their self-interest and common interest in the long term by holding on to infeasible solutions.

Only the last strategy (5) is truly effective in reaching its goals. Creating a culture of mutuality and cooperation embedded into respect for equal dignity, and having this culture inform institutions deals with feelings of humiliation through dealing with oppressive circumstances. This is the human rights projects of equal rights and dignity for all, and of building a decent world, following the call for a decent society by philosopher Avishai Margalit.196

The increase of the reality and imagery of global interdependence, the coming-together of the human family, opens space for the rise of the human rights movement and for solutions informed by its spirit. No longer is it necessary to simply make the best of systems of domination and submission. And confounding relationships with oppression and simply fleeing from committing to social relationships is only one other fallacy that needs unmasking. Engaging in commitment phobia and keeping away from loving relationships to avoid being oppressed is no longer necessary. The new solution is commitment to relationships of mutuality and cooperation without oppressive humiliation, in an atmosphere of respect for each other’s equality in dignity, combined with a broader horizon, namely, an understanding that in an interdependent world, self-interest is identical with common interest. Human rights are the appropriate frame not just morally, but also pragmatically. They are the only frame that works in an interconnected world.

Proceeding from accepting humiliating oppression \((1 - 3)\) to turning against it in ineffective ways \((4)\), to committing to relationships without oppression \((5)\), this is not just an individual process. Oppression has been part and parcel of culture around the world for the past millennia, therefore also liberation must become a political, cultural, social and psychological cultural project.

Many other conceptualizations can broadcast the same message. The intricate interplay of connecting two entities while avoiding oppression is expressed in Muneo Yoshikawa’s double-swing model that is graphically presented as the infinity symbol or Möbius strip \((\infty)\). Social cohesion (the European term197), social harmony (the term preferred in Asia198), social integration, cooperation, and solidarity can all be achieved by travelling through both loops of the Möbius strip rather than keeping them divided or forcing them to merge into one loop. Successful pendulation199 is necessary; without it, we have alienation and lack of social integration. When pendulation succeeds, the result is intersubjectivity and interdependence \((5)\), not dependence \((1-3)\), and not independence \((4)\).

The principle of unity in diversity is yet another framing through which the same message can be explained. Unity in diversity is the motto for successful pendulation \((5)\), while uniformity within the in-group vis-à-vis division towards out-groups \((1 - 3)\), and generalized division \((4)\), fail to produce true intersubjectivity and interdependence.

Also the notion of cultural creatives transports this message. The work done by sociologist Paul H. Ray and psychologist Sherry Ruth Anderson shows that we live in
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times in which two groups of people—those who turn their attention inward to gain a new level of consciousness, and those who turn it outward as activists, two groups that once were separate and even hostile toward each other—now are in the process of merging into a single new large movement, that of the cultural creatives. Increasingly, people understand that peace within is only the beginning and that now time has come for action. Part of that action will be to take those who resist the path of the cultural creatives—Ray and Anderson call them the traditions and the moderns—into the future. Cultural creatives aim for true interdependence (5), while traditional wish to turn back into the past (1-3) and moderns tend to idealize generalized division (4).

The same message as organizations is also broadcast by organizations such as the United Nations Environmental Programme or UNEP, the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) or Greenpeace, and so forth, who all wish to change humankind’s relationship with their ecological environment. Likewise, humankind must change the social relationships between its global citizens, between groups, between individuals, between men, women, and children, and even between the voices that each individual carries within her psyche. Improved social relationships will also impact humankind’s chances to build constructive relations with its ecological environment. Peace means social sustainability, and social and ecological sustainability must go together.

**Using New Leadership Styles**

New approaches to leadership are currently emerging, a new type of humble servant-leaders and selfless leaders, so-called outside-inside leaders, who forge innovative ways of organizing collaborative teams with a flexible network orientation, rather than rigid organizational structures, who can navigate the paradoxes of global leadership, and master the necessary identity transformations.

What characterizes all types of new leadership is that elements have gained significance that traditionally were part of female role descriptions, for instances, awareness of the cohesion of the social fabric, maintaining harmony, and engaging in dialogue. The UNESCO’s Culture of Peace Programme, for instance, attests to the strengthening of the traditionally “female” aspects in efforts of global leadership for conflict resolution. The list of potential female contributions is a long one: Using multitrack, “track II,” and citizen-based diplomacy; installing early warning institutions; rethinking the notion of state sovereignty; setting up projects to study and understand the history of potential conflict areas, collecting this information, and making it available to decision makers; using psychology on a macro level, taking identity as a bridge; keeping communication going between warring parties; talking behind the scenes; including people besides the warlords in peace negotiations; developing conflict-resolution teams with less hierarchy and more creativity; setting up mediation teams; installing “truth commissions”; allowing warring parties to feel the world community’s care, respect, and concern; taking opponents in a conflict out of their usual environment; taking the adversaries’ personal feelings and emotions seriously; recognizing the importance of human dignity; introducing sustainable long-term approaches on the social and ecological level; progressing from spending aid money after a disaster to allocating resources to prevent it; and so on.
The World on a Trajectory from Humiliation to Dignity: A List of “Factoids”

**Calling on Women**

Traditionally, women’s role is to follow, while men lead. For the period of the current paradigm shift, I suggest that more women should consider leading, particularly older and experienced women, inviting men to follow, so as to prepare for a future where all can lead together.211

Let me explain. The problem with new paradigms212 is that they should not be anchored in old paradigms, or, to be more precise, anchoring new paradigms in old ones must be done with caution if the new paradigm is to have any chance to be seen. Albert Einstein is credited with saying that “we can’t solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them.” Yet this is easier said than done. Living a new paradigm without a supporting culture and supporting institutions is difficult. This is the dilemma that human rights defenders face. If they take the new paradigm of equality in dignity for all seriously, if they emphasize this in their lives and in the world despite the fact that it may not fit mainstream expectations, they risk being ostracized. Their message, instead of being heard, may be ridiculed and dismissed. In some world regions, human rights advocates risk their lives.

Indeed, pioneer work typically lacks safety nets. Pioneers continuously run into difficulties. Well-meaning friends often advise pioneers that they should turn to the old paradigm to address the difficulties connected with pioneering the new one, overlooking that pioneers, if they want to be true to themselves, should avoid this strategy as much as possible. “Settle down, have kids, and concentrate on your home” is perhaps not the best advice for a woman who aspires to be a professor at a university, for instance, or who encounters the infamous “glass ceiling.”

The pragmatics of promoting new paradigms resembles extraordinary expeditions, expeditions to as-of-yet unconquered mountain peaks or as-of-yet undiscovered horizons. The human rights revolution may be compared with an expedition to an as-of-yet undiscovered plateau that is located at a much higher level of maturity than humankind has reached so far. Expeditions are structured very differently to “normal life.” Expeditions require a certain timing, a particular build-up of strength, and a very high level of dedication. Certain expeditions should not be envisaged if their leaders are not willing to invest their utmost.

Who has both the motivation and the resources to engage in the expedition of bringing human rights to a new level of implementation? Women with resources, those highly educated, highly creative, and highly courageous women who can be found in all walks of life and in all cultural realms may be the best candidates at the current point in history. They have the motivation to work for equality in dignity for all since many of them have experienced discrimination and humiliation, and at the same time, they have the necessary resources to be audacious.

Other groups that often combine those two aspects are minorities, migrants, and people with multicultural backgrounds and orientations, be it mixed ethnic or linguistic backgrounds, or sexual orientations that do not concur with cultural mainstream definitions.213 In sum, all people who experienced humiliation due to being outsiders, in whatever form, and who are resourceful, carry an important potential and responsibility
to nudge human rights from outright denial or mere rhetoric to factual reality. They can
realize the human rights potential when they acknowledge and own it pro-actively—
Barack Obama is a good recent example.

How can the experience of humiliation be a motivator? Moral judgment fails without
feelings. As Antonio Damasio points out in *Descartes’ Error*, one cannot even make
rational decisions without emotions. Joseph P. Forgas confirms that “individuals who
suffer certain kinds of brain damage to the prefrontal cortex that impairs affective
reactions but leaves cognitive capacities intact tend to make disastrous social decisions,
and their social relationships suffer accordingly, even though their intellectual problem-
solving ability may be completely normal.” Feelings of humiliation are the strongest
emotional driving force for the conscientization that is necessary to move the human
rights revolution forward.

How can the experience of being an outsider be of help? Intercultural research
indicates that creativity is enhanced through interactions of mutually contradictory but
equally compelling forces. Disorienting dilemmas, those that unsettle our fundamental
beliefs and call our values into question, can bring about transformative learning.
When cultural assumptions are called into question, a stress-adaptation-growth process
unfolds.

Regrettably, cognitive adaptation and emotional growth can also fail. Disorienting
dilemmas and the experience of humiliation can also bring meta-emotions (how people
feel about feelings) to the fore that nudge people toward past paradigms instead of
future paradigms. The potential that human rights entail is betrayed when simple past-
oriented tit-for-tat responses or revengeful humiliation-entrepreneurship are chosen as
“remedies” for humiliation. Violent conflict may ensue.

Israel may serve as an example. The disorienting dilemmas and humiliations that
characterized the Jewish Diaspora experience for two thousand years have produced
unparalleled intellectual brilliance; people with Jewish backgrounds around the world
have enriched humanity tremendously. Their brilliance is a great resource that merits
being invested into helping the world create a decent global society. Avishai Margalit, a
philosopher with a Jewish background based in Jerusalem, invested his brilliance into
authoring future-oriented books such as *The Decent Society*. The same brilliance is
wasted, however, even if only unwittingly, when it is invested into strengthening
traditional paradigms of a world society fragmented into in-groups pitted against hostile
out-groups.

What is needed for building a decent world society is the traditional female role
template. Relationship building is its foundation. Men are often blind to the need to build
relationships and lack the required skills, not because they are ill-intentioned, but because
they are socialized differently. Even the most feminist man may not remember
birthdays or be able to engage in the intricate dialogues that are necessary to create
networks of relationships of mutuality between equals. Traditional hierarchical system of
instruction-from-above-and-obedience-from-below are much less communication-
intensive. Therefore women who know about relationship building must invite men to
see. The blind are also blind to their blindness. It is inappropriate to become angry with
blindness.

And, as noted earlier, not only is the female role template beneficial for building a
decent global community, even the so-called corporate world profits from embracing it.
Consultants to the corporate sector spend much time on speaking about the importance of “human capital.” Emphasizing human capital signifies nothing else than the promotion of the female cultural template.224

Let me make a to-do list for those women and men who combine an experience of humiliation with the resources enabling them to bring the new paradigm of equality in dignity to a new level. I will speak particularly to women, because, when I meet women and men around the world—and I know thousands personally—I observe how highly resourceful women are held back from making the contributions to society that they can and should make because they are being discouraged, not only by their social environments but also from within their own psyches. I would like to place a counterweight to this discouragement through my work. This speaks not only to women, however, also men should feel addressed, not least fathers of daughters.

Before proceeding to the to-do list, please let me confirm my stance with respect to gender categorizations (as well as age categories, or in-group/out-groups categorizations such as ethnic, racial, religious categorizations) as not being essential aspects of “human nature.” Conceptualizing them as such would represent a misperception that leads to unnecessary humiliation. What is essential about human nature is that all human beings are born into a process of cultural adaptation. Everybody tries to negotiate culture with his and her desire for self-validation, acknowledgement, recognition, and love. The locus of control is neither in the individual nor in the group—culture influences individuals and vice versa. This section, and, indeed, my entire work, wishes to hasten the process of this cultural adaptation by reaching out to as many individuals as possible, explaining that there is room for more dignity within everybody’s own psyche and in everybody’s relationships with fellow human beings, and that this room needs to be proactively shaped so as to give space to more dignity and diminish humiliation.

See now a to-do-list of six points.

(1) Be Neither Arrogant Nor Submissive

To women: Do not be arrogant, be self-critical. However, don’t be obsessively self-critical. Women tend to under-estimate their own intelligence (while men are prone to over-estimate their level of intelligence).225 This bias is not due to personal choice, but to social pressure. Women are often penalized for being confident.226 In other words, do not forget that problems may stem from socialization into wider cultural environments rather than from personal shortcomings. Refrain from unduly weakening yourself through exaggerated self-criticism.
(2) Seek Weak Ties

Sociologist Mark S. Granovetter\textsuperscript{227} did research on whether people find jobs through strong or weak social ties. He built on Tönnies’ differentiation of \textit{Gemeinschaft} versus \textit{Gesellschaft},\textsuperscript{228} explaining that in a \textit{Gemeinschaft} people have strong ties and share norms so thoroughly that little effort is needed to gauge the intentions of others. Such settings do not allow for much individual autonomy and are easily disrupted by even minimal dissent. Granovetter recommends having many weak ties to a number of people, not least because this provides more individual autonomy.

Having many weak ties in one’s life does not exclude stronger ties. It does not mean failing responsibilities or violating dignity. It does not mean disconnection. It does not mean commitment phobia, not vis-à-vis other adults and not vis-à-vis once children.\textsuperscript{229} To women: Build large social networks of weak ties for yourself. Distribute the burden flowing from your expectations and needs onto a wider network than only a core group of people. Use the pathways for the constructive optimism and hope that C. Richard Snyder advocates in his hope theory. He defines hope as “the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals, and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathways.”\textsuperscript{230}

(3) Seek Recognition from a Network of Like-Minded People

Educator Paul Richards, in his work, formulates five messages that everybody needs to hear every day in order to remain psychological healthy:

The five most common basic messages:

- I see you fully and completely.
- I regret your misfortunes and sufferings. (Regret/apology without blame or guilt.)
- I accept and love you without condition. (“You are in the pack!”)
- I appreciate and am grateful for your contributions and achievements.
- You are safe from me and with me. (“Safety exists!”).\textsuperscript{231}

In traditional societies, men are given the power to define what makes a person a “good” or “bad” person. Therefore, respected males are often regarded as main providers for the above quoted messages, both by men and women. Many men seek their main recognition from male elders and peers they respect, while women seek them from their “significant Other,” who, in most cases, is also a male. All suffer when the person or persons they target with their expectations, fail them.

This socialization, to my view, is perhaps the most noteworthy obstacle for extraordinary women to succeed with their ambitions. Too often, they seek recognition from only one man, and not only that, they seek it from the one man who has the greatest problems with her intellectual capacities and their ambitions. Many of the highly educated women I meet around the world carry an emotional “black hole” in their lives, a black hole that swallows most of the energy they otherwise could invest constructively.
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They waste hours on end on discussing with their female friends “their man” (including past partners) and his myriad let-downs.

The story often goes as follows: Wherever I meet extraordinary women, around the world, in all cultural contexts, they testify that men find their excellence fascinating until the relationship becomes closer. The more committed the relationship becomes, the more traditional expectations seep in. Expectations connected with male identity as “the man in charge” become threatened.

Hopefully, women with high ambitions will find a more welcoming world in the future. But so far, scripts for love relationships between equals are still weak, and rivalry, either overtly or covertly, consciously or beyond consciousness, easily poisons the relationship. And this hurts women more than men when they have inserted their “significant other” into the center of their psychological health.

The problem for those women is that it is difficult to gauge, in the beginning of a relationship, whether a man can truly accept a strong woman, or whether his claims are only rhetorical. Since she does not have enough lifetime to test all the men who seem promising at the outset, it may therefore be better for ambitious women to pay the price of refraining from too close partnerships rather than being torn apart by repeating hopeful beginnings and heart-breaking ends.

Extraordinary women must be prepared to forsake the love they dream of at the current juncture in history. It is not prudent to place the core happiness of one’s life on winning probabilities comparable to a lotto game. Those who win deserve to be congratulated, but mainstream male culture may only catch up with extraordinary women in one hundred years or more. In the transition phase, women who desire to surpass traditional cultural paradigms must avoid draining their emotional strength. As a way out, until mainstream socialization has transformed, women of ambition may be well advised to create multilayered webs of weaker ties and stronger ties to like-minded women and men who can provide them with the recognition they need. The vision of the one deep, all-consuming, and mutually respectful dialogical love relationship with one partner that so many of my resourceful female friends yearn for, will inform male socialization in the future, only if women avoid being broken down by its lack at the current point in history.

Let me introduce Dalida to illustrate the challenges that extraordinary women face, a cosmopolitan artist, born in Egypt into an Italian family, who later built a career in France and internationally, performing in more than ten languages including French, Italian, Arabic, German, Spanish, Hebrew, English, Dutch, Japanese, and Greek. On YouTube, one can watch a summary of the news coverage of her voluntary death on May 3 1987, at the age of 54. Since she was a singer, she could express despair through art. Her interpretation of “Je suis malade” (“I am ill”) is an artistic rendering of the cries, the sobs, and the weeping of solitude and despair that I heard from extraordinary women I sat with around the world. One of the reasons for me doing the work I do is to show other ways out for ambitious women caught in this solitude than despair and suicide.

Like many creative people, Dalida, in addition to having a cosmopolitan background and leading an international life, was beautiful, feminine, and extremely successful. All this, however, did not make her happy. She was lonely within herself, even though she was surrounded by friends: this is how one of her friends explains her suicide.

Jasvinder Sanghera is the co-founder and director of Karma Nirvana, a community-based project that supports South Asian women, men and children affected by domestic violence.
violence and honor-based crimes. In an interview, she explains how vulnerable and alone she felt when breaking out of her forced marriage. She describes that women in England are aided by the Forced Marriage Act that came into force in England in 2008, however, that this does not make them less lonely. Through creating the Honour Network, she and her colleagues try to provide a substitute for the family that girls who fled from coercion typically lose. Also I know, first hand, from my time as a psychologist in Egypt the agony of girls who wish to go beyond the boundaries drawn for them by their families.

Interestingly, the same agony is shared by Western women when they surpass boundaries, even though, in their case, the boundaries are much wider. This is, incidentally, also why I can breathe in Norway more than anywhere else, and are less alone there, because the boundaries are widest in Norway.

To women, particularly to outstanding women who surpass traditional boundaries of female scripts: Strive to become more confident within yourself, lovingly remove power from people who, at the current point in the cultural transition, may be overburdened with providing you with the recognition you need, and systematically and intentionally widen your networks of weak ties, taking in the recognition flowing from such networks purposefully, rather than waiting for illusions in vain.

(4) Gain Critical Distance from Your Socialization

Many men are socialized into striving to be in control, particularly with respect to women, rather than to cooperate on an equal footing, particularly not with women. And many women support this script, either overtly or without being aware of it.

Earlier, I wrote that it is inappropriate to get angry with blindness. Care ethics, as proposed by feminist, educationalist, and philosopher Nel Noddings and feminist, ethicist, and psychologist Carol Gilligan place responsiveness to others at the centre, responsiveness that suggests providing care, preventing harm, and maintaining relationships. Noddings argues that because we are so intimately intertwined with one another, reasoning based on rules and contracts built around the self-contained individual distorts the actual conditions of our lives. Problems, including moral problems, are embedded into a contextual frame that eludes abstract, universal reasoning. Caring means apprehending the other’s reality, feeling the other’s reality, to the degree that acting on behalf of the other as though on my own behalf, becomes compelling.

Clinical psychologist Pamela J. Birrell critiques standard ways of defining ethics in psychotherapy and recommends the feminist ethic of care, informed by the ethics of Emmanuel Lévinas, along with feminist ethics of listening. I suggest that Birrell’s approach should be applied not only in psychotherapy, but also as a template for the present paradigm shift. Birrell’s approach means lending our eyes, ears, and souls to our fellow human beings and help each other see our blind spots and overcoming them lovingly.

“Listening into-voice” is a phrase Linda M. Hartling explains as follows:

The expression “listening into voice” draws our attention to the fact that human communication is a bi-directional experience. It is a phrase that encourages us to
attune to the fundamental relational nature of speaking. It reminds us to look beyond the individualist myth that speaking is a one-way experience in which the speaker is solely responsible for communicating effectively. Speaking is interactive. It is a two-way experience in which both (or all) people participating in the relationship can chose to listen and engage in a way that will help others to effectively express and clarify their ideas.²³⁹

(5) Learn Dialogue and Negotiation

There are two basic definitions of reconciliation and conflict resolution, one built on subjugation of non-equals—a past-oriented definition—and a future-oriented definition focusing on dialogue between equals.²⁴⁰

Let me illustrate this basic dichotomy with some stark examples. A tyrant will teach his underlings the lesson that conflict resolution and reconciliation are achieved when underlings are subservient. This “education” is the daily ration meted out to many people in Zimbabwe, Myanmar, or North Korea, as well as to many victims of domestic violence.

A Nelson Mandela or Rosa Parks, on the other hand, will edify the lesson that conflict resolution and reconciliation are obtained when equal rights and dignity for everybody are respected. Rosa Parks refused to acknowledge the racially discriminatory practices in the bus service in Memphis in 1955 and remained seated. She would have deserved the Nobel peace prize together with Martin Luther King for creating conflict rather than being complicit in the “peace” of subservience.²⁴¹

As Rosa Parks’s activism illustrates, there are also two kinds of conceptualizations of peace, security, stability, freedom, and empowerment—all these terms are used with opposing meanings.

The word *concord*, stems from Latin *cum* which means *with* and *cord* which means *heart*. Concord means that our *hearts* are *with* each other. The word *conflict*, in contrast, comes from verb *flectere*, to *bend*, to *curve*. In conflict, *discord* displaces *concord* and may lead to *confrontation*. The word *confrontation* entails the Latin word *frons* which means *forehead*. In confrontation, *foreheads* are placed *against* each other, in opposition. The word *reconciliation* has its roots in Latin as well and means *to restore harmony*, to “bend” conflict into concord. The problem occurring in the middle of a transition is that conflict may be bent back into the old concord, or forward into a new one, with two diametrically opposed kinds of harmony and peace as outcome.

A husband who habitually beats his wife and children, believing that domestic chastisement of disobedient family members is his duty, will define “successful reconciliation” and “peace” as the “quiet submission” of his family members under his routine domination. In conflicts of interest with men he considers fellow competitors he will most probably call it successful reconciliation when he has achieved “victory.” He will frame negotiation in terms of a duel, and aim to defeat the “enemy.”

Politics at macro levels are still widely conducted in this way: with equals, with those who have somewhat comparable leverage and/or standing, or who aspirre to obtain it, adherents of traditional Realpolitik often enter into duel-like combat. Subalterns, in contrast, are expected to “understand” that they will face “grave consequences” if they
resist routine domination. The protection of honor against humiliation is central for superiors, and “messages of strength” are sent off, so as “not to appear weak.” The path to “reconciliation” and “peace” may entail everything from violence and war to a shrewd mix of arm-twisting and deceptive Machiavellian “negotiation” of “conflicts of interest” (be it disputes over access to water, land, or other resources). Game theory is the conceptual frame, or, more precisely, versions of game theory that assume that people are “rational” actors who aim at self-preservation by cannily calculating their leverage, always gauging the bottom line of what they can aspire to and what not. Reconciliation is seen as accomplished when all defeated opponents “understand” that it is in their “interest” to acquiesce to the victor’s domination, and submissively enter the ranks of underlings.

In contrast, someone who defines domestic chastisement as *domestic violence*, will not differentiate between equals and non-equals, but will conceive of everybody as equal in dignity. This person will define successful reconciliation and peace as respectful dialogue and negotiation embedded into relationships of mutuality. In the same spirit, Realpolitik of the future will define reconciliation as Nelson Mandela understood it when he met with de Clerck in South Africa. Mandela invited de Clerck firmly and respectfully to forsake his belief in white supremacy. He welcomed de Clerck into a new world of equal dignity for black and white people. While in old times masters were toppled and new masters took their place, Mandela did not only ask the supremacists to step down. Mandela did not become a black supremacist. He dismantled the system itself. Mandela did not install black supremacy, and he did not perpetrate genocide on the former elite (as was done in Rwanda). Mandela treated de Clerck with respect. Mandela even turned many of his former prison guards into friends. He aimed at long-term peace of equal dignity for all, not merely at short-term victory over his opponents.

To conclude, conflict resolution and reconciliation can be defined (1) as *successful domination over un-equals* or (2) as *successful calibration of mutuality between equals*. In the first case, “routine humiliation” is its core tool, humiliation that is regarded as “honorable lesson” whose pain is beneficial. In the second case, humiliation transforms into an offensive violation of humanity itself. Both approaches are part of the two irreconcilable normative frameworks of ranked honor versus equal dignity.

One cannot use both frameworks alongside each other. One cannot rank people into higher and lesser beings and at the same time consider them as equal in dignity—the ranking and non-ranking of human value and worthiness cannot co-exist. In extension, terms such as conflict resolution, reconciliation, harmony, peace, or love, all entail alternative interpretations at their core which stand in diametrical opposition with each other. It is therefore that it is necessary to qualify these terms further, in all walks of life. This pertains also to terms such as love, sex and parenthood. It needs to be made clear which kind of love, sex and parenthood is refered to in any given moment, the one that carries humiliation as legitimate tool at its core, or the one that outlaws it.

As discussed earlier, from negotiation handbooks we learn that we need to focus on interest and not on position to attain optimal outcome. If two people fight over an orange, for example, sharing it equally would solve the conflict, however, not optimally. The optimal solution would be to ask more detailed questions, and consider, for example, that one person wishes to use the skin of the orange for a cake, while the other wants to make juice from the fruit meat. As a result, the outcome would be that both have 100
percent of their interest served, not just 50 percent of their position. Not that such a positive outfall can be guaranteed—sometimes a situation does simply not entail the potential for win-win solutions—but by not searching for such potential win-win solutions, those solutions are overlooked and untapped.

In times of transition, particularly when words entail such mutually exclusive meanings, it is of vital importance for all players to learn listening, dialogue and negotiation. It is not sufficient to operate with words and labels and expect shared meanings. Asking deeper questions is what is needed. Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss developed the notion of the “depth of intention,” the “depth of questioning,” or “deepness of answers.” Næss writes, “our depth of intention improves only slowly over years of study. There is an abyss of depth in everything fundamental.” Greater depth means continuing to ask questions at the point at which others stop asking.

The need to learn listening, dialogue, and negotiation is pressing in all walks of life, including in love relationships. In ranked collectivistic societies, the father, uncle or eldest brother of a girl usually negotiates with her future husband and his family the terms of the planned marriage, and the same men are expected to act as the girl’s advocate whenever she runs into difficulties with her in-laws. I witnessed this process innumerable times during my years in Egypt. I also saw the vulnerability of Western women married into Egyptian society if she and her family believed in love without negotiation.

To women: The Western concept of romantic love as love that would be weakened if “negotiated,” to me, betrays the youthful immaturity of this concept. Oppressive negotiation (when the father decides for his daughter, for example) is not remedied by non-negotiation but by non-oppressive negotiation. Much more is required, namely loving negotiation between non-dominators. What is needed is a new definition of loving negotiation as intricate dialogue, where all players invest into their relationships at all levels, verbal, nonverbal, directly and indirectly.

(6) Don’t Be Discouraged, Don’t Give Up, and Don’t Shy Away from Compromises

Sociologist Allan G. Johnson, in The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy, reports how millions of women, at the present point in time, are tired of struggling. They retreat into simply hanging on to what has been achieved so far. And well-intentioned men are passive because they fear inviting guilt and blame simply for being men. The result is a knotted tangle of fear, anger, blame, defensiveness, guilt, pain, denial, ambivalence, and confusion. The more this knot is exposed to pull, the tighter it gets.

To women: do not allow yourself to be discouraged. Be prepared. As soon as you, as a woman, wish to enter a world of primarily male dominance, you will not necessarily be supported, but face humiliation, overtly and covertly. Since men are still in the most influential positions in the world, outside in the public realm, while the female sphere is still mainly inside the home, women and men are bound to face an uphill struggle if they wish the solidarity and cooperation that characterizes the female role script to become more prevalent in society.
If you do nothing but engage in aggressive opposition, you will be sucked into negativity. Paradigms shift step by step, tipping point by tipping point. Creative “Trojan Horse” compromises can hasten such tipping turns. However, be prepared that such approaches often entail conditions that are humiliating, at least for a while. A Trojan Horse is a pitiable horse until it has revealed its true power. Likewise, cooperation, as an approach, may be ridiculed until it has had a chance to prove its true value. Cooperation, solidarity, nurturing, facilitating, selfless leadership, communal sharing, all those approaches that are widely practiced within the traditional female realm, need to be championed beyond this realm now, even in the face of initial derision. Be ready. Only by protecting our personal strength and integrity from being broken down by the adversities we meet, will we succeed.

Jean Baker Miller coined the phrase “waging good conflict,” a term that was central for my book *Emotion and Conflict: How Human Rights Can Dignify Emotion and Help Us Wage Good Conflict.*

To women: Keep waging good conflict!

**Concluding Remarks**

Globalization entails benign and malign aspects. “Globalization critics” do not oppose all aspects of globalization. They do not oppose global civil society, for instance, a benefit flowing from the coming-together of humankind. However, they are uneasy about the possibility for humiliation, or what I call the lack of *egalization.*

At the present point in human history, citizens increasingly relate to each other across borders, states are losing their status as more or less isolated entities that constrain and define their citizens’ global relationships. Yet such relationships can also turn sour. Global terrorism is only one example for the fact that globalization does not necessarily lead to global friendship. Even though a global *supranational We-feeling* is in the making, and the *struggle for recognition* by individuals alongside that of states is emerging as a force at the system level, such tendencies need to be nurtured and helped forward more systematically. We see the emergence of *postindividual consciousness* emerge, *unity consciousness,* or a “Kantian culture” of collective security or “friendship,” or a *global civic culture,* and a *world society,* however, they are still inadequately systematized and institutionalized.

A growing number of people are now joining the so-called cultural creatives movement who refuse “cynical realism.” As reported earlier, Paul H. Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson identify three main cultural tendencies: (1) moderns (endorsing the “realist” worldview of *Time Magazine,* the *Wall Street Journal,* big government, big business, big media, or past socialist, communist, and fascist movements); (2) the first countermovement against moderns, the traditionalists (the religious right and rural populations); and (3) the most recent countermovement, the cultural creatives (who value strong ecological sustainability for the planet, liberal on women’s issues, personal growth, authenticity, and anti–big business). In the United States, traditionalists comprise about 24–26 percent of the adult population (approximately 48 million people), moderns about 47–49 percent (approximately 95 million) and cultural creatives are about 26–28
percent (approximately 50 million). In the European Union, the cultural creatives are about 30–35 percent of the adult population.

What is lacking at the current point in human history is global leadership that informs the creation of a decent global community of social and ecological sustainability, following the call for a decent society by philosopher Avishai Margalit.262 Viable global superordinate institutional structures are still lacking, structures that can effectively overcome Hobbesian anarchy among citizens and states and that can successfully attend to the wounds humankind has inflicted on its ecological environment.

Since this paper has been prepared for the 15th Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, “Peace at Home, Peace in the World,” 28th-30th April 2010, in Istanbul, it calls on Turkey to be part of the responsible global leadership that is so urgently needed today.

In a brochure by the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, we read that the following values are common to all Turkish people: “Belief in the integrity of the family, loyalty and obligation to the country and community, fairness in dealing with other human beings, hospitality, compassion, and respect for tradition.”

For a worthwhile future for humankind, the loyalty that is at the core of Turkish values needs to be extended to all of the human family (“peace in the world”), and respect must be extended to all those traditions that include all human beings and their home planet.

In former times, fear reigned in a fragmented world, rivals, competitors, and enemies were subdued and dominated by humiliating them with “shock and awe.” Victory and power over one’s opponents was the aim.

In One World, space opens for love, humility, and for awe for a universe too large for us to fathom. Partners join hands to create a sustainable social and ecological future for all of humankind. No longer do superiors humiliate opponents into submission. In One World, partners respect each other as equals in dignity.
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