Psychological Factors in Arab Relations with the World

Presentation on 22nd January 2007, as part of the Pilot Course "Young Swedish Muslim Peace Agents," Alexandria 19th-27th January 2007, at the Swedish Institute in Alexandria, Egypt.

Introduction

The Pilot Course "Young Swedish Muslim Peace Agents," took place in Alexandria, Egypt at the Swedish Institute in Alexandria, 19th-27th January 2007. A group of fifteen young Muslims from Sweden, who had formed the organisation *Fredsargenterna* (www.fredsagenterna.se), were the participants. The program of Fredsagenterna indicates that they wish to "increase the knowledge about an Islamic peace culture among young Swedish Muslims." I believe that Fredsagenterna's goal is extremely important not only for peace within Swedish society, but for the wider world. With this paper I wish to make an attempt to underpin this goal with my reflections.

I had the privilege to listen in for almost two days and wrote the first draft for this paper during the night before I had my talk on 22nd January, being inspired by the presentations and the discussions. I had the particular pleasure to have my talk after the impressive presentation that Hans Blix gave.

Let me begin with briefly outlining the significance of humiliation, which, I believe, is of central importance for Arab relations with the world. The Muslim world feels humiliated by the West, and we see violent backlashes – and vice versa. Quotes that illustrate this reciprocated humiliation abound. The most recent event that had a humiliating effect on the Arab world was the hanging of Saddam Hussein. Ghada Karmi (2007) wrote, "For the Arab world, this has been a shameful, humiliating event that underlines its total surrender to western diktat" (Karmi, 2007, p. 5). But also the West feels humiliated. The downing of the Twin Towers in New York, the infamous 9/11 2001, has been widely compared with Pearl Harbor, a humiliating and crippling attack on the United States of America. Or, Henry Kissinger explained why he had supported the Iraq war: "Because Afghanistan wasn't enough. In the conflict with radical Islam, they want to humiliate us. And we need to humiliate them" (this is told in the book *State of Denial* by Bob Woodward (2006), where he recounts how Michael Gerson, at the time Bush's chief speechwriter, asked Kissinger).

Yet, what should not be forgotten is that the most painful humiliation may be felt by those who seek to build global partnership instead of global enmity (often called "moderates") – they may feel sabotaged and profoundly humiliated by the extremists in their own "camp." In other words, rather than between the West and the Arab world, the most significant fault line of humiliation may run between "extremists," those who continue turning cycles of humiliation, and "moderates," those who wish to stop those cycles.

What is the solution? Three main possible frames present themselves as frames for the relations between the Arab World and the rest, and vice versa: 1. the other as *evil enemy*, the other as *ignorant fool*, or, the other as *potential partner*. First, all sides could conceptualize the other as *evil enemies*, and indeed, this is being done by many extremists. However, is this path beneficial? This approach seems rather suicidal for humankind since frames frame. Framing others as enemies closes the door for turning them into friends, and defines the relationship as all-out never ending war. Today's world is so interdependent that an escalation of war would engulf all humankind, and would ultimately lead to its demise. It is a dangerous approach for all side. It is aided, unfortunately, by the regrettable human tendency for bias, in this case the tendency to treat the outgroup as undifferentiated block: when the "West" is referred to, the United States of America and Europe are often not being differentiated, and various sub-segments within the U.S.A. and Europe neither, even though the situation varies greatly, and, likewise, also the "Arab world" is often falsely depicted as undifferentiated block.

Second, the other side could be regarded as *dangerous and/or useless ignorant fools*. Is this a wise approach? Perhaps it keeps the door for peace a bit more open than fixing the other in the category of enemy, since ignorant fools, at least some, may become enlightened and reformed. However, the overall outfall would most probably follow the path described above.

Third, it seems that the only feasible way in an interdependent world is to define the other as *potential partner*, as difficult as this might seem in the midst of mutual feelings of humiliation. However, only by inviting the other side into global cooperation can humankind preserve a chance to successfully address the global challenges that it needs to solve at the ecological and social front, from global climate change to global violent conflict to global health. The partnership path could be called the path of moderation.

Extremists typically denigrate moderation as "soft," "cowardly," or "unmanly." However, this is a dangerous misconception, particularly in the new context of a shrinking world. It is a view that stems from an adaptation to the past that does not fit the future. This point will be explained in more depth further down in this paper. Cycles of humiliation, instead of leading to honourable victories, risk devouring everybody and may cost humankind its life. The dichotomy of moderation = soft, and extremism = forceful is a false one. True moderation is not soft but forceful. After 27 years in prison, Mandela's prison guards were his friends. Mandela's firm and respectful minimal approach brought his prison guards into the human rights camp. Mandela did not invest more energy then necessary – no overkill – he did not insult his adversaries in ways that made them unwilling to become his friends. Also Gandhi combined firmness with a refusal to re-act in kind. He disliked the words and ideas of "passive resistance." The term *satyagraha* (non-violent action), is a combination of *satya* (truth-love) and *agraha* (firmness/force).

In this paper, at first, a description of humiliation is being offered. What follows is a description of the current historic transition from a culture of honour to a culture of dignity. Thereafter this transition is discussed for the Arab World and how it plays out in its relation to the rest, inspired by some of the other presentations in the Pilot Course "Young Swedish Muslim Peace Agents." The paper will then end by recommending the path of forceful moderation as the only strategy that entails a chance to save humankind from self-destruction.

What is humiliation?

This section is adapted from
www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/humiliationdefinition.php.

Humiliation is when you are put down and feel hurt because you deem being put down as a violation.

Dynamics of humiliation are embedded in relationships. People and institutions inflict humiliation on those who are at the receiving end. Dynamics of humiliation entail actors who inflict acts of humiliation, and receivers, who feel feelings of humiliation. It is important to note, however, that humiliation is not always inflicted intentionally. Sometimes, feelings of humiliation emerge as a result of misunderstandings, more so, they may even emerge when people wish to help and do not realize that their help humiliates the recipients.

Humiliation entails core aspects that are universal and other aspects that are specific to cultural and personal peculiarities. What is universal is that humiliation always is related to feeling "put down" and perceiving this as an illegitimate assault. What is different is that in various contexts being put down is defined and experienced in a variety of ways.

In collectivist contexts of honour, for example, humiliation is defined and experienced in ways that often contrast the ways humiliation is defined and experienced in contexts that emphasize the dignity of the individual. So-called honour killings may serve as a stark example (according to Stephanie Nebehay (2000), honour killings "have been reported in Bangladesh, Britain, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Pakistan, Morocco, Sweden, Turkey and Uganda"...): when it occurs, in contexts that emphasize the honour of the group, such killings are perceived as a compelling duty so as to repair humiliated honour. In contexts that emphasize the individual's dignity, the same strategy is regarded as a violation of human rights, humiliating the human dignity of all involved. In both contexts, its representatives perceive it as profoundly humiliating to be criticized by the other side who is regarded as arrogant and self-righteous.

Wishing to respect cultural diversity is thus an endeavour that easily finds itself in a minefield of ubiquitous feelings of humiliation. Even the use of the example of so-called honour killings in this text, is responded to with rage by some friends, for example from Palestine, who feel that using this example means to arrogantly stigmatise non-Western culture as backward.

Our response is that we all, the entirety of humankind, "own" the plethora of cultural practices used on this planet, and that so-called honour killings are as much "our" human culture as any other practice. We do not condone the setting up of cultural realms against each other, on the contrary, we believe that we all carry a joint responsibility for the entire globe.

Not least, the notion of honour is to be found everywhere, including the so-called West. *Southern Honor*, for example, though no longer explicitly appealed to, is still permeating certain policies in the United States of America. Historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown (1982) describes Southern Honor in his book with the same title. Southern inclination toward the "warrior ethic" embraces the following elements, according to Wyatt-Brown, namely "that the world should recognize a state's high distinction; a dread

of humiliation if that claim is not provided sufficient respect; a yearning for renown; and, finally, a compulsion for revenge when, in issues of both personal leadership calculations and in collective or national terms, repute for one or another virtue and self-justified power is repudiated" (Wyatt-Brown, 2005, p. 2). David Hackett Fischer (1989) informs us that Southerners "strongly supported every American war no matter what it was about or who it was against" (Fischer, 1989, p. 843). Social psychologists Richard Nisbett and Dov Cohen – Nisbett and Cohen (1996) – explain the psychology of violence in the culture of honour in the southern part of the United States.

Conceptualizations such as "'they' want to break our will, but 'we' won't let it happen," or "'they' are cowards," or "*The* enemy" are embedded in gut feelings imbued with masculine norms of honour that thrive on contests of "strength," on "keeping the upper hand," on "victory," and on avoiding appearing to be a "wimp" or a "sissy," in other words, avoiding to appear "female." In such a context, humiliating "*The* enemy" is felt to be legitimate, especially when this enemy does not act "manly" and thus is felt to forfeit the status as equal in honour. Terrorists are "unlawful" in this frame of mind because they "hide behind civilians" and are "cowards," regardless of how much actual courage might be invested (even if misinvested). "Unlawful combatants" commit "treason" against traditional honour norms, which makes them "free" to be tortured. The introduction of categories such as "unlawful combatants" informs us that *Southern Honour*, though no longer openly invoked, is still permeating certain policies in the United States of America.

Apartheid can serve as an example for institutional humiliation. Though designed as a hierarchical system of "higher" and "lesser" beings that initially was regarded as representing a "natural" or "divine order," with the rise of human rights ideals, it was increasingly regarded as a system of institutionalized humiliation.

Feelings of humiliation may result in apathy and depression, or in humiliated fury – Lewis (1971) – that nurtures either violence – from domestic violence to large-scale atrocities, such as genocide or terrorism, instigated by extremist humiliation-entrepreneurs who keep cycles of humiliation in motion – or it may lead to constructive social change, promoted by moderate Gandhis and Mandelas, whose aim is to change humiliating systems without using humiliation as a tool.

In social contexts where it is regarded as "natural order" to have "higher" and "lesser" beings, "lesser" people are often routinely put down so as to "teach them lessons" and "remind" them of their due lowly place. Not seldom, inferiors have internalized this arrangement and react with subservient "humbleness." In such contexts, typically only elites invoke the notion of humiliation when put down; they defend humiliated honour with duel-like responses.

This setup changes dramatically as soon as human rights ideals enter the hearts and minds of people. Inferiors no longer humbly accept their lowly position. On the contrary, they invoke the notion of humiliation and demand being regarded as equal in dignity by elites who now are asked to descend from arrogating superiority. As soon as human rights begin to permeate social and psychological codes, applying old techniques of putting down people in order to "teach them where they belong" easily has counterproductive consequences. It does not anymore guarantee humble inferiors, be they subservient wives, subordinate employees, or second-class citizens who "know their place," but may render enraged adversaries who reject being put down as humiliating.

And since feelings of humiliation carry the potential of leading to grave consequences, Lindner calls them the "nuclear bomb of the emotions," the results may range from breakdown of social relations to terrorism.

The Normative Universe of Honour

The following three sections are adapted from Lindner (2006a).

During the past 10,000 years, *honour* has dominated human communities all over the globe. I define honour as the ranking of human worthiness and value, as the acceptance that there are *higher* beings who preside over *lesser* beings.

William Ury (1999), anthropologist, and director of the Harvard University Project on Preventing War, draws up a simplified depiction of history. He pulls together elements from anthropology, game theory and conflict studies to describe three major types of society: a) simple hunter-gatherers (during the first 90 percent of human history), b) complex agriculturists (lasting for roughly the past 10,000 years), and c) the currently emerging knowledge society.

In Ury's system, during the first 90 percent of human history, humankind lived as simple hunter-gatherers. They enjoyed a world of coexistence and open networks, within which conflicts were negotiated, rather than addressed by coercion. The abundance of wild food represented an *expandable pie of resources* that did not force opponents into win-lose paradigms.

Around 10,000 years ago, however, this rather benign situation came to an end. It was the point in time when many easily accessible parts of the globe had been populated and the "next valley" was no longer untouched. The next valley was now inhabited by other people (*circumscription* is the anthropological term). Homo sapiens had filled up the globe – the first round of globalization had come upon humankind, so to speak. This, together with climate change, brought to the fore a new way of life, for most of humankind, namely agriculture: when I can no longer find uninhabited wild nature, I have to use the land on which I stand more efficiently (*intensification* is the anthropological term).

Agriculture was quite a shrewd human adaptation to new conditions, one could say, however, it had serious side effects. It created what political scientists call the *security dilemma*: As soon as the resource I live on is land (and no longer freely available wild food), I have to defend my land against you, against the greed of my neighbor.

In other words, the normative world of honour, of honourable domination/submission, could be regarded as an adaptation to the fear of attack, which emanated from the fact that land became the resource of most of humankind, a resource that by definition is *not expandable*.

I have based my work on humiliation on Ury's work – see Lindner (2006b) (see also many full online texts on http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php). In a world of honourable domination/submission, everybody accepts that it is God's will or nature's order that masters hold down underlings. Intricate cultural practices were devised during the past 10,000 years, in different cultures in different ways, to keep this ranking system in place. Inferiors learned to kow-tow, they learned to accept being beaten regularly, or even killed. This was meant to "remind" underlings where they

"belonged," namely "below their masters." Humiliation was routine and seen as legitimate. Even the most atrocious methods of holding underlings down were regarded as "honourable medicine," good for the victims and good for society. Humiliation was not yet judged to be a violation. Only the masters themselves, when their privileged position was questioned, could define being put down as illegitimate humiliation of their honour and try to repair it, for example, by going to duel. In times of Apartheid, for example, the downtrodden had no right to protest, while the elites cried "foul" whenever their supremacy was questioned.

The word "civilians" did not exist; the common man and woman did not count. They were puppets in their rulers' hands. For thousands of years, rulers fought their wars, and the suffering of their people went unmentioned. People died, their homelands were devastated, their homesteads destroyed, their men killed and their women raped or taken away. Nobody asked whether they felt traumatized. For the common man and woman the actions of their rulers were like natural disasters. My grandmother said to me once, "Wir kleinen Leute können ja sowieso nichts tun. Die da oben machen ja doch was sie wollen," meaning that the masses, the "little people" as she called it, had no power. This was how my grandmother felt, this is what dominated her view of life and the world.

The moral world of honour can be illustrated by many examples, from all parts of the world, the so-called "West" as much as in the "non-West." The normative world of honour cross-cuts our world, it does not follow fault lines of "West" versus "non-West." Ranked honour is still strong in two realms: in certain segments of societies all around the world (see the earlier discussion of Southern Honour, and honour killings), and at macro levels, namely at the level of powerful international elites dealing with each other. Honour often plays a stronger role in foreign policy matters, in armed services and diplomatic staffs, than among the lower echelons of the average citizen. Thus, a passion to retain a state's "honourable" preeminence, as Donald Kagan (1998) proposes, applies in today's world no less than it did earlier, even when "national honour" is partly concealed by human rights rhetoric and no longer invoked as openly as in the past.

Let us now have a look at the new world of dignity.

The Normative Universe of Equal Dignity for All

Ury posits that a knowledge society resembles the hunter-gatherer model because the pie of resources – knowledge – appears to be *infinitely expandable* (there are always new ideas to be developed), lending itself to win-win solutions. This type of society moves away from rigid hierarchical structures toward the open network of our earliest hunter-gatherer ancestors. Negotiation and contract replace command lines, and coexistence is the primary strategy.

In other words, the vision of a future global knowledge society entails a surprisingly benign promise. As soon as land is not longer the main resource, all are freed from the security dilemma and from having to fight against neighbours. All can cooperate, together increase the pie of resources, and everybody gains. No longer do masters have to keep armies of inferiors to fight enemies. A global knowledge society entails the potential to liberate both, masters and inferiors, from having to force everybody into a ranked

system. All are called upon to throw their creativity into the task of forging better ways to protect our shared home, planet Earth, and build a world where all can live dignified lives.

And indeed, human rights are the new moral adaptation to the new conditions of an increasingly interdependent globalizing world. Many accuse the West of wanting to force human rights down the throat of the rest, but it may rather be that norms of ranked honour lose their utility under the new conditions.

The first sentence in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." This means that nobody ought to be humiliated – humiliation is now a violation of dignity that is illegitimate. For the past 10,000 years, honour has ranked people in higher and lesser beings; human rights un-rank them again, masters are called upon to descend and inferiors to rise, all meet in the middle, in equal dignity, connected in shared humility, back to what seems to have been the rule prior to 10,000 years ago.

Formerly, when inferiors staged revolutions, they merely replaced their masters and kept the hierarchical system in place – former inferiors soon acted as new tyrants. The human rights revolution is different, and recognizing this fact is essential for efficient crisis management today. The human rights revolution entails two parts, first the dismantling of humiliators, and second the dismantling of the very humiliating system, including our own humiliating behaviour. What was "benevolent patronage" before, transmutes into "oppression," and now this oppression has to be dismantling by non-dominating means – see the work by Morton Deutsch (2006), and Philip Pettit (1996), or by Howard Zehr (2002), and John Braithwaite (2002).

Honour codes had their place in a world that did not yet experience the coming-together of humankind into *one single global community*; they have their place in a world of *many fragmented units pitched against each other*. Human rights represent a normative framework that is better adapted to an emerging global knowledge society.

Human rights defenders no longer can humiliate others, not even humiliators. Looking down on others and treating them as lesser beings is no longer legitimate. This entails that also those people, who still endorse honour codes, wherever in the world, may not be looked down upon. The brother who kills his sister has his place in the old world of honour, and from the point of view of human rights, he deserves everybody's respect as a human being, even though his deeds are rejected. Mandela walked out of 27 years of humiliation in prison and many of his guards had become his friends.

Brave heroism and sacrifice in the old world of honour meant standing up *against* our enemies, it meant accepting to be part of a hierarchically organized ingroup, united in patriotic love for our ingroup, pitted against threatening outgroups. Brave heroism and sacrifice in the new world of dignity means standing up united in humanizing love *for* a vision of one united family of humankind, where everybody deserves to be respected as equal in dignity, a world without enemies and outgoups, a world of neighbours, who together find a way to live together even if they do not love each other, even after "divorce."

The Transition as it Plays out for the Arab World

Please let us recapitulate. The *culture of honour* of the past 10,000 years entails *normative-psychological scripts of honour*, while a *culture of equal dignity for all*, currently not much more than a vision for the future, entails *normative-psychological scripts of egality or equal dignity for all*. The culture of honour represents an adaptation to the strong Security Dilemma of the past 10,000 years (a strong Security Dilemma emerges when land is the resource for livelihood). In contrast, at the current point in historic time, in tact with increasing global interdependence and the weakening of the Security Dilemma, a culture of equal dignity for all receives a chance to thrive if humankind grasps this chance and does not squander it by mutual humiliating each other.

The transition from honour to dignity, from ranking people's worthiness to un-ranking and egalising it, resembles the transition from left-hand driving to right-hand driving. At the current point in historic time, still many drive on the left side, while others already drive on the right side. Clearly, accidents are pre-programmed. The pain emanating from those accidents might cloud the hope that the transition entails, and the fact that it has to be hastened, not slowed down.

This transition does not proceed en bloc; it entails many transitions. For example, the concept of *global cooperation* was absent in the past, since the awareness that humankind is one single family that is jointly responsible for their small home planet was not yet well developed. Instead, communities tried to stay clear of being attacked by their neighbours in two ways: either they attempted to preserve their integrity by *isolating* themselves, or they pre-empted being dominated by meeting out *domination* on their part. Particularly the second path expresses the tragedy of the Security Dilemma insofar as the Security Dilemma easily leads to war because it is so tempting to pre-empt being attacked by attacking first. Yet, isolation and domination are no longer viable strategies in a globalising world. *Global cooperation* becomes the absolute necessity if humankind wishes to survive the global challenges that it faces. *Isolating* oneself from neighbouring outgroups so as to preserve one's security, albeit undeniably a viable option as long as the world was not as interdependent as it is nowadays, is no longer helpful. Instigating xenophobic *hatred* for outgroups, so as to strengthen ingroup cohesion and keep emotional distance from outgoups, even though indeed feasible to a certain degree in the past, is no longer applicable today. Equally, also *domination* over neighbouring outgroups, turning them into subjugated parts of one's ingroup, the other way of dealing with the Security Dilemma, is no longer applicable. In extension, mutual humiliation, used as a tool to achieve domination and subjugation in the past, needs to be replaced by global cooperation today.

The concept that *all humankind is one family*, with everybody deserving equal respect and dignity, is a concept that has been present in many religions and philosophies since time immemorial. Daniel Stridsman, in his presentation in this Pilot Course on 21st January 2007, documented many relevant sources from within Islam, for example that instilling fear in your neighbours turns a believer into a non-believer ("anyone whose neighbour does not feel safe from his harm"). In other words, the core idea of human rights, namely that everybody is to be treated as equal in dignity, is not a Western idea, but universally present through all of human history. However, this idea had little chance to thrive during the past 10,000 years, since the Security Dilemma forced people into ranked societies. Today, in tact with humankind defining itself as one single family that uses knowledge as resource, and these are the good news connected to what we call

globalisation (notwithstanding its malign aspects), this concept has a chance to thrive in practice.

Globalisation is indeed another buzzword that is affected by the current transition. When framed in an honour culture, it means nothing but the domination of the rest by the strongest (at the current point in historic time, the American elite largely takes up this role). However, the world is growing towards interdependence, and globalisation needs to be humanised by *egalisation* (the true realisation of equal dignity for everybody, a term coined by Lindner).

Searching for common ground, in an honour context, is often applied in Machiavellian ways, to serve the aims of either isolation or domination. In contrast, a culture of equal dignity for all requires that searching for common ground is truly applied to build global cooperation. Not searching for common ground, or *attacking and criticising one's outgroup opponents*, while central to strengthen ingroup resistance to outgroups in the old context of honour, has to be avoided in an interdependent world, so as to not endanger global cooperation.

The idea of *Unity in Diversity*, in a fragmented world, is usually applied only within one's ingroup, not outside of it. In a fragmented world, diversity often divides, and division is actively boosted so as to divide even more, in the service of isolation or domination. In contrast, in the wake of growing global interdependence, since there is no longer any "outside," Unity in Diversity applies to all humankind. Diversity is extremely important and while it has to be strengthened, it has still to be put second to unity, not the other way round.

The *concept of God* in the old world of honour often portrays God as a draconian master. God is seen as a vicious feudal lord, who arbitrarily meets out punishment, or an early industrial factory owner, who cuts the salary of the worker when he or she is late for a minute or deviates in other ways from the ideal of functioning like a machine. In contrast, in a culture of dignity, God can be defined as merciful carer (Fazeela Saib explained this beautifully during this course). In the context of honour, the *hijab*, for example, may be worn by women out of fear for divine punishment, and its use may furthermore be encouraged by elites who wish to boost support for the old "solutions" of the Security Dilemma, namely domination or isolation. The practice of wearing the hijab stems from a historical time of honour, when men were guarding their women. An old saying, not only in Egypt, prescribes that a "good" woman ought to leave the house only twice in her lifetime, first, when she gets married and moves from the house of her father to the house of her husband, and second, when her dead body is carried to the cemetery. The hijab may serve as a mobile home that covers a woman while she ventures out of the house. In the context of a culture of dignity, in contrast, the hijab may be worn out of profoundly different motives, for example, out of a desire to signal humility, sincerity, and love for all humankind, including resistance against women being used as objects. The wearing of the hijab, in the new context, would follow Martin Buber (1944) and his differentiation between dignified I-Thou relationships and I-It relationships, where people instrumentalise each other. (However, the question remains, how men can be protected against being instrumentalised, and how men can make visible, through their clothes, that they wish to engage in I-Thou relationships rather than I-It relationships?)

Self-centred exploitative materialism, in the context of a fragmented world, was strong, because self-interest was defined as the self-interest of one's ingroup as opposed to

outgroups. This framing was relevant for believers and non-believers alike – in other words, religion, Islam included, does not protect against self-centred exploitative materialism. In contrast, when all humankind grows into one single ingroup, self-interest becomes identical with common interest. Currently, narrow ingroup materialism is still dominant throughout the world, since the transition to the future is not yet brought about sufficiently. In the future, under the new circumstances of interdependence, narrow materialism needs to be replaced by a focus on inclusive quality of life for everybody, on creating dignified living conditions for all. Both concepts, self-centred exploitative materialism, and inclusive quality of life for all, can be defended by drawing upon religions messages, and religion has to be "mined" selectively to support the adaptation to the future.

As mentioned earlier, *hatred,* and *anger-entrepreneurship* are important tools for the "solution" of the Security Dilemma in a fragmented world, namely isolation and domination, and elites instigate it. Regrettably, this outdated strategy is still being applied worldwide today, by global players as much as within regions (see, for example, the current Sunni/Shia power struggle). However, in an interdependent world, this strategy is suicidal for all humankind. *Love*, another buzzword, in a fragmented word, is defined as love for one's ingroup. It is encouraged to love one's ingroup to keep it cohesive in opposition to outgroups – patriotism is one of the key terms. In contrast, love for all human beings is crucial for the survival of the entire family of humankind in an interdependent and shrinking world. All religions can and need to support this call for love for all humanity.

Humiliation, in the old framework, is s seen as a legitimate tool to keep hierarchical ingroups hierarchical, and hold outgroups either in submission or keep them safely out. In the new world, humiliation is felt to be obscene in all cases. *Humility*, in a fragmented world, is seen as appropriate within one's ingroup, but not in relation to one's outgroups. Since all humankind is seen as one ingroup, today, humility is appropriate in relation to all.

Daniel Stridsman, in his talk, attacked the West as a decadent peddler of Coca Cola materialism. Somebody from within the audience commented that this attack on the West could be misunderstood as an attempt to polarize the world in the service of the old strategy of domination or isolation. Stridsman's defense was that his attacks were meant to highlight the shortcomings that humankind has to overcome together, in other words, he calls for joint resistance against short-sighted definitions of self-interest, with the one single interdependent world in mind, that we need to protect together.

As to *Euro-Arab relations*, Stridsman explained how he and his colleagues have discussed how they should call themselves: "Muslims in Sweden," meaning Muslims as opposed to the rest of the Swedish nation (and in extrapolation, to the non-Muslim world), or "Swedish Muslims," meaning that Muslims are an integral part of the Swedish society. They opted for the latter. Hopefully, in a future dignified world, also nationalities such as "Swedish" will be embedded into an identity of one single human family, and labels can be found that signify that both Swedes and Muslims are part of all humankind.

At last to the notion of *peace*. In the old fragmented world in the grip of the Security Dilemma, people attempted to achieve peace through dominating others or staying isolated. In the new context of One World, peace can only be attained through dialogue that gives priority to everybody's membership in one single human family. Diversity,

though immensely important, needs to be relegated to a secondary place. Diversity needs to be celebrated much more in today's world, Western dominance is impoverishing the treasure of cultural solutions that humankind could otherwise draw upon, however, diversity is only enriching and peace-promoting if placed within unity.

At the current point in time, the old order of honour still lingers on in many segments of world society. Examples such as Southern Honour of the United States, or so-called honour killings, have been discussed earlier, as has the strong role that honour often plays in foreign policy matters, in armed services and diplomatic staffs. Another example for regional cultural differences is what is called fundamentalism, be it Christian, or Hindu, or of any other denomination, wherever it evolves.

In an interdependent One World, we need to invite everybody into the culture of equal dignity for all and humanise globalisation by egalising it.

Table of the Transition as it Plays out for the Arab World

	Culture of honour (entailing normative-psychological scripts of honour) of the past 10,000 years	Culture of equal dignity for all (entailing normative-psychological scripts of egality or equal dignity for all), as a vision for the future
Security Dilemma (due to land being the resource for livelihood)	Strong.	Weak.
Global cooperation	This concept is absent. Instead: isolation or domination.	This concept is central.
Isolation from neighbouring outgroups	Strong concept. Hatred is seen as important emotional tool to keep the distance.	This concept is no longer applicable, because there are no outgroups defined anymore. Humankind sees itself as one family.
Domination over neighbouring outgroups, turning them into subjugated parts of one's ingroup	Strong concept. Humiliation is used as a tool to achieve domination and subjugation.	This concept is no longer applicable. It is replaced by the concept of global cooperation.
Concept that all humankind is one family, with everybody deserving equal respect and dignity	This concept is present in many religions and philosophies. HR is no singularly Western idea. See, e.g., Islam: "A non-believer is somebody who instils fear in his neighbours." But this ideal	This concept has a chance to thrive in practice.

	has no chance to be practiced.	
Globalisation	Domination of the strongest.	Globalisation & Egalisation.
Searching for common ground	This is often applied in Machiavellian ways, to serve the aims of either isolation or domination.	This needs to be truly applied to build global cooperation.
Attack and criticism of others	This is central to strengthen ingroup resistance to outgroups.	This has to be avoided so as to not endanger global cooperation.
Unity in Diversity	Applicable only within one's ingroup, not outside. Diversity divides.	Since there is no longer any "outside," this applies to all humankind.
The concept of God	God as draconian master ("machine paradigm" – God as a vicious feudal lord & early industrial factory owner).	God as merciful carer (Fazeela Zaib).
Hijab	The hijab may be worn out of fear for divine punishment, and may be called for by elites who wish to boost support for domination or isolation. It stems from a historical time of honour (men guarding women, hijab as a mobile home).	The hijab may be worn out of a desire to signal love for all humankind, to signal resistance against using women as objects (I-Thou versus I-It). However, how can men be protected against being used as objects, and express this through their clothes?
Materialism	Strong, because self-interest is defined as the self-interest of one's ingroup as opposed to outgroups, and this affects all believers and non-believers (Islam does not protect against materialism).	Self-interest equals common interest when all humankind is seen as one ingroup, and inspiration can and should be drawn from all religions.
Current examples where honour codes linger on	National elites around the world, and local cultural "pockets" still adhere to honour codes (e.g. *Southern Honour* in the United States of America, or the practice of honour killings).	We need to invite everybody into the culture of equal dignity for all (globalisation & egalisation).
Hatred, anger-entrepreneurship	Important tools for isolation and domination, and elites instigate it.	Suicidal for all humankind.
Love	Love for one's ingroup is used as tool to keep one's ingroup together in opposition to outgroups (patriotism).	Love for all human beings is crucial for the survival of the entire family of humankind.

Evelin Lindner, January 2007

Humiliation	Humiliation is seen as legitimate tool to keep hierarchical ingroups and outgroups either submissive or away.	Is felt to be obscene in all cases.
Humility	Humility is seen as appropriate within one's ingroup, but not in relation to one's outgroups.	Since all humankind is evolving to be one single ingroup, humility is appropriate in relation to all.
Daniel Stridsman's talk	Stridsman attacked the West as decadent and peddling Coca Cola materialism. Somebody commented that this could be misunderstood as an attempt to polarize the world in in- and outgroups in the service of domination or isolation.	Stridsman's defense was that his attacks were meant to highlight the shortcomings that humankind has to overcome together.
Euro-Arab relations	"Muslims in Sweden," meaning Muslims as opposed to the rest of the world.	"Swedish Muslims" (at some point labels may be found to indicate that both Swedes and Muslims as part of all humankind).
Peace	Through domination or staying isolated.	Through dialogue that gives priority to membership in one single human family, where diversity, albeit in need to be strengthened, is second to unity.

Table 1: Table of the Transition as it Plays out for the Arab World

Concluding Remarks

As mentioned earlier, the program of Fredsagenterna in Sweden indicates that they wish to "increase the knowledge about an Islamic peace culture among young Swedish Muslims." This is a goal that is constructive not only for peace within Swedish society, but for the wider world.

This paper makes the attempt to underpin this goal with more arguments. It does so by looking at long-term human history. This has three pay-offs, at least. First, it provides that *calmness, composure, and serenity* that is necessary to undertake the constructive social change that is needed at the current point in history, second, it opens space for *mutual respect across fault lines*, and third, it spells out a *roadmap for the future and reasons for hope*.

First, people who are caught in hot struggles typically suffer from "tunnel vision," which is detrimental to solving conflicts constructively. Taking a step back is useful to

calming down, and it opens up a wider horizon for potential explanations of the situation, and for finding new solutions.

Second, taking a step back opens space for *mutual respect*. People, who adhere to a culture of honour, for example, ought not be vilified by those who wish to promote a culture of dignity. Instead, a deep understanding for the fact that people born into the Security Dilemma are usually also caught in a culture of honour can help differentiate between people and their cultural traditions: human rights defenders can extend deep respect to those who adhere to honour traditions, while at the same time confronting the very practices of honour that need to be overcome in a world that is no longer exposed to the tragedy of the Security Dilemma.

Third, looking at long-term human history provides a *roadmap* for solving the world's problems, and spells out *reasons for hope*. For example, it is useful to ponder that the vision of a future presented in this paper entails a host of hopeful elements that may make this vision worth fighting for. The vision is that of a unified world society of human beings that uses knowledge as the resource for their livelihood and embeds diversity into unity. Reasons for hope are as follows (among others):

1. Knowledge as the resource for livelihood offers a win-win frame that is more benign than the win-lose lose frame that is forced when land is the main resource.
2. All humankind defining itself as one single ingroup is more benign than many outgroups confronting each other, because it frees humankind from malign outgroup biases.
3. The ideal of equal dignity for all invites everybody into developing their full personal potential. No longer are inferiors tools in the hands of their masters.
4. Cooperation is more constructive and benign than keeping enemies away.
5. Avoiding, preventing, and healing humiliation is easier than tackling the Security Dilemma.

The path worth to be followed today, it seems, is to respect "enemies" so as to turn them into friends, or, if not friends, then at least into neighbours who cooperate despite disagreement. We, all of humankind, need to cooperate in building a world of global neighbours who look at the future, deconstruct and reconstruct the world's cultural diversity, and embed it into unity. Old traditions must neither be eradicated blindly, nor venerated blindly; only practices with benign promises for the future merit being kept. If we look at China, for example, Chinese foot binding lasted for thousand years, still, today, nobody would opt for preserving this tradition just because it was a tradition. In contrast, certain Confucian teachings are very useful still today. Our forefathers did not have access to the vision of One World, they could not see photos of our home planet from the astronaut's perspective. Therefore, teachings from the past need to be scrutinised, and selectively kept or discarded. Not everything our forefathers believed in is suitable for the new world we live in today.

In order to build a functioning global neighbourhood, it is furthermore crucial that helpless victimhood is translated into constructive social change following Mandela's path. Fear has to be calmed down, because it brings back the past and risks fragmenting the world, while dignity brings the world into a constructive future of global solidarity. Extremists peddle fear and moderates need to resist this.

Global warming, poverty, violent conflicts, these problems can only be solved within a global framework of dialogue and negotiations, embedded into institutions that are based on human rights. A *decent* global community needs to be built, in the spirit of Avishai Margalit (1996) and his call for a *Decent Society*.

A *decent global village* is a place where coercion is used in novel ways. Pacifism no longer means the rejection of force. As mentioned in the introduction, Gandhi disliked the words and ideas of "passive resistance." The term *satyagraha* (non-violent action), is a combination of *satya* (truth-love) and *agraha* (firmness/force). United Nations peace keeping missions, for example, need a stronger mandate than hitherto in order to be able to prevent and police regional and local conflicts – and a strong mandate means precisely the interlink of coercion with respect. Respectful firmness is indeed the only way to stop sectarian extremists who are in the business of turning spirals of humiliation into an abyss that can swallow us all.

Human rights defenders, Mandelas, Gandhis, moderates, take the lead! Contain local conflicts with respectful firmness so that we all can take on the global challenges that we face and that endanger us all.

As mentioned in the introduction, I had the particular pleasure to have my talk after the impressive presentation that Hans Blix gave. Hans Blix formulated a list of adjectives that would be desirable for the conduct of an inspector, and I think that this list is relevant to everybody, in the spirit of building a new world, also within. Hans Blix recommends that inspectors, in order to be effective and successful, need to behave as follows:

- Driving and dynamic – but not angry and aggressive
- Firm – but correct
- Ingenious – but not deceptive
- Somewhat flexible – but not to be pushed around
- Calm – but somewhat impatient
- Keeping some distance – but not arrogant or pompous
- Friendly – but not cozy
- Show respect for those you deal with – and demand respect for yourself
- A light tone or a joke may sometimes break a nervous atmosphere (Hans Blix, quoted from http://www.un.org/).

Reference List

Braithwaite, John (2002). *Restorative Justice & Responsive Regulation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buber, Martin (1944). *I and Thou.* Edinburgh: Clark.

Deutsch, Morton (2006). A Framework for Thinking About Oppression and Its Change. In *Social Justice Research,* in press.

Fischer, David Hackett (1989). *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kagan, Donald (1998). Honor, Interest, and Nation-State. In Abrams, Elliot (Ed.), *Honor Among Nations*, Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center.

Karmi, Ghada (2007). These Shameful Events Have Humiliated the Arab World. Saddam's Trial and Mob Execution Reeked of Western Double Standards. Yet Iraq's Neighbouring States Failed to Speak Out. In *The Guardian,* Tuesday January 2, 2007http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1981010,00.html.

Lewis, Helen Block (1971). *Shame and Guilt in Neurosis.* New York, NY: International Universities Press.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006a). *Humiliation, Iran, and the Middle East Crisis.* Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, see http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006b). *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict.* Westport, CT, London: Greenwood Press and Praeger Publishers.

Margalit, Avishai (1996). *The Decent Society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nebehay, Stephanie (2000). "Honor Killings" of Women Said on Rise Worldwide. In *Reuters Dispatch,* April 7

Nisbett, Richard E. and Cohen, Dov (1996). *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Pettit, Philip (1996). Freedom As Antipower. In *Ethics,* 106, pp. 576-604.

Ury, William (1999). *Getting to Peace. Transforming Conflict at Home, at Work, and in the World.* New York, NY: Viking.

Woodward, Bob (2006). *State of Denial: Bush at War, Part III.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram (1982). *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Zehr, Howard (2002). *The Little Book of Restorative Justice.* Intercourse, PA: Good Books.