

Humiliation, Rape, and Love: Force and Fraud in the Erogenous Zones

'Force and fraud are in war the two cardinal virtues'
(Hobbes in 'Leviathan')

© Evelin Gerda Lindner

2000

Manuscript submitted for publication, now in the process of revision, first, longer version

We appreciate that you contact the author if you wish to quote from this text. Texts may usually be copied for non-profit educational use if proper credit is given to the author and Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies. No part of this file may be transmitted, distributed or reproduced in any other way without permission from the author.

(Dr. psychol., Dr. med. Evelin Gerda Lindner, University of Oslo, Institute of Psychology, P.O.Box 1094 Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway, e.g.lindner@psykologi.uio.no, <http://folk.uio.no/evelinl>)

Humiliation, Rape and Love: Force and Fraud in the Erogenous Zones

Abstract

This paper is about the intersection between war, sexuality and gender. It encompasses micro-social relations and macro-social structures and integrates several theoretical and disciplinary traditions (social psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, feminism, history and international relations). Its object is to discern the logic of male-female relations expressed in two kinds of society: those societies that accept the standards associated with human rights and those societies based upon the principle of honour that reject or are unfamiliar with human rights as a framework for living. The paper brings to visibility the meta-logic of humiliation that informs these two frameworks based, respectively, upon the idea of human rights and the idea of honour. Once this meta-logic has been understood, it allows strong links to be seen between public and private spheres: on the one hand, the arena of warfare between nations and ethnic groups, on the other hand, the arena of love and sexuality between individuals.

Keywords: Rape, love, honour, dignity, marriage, war

Humiliation, Rape and Love: Force and Fraud in the Erogenous Zones

This paper asks the following question: How have perceptions of love and sexual abuse, especially rape, in male-female relationships been altered with the spread of human rights as a set of standards for judging human behaviour? Behind this question lies another: How have perceptions of human identity been transformed by the transition from honour to human rights? This refers to the transition from traditional values and practices that emphasise the collective honour of a group, especially its male membership, to more 'modern' values and practices that emphasise the dignity of every individual, regardless of gender. Throughout the paper, particular attention will be paid to the way transformations of this kind impact upon the nature of humiliation and the way it is experienced within male-female relationships.

The increasing use of rape as 'weapon' in war is a pressing current problem. Romantic love as a historically relatively new and fragile basis of such social institutions as marriage is another contemporary difficulty. Both, seemingly unconnected, are introduced in this paper into one common conceptual framework, namely the meta-logic of humiliation.¹ The backdrop is the present process of globalisation that brings people and cultures together and permeates societies at all levels, thus driving transitions that were unimaginable until recently.²

Humiliation involves the imposition of harm upon a victim who is, or has been made or has become, helpless.³ Humiliation has the potential to cause intense suffering, probably more intense than any other assault. This assertion is supported by the research of, for example, Retzinger and Scheff (Retzinger, 1991; Scheff & Retzinger, 1991) who study 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.⁴

The approach adopted in this paper contributes to the integration of several theoretical and disciplinary traditions. It draws upon such fields as social psychology (the author's own core discipline), sociology, anthropology, philosophy, feminism, history and international relations.⁵ The guiding themes are the dynamics of humiliation and, in particular, the polymorphous character of love and rape as a framework for encounters between men and women.

This paper draws upon evidence collected by the author in two contexts. The first context is work as a clinical psychologist in Germany (1980-84) and Egypt (1984-91). The second context is research as a social psychologist examining the part played by humiliation in armed conflict, especially its role in genocide and massacre.⁶ 216 interviews have been carried out in Africa (Somalia, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, Egypt) and Europe (England, Norway, Germany, Switzerland) from 1997-2000.

The argument made in this paper is embedded in the normative stance that the sexual aspect of human relations ought to be deeply influenced by the idea of human rights. However, while professing to the standards associated with human rights, the paper also seeks to discern the logic expressed in societies based upon the principle of honour that reject or are unfamiliar with human rights as a framework for living. Furthermore, the paper brings to visibility the meta-logic that informs these two frameworks, one based upon human rights, the other based upon the idea of honour. Once this meta-logic has been understood, it allows strong links to be seen between public and private spheres: on the one hand, the arena of warfare between nations and ethnic groups, on the other hand, the arena of love and sexuality between individuals.

The paper is organised in four parts. In the first part, a typology is presented. It distinguishes between different ways in which physical encounters between males and females are perceived and experienced. The typology is constructed with reference to two factors. One factor is the extent to which the relationships within which the encounters occur are framed in terms of love and nurturing as opposed to hostility and destructiveness. The other factor is the degree to which traditional honour as opposed to human rights is emphasised by the parties concerned.

In the second part of the paper, the tension between honour-based marriage and loving relationships grounded in human rights is explored. The third part of the paper turns to the question of hostile sexual encounters and destructive relationships. In the fourth part the corrosive effects of false love in a human rights society are discussed.

A typology of male-female relationships

Richard Exley once wrote: ‘A true friend is one who hears and understands when you share your deepest feelings. He supports you when you are struggling; he corrects you, gently and with love, when you err; and he forgives you when you fail. A true friend prods you to personal growth, stretches you to your full potential. And most amazing of all, he celebrates your successes as if they were his own.’⁷

LOVE AND HOSTILITY

Negative Pole: Hostility and Destructiveness	Positive Pole: Love and Nurturing
Hands and arms <i>pushing down</i> the other: rejecting, excluding, diminishing, and crushing.	Arms <i>wrapped around</i> the other in love and respect.

Figure I: Love and hostility

If sexuality is placed in the positive context of true friendship then it becomes the language of love (see Figure I). This language is tactile. My beloved speaks to me through touch, gives me touch-signs of love. I do not feel harmed or humiliated by this touch. On the contrary, I feel a wave of warmth traversing my body, I feel happy. Even my immune system gets stronger, and my glands excrete beneficial hormones. In short, this is the most positive expression of sexuality. Surely, most people would agree: ‘If another person were to touch the most private parts of my body, then I would like it to be in this context.’⁸

At the other, negative, pole are child abuse or the mass rape of women in a civil war. A person who commits rape or abuses a child for sexual pleasure inflicts profound suffering on that individual stemming from the fact that the victim’s inner core of dignity is torn apart and humiliated.⁹ When rape is used as a weapon in war situations it imposes a multiple humiliation. It humiliates not just the individual victim but also her entire clan, her tribe, her ethnic group.¹⁰

In both love and sexual abuse, the location or setting is the same: the body’s erogenous zones. In the first case they are a joyful field of play, zones of care and creative complicity. In the second case they are a crime scene, zones of force and fraud.¹¹

The two cases may also be described in terms of the movements of hands and arms. The positive pole represents loving arms that open up to the loved person, welcome her, and then wrap lovingly and respectfully around the loved person. The negative pole represents hands that push a person down into the mud (humiliation is related to ‘humus,’ meaning that

the humiliated one is reduced to the level of the earth¹²). These hands might hold weapons intended to destroy the ‘unwanted’ human being after having degraded them, reducing them to the level of a ‘rat’ or ‘cockroach.’¹³

When I love a person with my whole body and heart, then I ‘put my arms around’ the loved one, not only my arms of flesh and blood, but also metaphorically: I wrap the loved person into my thoughts, my warm feelings, and my care. I embrace the person who is dear to me with my whole being without suffocating him or her. At this extreme positive side of the continuum we see two people’s bodies wrapped around each other in deep love, love which includes care for the well-being of the other, not just fascination for and by the other’s ecstatic feelings. This would be the outer positive pole.

The outer negative pole would be presented by the war lord who orders his men to exterminate the enemy but first, to rape the enemy’s women - in order to demonstrate the enemy’s utter unworthiness. This act of utter rejection is the opposite of welcoming opening arms. In this case, hands and arms engage in a brutal ‘pushing down’ or ‘putting down’ movement: a mixture of stabbing and burying, a thrusting-into-the-ground that crushes the life out of the victim. In daily life encounters at the outer poles will mostly be the exceptions; most human encounters occur somewhere between the outer poles, and feelings of love and hatred are often both present, warring for dominance.

The other dimension of the typology (see Figure II) addresses the degree to which honour (especially the public honour of the male, the family and the group) are emphasised as opposed to the inner human dignity of the individual, male or female. The dynamics of humiliation as a social process and a psychological experience differ greatly between ‘honour’ societies and ‘dignity’ societies. In honour societies, social identity is tied in with two things: a sense of membership on equal terms with your peers within a group (for example, the aristocracy, other males) and a sense of superiority over those groups that are ‘below’ your own (for example, the peasantry, females).¹⁴

HONOUR AND HUMAN RIGHTS

‘Honour’ Society	‘Human Rights’ Society
<p><i>Imperative:</i> Protect the public honour of the group (family, village, clan), especially its male membership.</p> <p>Inter-personal and inter-group humiliation is a <i>routine</i> and <i>legitimate</i> strategy for maintaining social hierarchies.</p>	<p><i>Imperative:</i> Protect the inner core of dignity possessed by each individual without exception. Humiliation is unacceptable.</p> <p>Care to <i>avoid</i> humiliating others is routine. The psychological damage caused by humiliation is more intense than in honour societies.</p>

Figure II: Honour and human rights

Humiliating your inferiors through insults and violence is a routine strategy for maintaining hierarchical social relationships within an honour society. It is accepted as normal and legitimate even though its victims may resent it. To quote the words of a Hutu from the North of Burundi, now an international intellectual,¹⁵ ‘A son of a Tutsi got the conviction that he is born to rule, that he was above the servants, while a son of a Hutu learned to be convinced that he was a servant, therefore he learned to be polite and humble, while a Tutsi was proud. A Tutsi learned that he could kill a Hutu at any time.’ He added, ‘The concept of humiliation

is related to tradition and culture: Tutsi are convinced that they are “born to rule,” they cannot imagine how they can survive without being in power.’

By contrast, in dignity societies – in other words, societies that recognise the central importance of human rights – the use of humiliation is thoroughly disparaged. This is because humiliation is always an attempt to impute fundamental differences between the humiliator and the victim, to exclude and degrade the latter, to declare that the victim is inferior and unworthy. This is unacceptable when the social order is legitimised by the idea that all human beings have equal dignity, irrespective of differences in respect of gender, ethnicity, nationality and any other form of group membership.

These differences between honour societies and dignity societies have been analysed at length elsewhere¹⁶ but may be briefly illustrated here with reference to the way rape is treated. In honour societies, the honour of the group is damaged if the worthiness of any single member of the group is attacked or compromised. If the damage cannot be made good, avenged, or ‘paid for’ in some way, then the damaged element has to be cut out or destroyed. In such societal frameworks, families are urged to treat unmarried females as exchangeable property¹⁷ for use in making marriage contracts with other families. The honour of the family is closely tied to the virginity of unmarried daughters. If a girl is raped, the whole family feels humiliated; furthermore, such a daughter would not anymore make an honourable marriage?¹⁸ One of the family’s fears is that their daughter’s damaged hymen could be understood by her future husband as an attempt to dishonour his family. A damaged hymen is a dishonourable gift to give from one family to another. It is humiliating to receive such a gift and humiliating to be accused of offering it. All members of the raped girl’s family feel ‘soiled’ or ‘damaged’ by the rape just as a whole body is affected when disease attacks a particular limb. The rape may set in motion a remorseless logic: either the daughter must marry the rapist, the very person who abused her, or she must die.¹⁹

Honour-killings shock and appal a human rights society. This is because in such a society rape is primarily seen as a violation of the girl’s inner core of dignity. To view the young woman only as a token of a family’s public honour is intolerable in a human rights context. To punish her further by killing her is seen to compound the offence in an incomprehensible way. This point of view is so familiar to a modern reader that there is little need to elaborate it. In a human-rights based society it will not be comprehensible that where male sexual aggression is seen as being stronger than the male’s capacity to exercise control over it,²⁰ female genital mutilation may be carried out with the intention of providing a kind of ‘protection’ against this very male sexual aggression – by ‘closing’ the otherwise ‘open’ woman and thus ‘strengthen’ the hymen/family honour, and furthermore by removing male ferocity perceived to be embodied in the clitoris.²¹ In such contexts, also, wearing a veil may not be rejected as a limitation upon freedom but, rather, accepted by women as a valuable protection providing them with a respect that in their eyes is absent in Western societies. These remarks are intended to contribute towards understanding these practices and their cultural logic, not towards defending them.

The two dimensions may now be put together to complete the typology (see Figure III).

HONOUR, HUMAN RIGHTS, RAPE AND LOVE

	Rape	Love
Honour society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggressive male sexuality is accepted as a ‘natural hazard,’ ‘useful’ for war. Rape violates a family’s public honour. • Killing the raped daughter, or marrying her to the rapist are imaginable solutions. • Female genital mutilation and veiling are ‘necessary’ forms of ‘protection’ in a male honour society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male-female relationships are hierarchical, a relationship between superior and inferior. • The possibility of mutual respect on equal terms is not included.
Human rights society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggressive male sexuality is regarded as illegitimate. • A man is expected to be able to control himself. • Rape violates the victim’s inner core of dignity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male-female relationships are between equals. • Full mature love entails respect for the loved person’s human rights and inner core of dignity.

Figure III: Honour, human rights, rape and love

In this section a typology has been developed which links together love, rape, honour and dignity. In the following section the tension between honour-based marriage and loving relationships grounded in human rights is explored.

Love, honour and human rights

Full and mature love between partners means the interweaving of souls of equal adults. It means including the loved person with all his or her needs, respecting the loved person’s human rights, treating him or her as an independent human being, as an end, not as means (Kant); in short, it means putting my arms around the loved person.

Does mature love mean wanting to be together with the loved person? One may answer, Yes, normally. Sentences such as the following seem to speak the language of love: ‘I love you so much, I cannot be without you!’ Or: ‘I love you so much, you are as important to me as the air I breathe!’ Spontaneously one might respond to such sentences with the comment: ‘What would love be, if the lovers did not need each other!’ However, after a second thought, it may become clear that the phrase ‘I cannot be without you’ may easily express a deep lack of mature love. This is because such sentences may come from a jealous husband who locks up his wife in the house when he goes out to work, and forbids her any contact with anybody except with him. Is this love? The husband might say: ‘Yes, this is love, this is extreme love.’ His wife might accept that and actually feel loved. She might gladly sit at home, watch some television, prepare the dinner, feel honoured that she is so important to him, and wait for his return every evening. But she may also feel unduly imprisoned, frustrated by not being able to go out, humiliated by his lack of faith in her, humiliated by the fact that he is not ‘mature’ enough to let her be anything else but a crutch to keep him going, frustrated and humiliated by him not letting her have a life of her own.²²

At this point it becomes particularly clear that a human rights perspective yields fundamentally different evaluations of this discussion of love than a traditional honour perspective. Husbands and wives who gladly accept locking away the woman are most likely to be found within a traditional honour society. The wife who feels humiliated by these practices is most probably living in the context of a human rights society. To conclude this line of argument, 'I need you' cannot be sufficient for defining mature love in a human rights context. Full and mature love is, however, expressed in the following sentence: 'I need you, but if my needs make you unhappy or destroy you, I am strong enough to protect you from them, or, I am strong enough to let you go.' Evidently, the line between mature love and clinging love with exploitative effects is difficult to draw and therefore full love needs to ask the loved person a lot of questions, 'Which of my needs make you happy when I ask you to attend to them? Which of my needs do not make you happy, or even burden you? Which solution can we find for those needs of mine which make you unhappy?' Full love knows a lot about the partner's special individual make-up; full love interweaves; full love is not content with saying, 'Sorry that it hurt you what I did, I thought you liked it, I did it out of love!' Full and mature love is only full and mature through dialogue.²³

How does sexual desire relate to love? Sexual desire is a fragile phenomenon. It unfolds best in a context of spontaneity. No man can order his penis to become erect; no woman can command her body to open up. To expect that openness can be commanded is a widely misunderstood problem with spontaneity. Spontaneity is also the opposite of customary practice. How many women 'deliver' their body to their partner's use, 'think of England,' and hope that it will be 'over' soon. The use of the other's body as legitimate part of marriage: this is the opposite of love. It is closer to rape. Even so, it is the traditional framework of marriage.²⁴

The objectification of the other is an act of subjugation and humiliation, and, if inflicted on the beloved person, makes authentic desire for her impossible. Many societies, groups and individuals are currently learning about human rights and about the inner core of dignity in each person, however, as this section highlights, not all facets of life have yet been adapted to these principles, and many may be unaware that the transition is to be made in the most minute details of people's involvement with each other, not just in macro-political structures.²⁵ Dialogue, fine-tuned verbal or non-verbal communication, seems more necessary within the new human rights framework than in the old, more rigid, honour code.

Citizens in Western societies are often convinced that they are firmly rooted in human rights, however, as this section suggests, much has still to be learned – and, this is the position of the present author, awareness of this yet to fulfil task would be more appropriate than looking down on the rest of the world.²⁶ Marriage based on feelings is bound to be more difficult to manage than marriage based on sets of rights and obligations as in traditional arranged marriages. Arranged marriages are astonishingly stable, and provide children with a secure environment in which to grow up. The West has not yet learned to interweave marriage based on love with stability and emotional security for children, since feelings of love between partners cannot be ordered. This is why divorce is bound to happen in a love context more often than in the hierarchical context of traditional honour societies. The West seems to be quite blind to the fragility of love and the difficulty of sustaining it. Love requires continual dialogue and individual tailor making of the relationship.

Divorce exposes sharply the transition of humankind from traditional honour-based social and cultural structures to human rights-based structures. In the old framework, divorce is regarded as a shameful and humiliating event, while in the new framework the opposite is true: namely, the avoidance of divorce may be seen as humiliating to the inner truth of the partners. While in the old framework partners have to stay together at all cost, in the new

framework they should work on friendly separation if necessary, staying together as friends, and as parents if they have children, while separating as partners.

The last task is extremely difficult to succeed in because human rights concepts of dignity *intensify* feelings of humiliation, which in turn deepen rifts. Forgiving each other and caring jointly for children while being separated as partners is an art the West has not yet mastered. The West should understand that introducing love grounded in human rights into marriage fundamentally changes dear traditional beliefs about marriage's nature. Introducing love rooted in human rights makes marriage much more demanding and can easily turn any separation into a bitter war. People in those regions in the world where arranged marriage is normal are, for example, appalled by the West's lack of family cohesion.

In this section the argument has focused upon the nature of love in honour and dignity societies and their transition. Now the argument turns to the implications of rape and allied phenomena in the two kinds of society.

Hostile sexual encounters and destructive relationships

We read in the Human Rights Watch report *Shattered Lives: Sexual Violence during the Rwandan Genocide and its Aftermath* in the introduction: 'During the 1994 Rwandan genocide, women were subjected to sexual violence on a massive scale. These crimes were perpetrated by members of the infamous Hutu militia groups known as the Interahamwe, other civilians, and soldiers of the Rwandan Armed Forces. Administrative, military and political leaders as well as heads of militia, directed or permitted the killings and sexual violence in an effort to further their political goals, and therefore bear responsibility for these abuses.'

Shattered Lives documents the widespread rape of women during the genocide, and confirms that women were gang-raped, raped with objects such as sharpened sticks or gun barrels, held in sexual slavery (either collectively or through forced "marriage") or sexually mutilated. These crimes were frequently part of a pattern in which women were raped after they had witnessed the torture and killings of their relatives and the destruction and looting of their homes' (Human Rights Watch, 1996).

'I survived only because the men who planned to rape me and then kill me, got into a fight with each other and instead killed each other. My parents had been killed in front of my eyes not long before. The killers, they were neighbours, did refrain from killing me together with my parents because they planned to rape me and then kill me by putting a long stick into my vagina. They killed each other before they could carry out their plan, therefore I have only some scars, but not many.'²⁷

In Somalia, and in other blood-revenge societies women traditionally are *not* systematically raped or killed in wars or periods of violent reprisals (International Committee of the Red Cross Somalia Delegation, 1997). Wars and blood-revenge are carried out between men, and women can move around freely. They are so to speak 'invisible.' Kari H. Karamé²⁸ told me during a personal conversation in 1997 that during the years of fighting in Lebanon there was a kind of contract between the warring parties not to rape each other's women. She recounts: 'It just happened twice, when fighters from 'outside' came, for example Palestinians. But a lot of sexual violence happened in connection with men, they were castrated, died of that.'

Compare the following testimony collected during fieldwork in and on Somalia (1997-2000): 'In Somalia we are used to settle disputes between clans through negotiation. Elders sit together and decide which compensation (diya) has to be paid for wrongs inflicted. Even if somebody has been killed, the traditional compensation procedure has a good chance to work. There is one thing though 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.'²⁹

'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 a seldom case when a girl was alone in the semi-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 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 enough to be able to sit together again.'³⁰

The Somali men cannot live together with their raped wives, because they cannot bear the humiliation, and the rifts in the social web of society cannot be healed because of the legacy of rape. The same is true for Rwanda and Burundi. Many survivors of the genocide in 1994 in Rwanda (where Tutsi and moderate Hutu were killed under orders of extremist Hutu) got very aggravated when I asked about reconciliation, 'All this talk of reconciliation! It irritates me! The government talks about reconciliation. How can I reconcile myself with people who made my grandmother parade naked in the streets before raping and killing her? Speaking of reconciliation would mean that I speak also on behalf of my grandmother. How could I!? Never! Co-existence is the maximum I will ever want to imagine.'³¹

The recent upsurge in war-rape is thus in some societal contexts a new phenomenon. It draws women into the 'game.' This represents, so to speak, a 'democratisation' of war, a transition from combat among a select group of honourable warriors, to torturing, raping and slaughtering everybody. Leaders who want to create the conditions for spontaneous mass mobilisation for war might see war-rape as a 'cost-effective' way to minimise the cost of getting willing soldiers. In populations that have humiliated each other enough, the divisions and hostilities run so deep that 'war fever' infects the whole population.

To summarise: Rape can have humiliation as its primary goal, or humiliation may be a 'side-effect.' A would-be humiliator may look for ways to humiliate other people, let us say people of another ethnic group, and find that raping the enemy's women is one possible tool among others for humiliating the enemy. Rape in this case is carried out with the deliberate intention of causing humiliation. The main object is, typically, not to humiliate the raped woman herself – she may be insignificant in the rapist's eyes – but, much more important, to humiliate her 'men.' However, whether or not the deliberate objective of rape is to humiliate, to be raped is always painful and humiliating. This is to be expected whether it is honour or dignity that is being attacked.

There are, broadly speaking, four ways, rape, sex and humiliation can be connected (see Figure IV).

RAPE, SEX AND HUMILIATION

	Enjoyment of Rape as main intention; Humiliation as an <i>unintended</i> consequence, or as an intended but <i>secondary</i> factor			Humiliation as the main intention; rape used as a means to achieve this
	Rape carried out without conscious intention	Rape consciously intended as sex	Rape as sex plus humiliation	Rape intended as humiliation
The rapist's intention	The rapist is mentally disturbed and has no conscious intention to rape a woman.	The rapist's intention is to have sex with another individual.	The rapist wants to have sex and sadistic pleasure from forcing and humiliating somebody.	The rapist's intention is to employ humiliation as a weapon in war.
The rapist's targeted victim	The rapist targets another individual.	The rapist wants to have sex with another individual.	The rapist wants to have sex and sadistic pleasure from forcing and humiliating somebody.	The rapist's intention is to humiliate the 'enemy' as a group, especially the male protectors of the women.
The rapist's wish for the victim's reactions	The rapist does not reflect consciously on the victim's reactions.	The rapist wants the victim to enjoy it.	The rapist wants the victim to feel humiliated. He may wish the victim to receive masochistic pleasure.	The rapist wishes the whole group to feel humiliated.
The victim's actual reactions	The rape victim feels humiliated.	The rape victim feels humiliated.	The rape victim feels humiliated.	The rape victim feels humiliated; in addition the whole group feels humiliated.

Figure IV: Rape, sex and humiliation

Rape is humiliating even if the rapist does not have the intention of actually causing humiliation; for example, the rapist may be a disturbed person who does not really know what he is doing. Damage is done to the victim even though the rapist may want to give his victim pleasure and may even be convinced he is doing so. However, victims of rape do not enjoy the experience. This discrepancy between the perceptions and attributions of the actor and the one acted upon is not restricted to situations of rape; it is replicated in *all* cases where someone who defines herself as a 'helper' discovers to her dismay that the recipient of the help actually feels humiliated by it and not helped.

This exposes how crucial the framing of the situation is, both by perpetrator and victim (or actor and re-actor). So are differences between their perceptions and attributions. Humiliation is not just a physical encounter; it is also, in fact it is mainly, a mind game. Somebody who intentionally sets out to humiliate another party has the aim of ‘lowering’ the other, partly in front of third parties, but especially in the eyes of the humiliator and the victims themselves. Humiliators want their victims to ‘understand’ that they are ‘rats,’ ‘cockroaches,’ or ‘despicable worms.’

The humiliator’s aim is to act upon the perceptions and self-identities of both participants to the humiliation process: perpetrator and victim. Humiliators want their victims to lose their former sense of self, to be deprived of self-respect and self-esteem, to be degraded in their own eyes. Humiliators also want to convince themselves that the victim actually deserves to be abused.

However, humiliators do not always achieve their goals, not with themselves,³² and not with all victims either. In cases of great power balance, for example, a would-be humiliator may not be taken seriously; a ‘slave’ would not be able to insult a ‘master,’ because the master would just laugh. In other cases, victims manage to keep their self-esteem strong in the face of humiliation; a Nelson Mandela managed to prevent humiliation from spoiling his dignity. Humiliation is effective only if victims actually lose their self-respect, if their sense of self is altered. Ironically, some effective instances of humiliation may be unintended. This was seen in the discussion of rape and it applies generally to cases where victims receives ‘help’ that they perceive as humiliating (see Figure V).

THE HUMILIATOR’S INTENTIONS AND THE VICTIM’S PERCEPTIONS AND ATTRIBUTION

	The victim feels humiliated	The victim does not feel humiliated
The perpetrator wants to humiliate	Rape in war.	A ‘master’ laughs in front of a ‘slave’s’ wish to humiliate the ‘master.’ A Nelson Mandela manages to prevent humiliation from spoiling his dignity.
The perpetrator does not want to humiliate	Rape that is intended to give pleasure. Or the rapist is mentally disturbed and does not intend any humiliation.	Co-existence, co-operation, love.

Figure V: The humiliator’s intentions and the victim’s perceptions and attributions

In this section rape has been analysed in terms of its complex relationships with humiliation. It has become clear that the motivations ascribed to the perpetrators by the victims of sexual abuse are of special relevance. If the victim perceives the perpetrator as not being in control of, or not responsible for, his or her actions this alleviates some of the hurt. However, if the victim discovers that he or she has been deceived this intensifies the hurt. This deception may be a result of the perpetrator’s deliberate design or it may be a consequence of the victim’s

self-deception, bad judgement or wishful thinking. In the remainder of the paper this theme will be explored further.

‘False love’ as ‘rape’

Kanin asked rapists about their behaviour towards women (Kanin, 1985), and found that the actual rape was just the ‘tip of the iceberg.’ The rapists did not take moral boundaries at all seriously in sexual matters and, furthermore, they believed that their peers had the same approach. They used all kinds of techniques to get women into bed. In particular, they told them lies and falsely declared themselves to be in love with them. They felt ‘justified’ and encouraged by their peers to make sexual conquests by deceit. The following table gives exact numbers:

Methods self-reported rapists used (on other occasions) to manipulate women to have sex with them (compared with controls who had not admitted to date rape)

	Rapist (N = 71)	Controls (N = 227)
Attempt to intoxicate female with alcohol	76*	23 α
Falsely professed love	86	25
Falsely promise ‘pinning,’ engagement, or marriage	46	6
Threaten to terminate the relationship	31	7
Threaten to leave female stranded	9	0

* 28% also involved marijuana

α 19% also involved marijuana

Table I: Kanin 1985, adapted from Sabini, 1995, page 429³³

Table I shows how widespread the phenomenon of falsely professed love is. It shows that men deceived women on this matter not only in the rapist group but also in the control group.³⁴ Men who falsely profess love treat their victims as means, not ends. They obviously hypothesise that a woman will give her body more readily to a man if she is in love with him. Such a man manipulates a woman into loving him. He is, so to speak, saving money, because he would have to pay a lot to a high-class call-girl, and would still not get her devotion and passion. Some men find it very clever to make such ‘shrewd deals.’ Other men will be less ‘shrewd.’ Sabini (429) summarises studies that show that men with old-fashioned attitudes toward women and their role in society are more lenient towards date rape, and of deceit, than are men with less conservative attitudes.

It is to be assumed that the majority of partnerships can be found in the range between full love and false love.³⁵ If somebody tells lies and is aware of it, the case is straightforward. But what about cases where partners authentically believe in different definitions of love?

Alice³⁶ came to me as a client because her marriage had collapsed. Alice was an intelligent well-educated European woman. She told me the following: ‘I met Robert 10 years ago. He is 18 years older than me. When I met him, I just came out of a relationship with an abusive man who could not endure an intelligent woman at his side. I was happy to meet somebody who was older and kinder. I yearned for kindness, for being taken care of, for not being hurt several times a day. I was touched and happy when Robert said that he needed me.

My former husband never said that, he only said that I was old and ugly. I was happy about the new compliments in my life. I was ready to give Robert everything, I was happy to have found somebody who finally loved me, and obviously did not feel threatened by me, my education, my intelligence.'

'Robert lived and worked in Indonesia, and I moved to Indonesia to join him. He was separated from his wife who lived back in Europe, and he told me that he considered me his wife now, but that he could not get a divorce because of the laws back home in his country. I accepted. I preferred a happy relationship to a painful marriage. When I arrived in Indonesia I was full of plans, wanted to do research, get another degree, have a family.... Nothing of that happened. Now I am 10 years older and I have nothing. I have wasted all these years on this man. And the worst, I did not even recognise that I wasted the time while I did it! Every time we wanted to realise one of my goals, there was an existential crisis in his life. He had problems with his job, problems with his family, we always lived in emergencies. I hardly ever relaxed. I was all the time busy helping him with his problems, hoping that we would start 'our' life 'then,' that also 'my' life would start one day. It never started.'

'How on earth could I be so stupid and accept all that? I think I did it because my mother taught me that a good woman is loyal to her man. My mother is very religious and believes that a wife has to support her husband. Today she reproaches me and asks me why I did not get my degree, why I do not have a family. She does not want to recognise that my wish to get her approval drove me into that. And what does Robert say? He says: "But why did you not tell me that you were not happy! If I only knew that I would have arranged our life differently!" When he talks like that I shout at him in despair: "But you knew what hopes I had for my life! You knew all that! And when we decided to stay together you promised to take care of these hopes! And do you not remember how often I cried? You used to tell me off then, you used to accuse me of being weak. You told me to be optimistic, that was all you did! How can you pretend today that you did not know! How dare you accuse me that I did not tell you! You are such a coward!"'

Alice continues, exhausted from a life of emergencies and sacrifices: 'Stupid me, I tried terribly hard to relax and be optimistic! Whenever I thought I was not optimistic enough, I felt guilty of not loving him enough: How could I be weak in supporting this wonderful man who had so many troubles, I told myself. How blind, how stupid, I say today! How could I ever be proud of being intelligent while being so stupid? And proud of being a "good woman"? But now I realise that Robert used all these emergencies to hide behind them, to avoid real commitment to me. He was not really interested in my needs, my dreams, my happiness. He needed my presence; he enjoyed me being near him, this was what he wanted. I feel today that I was a valuable object to him, let us say like an expensive Chinese vase, in other words, he loved me like one loves a piece of art that one looks at everyday. He did not think of giving the loved object food or protect her from illness, of course not, because vases do not need that. It may even not be a lack of love on his side; it is lack of ability to be empathic. I did not recognise to what degree he is isolated within himself. His kindness is not fake, he is kind, but he is deeply limited to himself, to his own needs and wishes, his kindness has its limits as soon as his needs and wishes are endangered.'

'Today my loyalty to him, as well as my intelligence, which made me proud once, make me feel disgusted of myself. I am not only ashamed of myself; I feel that I humiliated myself in front of the Alice who once thought highly of herself. I feel exploited by Robert; he manipulated me into helping him and sacrificing my life for him. And at the end he leaves me with the feeling that it was alone my fault, that I exploited myself, and he is even right! *I feel that he raped me, in a slow process, a slow humiliating rape, which I allowed. I could kill Robert. He destroyed me and my inner core of dignity. What he did to me is worse than overt rape. A brute rapist does at least not lie. Robert raped me and made me believe it was love.*

The resentment, pain and suffering which this brought into my life cannot be measured (emphasis added).

The case of Alice may be described as one of 'love-rape.' This case shows how fine and difficult the line is between full love and exploitation. Robert offered false love to Alice. He was either too weak to recognise this or 'shrewd' enough to avoid recognising it. He lied to himself about his love, or just stayed uninformed about himself. Either he found it more convenient to believe that he really loved her, while in fact he employed his talent for manipulation to escape difficult sacrifices that would have been necessary for full love. Or he was just a weakly person, and was therefore unable to confront the fact that he was not able to give Alice full and mature love. If Alice assumes that he more or less consciously deceived her, he is a bastard in her eyes. If she assumes that he is a weak man, he is a pitiable creature – for Alice both versions are about as bad. A bastard she hates, a weakling she pities. What she never can restore is respect for Robert.

To employ the image, introduced earlier, of the arms (which open up or push down), full and mature love puts the arms around the loved one without suffocating him or her; clinging love imprisons the loved person with arms clinging too hard; false love holds the partner, but looks into another direction while doing that, not seeing the other as a real other. This conceptualisation of love makes it clear that eyes are as important as arms and have to be included into this metaphoric description for love.³⁷ I can hold somebody in a casual manner, 'looking through' the other, or I can look deep into their eyes.³⁸

The story of Alice and Robert illustrates the point that cases that move from the positive to the negative side are among the most difficult and painful. Alice lives in a false world for years, only to discover that she has been deceived, that her judgement was not good enough. The humiliation stemming from exposed love-rape is deep because it mirrors the conceptual distance between love and destruction. Love is the complete opposite of destruction. Rape and war are conceptually much closer since both intend destruction. Therefore the depth of the hurt inflicted by love-rape may be expected to be greater than that stemming from war-rape. To detect that my inner core of dignity has been violated while I believed it was love is the worst humiliation imaginable.

To summarise, it is humiliating to discover that those who are claiming to protect you are actually restricting your freedom. That was Alice's experience. It is also the experience being undergone by millions of women, as they become part of the global human rights revolution. This process is bound to create great suffering. A woman who finds out, for example, that female genital mutilation and wearing the veil may be interpreted as violating her inner core of dignity, will feel enormous revulsion. She will no longer believe that they are a necessary 'protection' in a world of male aggression, but will interpret them as collective cultural 'rape,' as deeply humiliating.³⁹

Conclusion

This paper contributes to the task of mapping the field of love, rape, and humiliation. In doing so it presents full and mature love as a reference point. Serious obstacles lie in wait on the way to full love. Especially important is the suffering inevitably associated with the transition from traditional honour concepts to human rights beliefs and attitudes. One disturbing feature of this transition is the gruesome and increasingly frequently employed practice of deliberately using the deepest feelings of the population at large as a weapon of war – for this is the function of war-rape. This has to be studied carefully in order to find means of reversing this trend.⁴⁰

The systematic manipulation of feelings to produce hatred or love is an especially potent force in societies that are in transition from honour ideals to human rights ideals. Those

who are newly liberated from traditional authoritarian hierarchies are particularly vulnerable to manipulation in this way. This is because many long-established restraints and boundaries are weakened. The breakdown of hierarchies has happened at many levels during the past century including the end of the European colonial empires and the erosion of the patriarchal family.

The breakdown of the extended family dominated by the male elders has swept away a complex tissue of norms and constraints that used to regulate sexual relations. People in human rights societies have acquired great freedom in their personal lives. However, despite the triumph of those ideals, human rights societies are still in their infancy in respect of the task of developing a microstructure of norms and practices for achieving those ideals in personal relationships. For example, 'false love' acquires great significance in human rights contexts where partners are expected to build their relationships on each other's feelings and to depend on their authenticity. Understanding and handling 'false love' is a central challenge for the maintenance of cohesion of future society. It is vastly underestimated by society at large and mainly addressed as a 'personal problem' to be handled amongst friends or through therapy.

Western couples are invited to take love as the basis for marriage, an institution that is central to the stability of society and future generations. But society leaves couples to cope alone with love and its difficult implications. Clearly, 'false love' can never be eliminated any more than can lying and double-dealing in other aspects of life. However, people can learn to recognise the problem and, perhaps, as a result, avoid its worst effects. Social analysts have a responsibility to examine the dynamics of love more closely. We need to understand the part played by love in a '*decent society*' (Margalit, 1996), and discover how humiliation can best be avoided. Furthermore, to build a decent society is not only a national and local task, but also an international, global challenge. A '*decent global village*' ought not to entail war-rape. The global community, including its social researchers, carries the responsibility to study and understand this phenomenon more thoroughly, in order to be better prepared for preventing it.

The two examples of manipulation just mentioned, war-rape and false love, have been chosen because they illustrate the core argument of this paper. They are particular instances of the meta-logic of humiliation in male-female relationships. Hopefully, the argument has effectively traced the skeletal structure of this meta-logic. Hopefully, it has also shown some hidden interconnections that exist between the many forms that gender relations take: in the public and private spheres, in honour societies, in human rights societies, and in societies undergoing transition between those two states.

Reference List

- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Beck, U. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. 1999. *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. 2000. *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Billig, M. G. 1998. Dialogic Repression and the Oedipus Complex: Reinterpreting the Little Hans Case. In *Culture & Psychology*, 4, 11-47.
- Boehm, C. 1984. *Blood Revenge: the Anthropology of Feuding in Montenegro and Other Tribal Societies*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Bond, M. H. & Venus, C. K. 1991. Resistance to Group or Personal Insults in an in-Group or Out-Group Context. In *International Journal of Psychology*, 26, 83-94.
- Bond, M. H. (ed.) 1996. *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Bond, M. H. 1986. Mutual Stereotypes and the Facilitation of Interaction Across Cultural Lines. In *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 259-276.
- Bond, M. H. 1998. Unity in Diversity: Orientations and Strategies for Building a Harmonious, Multicultural Society. In *Trames, A Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 234-263.
- Bond, M. H., Chiu, C. K., & Wan, K. C. 1984. When Modesty Fails: the Social Impact of Group-Effacing Attributions Following Success or Failure. In *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 14, 335-338.
- Brehm, S. S. 1992. *Intimate Relationships*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brewer, M. B. 1999. The Psychology of Prejudice: Ingroup Love and Outgroup Hate? In *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 429-444.
- Brøgger, J. 1986. *Belief and Experience Among the Sidamo: a Case Study Towards an Anthropology of Knowledge*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Buber, M. 1944. *I and Thou*. Edinburgh: Clark.
- Campbell, D. 1994. Breaching the Shame Shield: Thoughts on the Assessment of Adolescent Child Sexual Abusers. In *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 20, 309-326.
- Campos, G. P. 1998. Social Representation and the Ontology of the Social World: Bringing Another Signification into the Dialogue. In *Culture & Psychology*, 4, 331-347.
- Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society, the Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. I*. Cambridge, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Castells, M. 1997a. *The End of the Millennium, the Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. III*. Cambridge, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. 1997b. *The Power of Identity, the Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. II*. Cambridge, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Crooks, R. & Baur, K. 1996. *Our Sexuality*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Duck, S. 1991. *Human Relationships*. London: Sage Publications.
- Eide, A. & Hagtvet, B. 1996. *Conditions for Civilized Politics: Political Regimes and Compliance With Human Rights*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Erber, R. & Gilmour, R. (eds.) 1994. *Theoretical Frameworks for Personal Relationships*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eriksen, T. H. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Featherstone, M. 1990. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalism and Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Feeney, J. 1996. *Adult Attachment*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fehr, B. 1996. *Friendship Processes*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fehr, B. 1999. Laypeople's Conceptions of Commitment. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 90-103.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. 1991. *Getting to Yes. Negotiating Agreement Without Giving in*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fletcher, G. J. O. & Fitness, J. (eds.) 1995. *Knowledge Structures in Close Relationships: A Social Psychological Approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., Thomas, G., & Giles, L. 1999. Ideals in Intimate Relationships. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 72-89.
- Føllesdal, D. 1988. Husserl on Evidence and Justification. In Robert Sokolowski (ed.), *Edmund Husserl and the Phenomenological Tradition: Essays in Phenomenology. Proceedings of a Lecture Series in the Fall of 1985, in Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy*, pp. 107-129. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Foucault, M. 1979. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 1987. *The Use of Pleasure. Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 1990. *The Care of the Self. Vol. 3 of The History of Sexuality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Galtung, J. & Tschudi, F. 1999. *Crafting Peace: on the Psychology of the Transcend Approach*. Transcend, a Peace and Development Network, retrieved from <http://www.transcend.org> in May 2000.
- Galtung, J. 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means*. Oslo and London: PRIO (International Peace Research Institute Oslo) and Sage.
- Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. 1996. Affluence, Poverty and the Idea of a Post-Scarcity Society. In *DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE*, 27, 365-377.
- Harvey, D. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity: an Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hatfield, E. & Rapson, R. L. 1996. *Love and Sex: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hendrick, S. S. & Hendrick, C. 1993. *Romantic Love*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hermans, H. J. M. 1999a. The Dialogical Self: Meaning As Movement - Hermans,HJM, Kempen,HJG. In *Culture & Psychology*, 5, 491-498.
- Hermans, H. J. M. 1999b. Dialogical Thinking and Self-Innovation. In *Culture & Psychology*, 5, 67-87.
- Hobbes, T. 1951. *Leviathan*. The APHIL Library, retrieved from <http://coombs.anu.edu.au/Depts/RSSS/Philosophy/Texts/LeviathanTOC.html> on 9th November 2000.
- Hultin, M. 1998. Gender Differences in Workplace Authority: Discrimination and the Role of Organizational Leaders. In *Acta Sociologica*, 41, 99-113.
- Human Rights Watch, O. 1996. *Shattered Lives: Sexual Violence During the Rwandan Genocide and Its Aftermath*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- International Committee of the Red Cross Somalia Delegation 1997. *Spared From the Spear: Traditional Somali Behaviour in Warfare*. Nairobi: International Committee of the Red Cross.
- Josephs, I. E. & Rommetveit, R. 1998. Do You Know Ragnar Rommetveit? On Dialogue and Silence, Poetry and Pedantry, and Cleverness and Wisdom in Psychology (An Interview With Ragnar Rommetveit). In *Culture & Psychology*, 4, 189-212.
- Kanin, E. J. 1985. Date Rapists: Differential Sexual Socialization and Relative Deprivation. In *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14, 219-231.
- Kimmel, M. 1997. *Reducing Men's Violence: The Personal Meets the Political*. Paper presented at the expert group meeting on 'Male Roles and Masculinities in the Perspective of a Culture of Peace,' Oslo, Norway, 24-28 September 1997.

- Kimmel, M. 2000. *The Gendered Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lévinas, E. & Hand, S. 1989. *The Levinas Reader*. New York, NY: B. Blackwell.
- Lévinas, E. 1998. *Entre Nous: on Thinking-of-the-Other / Emmanuel Levinas*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1957. Reciprocity, the Essence of Social Life? In L. A. Coser & B. Rosenberg (eds.), *Sociological Theory*, New York: Macmillan.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1968. *Les Structures Élémentaires De La Parenté*. Paris: Mouton.
- Lindbekk, T. 1998. The Education Backlash Hypothesis: the Norwegian Experience 1960-92. In *Acta Sociologica*, 41, 151-162.
- Lindner, E. G. 1996. *The Feeling of Being Humiliated: A Central Theme in Armed Conflicts. A Study of the Role of Humiliation in Somalia, and Great Lakes Region, Between the Warring Parties, and in Relation to Third Intervening Parties. Outline of Research Project*. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Lindner, E. G. 1998. *Humiliation As Psychological Variable in Armed Conflict: What Is Our Common Sense Definition of Humiliation?* Oslo: Paper presented at the annual seminar of the Research Programme of the Multilateral Development Assistance Programme at Soria Moria, 19th - 20th February.
- Lindner, E. G. 1999. Women in the Global Village: Increasing Demand for Traditional Communication Patterns. In I. Breines, D. Gierycz, & B. Reardon (eds.), *Towards a Women's Agenda for a Culture of Peace*, pp. 89-98. Paris: UNESCO.
- Lindner, E. G. 1999a. *Humiliation Dynamics and Humiliation Entrepreneurship - the Dyad of Slave and Master*. Bujumbura, Burundi: Rapport de la conference internationale sur le role de l'education dans la promotion d'une culture de convivialité et d'edification des communautes, 23rd - 26th February, Ministère de l'Education Nationale.
- Lindner, E. G. 1999b. Love, Holocaust and Humiliation. The German Holocaust and the Genocides in Rwanda and Somalia. In *Medlemsbladet for Norske Leger Mot Atomkrig, Med Bidrag Fra Psykologer for Fred*, 3, 28-29.
- Lindner, E. G. 1999c. *Humiliation, Genocide, Dictatorship and the International Community. Somalia As a Case Study*. Oslo: University of Oslo, film.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000a. *Humiliation - the Worst Form of Trauma: an Analysis Based on Fieldwork in Germany, Rwanda / Burundi, and Somalia*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000b. *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*. Oslo: Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, doctoral dissertation.

- Lindner, E. G. 2000c. Gendercide and Humiliation in Honour and Human-Rights Societies. In *Journal of Genocide Research*, forthcoming.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000d. *Social Constructionism, Logical Positivism, and the Story of Humiliation*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000e. Were Hitler and Siad Barre 'Robin Hoods' Who Felt Humiliated by Their Own Followers? In *Medlemsblad for Norske Leger Mot Atomvåpen, Med Bidrag Fra Psykologer for Fred*, forthcoming.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000f. *Humiliation in the Flesh. Honour Is "FACE," Arrogance Is "NOSE UP," and Humiliation Is "TO BE PUT DOWN"*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000g. Humiliation, Human Rights, and Global Corporate Responsibility. In *Global Social Policy*, forthcoming.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000h. *How Globalisation Transforms Gender Relations: the Changing Face of Humiliation*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript .
- Lindner, E. G. 2000i. Were Ordinary Germans Hitler's 'Willing Executioners'? Or Were They Victims of Humiliating Seduction and Abandonment? The Case of Germany and Somalia. In *IDEA: A Journal of Social Issues*, forthcoming.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000j. *Humiliation and Rationality in International Relations. The Role of Humiliation in North Korea, Rwanda, Somalia, Germany, and the Global Village*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000k. *Recognition or Humiliation - the Psychology of Intercultural Communication*. Oslo: University of Oslo, manuscript written for the ISSEI Millennium conference 'Approaching a New Millennium: Lessons from the Past - Prospects for the Future,' the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas, Bergen, Norway from 14th - 18th August.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000l. Were the Germans Hitler's 'Willing Executioners'? In *Medlemsblad for Norske Leger Mot Atomvåpen, Med Bidrag Fra Psykologer for Fred*, 2, 26-29.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000m. *How Humiliation Creates Cultural Differences: the Psychology of Intercultural Communication*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000n. *The Anatomy of Humiliation and Its Relational Character*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000o. *Humiliation and How to Respond to It: Spatial Metaphor in Action*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000p. Hitler, Shame and Humiliation: the Intricate Web of Feelings Among the German Population Towards Hitler. In *Medlemsblad for Norske Leger Mot Atomvåpen, Med Bidrag Fra Psykologer for Fred*, 1, 28-30.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000q. *What Every Negotiator Ought to Know: Understanding Humiliation*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.

- Lindner, E. G. 2000r. Humiliation and the Human Condition: Mapping a Minefield. In *Human Rights Review*, 2, 46-63.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000s. *The 'Framing Power' of International Organizations, and the Cost of Humiliation*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2000t. *Globalisation and Humiliation: Towards a New Paradigm*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2001a. *The Concept of Humiliation: Its Universal Core and Culture-Dependent Periphery*. Oslo: University of Oslo, unpublished manuscript.
- Lindner, E. G. 2001b. How Research Can Humiliate: Critical Reflections on Method. In *Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict*, forthcoming.
- Luke, T. W. & Toulouse, C. (eds.) 1998. *The Politics of Cyberspace: a New Political Science Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Luke, T. W. 1989. *Screens of Power: Ideology, Domination, and Resistance in Informational Society*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Luke, T. W. 1990. *Social Theory and Modernity: Critique, Dissent, and Revolution*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lumsden, M. 1997. Breaking the Cycle of Violence. In *Journal of Peace Research*, 34, 377-383.
- Luukkonen-Gronow, T. 1987. University Career Opportunities for Women in Finland in the 1980's. In *Acta Sociologica*, 30, 193-206.
- Margalit, A. 1996. *The Decent Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mauss, M. 1950. *Sociologie Et Anthropologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- McLuhan, M. & Fiore, Q. 1986. *War and Peace in the Global Village*. NY: Bantam Books.
- Mestrovic, S. G. 1997. *Postemotional Society*. London: Sage.
- Meznaric, S. 1994. Gender As an Ethno-Marker: Rape, War, and Identity Politics in the Former Yugoslavia. In V. M. Moghadam (ed.), *Identity Politics and Women*, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Miller, W. I. 1993. *Humiliation and Other Essays on Honor Social Discomfort and Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Moghadam, V. M. (ed.) 1994. *Identity Politics and Women. Cultural Reassertions and Feminisms in International Perspective*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nisbett, R. E. & Cohen, D. 1996. *Culture of Honor: the Psychology of Violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Peperzak, A. T. & Lévinas, E. 1993. *To the Other: an Introduction to the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas*. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press.
- Prior, J. M. 1988. *Church and Marriage in an Indonesian Village*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Prosser, M. H. 1978. *The Cultural Dialogue: an Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rathus, S. A., Nevid, J. S., & Fichner-Rathus, L. 1997. *Human Sexuality in a World of Diversity*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Retzinger, S. M. 1991. *Violent Emotions: Shame and Rage in Marital Quarrels*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rodina, M. 1999. *Blood Code Rules in Northern Albania*. Paris: Agence France-Presse dispatch 30th June.
- Rummel, R. J. 1995. *The Holocaust in Comparative and Historical Perspective*. Jerusalem: Paper delivered to the Conference on "The 'Other' as Threat - Demonization and Antisemitism," June 12-15, 1995, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Sabini, J. 1995. *Social Psychology*. New York, London: Norton.
- Scheff, T. J. & Retzinger, S. M. 1991. *Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Scheff, T. J. 1988. Shame and Conformity: the Deference-Emotion System. In *American Sociological Review*, 53, 395-406.
- Scheff, T. J. 1990. Socialization of Emotions - Pride and Shame As Casual Agents. In T. D. Kemper (ed.), *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, pp. 281-304. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Scheff, T. J. 1997a. *Emotions, the Social Bond, and Human Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheff, T. J. 1997b. *Emotions, the Social Bond and Human Reality. Part/Whole Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheler, M. 1954. *The Nature of Sympathy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sennett, R. 1993. *Authority*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Smith, D. 1981. *Conflict and Compromise. Class Formation in English Society 1830-1914*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, D. 1983. *Barrington Moore. Violence, Morality and Political Change*. London: Macmillan.
- Smith, D. 1984a. Discovering Facts and Values: Barrington Moore. In *Skocpol 1984*, 313-355.

- Smith, D. 1984b. Norbert Elias- Established or Outsider? In *Sociological Review*, 32, 367-389.
- Smith, D. 1991. *The Rise of Historical Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Smith, D. 1997a. *Civilization and Totalitarianism in the Work of Norbert Elias and Hannah Arendt*. Toronto: American Sociological Association Annual Conference, August 1997.
- Smith, D. 1997b. *The Civilizing Process and the Care of the Self: Comparing Elias and Foucault*. Bielefeld: Norbert Elias Centenary Conference, Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Forschung, University of Bielefeld, June 1997.
- Smith, D. 1999. *Zygmunt Bauman: Prophet of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Smith, D. 2000a. Organisations and Humiliation: Looking Beyond Elias. In *Organization*, forthcoming.
- Smith, D. 2000b. 'The Civilizing Process' and 'The History of Sexuality': Comparing Norbert Elias and Michel Foucault. In *Theory and Society*, 28, 79-100.
- Smith, D. 2000c. *Norbert Elias and Modern Social Theory*. London: Sage.
- Smith, P. B. & Bond, M. H. 1999. *Social Psychology Across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sprecher, S. & McKinney, K. 1993. *Sexuality*. London: Sage Publications.
- Sprecher, S. 1999. "I Love You More Today Than Yesterday": Romantic Partners' Perceptions of Changes in Love and Related Affect Over Time. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 46-53.
- Sümer, S. 1998. Incongruent Modernities: a Comparative Study of Higher Educated Women From Urban Turkey and Norway. In *Acta Sociologica*, 41, 115-129.
- Tappan, M. B. 1998. Toward a Dialogic Conception of Human Development. In *Narrative Inquiry*, 8, 391-396.
- Ullman, S. E., Karabatsos, G., & Koss, M. P. 1999. Alcohol and Sexual Aggression in a National Sample of College Men. In *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 673-689.
- Ury, W. 1999. *Getting to Peace. Transforming Conflict at Home, at Work, and in the World*. New York: Viking.
- Van der Lippe, T. & Fodor, É. 1998. Changes in Gender Inequality in Six Eastern European Countries. In *Acta Sociologica*, 41, 131-149.
- Vogel, W. & Lazare, A. 1990. The Unforgivable Humiliation - a Dilemma in Couples Treatment. In *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 12, 139-151.
- Volkan, V. D. 1988. *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies: From Clinical Practice to International Relations*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Volkan, V. D. 1997. *Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Volkan, V. D., Demetrios, J. A., & Montville, J. V. (eds.) 1990. *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Weltzien Hoivik, H. v. & Føllesdal, A. (eds.) 1995. *Ethics and Consultancy: European Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Wikan, U. 1984. Shame and Honour: a Contestable Pair. In *Man*, 19, 635-652.

Wold, A. H. (ed.) 1992. *The Dialogical Alternative. Towards a Theory of Language and Mind*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Zurbriggen, E. L. 1998. *Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Motives: Predictors of Aggressive Sexual Behavior*. Montréal, Canada: Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology, Twenty-First Annual Scientific Meeting, 12th -15th July.

¹ See Lindner, 1996; Lindner, 1998; Lindner, 1999a; Lindner, 1999b; Lindner, 1999c; Lindner, 2000a; Lindner, 2000b; Lindner, 2000c; Lindner, 2000d; Lindner, 2000e; Lindner, 2000f; Lindner, 2000g; Lindner, 2000h; Lindner, 2000i; Lindner, 2000j; Lindner, 2000k; Lindner, 2000l; Lindner, 2000m; Lindner, 2000n; Lindner, 2000o; Lindner, 2000p; Lindner, 2000q; Lindner, 2000r; Lindner, 2000s; Lindner, 2000t; Lindner, 2001a; Lindner, 2001b. The theory of the humiliation process will be developed further in a book I am currently writing in collaboration with Dennis Smith. Smith is professor of sociology at Loughborough University (UK), see his publications: Smith, 2000a; Smith, 2000b; Smith, 2000c; Smith, 1999; Smith, 1997a; Smith, 1997b; Smith, 1991; Smith, 1984a; Smith, 1984b; Smith, 1983; Smith, 1981.

² New information communication technologies are the driving force in these transitions. See, for example, the coining of the term 'global village' by McLuhan & Fiore, 1986, see also Manuel Castells work on the network society (Castells, 1996; Castells, 1997a; Castells, 1997b), or Harvey, 1990; Luke & Toulouse, 1998; Luke, 1989; Luke, 1990; as well as Ulrich Beck's work on globalisation, globalism and risk society (Beck, 1992; Beck, 1999; Beck, 2000), Giddens' work on new identities (Giddens, 1991; Giddens, 1996), as well as the work by Michael Featherstone, 1990.

³ That helplessness may have many causes, including deception and self-deception. For example, a woman who is being manipulated into believing that she is loved, while in fact she is abused, is helpless; her helplessness stems from deception by the perpetrator and/or her own lack of good judgement. This example will be pursued later.

⁴ See also 'The Unforgivable Humiliation - a Dilemma in Couples Treatment' (Vogel & Lazare, 1990).

⁵ This paper belongs also in the line of work that seeks to make innovative interconnections between clinical psychology and social psychology. See, for example, the work of Scheff (Scheff & Retzinger, 1991; Scheff, 1997a; Scheff, 1997b; Scheff, 1988; Scheff, in Kemper, 1990). See also Volkan, 1997; Volkan, 1988; Volkan, Demetrios, & Montville, 1990.

⁶ Its title is *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*. The project is supported by the Norwegian Research Council and the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I am grateful for their support, and would also like to thank the Institute of Psychology at the University of Oslo for hosting it. I extend my warmest thanks to all my informants in and from Africa, many of whom survive under the most difficult life circumstances. I hope that at some point in the future I will be able to give back at least a fraction of all the support I

received from them! I thank Reidar Ommundsen at the Institute of Psychology at the University of Oslo for his continuous support, together with Jan Smedslund, Hilde Nafstad, Malvern Lumsden (Lumsden, 1997), Carl-Erik Grenness, Jon Martin Sundet, Finn Tschudi, Kjell Flekkøy, and Astrid Bastiansen. Michael Harris Bond, Chinese University of Hong Kong, helped with constant feedback and support (see Bond, 1996; Bond, 1986; Bond, 1998; Bond, Chiu, & Wan, 1984; Bond & Venus, 1991; Smith & Bond, 1999). The project would not have been possible without the help of Dennis Smith, professor of sociology at Loughborough University (UK). Without Lee D. Ross's encouragement my research would not have been possible; Lee Ross is a principal investigator and co-founder of the Stanford Center on Conflict and Negotiation (SCCN). I also thank Pierre Dasen, Professeur en approches interculturelles de l'éducation, Université en Genève, Département de Psychologie, for his most valuable support. The project is interdisciplinary and has benefited from the help of many colleagues at the University of Oslo and elsewhere. I would especially like to thank Johan Galtung (Galtung, 1996; Galtung & Tschudi, 1999), Jan Øberg, William Ury, Director, Project on Preventing War, Harvard University (Ury, 1999; Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1991), Heidi von Weltzien Hoivik and Andreas Føllesdal (Weltzien Hoivik & Føllesdal, 1995), Dagfinn Føllesdal (Føllesdal, in Robert Sokolowski, 1988), Thomas Pogge, Helge Høybråten, Thorleif Lund, Thomas Hylland Eriksen (Eriksen, 1993), Unni Wikan (Wikan, 1984), Asbjørn Eide and Bernt Hagtvat (Eide & Hagtvat, 1996), Leif Ahnstrøm, and Jan Brøgger (Brøgger, 1986).

⁷ I owe this reference to Dr. Yehia Abdel-Hamid Ibrahim Abdel-Aal, Professor in Social Science, Assiut Governorate, Egypt.

⁸ See Brehm, 1992; Crooks & Baur, 1996; Duck, 1991; Erber & Gilmour, 1994; Feeney, 1996; Fehr, 1996; Fehr, 1999; Fletcher et al., 1999; Fletcher & Fitness, 1995; Foucault, 1990; Foucault, 1979; Foucault, 1987; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1993; Smith, 1997b; Smith, 2000b; Sprecher, 1999; Sprecher & McKinney, 1993.

⁹ See for example Campbell, 1994.

¹⁰ See the Human Rights Watch Report from September 1996: *Shattered Lives: Sexual Violence during the Rwandan Genocide and its Aftermath*. See also Brewer, 1999; Meznaric, in Moghadam, 1994 and Moghadam, 1994.

¹¹ 'To this war of every man, against every man, there also is consequent; that nothing can be unjust. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have there no place. Where there is no common power, there is no law: where no law, no injustice. Force and fraud are in war the two cardinal virtues' (Hobbes, 1951, 145).

¹² Lakoff and Johnson describe orientational metaphors as up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, and central-peripheral (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

¹³ 'Now, we do know well that in some genocides the victims have been perceived by the regime as a threat and publicly characterized as less than human, as apes, pigs, cockroaches, vermin, and the like. The Nazi view of the Jews well exemplifies this. Not only were they the lowest of humanity, if at all seen as human, but they were believed to be a direct genetic threat to the master race of Aryans and a pollutant of the good German society and culture' (Rummel, 1995).

¹⁴ William Ian Miller wrote a book entitled *Humiliation and Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence* (Miller, 1993), where he links humiliation to honour as understood in *The Iliad* or Icelandic sagas. Miller explains that these concepts are still very much alive today, despite a common assumption that they are no longer relevant. Also the honour to which Cohen and Nisbett (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996) refer is the kind of honour and humiliation that Miller addresses; the South of the United States harbours pockets of the 'old way.' They operate also in the more traditional branches of the Mafia or, more generally, in blood feuds. See for literature on blood revenge, for example, Boehm, 1984, or Rodina, 1999. I owe these references to Adam Jones. The present author's clinical experience in Egypt (1984-1991) and recent fieldwork in Africa brought her in close contact with traditional honour codes that also dominated Europe until recently (see, for example the tradition of duelling). 'For example, in medieval and early modern Europe, armed combat among members of the most "honourable" class, the aristocracy, was a means of defending or enhancing family honour. Defeat in a duel lowered the loser's rank in the scale of honour. Small humiliations could be borne by those who had fought bravely. However, a cowardly response to a challenge could mean that all

honour was lost. Furthermore, it was not possible to accept defeat by an opponent one did not respect. In extreme cases where no road back to honour existed, suicide was preferable. The main point is that within “honour societies,” humiliation and violence were regarded as normal means of managing tensions. For the most part, people accepted them and got on with their lives. Violence did not have the strong connotation of “violation” it has since acquired’ (Lindner, ‘What Every Negotiator Ought to Know,’ 12.) To put it another way, honour-humiliation regards “structural violence” (see Galtung, 1996, *Peace by Peaceful Means*) as legitimate.

¹⁵ He wishes to stay anonymous. The interview was carried out in December 1998 in Africa.

¹⁶ See *Humiliation and the Human Condition: Mapping a Minefield* (Lindner, 2000r).

¹⁷ See for the practice of exchanging women between groups Marcel Mauss and Claude Lévi-Strauss (Mauss, 1950; Lévi-Strauss, 1968; Lévi-Strauss, in Coser & Rosenberg, 1957).

¹⁸ Many years of psychological work in Cairo, Egypt, brought me in contact with a whole range of ways of tackling rape, from harsh patriarchal honour-oriented approaches described here, to very loving, and also to extremely Western oriented ways. Cultural boundaries are porous, and the more so the more globalisation brings people together.

¹⁹ See Wiseberg (Human Rights Internet, HRI, www.hri.ca) for the currently increasing attention to ‘honour-killings’ as violation of human rights, as opposed to just being treated as private affair (Laurie S. Wiseberg at the ‘Seminar om Sosial Utvikling og Menneskerettigheter,’ 10th February 2000, Diakonhjemmets Internasjonale Senter, Oslo).

²⁰ See Lindner, in Breines, Gierycz, & Reardon, 1999, where I explore the functionality of male uncontrolled ferocity for his role as defender of the group in a world of ‘anarchy’ as described by Hobbes and used as basis for Classical Realism in International Relations Theory. It is evident that a society who encourages her men to be aggressive in war situations has problems controlling man’s fierceness when he comes home (see also Zurbriggen, 1998). As I learned during my years as clinical psychologist in Egypt, the society as a whole takes over the task of controlling the male, for example by institutionally keeping him away from women, for example through segregation or veiling. The current development of a global village diminishes the ‘need’ for ‘ferocious warriors,’ thereby opening up for a society which transfers the responsibility for control of male ‘wildness’ to men individually, freeing society as a whole from this task.

²¹ In this context, the clitoris is interpreted as being a ‘dangerous’ trace of maleness in the female body, perplexing as this philosophy may sound for a Western audience, and unjustifiable it is from a modern scientific point of view. I am aware that I might be misinterpreted as wishing to excuse honour societies and their handling of women. This is not my intention. However, seven years of working as a clinical psychologist in Egypt have taught me humility, not in order to excuse anything, but in order to allow for understanding. According to my perception, Western human rights based rage sometimes is too arrogant and forecloses the possibility to actually discern a logic in honour societies’ handling of women, a logic which has to be understood calmly and with respect in order to be argued against more efficiently. Common Western assumptions are that men are the source of such brutalities as honour killings – what is often overlooked is that women – mothers and grandmothers – are often bearers of such traditions as much as their male counterparts. Women as well as men have to be included in conversations about human rights.

²² Consider also other factors that may act against the desire to be with the loved one. What if I have a contagious illness, should I then not protect the loved person from myself? What if I am much older or younger than the person I love, and I know that I cannot give her the family he or she yearns for? Should I then keep my feelings to myself the rest of my life, give him or her the chance to find a more suitable partner, and never declare my feelings to my beloved? Or what if I am the prison guard or therapist of the person I love, and it is unethical to proceed with declaring my love? What if I am in love with a dissident in a country that toils under a cruel dictatorship, and my feelings, if I declared them, would endanger the life of my loved one?

²³ See classical work by Max Scheler. In his first period, for example in *The Nature of Sympathy* Scheler 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* (Scheler, 1954). See on dialogue, among many, Bakhtin, 1981;

Buber, 1944; Wold, 1992; Billig, 1998; Campos, 1998; Josephs & Rommetveit, 1998; Hermans, 1999a; Hermans, 1999b; Prosser, 1978; Tappan, 1998.

²⁴ Rape within marriage has only recently been incorporated as liable to be punished into the judicial body in Germany.

²⁵ Kimmel (1997) identifies elements which need special attention if necessary changes shall succeed: Privilege is essentially invisible and must be discovered (a white middle class man thinks he is a 'average' human being and does not realise that he is a privileged white middle class man); violence stems from a feeling of powerlessness, men beat and abuse during the breakdown of patriarchy; men still feel 'entitled' to power, even if they do not have it (this women "stole" my! Job!); disenfranchised men with uncertain future may be tempted to go to ethnic nationalist violence; there are rape-prone and rape-free cultures, we have to emulate the latter; for a culture of peace we have to take special care of women's' property rights after marriage, and at fathering (Kimmel, 1997, see also Kimmel, 2000). For background literature see work being published in *Acta Sociologica*, such as Hultin, 1998; Lindbekk, 1998; Luukkonen-Gronow, 1987; Sümer, 1998; Van der Lippe & Fodor, 1998.

²⁶ See Hatfield & Rapson, 1996 and Rathus, Nevid, & Fichner-Rathus, 1997.

²⁷ This account I obtained during my fieldwork in Africa 1999 from a educated young woman in Burundi. She wishes to stay anonymous.

²⁸ Kari H. Karamé, Norwegian Institute for International Affairs (NUPI).

²⁹ This is the account by a former Somali ambassador whose identity I do not want to disclose here (January 1999 in Nairobi, Kenya). This account was confirmed by several Somali men from the North of Somalia, the self-proclaimed republic 'Somaliland' (November-December 1998). The informants belonged to the Isaaq clan. The former dictator Siad Barre tried to annihilate the Isaaq clan during the 1980s, the rape of women in front of their families was one of his soldiers' tactics. The informants talked about the weight and severity of the problem of rape only after many hours or days of conversation. Somali women usually spoke more openly about the impact of rape than Somali men.

³⁰ Continuation of the interview with the former Somali ambassador.

³¹ Interview with a young Rwandan (Kigali, 1999) whose identity I do not want to disclose.

³² Perpetrators of the Rwandan genocide in 1994 (where children were killed as brutally as their parents) are said to be under psychiatric treatment because they suddenly see children's fingers on their plates when they eat (Nairobi 1999, unconfirmed).

³³ See also Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999; Prior, 1988.

³⁴ Evidently, men and women both lie, and women also 'play around' with men. And it is self-evident that a man suffers as much as a woman when he finds out that he loves somebody who only 'wants his money.'

³⁵ A marriage will rarely be built only on false love. However, one spectacular case was unveiled in 1989 when the former communist German Democratic Republic, DDR, collapsed. The DDR had a watch-dog organisation, Staatssicherheit or Stasi, which aimed at securing the population's communist enthusiasm. A female dissident, Vera Wollenberger, had a Stasi 'shadow' whose job it was to inform the Stasi about her activities and contacts. He married her and had a child with her, everything as part of his job. She divorced him as soon as she learned about the truth of her husband's feelings, and many sympathised with her and felt deceived and humiliated in her place.

³⁶ The names have been changed

³⁷ For the 'face of the other' see Lévinas (Lévinas & Hand, 1989; Lévinas, 1998; Peperzak & Lévinas, 1993).

³⁸ The work of Richard Sennett is relevant here, he addresses false love and authority (Sennett, 1993).

³⁹ A Somali woman whose name I do not want to disclose commented the practice of female genital mutilation as follows, 'I feel that my culture humiliates me!' (Turku, at the International Congress of Somali Studies, 6th -9th August 1998)

⁴⁰ On related themes, see Stepan Mestrovic's Postemotional Society (Mestrovic, 1997).