

## **Humiliation, Killing, War, and Gender**

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006). Humiliation, killing, war, and gender. In Fitzduff, Mari and Stout, Chris E. (Eds.), *The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts: From War to Peace*. . Volume 1: *Nature vs. Nurture*, pp. 137-174. Westport, CT, London: Praeger Security International.

Evelin Gerda Lindner, MD, PhD, PhD (Dr psychol, Dr med)

Social scientist

Founder of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies ([www.humiliationstudies.org](http://www.humiliationstudies.org))

and affiliated to

the University of Oslo, Department of Psychology (<http://folk.uio.no/evelin/>),

the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris,

and in cooperation with

the Columbia University Conflict Resolution Network, New York

In order to phone me, please send first an email to [e.g.lindner@psykologi.uio.no](mailto:e.g.lindner@psykologi.uio.no) in order to find out where I might be phoned; I am continuously traveling.

## **Humiliation, Killing, War, and Gender**

### **Abstract**

The chapter “humiliation, killing, war, and gender” analyzes these phenomena in their embeddedness in the current transition to Human Rights ideals that promote equal dignity for all. Honor norms are anchored in a social context that is deeply different from contexts of equal dignity for all. Currently, both, honor and equal dignity are cultural concepts that are significant for people world-wide. The problem is that they clash and are incompatible in many ways.

The chapter sheds light on the transition from norms of honor to norms of equal dignity, and how this is played out in the field of gender, killing, and war. Also the phenomenon that people can feel humiliated and retaliate with acts of humiliation is discussed in relation to this transition. The chapter is rounded up by a call for a *Moratorium on Humiliation* in order to safeguard a world that is livable for coming generations.

## Humiliation, War, and Gender

This chapter represents a psychological device, namely persuasion, with the aim to mobilize you, the reader, to *get up* instead of *standing by* on the global arena. This chapter tries to entice you to use a psychological mindset for the maintenance of our *global village* that you might have observed in some of your female family members (not exclusively of course), namely the art of how to focus on relationships and their sustainable maintenance.

January 11, 1998, in Nairobi, I met with Asha Ahmed. She is a young Somali woman, and was at that time Information/Dissemination Officer at the Somalia Delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross. She and her colleague described to me how they, over years, had struggled to explain the Geneva Convention and the concept of Human Rights to fellow Somalis. However, so she recounted, to their surprise all such difficulties went away in 1997. “How?” I asked. The explanation was interesting. The ICRC had invited historians from all Somali clans to do research and come up with what eventually became the *Spared from the Spear* booklet by the International Committee of the Red Cross Somalia Delegation (1997).

This booklet shows something remarkable, namely that women and children traditionally were “spared from the spear.” It documents that traditional Somali war code explicitly protects civilians against warrior onslaughts. Women were not to be touched. Women represented potential bridges between families and clans, precisely because they could move freely, even in wartime. Asha pointed out: “When you look at this booklet, the Geneva Convention is all in there! At first the Geneva Convention was like Latin to the Somalis!”

In my doctoral dissertation – Lindner (2001f), pp. 342-343 – I give Ambassador Dualeh the word. I interviewed him on January 9, 1999, in Nairobi. He backs up what I learned from Asha; see also Lindner (2000a):

There is one thing which never was part of traditional quarrelling between clans, and this is rape, especially mass rape in front of the family. This is new. It happened for the first time when Siad Barre’s dictatorial regime sent soldiers to annihilate us. Soldiers would rape our women in front of their husbands and families.

...

It is somehow a “tradition” that young men of one clan steal camels from another clan, and sometimes a man gets killed. But women were never touched, never. There might have been the rare case when a girl was alone in the desert guarding her animals, and a young man having spent a long time in the desert lost control and tried to rape her. She would resist violently, and at the end the solution would perhaps be that he had to marry her. But mass rape, especially rape in front of the family, this never happened before, this is new.

...

Have you noticed how many Somali families live apart? Have you ever thought about the reason why so many Somali women with their children live apart from their husbands? It is because the men cannot live with the humiliation caused by the fact that they were not able to defend their women against the soldiers who raped them.

The husband cannot live together with his wife, because he cannot bear to be reminded of his inability to protect her. The perpetrators intended to humiliate their enemies and they succeeded thoroughly. Rape creates social destruction more “effectively” than any other weapon.

...

This is the reason why today Somalia is so divided. We Somalis are united through our common ethnic background, we speak one language, and are all Muslims. Why are we divided today? Humiliation through rape and its consequences divides us. The traditional methods of reconciliation are too weak for this. It will take at least one generation to digest these humiliations sufficiently to be able to sit together again.

At the end of our conversation, Ambassador Dualeh sighed: “Evelin, believe me, humiliation, as I told you before, was not known to the Somali before Siad Barre came to power!”

Scandinavia houses a large Somali diaspora community. The divorce rate is very high. I remember one Somali woman angrily contesting Ambassador Dualeh’s framing, it was in an informal setting in 2001 in Norway. She called out, “It is us, the Somali women, who leave our husbands! Particularly in the diaspora! Because here we receive support for our quest to be treated like human beings! Do you know the saying that a Somali husband will fetch the doctor when his camels are sick, but not for his wives? How come that our husbands shun us after we were raped? Are we not human beings who need more support after being victimized, and not less? How come that these men are so consumed by their own pride and honor – and how it has been humiliated – that they do not see that we suffer and need help? Instead of helping us they sulk and nurture their feelings of humiliation and their hurt pride!”

So far, my aim was to wet the “appetite” of the reader of this chapter and create question marks. Let me continue: On December 3, 1998, I was a guest in a *khat* chewing “focus group” session in Hargeisa, capital of Somaliland. Such sessions typically last for many hours, starting in the afternoon and running through half of the night (typically, such meetings are not attended by “respectable” women; I tried therefore to keep “decent” by at least not chewing *khat* myself...). I asked the men in the round about humiliation or *quudhsiga* (belittling = humiliation). The hours were well invested and yielded many proverbs, such as the following: “Hadellca xun ayaa ka xanuun kulul xabada,” meaning “Humiliation is worse than killing; in times of war words of humiliation hurt more than bullets” or “Rag waxaaa ku maamula aagaan ama ku maamuusi,” meaning “I can only be with people who are equal,” or “Masse inaanu nahay oo tollim meerto no tahay,” meaning “A man deserves to be killed and not to be humiliated.”

At this point, I would like to end my introductory vignettes. I hope that they have elicited the reader’s interest for the topic of humiliation, war, and gender. As you understand, for some, humiliation overrides fear of death – indeed, a formidable phenomenon. And as you also see, in much of traditional warfare – and incidentally also in blood feud – women go free; they are, ideally, spared selectively while men are

targeted selectively.<sup>1</sup> And in case such rules are violated or neglected, stark feelings of humiliation may be rendered or maintained in the hearts and minds of those who identify with these codes of behavior.

However, and this I also found out, the fact that women are spared in certain settings, does not necessarily signify that women are too valuable to lose, or that women stand for more “peaceful” attitudes than their fellow males. Sometimes, I was told in Somalia, it was the women who drove their men into tribal war to address their grievances.<sup>2</sup> And, furthermore, women were not spared under all circumstances. In different situations, women were – and in numerous cultural contexts still are – the ones to be killed selectively, for example, in cases of so-called honor killings. When family honor is perceived to be soiled and humiliated through the rape of a daughter, for example, it is first and foremost the raped daughter who is killed, and rarely also the rapist (Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian, a criminologist of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, feels uneasy with the term “honor killings” and prefers to use the term “femicide,” personal communication, November 2003, Jerusalem<sup>3</sup>).<sup>4</sup>

Thus, women and men – in what I, in the spirit of Weber’s *ideal type* approach, call *traditional hierarchical honor-based societies* – are either selectively identified as persons to be spared or selectively identified as persons to be killed, according to certain rules.<sup>5</sup> And the violation of such rules carries the potential to elicit or maintain feelings of

---

<sup>1</sup> Blood feud has become rampant in Albania since Hodscha’s downfall. Today, around 10,000 men sit in their homes and cannot go out, because they fear blood revenge. At the same time, their women can go around freely, thus they have to shoulder all family responsibilities and tasks alone. See other evidence relating to blood feuds in Boehm (1984), Malcolm (1998), and Rodina (1999).

<sup>2</sup> Militarism has been examined from a feminist point of view in, for example, *Women and War* by Elshtain (1995). Jean Elshtain examines how the myths of *man as just warrior* and *woman as beautiful soul* are undermined by the reality of female bellicosity and sacrificial male love, as well as the moral imperatives of just wars. Cynthia Enloe (1990) investigates international politics and reveals the crucial role of women in implementing governmental foreign policies; see also Enloe (2000). International relations as a mirror to masculinity have been discussed, for example, by J. Ann Tickner (1992). She examines the meaning of global security through a gender-sensitive lens. V. Spike Peterson and Anne Sisson Runyan describe both women’s roles in world politics and the impact of world politics on women’s roles; see Peterson (1992a), Peterson (1992b), Peterson & Runyan (1993).

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Shalhoub-Kevorkian (2000), and literature she uses, such as Abu-Odeh (2000), Al-Khayyat (1990), Baker, Gregware, & Cassidy (1999), Polk (1994), Radford & Russel (1992), Hanmer, Hester, Kelly, & Radford (1996), and Stout (1992).

<sup>4</sup> The phenomenon of “honor killings” is to be found in many parts of the world, even though they occur most in Muslim countries, despite the fact that Islamic religion and law do not sanction it. According to Stephanie Nebehay (2000), “honor killings” “have been reported in Bangladesh, Britain, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Pakistan, Morocco, Sweden, Turkey and Uganda.” Afghanistan, where the practice is condoned under the rule of the fundamentalist Taliban movement, can be added to the list, along with Iraq and Iran” (Nebehay, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> Please read in Coser (1977), “Weber’s three kinds of *ideal types* are distinguished by their levels of abstraction. First are the *ideal types* rooted in historical particularities, such as the ‘western city,’ ‘the Protestant Ethic,’ or ‘modern capitalism,’ which refer to phenomena that appear only in specific historical periods and in particular cultural areas. A second kind involves abstract

humiliation. In all these cases humiliation and gender – or, more precisely, humiliation and the gender selective taking or sparing of lives – are interlinked in very precisely defined ways.

Apart from such cases, clearly, in the course of human history, killing and dying also occurred with no gender selection involved and no humiliation being invoked. History offers ample examples. Often men, women and children died from the ravages of war, indiscriminately. Wars destroyed whole regions so that their inhabitants withered away from famine and lack of resources. In pre-human-rights times, the latter case typically was not regarded as any violation or humiliation; it was rather seen as “fate” or “God’s will” or “natural disaster.”

In contrast, nowadays, wherever Human Rights ideals are guiding moral deliberations, the killing of people is deplored and seen as illegitimate, under whatever circumstances (except in clear cases of self-defense, or for military personnel in wars that are perceived to be legitimately waged, or for those waiting in the death row in countries that legitimize capital punishment). In present times, predominantly in the West, but also in many non-Western cultural spheres, the overall ethical framework is in the process of changing. Human rights ideals stipulate that people ought to be offered so-called “enabling environments” that give them the chance to build dignified lives. People should not be victimized by war lords who render their homes unsafe and bring famine upon them. And the killing of raped girls in order to redress humiliated family honor is not condoned by Human Rights either. On the contrary, a Human Rights promoter may claim that the act of killing a girl – who has been victimized through being raped – victimizes her doubly, and thus compounds humiliation instead of redressing it. Incidentally, as is widely known, rape has lately increasingly been used as “weapon” in war, thus intensifying the moral dilemma entailed in such cases.

In the following, I will briefly describe how I researched the notion of humiliation that formed the starting point for my subsequent theoretical work on humiliation. I am currently building a *theory of humiliation* that is transdisciplinary and entails elements from anthropology, history, social philosophy, social psychology, sociology, and political science.<sup>6</sup> After laying out my research, I will explain the current state-of-the-art of related

---

elements of social reality – such concepts as ‘bureaucracy’ or ‘feudalism’ – that may be found in a variety of historical and cultural contexts. Finally, there is a third kind of *ideal type*, which Raymond Aron calls ‘rationalizing reconstructions of a particular kind of behavior.’ According to Weber, all propositions in economic theory, for example, fall into this category. They all refer to the ways in which men would behave were they actuated by purely economic motives, were they purely economic men” (Coser, 1977, p. 224).

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Lindner (1999), Lindner (2000b), Lindner (2000c), Lindner (2001a), Lindner (2001b), Lindner (2001c), Lindner (2001d), Lindner (2001f), Lindner (2002a), Lindner (2002b), Lindner (2002c), Lindner (2003b), Lindner (2003c). The concept of humiliation may be deconstructed into at least seven layers, Lindner (2001e), each requiring a different mix of interdisciplinary research and analysis. The seven layers include a) a core that expresses the universal idea of “putting down,” b) a middle layer that contains two opposed orientations towards “putting down,” treating it as, respectively, legitimate and routine, or illegitimate and traumatizing, and c) a periphery whose distinctive layers include one pertaining to cultural differences between groups and another four peripheral layers that relate to differences in individual personalities and variations in patterns of individual experience of humiliation.

research carried out by other scholars. Thereafter I will discuss how the phenomenon of humiliation is embedded into a larger historical time-line. I will describe in what way I see globalization at work. At the end I will address what can be done about the destructive effects of humiliation.

Before proceeding further, let me make a little note. In everyday language, the word humiliation is used at least threefold. Firstly, the word *humiliation* points at an *act*, secondly at a *feeling*, and thirdly, at a *process*: “I humiliate you, you feel humiliated, and the entire process is one of humiliation.” In this text the reader is expected to understand from the context which alternative is referred to, because otherwise language would become too convoluted.

Let me give you, furthermore, the definition of humiliation that I use in my work:

Humiliation means the enforced lowering of a person or group, a process of subjugation that damages or strips away their pride, honor or dignity. To be humiliated is to be placed, against your will (or in some cases with your consent, for example in cases of religious self-humiliation or in sado-masochism) and often in a deeply hurtful way, in a situation that is greatly inferior to what you feel you should expect. Humiliation entails demeaning treatment that transgresses established expectations. It may involve acts of force, including violent force. At its heart is the idea of pinning down, putting down or holding to the ground. Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of humiliation as a process is that the victim is forced into passivity, acted upon, made helpless.

People react in different ways when they feel that they were unduly humiliated: some just become depressed – anger turns against oneself – others get openly enraged, and yet others hide their anger and carefully plan for revenge. The person who plans for revenge may become the leader of a movement. ... Thus, feelings of humiliation may lead to rage, that may be turned inwards, as in the case of depression and apathy. However, this rage may also turn outwards and express itself in violence, even in mass violence, in case leaders are around who forge narratives of humiliation that feed on the feelings of humiliation among masses.

There are many points that would merit closer attention and that are not discussed here, out of lack of space. For example, what is the difference between humiliation that is felt genuinely and feelings of humiliation that are instigated by propaganda or prescribed culturally? Or, if feelings of humiliation are felt by individuals, how are they elevated to group levels, if at all? Or, what about people who are resilient to feeling humiliated even in the face of serious attempts to humiliate them? Why did Nelson Mandela find a constructive way out of humiliation, and a Hitler unleashed a world war? Why did Mandela not instigate genocide on the white elite in South Africa? All these questions and many more are attended to elsewhere in Lindner’s writing – see reference list further down.

Furthermore, what should be discussed in more length is my personal stance in relation to Human Rights. I promote Human Rights ideals, where human worthiness and dignity is regarded to be equal for every human being. However, I stand in for Human Rights not because I enjoy presenting myself as an arrogant Westerner who humiliates the non-West by denigrating their honor codes of ranked human worthiness. On the

contrary, to my view, people who endorse honor codes may not be looked down upon; my conceptualization is that honor codes had their respected place in a world that did not yet experience the coming-together of humankind into *One single* family. However, we live in a new reality, the vision and emerging reality of a *global village*, and this new reality can, according to my view, best be tackled with Human Rights norms. I believe that Human Rights represent a normative framework that is better adapted to an emerging *global village*. Thus, I wish to encourage every inhabitant of the globe to abandon “we” and “them” differentiations and define herself as “we,” as “we humanity,” who *together* searches for the best ways to provide our children with a livable world.

### **My research and the current state-of-art**

In 1994, after many years of international experience – as medical student and psychology student in Asia, Africa, Middle East, America and Europe, and later seven years as a psychological counselor and clinical psychologist in Cairo, Egypt – I asked myself: “What is the most significant obstacle to peace and social cohesion?” My hunch was that dynamics of humiliation may be central. This hunch was based not only on my clinical experience, but also on other evidence. There is a widely shared notion that German was humiliated through the Versailles Accords and that this gave Hitler the necessary platform to unleash World War II and the Holocaust. Marshal Foch of France said in 1919 about the Versailles Treaties: “This is not a peace treaty – it will be a cease-fire for 20 years.”

In 1996, I began to examine the available literature and was surprised that humiliation had not received much academic attention. Search terms such as “shame” or “trauma” would render innumerable hits, however, not “humiliation.” I was astonished, because, if humiliation indeed can trigger war, there must be a large body of research to be found. However, this was not the case. I thus designed a doctoral research project on humiliation (for a doctorate in psychology).

I conducted a four-year doctoral research project (1997-2001) at the University of Oslo (1997-2001). It was entitled *The Feeling of Being Humiliated: A Central Theme in Armed Conflicts. A Study of the Role of Humiliation in Somalia, and Rwanda/Burundi, Between the Warring Parties, and in Relation to Third Intervening Parties*. I carried out 216 qualitative interviews addressing Somalia, Rwanda and Burundi and their history of genocidal killings. From 1998 to 1999 the interviews were carried out in Africa (in Hargeisa, capital of Somaliland, in Kigali and other places in Rwanda, in Bujumbura, capital of Burundi, in Nairobi in Kenya, and in Cairo in Egypt), and from 1997 to 2001 also in Europe (in Norway, Germany, Switzerland, France, and in Belgium).

As the title of the project indicates, three groups had to be interviewed, namely both the conflict parties in Somalia and Rwanda/Burundi, and representatives of third parties who intervene. These three groups stand in a set of triangular relationships (at least this is the minimum version – where there are more than two opponents, as is the case in most conflicts, the pattern, obviously, has more than three corners). Both in Somalia and Rwanda/Burundi, representatives of the “opponents” and the “third party” were approached. The following people were included in the “network of conversations” that was created in the course of the research:

- Survivors of genocides were interviewed, that is people belonging to the groups that

were targeted for genocidal killing. In Somalia this included, among others, the Isaaq tribe, in Rwanda the Tutsi, in Burundi Hutu and Tutsi. The group of survivors is typically divided into two parts, namely those who survived because they were not in the country when the genocide happened, - some of them returned after the genocide, - and those who survived the onslaught inside the country. The German background of this fieldwork consists of the network of contacts that I have established, over some decades, with survivors from the Holocaust and, especially, their children.

- Freedom fighters were included into the “network of conversation.” In Somalia, interviews were conducted with SNM (Somali National Movement) fighters in the North of Somalia, who fought the troops sent by the central government in Mogadishu in the South; in Rwanda the interviewees were the former Tutsi refugees who formed an army, the RFP (Rwandese Patriotic Front), and attacked Rwanda from the North in order to oust the extremist Hutu government which carried out the genocide in Rwanda in 1994; in Burundi there were also Hutu rebels. In Germany, the equivalent of these contacts were exchanges with those aristocratic circles in Germany that fed opposition against Hitler, but also with those, especially from the researcher’s family, who advocated Human Rights in the middle of World War II and paid a high price for their human compassion. Furthermore, the researcher’s contacts with people from the occupied countries who tried to sabotage German oppression, for example the Norwegian resistance movement, belong into this group, as well as representatives of the allies who finally put an end to German atrocities.
- Some Somali warlords who have their places of retreat in Kenya were interviewed.
- Politicians were included, among them people who were in power before the genocide and whom survivors secretly suspected of having been collaborators or at least silent supporters of those who perpetrated the genocide. The equivalent in Germany is the atmosphere of underlying suspicion in which I grew up, generally a mistrust towards everybody of a certain age, but in particular suspicion towards the past of those people in power, a suspicion that only diminishes as the years pass and people die.
- Somali and Rwandan/Burundian academicians who study the situation of their countries were interviewed. For Germany the last striking manifestation in this field, and a focal point for discussions, has been Daniel Jonah Goldhagen’s book on *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*.
- Representatives of national non-governmental organizations who work locally for development, peace and reconciliation were included. In Germany, the response to the atrocities of World War II permeates everybody’s life – even the generation born after the war – and the researcher’s intimate knowledge of a culture of German self-criticism may stand as an equivalent to the pre-occupation with past, present, and future anticipated bloodshed that characterizes people’s lives in Somalia, Rwanda, and Burundi.
- Third parties were interviewed, namely representatives of United Nations organizations and international non-governmental organizations who work on emergency relief, long-term development, peace, and reconciliation in all parts of the world.
- Egyptian diplomats in the foreign ministry in Egypt who deal with Somalia were

visited; Egypt is a heavyweight in the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

- African psychiatrists in Kenya who deal with trauma and forensic psychiatry were asked about their experience with victims and perpetrators from Rwanda/Burundi and Somalia. In Kenya many nationals from Somalia and Rwanda/Burundi have sought refuge, some in refugee camps, others through various private arrangements. Some, both victims and perpetrators, seek psychiatric help. The equivalent in Germany are those researchers who focus on the effects of the German Holocaust and other World War II atrocities.
- Those who have not yet been interviewed are the masterminds of genocide in Rwanda, those who have planned the genocide, and organized it meticulously. Some of them are said to be in hiding in Kenya and other parts of Africa, or in French-speaking parts of Europe, or in the United States and Canada. Some are in prisons in Rwanda and in Arusha, Tanzania. However, accounts of people who were close to Somali dictator Siad Barre have successfully been collected. In the case of Hitler and those who supported him, a culture of openness and frank discussion is currently unfolding in Germany – the whole country has entered into a phase of “working through” these past experiences, and people who never talked before, do so now, more than 50 years after World War II.
- The topic has also been discussed with more than 500 researchers working in related fields. The current state-of-the-art has been mapped, showing that few researchers have turned their attention to this field. A Theory of Humiliation is currently being developed by the author, and a larger book project is envisaged (in co-operation with Dennis Smith, professor of sociology).

Some of the interview conversations were filmed (altogether the author produced 10 hours of film, comprising many interviews, but also images of Somaliland and Rwanda), other interviews were taped on mini discs (altogether more than 100 hours of audio tape), and in situations where this seemed inappropriate the researcher made notes. The interviews and conversations were conducted in different languages; most of them in English (Somalia) and French (Great Lakes), many in German, and in Norwegian.

Few researchers have studied humiliation explicitly. In many cases the term humiliation is not differentiated from other concepts; humiliation and shame, for example, are often used exchangeably, among others by Silvan S. Tomkins (1962–1992) whose work is carried further by Donald L. Nathanson. Nathanson describes humiliation as a combination of three innate affects out of altogether nine affects, namely as a combination of shame, disgust and dissmell (Nathanson in a personal conversation, October 1, 1999).<sup>7</sup>

In Lindner’s work, humiliation is distinctly addressed on its own account and differentiated from other concepts. Humiliation is, for example, not regarded simply as a variant of shame. Dennis Smith, professor of sociology at Loughborough University, UK and founder of LOGIN, has been introduced to the notion of humiliation through Lindner’s research and has since incorporated the notion actively into his work in a fascinating way; see, for example, Smith (2002).

The view that humiliation may be a particularly forceful phenomenon is supported by

---

<sup>7</sup> See also Nathanson (1992).

the research of, for example, Suzanne M. Retzinger (1991) and Thomas J. Scheff & Retzinger (1991), who studied shame and humiliation in marital quarrels. They show that the suffering caused by humiliation is highly significant and that the bitterest divisions have their roots in shame and humiliation. Also W. Vogel & Lazare (1990) document *unforgivable humiliation* as a very serious obstacle in couples' treatment. Robert L. Hale (1994) addressed *The Role of Humiliation and Embarrassment in Serial Murder*. Humiliation has also been studied in such fields as love, sex and social attractiveness, depression, society and identity formation, sports, history, literature and film.

Donald Klein (1991) carried out very insightful work on humiliation in, for example, the *Journal of Primary Prevention* that devoted a special issue to the topic of humiliation in 1991, 1992, and 1999. Hartling & Luchetta (1999) pioneered a quantitative questionnaire on humiliation (Humiliation Inventory) where a rating from 1 to 5 is employed for questions measuring *being teased, bullied, scorned, excluded, laughed at, put down, ridiculed, harassed, discounted, embarrassed, cruelly criticized, treated as invisible, discounted as a person, made to feel small or insignificant, unfairly denied access to some activity, opportunity, or service, called names or referred to in derogatory terms*, or viewed by others as *inadequate*, or *incompetent*. The questions probe the extent to which respondents had felt harmed by such incidents throughout life, and how much they feared such incidents.

Scheff and Retzinger extended their work on violence and Holocaust and studied the part played by *humiliated fury* in escalating conflict between individuals and nations – see Scheff 1997, p. 11; the term *humiliated fury* was coined by Helen Block Lewis (1971). Consider Scheff (1988), Scheff (1990a), Scheff (1990b), Scheff (1997), Masson (1996), Vachon (1993), Znakov (1990), and see, furthermore, Charny (1997), and his analysis of excessive power strivings. Psychiatrist James Gilligan (1996), as well, focuses on humiliation as a cause for violence, in his book *Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and How to Treat It*.

Vamik D. Volkan and Joseph Montville carried out important work on psycho-political analysis of intergroup conflict and its traumatic effects. See Volkan (1988), Volkan (1992), Volkan (1994), Volkan & Harris (1995), Volkan (1997), and Montville (1993), Volkan, Demetrios, & Montville (1990), Montville (1990). See also Blema S. Steinberg (1996). Furthermore, Ervin Staub's work is highly significant. See Staub (1989), Staub (1990), Staub (1993), and Staub (1996). See also the journal *Social Research* in 1997, whose special issue was stimulated by the *Decent Society* by Avishai Margalit (1996).

Nisbett & Cohen (1996) examined an honor-based notion of humiliation. The honor to which Cohen and Nisbett refer is the kind that operates in the more traditional branches of the Mafia or, more generally, in blood feuds. William Ian Miller (1993), wrote a book entitled *Humiliation and Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence*, where he links humiliation to honor as understood in *The Iliad* or Icelandic sagas, namely humiliation as violation of honor.

There is a significant literature in philosophy on *the politics of recognition*, claiming that people who are not recognized suffer humiliation and that this leads to violence; see also Honneth (1997), on related themes. Max Scheler (1912) set out these issues in his classic book *Ressentiment*. In his first period of work, for example in his *The Nature of Sympathy*, Scheler (1954) focuses on human feelings, love, and the nature of the person.

He states that the human person is at bottom a loving being, *ens amans*, who may feel *ressentiment*.

This overview does not exhaust the contributions to be found in the literature on the topic of humiliation – or rather on related issues, since, to my awareness, only Miller, Hartling, and the two above-mentioned journals explicitly put the word and concept of *humiliation* at the centre of their attention. Later other authors will also be introduced and cited.

However, as soon as we turn to issues that are related to humiliation then a wide field of research opens up: Research on mobbing and bullying touches upon the phenomenon of humiliation and should therefore be included.<sup>8</sup> Research on mobbing and bullying leads over to the field of prejudice and stigmatization,<sup>9</sup> which in turn draws on research on trauma and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder PTSD,<sup>10</sup> aggression (see further down), power and conflict,<sup>11</sup> stress,<sup>12</sup> and last but not least emotions.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See especially Heinz Leymann for work on mobbing, Leymann (1990), Leymann (1996), Leymann & Gustafsson (1996), as well as Dan Åke Olweus on mobbing and bullying at school, Olweus (1993), Olweus (1997). The confusion around the use of the terms mobbing and bullying stems from the fact that these phenomena are addressed differently in different countries. Leymann suggests keeping the word bullying for activities between children and teenagers at school and reserving the word mobbing for adult behavior at workplaces.

<sup>9</sup> Edvard E. Jones (1984), *Social Stigma - The Psychology of Marked Relationships*, is a central book on stigmatization.

<sup>10</sup> There exists a huge body of research and literature, see, for example, Bremner, Southwick, Brett, Fontana, Rosenheck, & Charney (1992), Eitinger (1990), Everly (1993), Figley (1989), Gerbode (2000), Havermans (1998), Horowitz, Weine, & Jekel (1995), Kardiner (1941), Lavik, Laake, Hauff, & Solberg (1999), McCann & Pearlman (1992), Nadler & Ben Shushan (1989), Pearlman (1994), Pearlman (1998), Perry (1994), van der Kolk, Blitz, Burr, & Hartmann (1984), van der Kolk (1994), van der Kolk & van der Hart (1989), van der Kolk & van der Hart (1991), van der Kolk & Kadish (1987).

<sup>11</sup> Political scientists P. Bachrach & Baratz (1962), were among the first to address power and conflict in their article ‘The Two Faces of Power’ that is placed within the context of the civil rights movement in the USA of the nineteen sixties. See also Tedeschi, Schlenker, & Bonoma (1973) on Conflict, Power, and Games: the Experimental Study of Interpersonal Relations.

<sup>12</sup> Standard reading on stress psychology is Richard S. Lazarus (1966), *Psychological Stress and the Coping Process* and Lazarus & Folkman (1984), *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. Stress is not necessarily negative, it may also be a stimulating challenge – and there are individual differences why some people thrive under stress and others break. See, for example, *Resilience and Thriving: Issues, Models, and Linkages* by Carver (1998), *Embodying Psychological Thriving: Physical Thriving in Response to Stress* by Epel, McEwen, & Ickovics (1998), *Quantitative Assessment of Thriving* by Cohen, Cimboric, Armeli, & Hettler (1998), *Beyond Recovery From Trauma: Implications for Clinical Practice and Research* by Calhoun & Tedeschi (1998), *Exploring Thriving in the Context of Clinical Trauma Theory: Constructivist Self Development Theory* by Saakvitne, Tennen, & Affleck (1998).

<sup>13</sup> Antonio R. Damasio (1994), with his book *Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain*, provides a perspective on the important “constructive” role that emotions play for the process of our decision making; it shows how the traditional view of “heart” versus “head” is obsolete. Daniel Goleman (1996), in his more widely known book *Emotional Intelligence* relies heavily on Damasio. Goleman gives, among others, a description of the brain activities that lead to post-traumatic

Conflict and peace are topics that have been widely studied; thousands of publications are to be found that cover a wide range of conflicts, from interpersonal to intergroup and international conflict. The search word *terrorism* renders thousands of hits in databases. Instead of presenting large lists of publications at this point I would like to mention some of those that had particular significance for this research project on humiliation. A pioneer of conflict studies in social psychology was Morton Deutsch, the founder of the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution (ICCCR) at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, see, for example, Deutsch & Coleman (2000).

Also Herbert C. Kelman was among the first to work in this field, see, for example, Kelman (1999), and Kelman & Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (1965). David A. Hamburg's work for prevention, as President of the Carnegie Corporation, has been crucial, see, for example, Hamburg (2002).

Lee D. Ross, principal investigator and co-founder of the *Stanford Center on Conflict and Negotiation (SCCN)*, addresses psychological barriers to conflict resolution, see, for example, Ross & Ward (1995). William Ury, Director of the *Project on Preventing War at Harvard University*, and co-author of *Getting to Yes*, Fisher, Ury, & Patton (1991), and author of *Getting to Peace*, Ury (1999), focuses in his anthropological work on conflict. Monty Marshall (1999), founding director of the *Integrated Network for Societal Conflict Research (INSCR)* program at the *Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM)*, University of Maryland, wrote a seminal book on protracted conflict and the hypothesis of *diffusion of insecurity*. Bar-On & Nadler (1999) call for more attention to be given to conflicts in contexts of power asymmetry.

In cases where humiliation shall be studied in cross-cultural settings, cross-cultural psychology has to be included,<sup>14</sup> and the anthropological, sociological and philosophical

---

stress disorder. The *Handbook of Emotion and Memory* by Christianson (1992), addresses the important interplay between emotions and memory. Humiliation is a process that is deeply embedded in the individual's interdependence with her environment, and therefore relational concepts of mind such as Gibson's ecological psychology of "affordance" are relevant. Gibson "includes environmental considerations in psychological taxonomies" writes de Jong (1997) (Abstract). M. A. Forrester (1999) presents an related approach, that he defines as "discursive ethnomethodology," that focuses on "narrativization as process bringing together the discourse theory as developed by Foucault (1972), the affordance metaphor used by Gibson (1979) and conversation analysis. I thank Reidar Ommundsen and Finn Tschudi for kindly helping me to get access to psychological theories on emotion, especially as developed by Tomkins and Nathanson. Silvan S. Tomkins (1962), developed one of the most interesting theories of the human being and emotions; see his four volumes of *Affect Imagery and Consciousness*. See also Virginia Demos (1995), editor of *Exploring Affect*, a book that eases the otherwise difficult access to Tomkins' thinking. Donald L. Nathanson (1996) builds on Tomkins' work; he writes on script, shame, and pride. Tomkins does not always differentiate between humiliation and shame and uses it exchangeably, while Nathanson describes humiliation as a combination of three innate affects out of nine, namely a combination of shame, disgust and dissmell (Nathanson in a personal conversation, 1st October 1999 in Oslo). Abelson (1976) addresses the issue from the cognitive perspective, compared to Tomkins personality-psychological perspective. Also the sociology of emotions is relevant; see especially the work of Thomas J. Scheff (1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1997) on violence and emotions such as shame.

<sup>14</sup> See, example the work of Michael Harris Bond. I can only present a small selection of important books and some articles, Bond (1997), Bond (1998), Smith & Bond (1999), Bond,

embeddedness of processes of humiliation in different cultural contexts has to be addressed. If humiliation between groups or even nations is to be studied then history and political science play a central role.

...

Please read the rest of this chapter in

Fitzduff, Mari and Stout, Chris E. (Eds.), *Psychological Approaches to Dealing With Conflict and War*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press and Praeger Publishers.

---

Leung, and Schwartz (1992). Harry Charalambos Triandis is an important name as well, see, for example, Triandis (1980), Triandis (1990), Triandis (1995), Triandis (1997), Schwartz (1994). Richard W. Brislin is another very relevant name, see, for example Brislin (1993), Cushner & Brislin (1996), Landis & Brislin (1983).