

2005 Workshop on Humiliation and Violent Conflict Representing the Sixth Annual Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies Meeting

15-16th December
New York, NY
Teacher's College, Columbia University

Meeting Notes Day 1

Please be advised that these notes are marked as 'Unconfirmed'

Please advise HumanDHS if there are any errors



Contents

Day One, December 15, 2005

Introduction: Appreciative Inquiry Framework	3
Introductory Lecture: Humiliation in a Globalizing World: Does Humiliation Become the Most Disruptive Force?.....	3
What's Relevant in Destructive Conflict? (Round Table 1, Section 1).....	7
Is Humiliation Relevant in a Destructive Conflict? (Round Table 1; Section 2)	12
Is Humiliation Relevant in a Destructive Conflict? (Round Table 2; Section 1)	17
Honored Presentations	23

Unconfirmed See Page 1

Day One December 15, 2005

Introduction: Appreciative Inquiry Framework

Presentation by Donald Klein, Graduate College, Union Institute and University, USA, and Linda Hartling, Ph.D., Associate Director, Jean Baker Miller Training Institute, Wellesley College, Boston, USA.

I. Appreciative Inquiry

The purpose of *appreciative inquiry* is to develop a useful frame of our work. Our HumanDHS efforts are not just about the work we do together, but also about how we work together. At appropriate points during our meetings, for example, we take a moment to reflect on the practices we observed that contributed to an appreciative and humiliation-free learning experience.

It is important to emphasize that an appreciative approach is not about expecting people to agree. In fact, differences of opinion enrich conversations and deepen people's understanding of ideas. Perhaps, this could be conceptualized as "waging good conflict," a term used to describe the practice of radical respect for differences as well as being open to a variety of perspectives and engaging others without contempt or rankism. As we have seen in many fields, contempt and rankism drains energy away from the important work that needs to be done. Most people only know "conflict" as a form of war within a win/lose frame. "Waging good conflict," on the other hand, is about being empathic and respectful, making room for authenticity, clarity, and growth.

Please read *An Appreciative Frame: Beginning a Dialogue on Human Dignity and Humiliation* that Linda has written for us in 2005, on www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/HartlingAppreciativeFrame.pdf.

Introductory Lecture: Humiliation in a Globalizing World: Does Humiliation Become the Most Disruptive Force?

Presentation by Evelin Lindner, Founding Manager of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS)

This talk highlights how globalization is interlinked with new and unprecedented psychological dynamics that call for novel solutions at all levels – macro, meso and micro levels, and in all fields of public policy. For her full paper see <https://ssrn.com/abstract=668742>.

I. Dynamics of humiliation lead to rifts and then to the break down.

Evelin discussed her field work in Rwanda and Somalia, and showed how the feelings of humiliation can be *nuclear bombs of emotion* (her term) leading to destruction. Propaganda fueled feelings of humiliation to the extent that neighbors killed neighbors with what they had at home, namely machetes. Victims paid to have bullets to be shot rather than to be hacked to death.

II. Concept of Humiliation (Broad Theory)

A. Periods of human history

1. Hunter and gatherer period: For the first ninety percent of human history, humans lived as hunter-gatherers in relatively small egalitarian groupings.
 - a) Pride is the most appropriate label for the emotional culture of hunter-gatherer communities: pristine pride, pride that is yet untouched. The act of putting down was not yet applied to human beings in an institutionalized form. It was, however, applied to abiotic nature. Language may be seen as the first application of the “putting down” act because language “puts down” objects by naming. Furthermore, tools were made, which “put down” pristine nature by instrumentalizing it.
 - b) The egalitarian hunter-gatherer societal structure of pristine pride may be visualized by drawing a horizontal line – the line of equal pristine pride.
2. Agricultural period: About 10,000 years ago, agriculture emerged. The agricultural period of human history lasted until very recently and still dominates non-industrial parts of the world.
 - a) Honor is the most appropriate label for the emotional culture of agriculturists. Not only animals were domesticated and “put down,” but humans were also humiliated by other humans, placed into a rank system, with each layer having its “honor.” Domestication and slavery represent an expansion of the act of “putting down” – an expansion from “putting down” abiotic nature to also “putting down” biotic nature, living creatures, animals and humans. Animals and people were used as tools rather than simply abiotic matter. This can be expressed graphically by adding to the line of pride a master-slave gradient, ranging from a top line for masters and a bottom line for underlings and slaves.
 - b) For thousands of years, ranking human worthiness hierarchically was seen as the core characteristic of civilization; egalitarian societies were looked down on as “barbaric.” Up until around 250 to 300 years ago, the idea that humiliation/humbling may be a violation of norms did not exist. Until 1757, humiliating/humbling underlings, or to show them “their place,” was regarded as profoundly legitimate. In Norway, for example, until as recently as 1868, Norwegian law obliged husbands to beat insubordinate wives.

- c) When underlings tried to rise, they replaced the master rather than eliminating the hierarchical system.
- 3. Present period: In 1757, for the first time in the English language, the verb “to humiliate” is documented with the connotation to be a violation, and the notion of equal human dignity entered the stage of human history – equal dignity for each individual in an increasingly “global knowledge society.”
 - a) Dignity is the most appropriate label for the emotional culture of the present knowledge society. Equal dignity means the dismantling of the idea that “putting down” may be legitimate. The central message of human rights, enshrined in the preamble, is that every human being is endowed with equal dignity.
 - b) This historical change can be made visible graphically by dismantling the master-slave gradient and regaining the line of pride in the middle, or, more precisely, now the line of equal dignity and humility, since pride is no longer pristine. Pristine pride is a pre-humiliation state, and equal dignity and humility as a post-humiliation state. Human rights advocates accuse masters of arrogating superiority and call for their descent from arrogation to humility, while underlings are empowered to define their lowliness as humiliating violation of their dignity. Human rights promoters invite masters down and underlings up.

III. What is new?

- A. Advocating human rights increases feelings of humiliation
 - 1. The awareness of human rights is growing worldwide.
 - 2. Human rights turn old practices of subjugation into illegitimate practices. People who learn about human rights, learn that they have the right to feel humiliated when they find themselves being placed somewhere at the bottom of society as *lesser* beings. They become conscious that they are justified to have feelings of humiliation.
 - 3. The problem is that, in response, they may not become “Mandelas,” but “Hitlers.”
 - 4. In a human rights context, a former habit of underlings becomes particularly malign, namely the tendency of underlings to admire and imitate masters in an attempt to rise. Imitation, however, typically does not achieve equal dignity, and those who get disappointed may encourage revolt (see, for example, Fanon, 1986).
 - 5. Human rights ideals also turn the “licking of the master’s shoes” into a shameful undertaking. More discussion and thinking needs to be carried out on the intricate web of shame over elite admiration, which – as soon as they subscribe to human rights ideals of equal dignity – may be perceived by underlings as self-humiliation. Shame over elite admiration may be at the core of the unprecedented cruelty of present genocides. Long-established elites suppress, while recently risen underlings seem to “cleanse,” see, for example, Rwanda. Perhaps this “cleansing” does not only function as the cleansing of the other ethnic group, but as the cleansing of their own admiration for the

former elite, an admiration that turned into a cause of shame. Genocide, understood thus, may be seen, among others, as an attempt to undo self-humiliation.

6. Genocide becomes more than oppression. It is cleansing.
7. Human rights advocates have a responsibility to not only instigate feelings of humiliation, and risk Hitler-like responses from underlings, but also challenge the cruel cleansing of perceived elites. Human rights advocates carry the responsibility to invest in peaceful and constructive ways out of feelings of humiliation.

B. Globalization and egalization

1. In the course of human history smaller entities often were absorbed into larger entities (typically with women “inside” and men guarding the frontiers to the “outside”). The global village represents the first and unprecedented coming-into-being of only one single entity – everyone is invited to be part of the one single family of humankind.
 2. Globalization is the coming-together of people into one single global village. This is beneficial because in-group /out-group definitions disappear. Yet, how will this village be formed? Only through dismantling the current hierarchical pyramid structure: *egalization*. I coined this term to match the term globalization and make the point that globalization can only be humanized by egalization, by putting into practice the human rights call for equal dignity for all.
-

What's Relevant in Destructive Conflict? (Round Table 1, Section 1)

This section of Round Table 1 contains the following presentations:

- I. Destructive Conflict and Oppression
- II. Education and Humiliation
- III. Deconstructing International Deadly Conflicts
- IV. The Simplicities of Reversing Destructive Conflict
- V. From Humiliation to Empowerment: Creative Conflict Management in the Multi-ethnic School
- VI. "Humiliation" as Positions in Narratives: Implications for Policy Development

I. Destructive Conflict and Oppression (Morton Deutsch)

Morton Deutsch was born in 1920, and has numerous interests in the issues of this conference, all reflecting his life work. As he observes, the topic of genocide brings many of us to this work. He flew with the Air Force in WWII, finding himself involved with bombing and destruction. He knew about the Holocaust. Returning to work in psychology, he turned his interest to issues of competition, then to conflict resolution, and attempted to study what it takes to bring conflict resolution to constructive results. He and colleagues currently work on the second edition of their *Handbook of Conflict Resolution* where the ideas discussed above are published.

With regard to conflict resolution, if the parties involved view the situation as a mutual challenge, it is likely to take a constructive course. If the situation is defined as a win-lose competition, then it will likely take a more destructive course. Typical effects of a successful cooperation are that they tend to induce further cooperation, open honest communication, and an enhancement of everybody's power. In competition, however, communication is designed to deceive and to keep or place others in inferior positions. There is an environment of mutual distrust.

Oppression is widespread systemic injustice. Conflict may be open and active, but the conflict may also be latent, particularly, when the disadvantaged do not have awareness.

II. Education and Humiliation (David Hamburg)

It is easy to see a historical pattern of behavior throughout time. In England, in the 1640s and 1650s, we find the first evidence of ethnic cleansing. Evidence of ethnic cleansing is also to be found in Turkey-Armenia, but its height was not reached until the middle of the 20th century. Since there is such a long list of countries where people have been killed since WWII, it is incredible that there has not been a collective denunciation of mass killing. It is of key importance that a public health model is used and studied. The problem is the lack of contingency plans and response options. Tools and strategies of prevention can be applied even to mass genocide. It is important to explore different ways of addressing the issue and bring all groups into a dialogue.

III. Deconstructing International Deadly Conflicts (Andrea Bartoli)

Behavior arises as the reaction of a person to her environment; but still, the response to humiliation may be extraordinarily creative, e.g. that of Nelson Mandela. The progression to violence, retaliation, and destruction is a choice; some people have altruistic reactions even in the midst of humiliation. This demonstrates that hope can find a home everywhere, and that the human heart can be extraordinarily generous. Genocide is violence that occurs in one direction only, one that does not encounter response. Killers kill unpunished, unstoppable. The duty to kill is seen as a form of purification, enhancement, and possible response to past humiliation.

It is phenomenal how a conducive environment can create such a huge amount of human death. It is amazing what the mind can do, when it feels that the only way to move forward is to kill. We need to have a collective reaction to that phenomenon; we need to make sure that the capacity is not there for those who drive such violence, but also study humiliation to understand how such situations can come about.

On one hand, we need to take humiliation seriously as an utterly negative violation; however, on the other hand, we may hope that people will respond to humiliation creatively and not just with violence. The challenge for ourselves and others on genocide prevention is to see how a human rights paradigm may offer a way of expressing suffering that is not humiliating by giving a language for discussion.

IV. The Simplicities of Reversing Destructive Conflict (Maria Volpe)

These conflicts are very complex and have a long history where everyone has been humiliated. People are experiencing migraines, ulcers, or rashes that are intense in the presence of abusive colleagues. What are ways to reduce these people's destructive behaviors? Can we agree to say good morning to each other – getting things down to something very simple as a beginning? We need to prepare individuals to deal with the potential minefields of humiliation. What are the simplicities of preventing humiliation? Working with the “ouch” rule, works for individuals who don't have major skills in this, sharing with each other that they need to find a place to have safe discussion. Use “what I heard you say is...” as opposed to a long lesson in paraphrasing. Discuss timing: when will they have these discussions with each other? Use phrases like “I'd like to speak with you later” rather than in the moment. The role of allies (versus adversaries) is important to help discontinue humiliation. Have them rehearse simple ways of what to say to allies who will egg them on.

V. From Humiliation to Empowerment: Creative Conflict Management in the Multi-ethnic School (Kjell Skyllstad)

Kjell represents the House of Pacific Relations, which is a collection of 40 national houses, which focus on shared emotions, cultural learning, and celebration of others through song and dance. By recognizing the role of the arts in the education of citizenship and in social coherence, we can also see the role it can play in healing social relationships. It is a truly untapped resource. In both Greenland and Africa, drums have served as peacemakers between groups. In Sri Lanka there are cases of ritual integration and personal reconstruction through music and dance.

Many inner cities now have ethnic clusters, but the teachers and textbooks were not prepared for this massive immigration. School curricula have nothing reflecting these cultures. The thought is that it could start with music. The musical experience can be seen as a way of integrating cognitive growth, and the use of music as a tool for group coordination. In Asia every child is seen as having an intrinsic, empathic competence. Eighteen schools and seven hundred and twenty students participated in the program based on their own culture, which led to significant decrease in conflict in their schools, and an increase in strength of identity.

VI. "Humiliation" as Positions in Narratives: Implications for Policy Development (Sara Cobb)

This study sees humiliation as a narrative rather than an emotion, examining how to turn humiliation upside down. How will we think about ending humiliation at the policy level?

First we must define what we mean by "Humiliation" as Positions in Narratives." The first definition we have is a story people tell about suffering as a result of others' actions, which are planned to bring them harm. This could also include being forced to violate one's own moral code. The definition includes an individual's suffering while being violated in a public space, or in front of witnesses. This narrative has a corresponding revenge narrative which includes innocent suffering, immorality of actions, a contrast with a moral code that should guide action, and the character who refuses to remain humiliated.

At the heart of the revenge narrative is an attempt to relocate self. Humiliation can be exacerbated by imperviousness. People are alone as they tell the narrative, and what is at stake is the reformulation of self.

We need to transform the concept. Shame is internalization of responsibility, whereas, humiliation is done by someone else. Telling a humiliation narrative can, in itself, be a humiliating activity, and truth and reconciliation commissions can perpetuate this humiliation. The shadow of the law can reduce the transformation.

But what can we do when it comes to policy? In order to make space for the transformation of the humiliation narrative into a shame narrative, we have to have space

for policy makers to reflect. We do not have that in place as for now. We need policy to be processed differently, not just new policies. Building on a narrative of humiliation, good policies would generate instability in themselves.

DISCUSSION ON WHAT'S RELEVANT IN DESTRUCTIVE CONFLICT

Floyd Rudmin – Humiliation is a necessary and unavoidable process. People in academia are in the business of making truth, and part of making truth is building something and then wrecking it.

Andrea Bartoli – I would mildly and respectfully disagree. We have the capacity that we use in ourselves, that of truth seeking, finding, revealing - not making. There is nothing wrong in making a mistake. Through mistakes human knowledge is positively confirmed. We should not be too negative about this human capacity, and use judgment positively.

Evelin Lindner – We need to differentiate between humbling and humiliating, and humility and humiliation.

Morton Deutsch – David Johnson and his brother wrote a constructive controversy-book on it and there is also a great chapter in the handbook, *Recovering academic-truth depends on dominant paradigm*. It is necessary to separate the person from the problem. We must learn how to respond in the culture of critique, and go after text rather than the person, with a genuine intent to dialogue. Truths are ephemeral.

Beth Fisher-Yoshida – We must not slash and burn but rather acknowledge and build.

Sara Cobb – We should not separate people from the problem. People and what they think and say cannot be abstracted from history and culture. There is a 90% failure rate on International Peace agreements. We should advocate for not separating people from issues.

Jessica Benjamin – You cannot separate narratives from emotional structures. The matter of taking humiliation and working with it in a different way requires not only taking humiliation into change, but a demand and desire to have suffering acknowledged. In the presence of empathic responsibility, we must realize that others do not have the same experience of explaining humiliating situations to those around them. When people accept an apology for wrongdoing, this restores dignity because you can create the moral dignity by not taking revenge. We become stronger when we can create moral community. How do we learn that dignity will come from creating moral ground?

Grace Feuerverger – I do a lot of work with immigrant students and their parents and their teachers. Toronto is one of the most ethnically diverse cities in the world. Most of these students (high school) come from places of horrible devastation and war and understandably have a lot of anger and rage. I want to open this up for dialogue in a safe

place, since colleagues on campus are not always sympathetic. How can we reconcile Soul vs. Ego in academia in comparison to holistic education? How can we try to bring together body, mind, spirit, and soul? We need to find our courage, and when we do this, it's very emancipatory; something shifts, and the possibility of people to reflect on what they are doing is opened up. It takes courage to say that it does not have to be like this. It is difficult, in academia, because we are all under this hierarchy. It must be about courage, about commitment to a higher cause, not just about you or your colleagues. You have to recognize that people can start to bring things to another level, you have to witness and observe. I find it fascinating and hopeful; small things can happen that can change everything.

Miriam Marton – I am working with women in groups talking about abuse. Having a witness is a first step of healing, but a perpetrator's apology takes things to the next level.

Judith Thompson – I work with narrative and human dignity and links between the two. Narrative has a utility toward truth; when narrative becomes utilitarian, it can perpetuate humiliation. Using the story to immobilize anger only perpetuates suffering. The tone and framing of the leaders is important. Narrative does not necessarily have to be humiliating. How do we learn how to create containers and contexts where there is human dignity conferring between all involved?

Donald Klein – I am confused about the narrative from humiliation to shame. I have experiences with humiliation as a Jew in Massachusetts, but I am not ashamed of being a Jew.

Sara Cobb – We have to be careful of the context we are talking in when we enter into the dialogue. I was talking of reciprocal humiliation at the policy level. How we think of narrative at macro level is different than when we translate back to micro.

Is Humiliation Relevant in a Destructive Conflict? (Round Table 1; Section 2)

This section discusses the following topics:

- I. Elements of Humiliation-Shame Dynamics for Computational Modeling and Analysis of Real-life Scenarios
- II. Turkish Denial of the Genocide of Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians: Transforming Humiliation into Understanding and Forgiveness
- III. Displaced Identity and Humiliation in Children of Vietnam Vets
- IV. The Third Force: A Practical, Community-Building Approach to Settling Destructive Conflicts
- V. Humiliation and Human Strength: Stories of African-Spanish Migrations
- VI. Humiliation and Honor
- VII. From Violent to Subtle Humiliation: The Case of Somali Victims of UNOSOM Living in the Refugee Camps in Kenya; Is Hope the Last to Die?; Report on Field Research Conducted in Dadaab Refugee Camps (16.05.05-01.06.05)

I. Elements of Humiliation-Shame Dynamics for Computational Modeling and Analysis of Real-Life Scenarios (Carlos Sluzki)

Conceptual meandering sings in our mind and measures the motions in our thought; what happens in our throat registers the same as if we were singing. It is the same with emotions – draft for action and emotions are tied together. When the draft takes place there is an alternative open. If it is repetitive, or if action takes place, there is not any solution. There is no alternative. You are trapped. Ahab in *Moby Dick* – humiliated by being attacked by this whale – went after the whale without regard for its effect on anything else. Perhaps suicide bombers are a case of shame and humiliation together. What about those who mastermind and do not put themselves in harm?

What is the boundary between the collective and individual self? There are cultures in which identity as an individual is unknown.

Social strength is found in looking at the power of a victim and the weakness of a perpetrator. We need to find how to unload or shift when there is inequality in power, making the situation difficult or ethically unfair.

II. Turkish Denial of the Genocide of Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians: Transforming Humiliation into Understanding and Forgiveness (Anie Kalayjian)

My father was a genocide survivor of the 1915 Turkish genocide, and the aspects of transgenerational transmission impacted the intensity of my work on dialogue. I was involved in work with Armenians and Turks (including the Turkish secret service, MIT). I was threatened to be killed by MIT, and for months I could not write. Finally I decided to dialogue. The Turkish government still denies that any genocide took place. The US is allied with Turkey on this. Last year the New York Times published that they would no longer use the word "alleged" when discussing the genocide. It is difficult for victims to have closure in the current political situation. It is documented that people need closure for healing. Without acknowledgment, there is no healing. Turks do not know anything about the genocide. We need Turkish scholars to explain their true history. Typically, Turks feel humiliated. Many back off, even physically, when they hear about the emotions of hurt and pain on the side of the Armenians.

III. Displaced Identity and Humiliation in Children of Vietnam Vets (Annette A. Engler)

I work with NOVA at Southeastern University. I speak to children of Vietnam Vets. Many of these children feel displaced due to their fathers having fought in the war. Collective identity and memory impacts how they focus on social responsibility, and they tell their stories. I am interested in hearing about this process - helping me to understand humiliation, even unconscious humiliation. Looking at transgenerational transmission of trauma helps us to understand children who are unable to identify themselves apart from the father's experience. When an adult child sits in a round circle like this, what is it that they experience? What makes them feel more human, more able to share their experiences, and, on the other side, what makes them feel that they do not have a voice, do not seem to have a voice? They appreciate the honor of knowing that people appreciate their experiences. I am interested in knowing others' experiences with transgenerational trauma.

IV. The Third Force: A Practical, Community Building Approach to Settling Destructive Conflicts (James Edward Jones)

In mountain climbing you have to climb a mountain of stereotypes in order to see what is below. There is no way around that mountain, you have to climb it.

I have worked with PVEE Syndrome (Post Victim Ethical Exemption Syndrome). We have to let this go if we are going to move forward.

There is a group going to Jerusalem together. We have to be supportive, have to be authentic, this has to be a partnership.

V. Humiliation and Human Strength: Stories of African-Spanish Migrations (Moira Rogers)

I am a citizen of Argentina and teach Spanish and immigration issues. I was asked to run a comparative workshop on Spanish and American immigration issues. I am at the beginning of a research project, and have requests to run workshops for students. I am unsure of how to frame them. I am looking at Southern Spain and migrations from Africa. Some people are shot or deported. There is a militarization of the borders where millions are spent to make fences higher. There is a Spanish song with the lyrics "The world belongs to all/We need new images to raise our vision/Energize us, and give us courage to dream and act boldly." I am struggling to see how humiliation and human dignity will fit best in telling these people's stories in Spanish society. Also, I am looking at how humiliation and human dignity will play a part in telling the stories of the students who volunteer in the refugee camps.

VI. Humiliation and Honor (Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera)

I am very interested in identifying emotions. I have developed a model of humiliation that has two parts, cognitive antecedents and behavioral consequences. There are two appraisals, one of disrespect, and one of relationship strain. Then I looked at how the participants evaluated concern for social worth. There were two groups, the first was the "honor group" (Turkish Dutch), and the second was the "ethnic Dutch (white) group." The more the honor group thought their social worth was affected, the more there was disrespect, relationship strain and humiliation.

VII. From Violent to Subtle Humiliation: Case of Somali Victims of UNOSOM Living in the Refugee Camps in Kenya; Is Hope the Last to Die?; Report on Field Research Conducted in Dadaab Refugee Camps (16.05.05-01.06.05) (Ana Ljubinkovic)

I worked with CARE and Somali refugees. I investigated abuses and psychological consequences and what the current situation was in the camps. I also researched connections between humiliation and the activities in these camps. There were multiple types of humiliation, some psychological like PTSD, and others more cultural. There is also more, beyond the consequences of any kind of war. I came across Evelin's theory of humiliation when looking for more explanations.

DISCUSSION ON "IS HUMILIATION RELEVANT IN A DESTRUCTIVE CONFLICT?"

Bertram Wyatt-Brown to Patricia - I have a question about how passive the honor culture was in comparison to the native Dutch.

Patricia Mosquera - Anger-confrontation is an example of waging good conflict. Honor oriented groups do not easily engage in the kind of reactions talked about in US, it's more

about confronting the other person, and if they do not apologize, they end the relationship with that person.

Ana Ljubinkovic - How do you see that people overcome this mass trauma and humiliation? What I heard in this discussion was humiliation as a negative thing. Humiliation also has a capacity to create identity.

Anie Kalayjian - Difference between natural and human made disasters. Katrina, Rita, and Tsunami survivors had high PTSD (75%) but also had high resilience. It is possible that the idea of Buddhist karma contributed to this result. The ones that had high meaning and lessons in the trauma had lower PTSD. There was some guilt about not being able to save children and loved ones, but no humiliation. Over 232,000 people died.

Carlos Sluzki - I want to formalize the definition of humiliation more and be tighter about it. Humiliation creates society. By creating a common enemy we create society.

Jimmy Jones - I agree with Carlos. I am not trying to imply that all victimhood is negative, e.g. after slavery victimhood held people together. It is starting to move forward from victimhood that can be bad.

Munir Zaki Nuseibah - I want to know what other goals we have in peace building work with Zion and Palestinians. Is it just climbing mountains or other things as well? If it were not for saving the lives of some children, I would not have sat with co-leader of this group. Jews and Muslims in this country have a common cause: to think about how we can say to our respective leaders that we want you to settle this thing with justice.

Myra Mendible - Question for Annette: Do you mean to suggest that they are humiliated because they lost the war, or because they fought in it? The first scenario is humiliation; the second is shame and guilt.

Annette Engler - As a collective group these children of veterans see the impact of war and what has happened to their fathers as social neglect. They feel that they are left to carry the torch. How do they separate that from their own lives and identity? When their fathers came back the stories were misconstrued - they saw their fathers as valiant men who then came back and had to be less than men. How do the children integrate how they have been socialized with what their fathers' stories are?

Anie Kalayjian - The silence of the fathers - the depression, anxiety, and other emotions - are palpable to the kids. The world's silence is injurious to their collective identity.

India women's college - Women are not the actors, they are the ones acted upon. Honor is not constructed by women in honor cultures. Annette, do women construct stories differently than men?

Patricia Mosquera - This is true and does not seem to vary across cultures. How have women been empowered to change honor cultures?

Annette Engler - The women were more sorrowful, more protective of what had happened to their fathers. The men were more protective, wanted justice for the sake of their children. Women wanted to tell the story.

Anie Kalayjian - Men tell a story with their head up, as if rejecting emotional state.

Philip Brown - Draft status and action status got me thinking about the position of the witness. It is unclear from moment to moment what you might encounter as the next step;

change in bullying culture can only take place when the witness sees that there is another possible situation.

Carlos Sluzki - Friendly witnesses facilitate the reduction of emotion, while hostile witnesses increase hostile emotion. It is rare that there are not witnesses to situations.

Beth Fisher-Yoshida - I like that this gathering is a global representation. It encourages everyone to leave the US every once in a while to get news from somewhere else.

Unconfirmed See Page 1

Is Humiliation Relevant in a Destructive Conflict? (Round Table 2; Section 1)

This Section discusses the following topics:

- I. Humiliation: Real Pain, A Pathway to Violence
- II. Honor, Shame, and Iraq in American Foreign Policy
- III. Humiliation, Social Justice and Ethno-mimesis
- IV. Refugees in South Asia and Humiliation
- V. Humiliation and Violent Conflicts in Burundi
- VI. Psychosocial Aspects of the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict

I. Humiliation: Real Pain, A Pathway to Violence (Linda Hartling)

I am exploring possible pathways from humiliation to violence. I want to advocate for a relational perspective. The central principle to a relational view of humiliation is that we need relationships as much as we need air, food and water. We must keep in mind that all relationships are within cultural context. What happens between humiliation and violence? How is humiliation linked to violence?

Jean Twenge conducted research on exclusion which proved that those excluded are more likely to engage in self-defeating behavior. This was because those who were humiliated had a decreased sense of self-awareness. Roy Baumeister found that such people have difficulty regulating behavior. The research on social pain by Eisenberg found that when people feel social pain it triggers the same part of the brain as when feeling physical pain. My proposal is that we take time to think about humiliating pain as real pain and study it from that perspective. I support the idea that humiliation is a nuclear bomb of emotions -- the silent weapon of mass destruction.

II. Honor, Shame, and Iraq in American Foreign Policy (Bertram Wyatt-Brown)

I looked at honor and humiliation as it is related to war. There is a collective sense of national honor as it is associated with war. Honor is not in politicians' lexicons in relationship to the Iraq war. There is a sense that our exposure to vulnerability may have led to retaliation for 9/11. 9/11 brought us to face with our own powerlessness. We have done all the humiliating of the Iraqis because of our lack of knowledge, our arrogance, etc. Honor figures as well because it was done to humiliate the enemy (Abu Ghraib). On the other hand, we have the reaction of Captain Fishbeck, who tried to find out why there is no set of rules of how to treat detainees. He went to congress and explained this. Now he is up on charges from the military because he was insubordinate. According to Barry O'Neill at UCLA - how to negotiate with an honor society - we are still struggling because there is a rigid sense of black and white (Barry O'Neill, *Honor, Symbols and War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999; paperback, 2001)

III. Humiliation, Social Justice and Ethno-mimesis (Maggie O'Neill)

We cannot underestimate the importance of connections and the impact of social exclusion. It is important that we are focused on developing research that fosters inclusion. My work involves PAR-theory, experience and practice/praxis, and practical work. This research involves social researchers with artists and art practitioners. Ethno-mimesis means creative consultation. We focus on the notion of art as not merely representative, but on mimesis as sensuous knowledge. Sharon Nicholson, talks about how works of art can bring us into intractable knowledge.

IV. Refugees in South Asia and Humiliation (Zahid Shahab Ahmed)

I worked in India about a year ago with a family who emigrated to India from Pakistan - two of their sons were killed by Muslims as they emigrated. The husband felt humiliation when his wife would not look at him. In text books, the heroes in India are villains in Pakistan and vice versa. Countries are not accepting refugees, and therefore, they have no identity. I want to look in more detail into this issue.

V. Humiliation and Violent Conflicts in Burundi (Jean Berchmans Ndayizigiye)

Tutsis are seen as the people who oppressed the Hutus, but there are both in oppressed and oppressor groups. I am looking at Ubuntu: justice, respect, and justice toward self and others. We see that oppressors gain more and more power, and at the same time they see other groups as less. In 1962, independence was won, and the two groups worked together to fight against colonialists. After the colonialists had been defeated, they fought each other. Trying to get these groups to dialogue regarding the conflict has proved difficult. The Civil War in 1993 had a positive effect of bringing leaders together for peace talks.

VI. Psychosocial Aspects of the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict (Judy Kuriansky)

I am a member of the faculty at Teachers College. My major point is putting humiliation into all issues. For example, children are the source of a lot of our hope. The education system can be a source of hope, or it can be negative. Being present with people and helping is important; you do not even have to take a certain point of view. Contact alone brings comfort. We found that stroking teddy bears and pets was helpful - blood pressure was reduced when stroking pets. Restoring safety and being present are both helpful. I work with a combination of East-West techniques. Peace out there in the world is only possible when peace within occurs. It's also important to examine the role of the media, and the mix of Eastern and Western techniques.

DISCUSSION ON “IS HUMILIATION RELEVANT IN A DESTRUCTIVE CONFLICT?” ROUND TABLE 2

Linda Hartling - Linda wants Jean to talk about Ubuntu more.

Jean Berchmans Ndayizigiye - Ubuntu is the concept of the spirit of people living together that makes a connection with the individual. Saying the truth is the most important thing, and respect is the second. When you lie to someone it means you do not have respect for that person. This is an insult not only to the self but also to the whole community. The third concept is how you see the place in which you live. What do you see outside and inside of the wall? Each person lives in her own wall. All of these concepts are internalized by the Burundians. You can never take Ubuntu away from someone, you can only kill them. Keeping them silent by force dehumanizes them, since they are not using their power as they should. Collective healing is done by people from the community who are known for their wisdom. Justice (called intake) is organized by the community, and does not have to do with people in power.

Linda Hartling - The two most powerful predictors of depression are loss of relationships and humiliation. Developing survival tactics includes aligning oneself with people who have had similar experiences. At least one supportive relationship can really help someone overcome their depression.

Maggie O'Neill - We need to examine community cohesion as civil servants. What can we do together? Building bridges between adults and the young and between different communities is important. The social exclusion of others and returning people to unsafe countries demonstrates that the governance issue is deeply problematic.

Thushari Samarawickrama - There is a question about internalization of shame and humiliation. I see it differing from culture to culture and religious perspectives. How does one deal with differences culture to culture?

Judy Kuriansky - There are dozens and dozens of models. Cognitive models have the person notice their thought process. There is also a historical model. Japanese models have the person do something rather than simply feeling the shame and humiliation. For example, they might wash a tea cup.

Judith Thompson - One should have people share from their cultural lenses what their models are; make sure that we hear from people what their interpretation of the question is, and their techniques for dealing with it.

Ana Ljubinkovic - Jean, do you think that Ubuntu is cross-cultural? Do all people have it? Or only in your culture?

Jean - Ubuntu is something that all people share, but there is no clear word for it in English. Victor Frankl said, "Everything can be taken from you except your humanity and your soul." You are responsible for your reactions. Our struggle is to teach people to see that they have power and responsibility. People cannot be humiliated if they do not allow it to happen.

Anie Kalayjian - Another Victor Frankl concept is forgiveness and how to use that with the individual; you are not forgiving the act, but the person who did not know better in that moment and time.

Sara Cobb - I am very excited about the ideas I have heard and would like to hear what other people are excited about.

< Wrap-up, everybody writes down his/her thoughts: >

Sophie Schaarschmidt - I feel excited about the ideas people expressed in the round tables, however, I need more time to think and reflect upon them since the ideas are very diverse.

Sara Cobb - Lots of ideas that floated today and sparked my enthusiasm and imagination. They are not all things we know about, but things we became curious about. I would like to know more about the role of the witness; I think it is an enormously complicated and deep domain. The issue is one of non-linear dynamics - and this process - and how it stacks up against what we have seen. Third thing, one faculty at the institute just delivered a scathing critique because it makes parties symmetrical as it tries to bring them together. There is such profound injustice here; making groups equal denies history. Perhaps this will spur a return to morality and a moral community.

Ariel Lublin - There is a connection between humiliation and expressions of violence. What interrupts and transforms those cycles? There are individual and group experiences of humiliation. They might be similar or different experiences.

Morton Deutsch - I find the discussion of the humiliator missing from the talks. I reject the criticism of Sara's colleagues. There is a conference about interrupting oppression and sustaining justice; there are proceedings from this on the website of the ICCCR center. Her colleague is expressing an old critique.

Myra Mendible - I have an interest in narrative as well. I am interested in Jimmy Jones's social strength of the victim. Under what circumstance can we perceive one as the protagonist and one as the antagonist?

Anne Wyatt-Brown - I am puzzled by humiliation and shame being so different. I am not clear about the distinction.

Donald Klein - I think it is useful to make a distinction. The terms are used in overlapping ways, and both are charged with emotions. Distinction between the terms is not that simple, but humiliation is in violation of somebody's social norm, and where you do not share that norm; shame, on the other hand, is violating your own norm.

Bert Wyatt-Brown - There is often the humiliation of being defeated, yet you maintain honor which will be revenged later.

Carlos Sluzki - Ahmed said he felt shame, guilt, humiliation, but we feel them all at the same time. It is useful to make operational definitions that differentiate, but also for defining emotional cocktails. The project that Linda presented is an important base for the current bio-psycho-social factors.

Noel Mordana - Shame is the feeling of "if I knew what I had done," while humiliation is more "if you knew what I had done." Shame is an act for which I am brought down and

violates my values, humiliation results from an act that brings me down, but does not violate my values. It brings me down even though I do not think I should be punished for it.

Judith - I am interested in how we have seen or noticed humiliation transformed into something else, and what we have learned about the path out of humiliation. I welcome you all to share some of what we have observed and begin to draw conclusions.

Rina: Democracy gives us the mechanism of criticism and allows us to disassociate from action, and allows the person to not feel humiliated because it is criticizing her environment.

Psychologist - The degree to which all of this is attended upon trauma - degree of ridicule, or trauma and ridicule, is a very grave distinction. There are different kinds of helplessness. Speaking as a clinician, I want to bring the idea of social pain to the discussion. The social system shuts down when you are traumatized, it impairs your ability to reconnect, and you cannot restore your dignity and humanity. You can have a fake sense of it, but unless you can connect to some other group, you cannot overcome shame. Not wanting to tell anyone about your experience creates the disconnection. You are unable to restore your dignity without reconnecting. You need to overcome neurological shut down.

Don - I am reminded of a time when the field of community mental health was just developing. I really agree with what Morton said about neglecting the humiliator; we are clearly identifying ourselves with the underdog. I would like to get people to talk about experiences when humiliating someone else.

Bob C - The idea of a “cocktail of emotions” is interesting to me. I felt included in this conference, it all felt very collective, even though I am very new to this. I felt as though I was very much a part of what was going on. My sense is that there is something about my capacity to create shame and humiliation that is actually the clearest work to doing the work with those on either side of the humiliation. Not only who is the victim or the cause, but also what is the part that we play in all of that? How do we affect it, and what do we add?

Victim - The victim’s need for recognition is important; they become the upholder of moral reality. It is too much of a burden for a victim to be holding that moral reality. We need to think about our sense of trying to empower victims.

Judy Kuriansky – We should also discuss accepting responsibility. A way to examine this is to use Marshall’s model, which is a variation of a way to communicate an interaction.

Philip Brown - We can use a bully as a model of someone who gains power. Most bullies tend to be socially adept and tend to think highly of themselves; gaining social power gives them some access to defining culture.

UN U – I agree that we do not talk about the humiliator. The relationship between the concept of humiliation and human dignity is a grey area, even greyer than what is being

discussed here. In the concept of dignity, the situation is not always a humiliator and the humiliated—both can feel humiliated.

Jean – The concept of apology is interesting as well, whenever it is given without intent of repentance the words do not mean anything. The person will not feel change and will not forgive you, unless the actions show it. Apology and repentance go together.

Stephanie Heuer – Students at school are a good example of this. Sometimes apologies are not enough, and they need more. Recognition is important; often an act has to go with the apology to make it valid.

Don – Aaron Lazare wrote a book on Apology. He also did a study on the use of humiliation in medical education, and how doctors treat patients and develop power.

Anie: Who will identify themselves as a humiliator is not so clear cut. I work with dialogue groups. Turkish second generation felt humiliation because they had never heard of it, and they felt they had not done anything wrong. When it is not talked about there is a fantasy that everything is democratic and living harmoniously. My own quest to study humiliators brought me to Turkey. My quest was to engage them and have a window into their psyche and intentions. The author of *Peace Begins in the Soul* says, “Even Nazi people thought they were coming from good conscious.”

Noel Mordana – I am personally concerned with non-linear dynamics of apologies and action. For me they all come together. I do not see humiliation and respect or dignity as the only two options, I see a third option - communal response. Except in instances where a personal relationship has been betrayed, I am seeking a collective response of the community. My idea of action is for the community to step in and reject the behavior.

Judith – I would like to look at how the restorative justice model addresses so many of these things. One thing that has not been mentioned is the feminist lens and feminist theory and how it is related to all this. A lot of what happens in circle work, and indigenous justice work is that people are held to accountability, and allowed to explore their role as humiliator, without being labeled as bad. I am interested in healing as justice and justice as healing.

Psychologist: We need to understand the cycles of victims becoming perpetrators, creating narrative that allows them to take what was done to them and transform that into allowance for them to do something just as bad. The perpetrator and victim are not the only two choices.

Sara Cobb – The issue of apology is rolling around the room and is associated with a Christian concept.

Honored Presentations

I. Destructive Conflict and Oppression by Morton Deutsch

Much of this talk is based on the paper “A Framework for Thinking About Oppression” www.tc.edu/icccr (paper is available there)

How shall we define “oppression” and “humiliation?”

Let’s consider the definition from the perspectives of both the person/group who is humiliated and the person/group/system who is doing the humiliating. To be humiliated one must in some way accept the humiliation that is being done; this is closely related to identification with the oppressor.

Deutsch suggests that humiliation is felt when one is dependent on the oppressor.

What conditions allow a person to resist feeling humiliated?

Nelson Mandela was in prison for 27 years. He had exceptional self discipline. In *The Long Walk to Freedom* he describes how he stayed in exceptional physical condition, did a wide range of reading, and refused to accept the definition of himself that his oppressors tried to force on him. Mandela recognized that he could not give in. He walked slowly and deliberately. There was persistent refusal to be or feel humiliated. He rejected the relationship the oppressor sought to put on him, and was consequentially respected by other prisoners and less sadistic guards.

A dictionary definition of oppressor is that an oppressor exerts power in a harmful way. The difference between injustice and oppression is that injustice can be a single event, while oppression is experience of widespread persistent injustice. “Civilized Oppression” is imbedded in unquestioned norms and rules. We cannot eliminate this by getting rid of rules or making new laws; they are systematically reproduced throughout society. In the paper, there are 5 kinds of injustice:

Distributive injustice: One could look at the standard of living, wealth, or any other various facets of life and how they are distributed. For example, blacks have fewer benefits and more harm than whites. Females have less education, less inheritance and more sexual abuse.

Procedural injustice: Fair procedures are more important to most people than are fair outcomes. When fair outcomes are not clearly defined, fair procedures are put in place. People feel disassociated with procedures if they feel they are unfair - it is easier to accept disappointing outcomes if they feel procedures are fair.

Moral Exclusion: All, e.g. Bosnia: Serbs, Muslims and Croats, were more or less part of one group. Vilification of the other came from the oppressor, but spread to others. Moral

Exclusion is perhaps the most dangerous form of oppression. Lesser forms include marginalization of women, the impaired, and religious groups.

Cultural Imperialism: This is what keeps oppression in place (find more information on the web). One would expect satisfaction from those in power, and change to come from those in less power. How do high-power groups maintain control of instruments of systematic power, control of the state, control over institutions - family, school, church, media, social production of meaning - science and the interpretation of science?

Distorted relationship: Child, wife, employee, citizen - each is dependent on the oppressor. The reaction of the oppressed may be anger, anxiety, or fear of what will happen if a desire for liberation is expressed. This can lead to guilt and self hatred - feelings toward the oppressor who is responsible for the situation, and eventual feelings of submission to the oppressor. People who feel oppression in one situation may not feel it in other situations. There are often distortions in relationships that help perpetuate the process of oppression.

II. Education and Humiliation by David Hamburg

Unfortunately - indeed tragically - in all parts of the world there are ample occasions for children and adolescents to experience humiliation in the course of their development. We are all familiar in one way or another with discrimination by age, class, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationalism, or other criteria that may readily become a depreciated out-group. Early adolescence is especially risky in this way, since it involves the major transition from being a child to becoming an adult. The exploratory behavior of this developmental phase often leads to difficulties in which the individual feels demeaned, depreciated, indeed humiliated. The problem is ubiquitous. Our great challenge is to organize educational institutions and experiences in such a way as to minimize lasting danger from transient humiliating episodes. In this way, the harsh reaction patterns, such as intense anger or even violence-prone reactions, may be minimized by finding buffers of resilience, self-worth, and mutually respectful human relationships. We need to be mindful of the danger of deep psychological scars in the long term if we do not take prompt action to provide more constructive patterns in education.

The ever-present, worldwide problem of invidious distinctions between in-groups and out-groups can be buffered or minimized with respect to humiliating experiences. To do so, the schools at every level, from early childhood to young adulthood, must build in a strong sense of responsibility for their students. Parents, teachers, and principals may do a great deal of constructive work along these lines. To address the humiliation problem adequately requires several systematic measures: (1) the structure of the school; (2) the content of education; (3) bases for self-esteem; (4) non-violent, active coping strategies; and (5) learning from the terrible history of genocides as an essential educational experience that can provide both a moral and pragmatic basis for dealing with other dangers and other groups on the basis of understanding, fairness, and mutual benefit. This paper offers a sketch based on research as to how these measures can be implemented.

One source of insight into these matters comes from decades of research in social psychology and related fields on racial prejudice in the United States and ways to reduce such prejudice

In this context, a great deal of work has been done on desegregation in the United States by pioneering investigators such as Morton Deutsch of Columbia University. In a classic study, he examined two New York City public housing units undergoing desegregation.ⁱ In one, families were assigned apartments at random without regard to race. In another, blacks and whites were assigned to separate buildings. A subsequent survey showed that those in the desegregated housing were much more likely to favor interracial living than were those in the other arrangement. The experience of human contact had diminished negative stereotypes.ⁱⁱ

But research on school desegregation has yielded varying results. Clearly the problem is complicated and desegregation alone does not produce strong results. So what then are the conditions under which desegregation does in fact reduce prejudice between groups? Putting together a great deal of laboratory and field research, it appears that the quantitative amount of contact between racial groups does not have a high degree of relevance to the outcome. Much depends on whether the contact occurs under favorable conditions. If the conditions involve an aura of suspicion, if they are highly competitive, if they are not supported or if they are undermined by relevant authorities, or if they occur on the basis of very unequal status, then they are not likely to be helpful, whatever the amount of contact. Indeed, such unfavorable conditions can exacerbate old tensions and can reinforce stereotypes.

On the other hand, there is a strong effect of friendly contact in the context of equal status, especially if such contact is supported by relevant authorities, is embedded in cooperative activity, and fostered by a mutual aid ethic. Under these conditions, the more contact the better. Such contact is associated with improved attitudes between previously suspicious or hostile groups as well as changes of patterns of interaction between them in constructive ways.

Circumstances of cooperative learning — well developed techniques in elementary and secondary education — are conducive to the improvement of intergroup relations, but highly competitive, extremely individualistic circumstances in the classroom are more likely to have a negative effect.

Superordinate Goals and Cooperative Behavior

Superordinate goals have the potentially powerful effect of unifying disparate groups in search of some common aspiration that can only be obtained by their cooperation. A shared goal that can only be achieved by cooperative effort overrides the hostile differences that people bring to the situation. In Sherif's classic experiments, he readily made strangers into enemies with isolation and competition, but when he introduced powerful superordinate goals, he was able to transform enemies into friends.ⁱⁱⁱ

These experiments have been fundamentally replicated since then in work with large numbers of business executives and others in many different groups.^{iv} So the effect is certainly not limited to children and youth. Indeed, the findings have been extended in ways that indicate the beneficial effects of working cooperatively under conditions that lead people to formulate a new, inclusive group that goes beyond the subgroups with which they entered the situation. Such effects are particularly strong when there are tangibly successful outcomes of cooperation—for example, clear rewards from cooperative learning. In the successful case of cooperation, previously suspicious groups come to have a new appreciation of each other. Overall, this work can be joined with other evidence to indicate that prejudice tends to be reduced when there is equal status contact between groups in the pursuit of common goals and shared efficacy in reaching those goals.

What about joint efforts to overcome the serious global problems of food, water, health, and the environment? The world is one in which friendly personal contacts on an equal status basis and cooperative ventures can occur more readily than ever before, despite all the cultural barriers that have so long separated peoples. A great opportunity and challenge now is to identify superordinate goals and organize cooperative efforts to meet them. One good place to start is in education at every level.

Gordon W. Allport (1954) clarified the possibility of building on the notion of “concentric loyalties” — where there is compatibility between loyalties of larger groups (for example, nations, humankind) and of subgroups (for example, family, profession, religion).^v The needs of the ingroup and outgroup are seen as compatible if these groups are subsumed by the superordinate group. Outgroups can be perceived with indifference, sympathy, even admiration. Some persons put it simply: “we have our ways and they have their ways.”

Because the identity of individuals within a more complex social structure includes attachments to various groups (such as religious, occupational, residential), they are more apt to be fellow ingroup members in one category and outgroup members in another. Such crosscutting intergroup distinctions leads to a broadening of identifications that reduces polarization between groups, increases tolerance for outgroups in general, and helps to stabilize society.

Summary of Research Findings

Following are some recurrent findings that have grown from research in this field.

- Contact produces changes in attitude that may be positive or negative depending on the conditions under which contact occurs.
- The intensity of an attitude toward another group is important—for example, strengthening a weak pre-existing positive attitude toward another group may produce constructive behavior change.
- Behavior change is often limited to a specific area or aspect of the attitude (for example, work situations).

- Favorable conditions that reduce prejudice include the following contact situations: (1) when there is equal status; (2) between members of a majority group and *higher* status members of a minority group; (3) when supported by authority or social climate; (4) when it is intimate rather than casual; (5) when it is pleasant or rewarding; (6) when there are highly valued common or superordinate goals that can be achieved only by cooperating.
- Unfavorable conditions that heighten prejudice include situations that (1) are very competitive; (2) are unpleasant, involuntary, tension-laden; (3) when prestige or status of one group is lowered; (4) when group members are frustrated or led to seek a “scapegoat,” (5) when moral or ethical standards of one group are objectionable to the other; (6) when the minority group is deeply depreciated in relation to the majority group.

These concepts could be usefully adopted and evaluated in education and elsewhere in diminishing intergroup hostility and minimizing prejudice in child development. Further research is necessary to enhance the efficacy of policies and practices based on contact theory. But the promise of this approach is clear.

Promoting Positive Intergroup Relations in Schools

Can these favorable conditions for positive intergroup relations be widely applied to schools? After all, this is the primary locale for most children and youth for many hours every day, week in and week out for most of each year. The potential for shaping prosocial attitudes and behavior during these meaningful hours is formidable. Could schools be organized from beginning to end in ways that are favorable to forming decent human relationships? Could classroom and extracurricular activities, in the natural course of events, minimize prejudice and hateful attitudes? In this chapter and several others to come, we explore attractive possibilities in this domain.

Janet Ward Schofield, a leading scholar in this field, applies this approach to American schools. She emphasizes that improving intergroup relations between children and youth from different racial and ethnic backgrounds is vital because serious problems still exist in intergroup relations, and because minority-group members are becoming an increasingly large part of the U.S. population—now more diverse than ever before. Since residential segregation is so pervasive in American society, children frequently have their first contact with people from different racial or ethnic backgrounds in school. Therefore, Schofield focuses on an exploration of policies and practices favorable to improving intergroup relations in school settings. She reviews strategies that attempt to foster positive relations and inhibit negative relations in situations where intergroup isolation or tensions exist—but where there have not been major conflicts. This is analogous to primary prevention of disease in public health.

Cooperation in achieving a shared goal that cannot be accomplished without the contribution of members of all groups is real in schools, such as the production of a school play, team sports, or class committees. These cooperative activities must be carefully structured to avoid traditional stereotypes. Educators must ensure that all groups

contribute to the final product, instead of assuming that a putatively cooperative group automatically means that all children will be motivated or permitted to contribute.

Support of Authorities

Authorities who support cooperation are crucial in creating positive changes in intergroup attitudes. In American school settings, the leadership and supportive role of the principal is vital. The principal can serve an enabling function by making choices that facilitate positive intergroup relations, such as encouraging teachers to adopt cooperative learning techniques, on which there has been much valuable research. The principal can also set a model of behavior for both teachers and students, and usefully place positive intergroup relations as a high priority for the school. Finally, the principal can play a sanctioning role (positively and negatively) by rewarding prosocial practices and behaviors, discouraging negative ones, and clearly expressing an expectation of respect for each other's rights and dignity.

Teachers are also vital authority figures with the power to foster or inhibit positive relations in the school setting. They can serve some of the same enabling, modeling, sensitizing, and sanctioning roles as principals. One important way that teachers and principals can encourage the development of positive intergroup relations is to recognize openly that individuals in a desegregated school may misunderstand each other's motives due to cultural differences, uncertainty, and fear. Encouraging students to relate to each other as individuals rather than group stereotypes can become a part of the school climate in the basic work of students.

Parents are significant authority figures, so it is crucial that educators find methods to encourage parents to involve their children in diverse settings and encourage intergroup contact. Parents can be involved in creating school and community-wide multiethnic committees that serve educational or youth development functions. The mixture of people addressing a shared task of high significance such as educational success can be helpful.

Thus, we see that basic research on intergroup contact has substantial, intrinsic interest; and it can be usefully applied in educational settings as diverse as the schools of the United States. Indeed, similar work is under way in many countries and it is plausible that this approach will (with suitable adaptations) be useful on a worldwide basis. The net effect can be a substantial reduction in severe humiliating experiences.

Research on resilience by behavioral scientists is also informative. Even in the face of serious adversity, one solid attachment, one reliable interpersonal relationship can go a long way toward facilitating constructive coping. Three protective processes are necessary for developing strong bonds: (1) opportunities; (2) skills; and (3) recognition. These can be built into effective educational programming.

In developing conflict-resolution curricula, schools can create environments that support the development of resilient characteristics in children in three ways.

- Resolving conflicts in principled ways that promote and preserve enduring relationships, thereby facilitating the bonding that is essential to the development of resilience. From the start of the conflict-resolution encounter, the issue is put in the context of sustaining a mutually rewarding long-term relationship-or at least of keeping that option open.
 - Conveying to youth that they have the power to control their own behavior by making choices that satisfy their needs while taking into account the needs of others. Mutual accommodation leads to mutual benefits.
 - Giving students the opportunity to resolve their conflicts peacefully, a conflict-resolution education program sends to involved youth a powerful enabling message of trust and perceived capability.
- In short, education has the capacity to minimize humiliating experiences - if only we see this is a vital component of education and child development altogether.

III. History and Humiliation by Evelin Linder

We have to be careful when we preach a human rights message; if we teach underlings that they have a right to feel humiliated and do not teach them what to do with emotions afterwards, we are causing additional strife. We need to examine the Mandela-way out of humiliation versus the Hitler-way.

Consider the historic state we are in. There are pyramids of power, yet we want a global village of equal rights for all. In former times, the defining human emotion was fear - now it is humiliation.

DISCUSSION:

Stephanie Heuer - Evelin, can you elaborate on the concept of the 3rd room?

Evelin - The master, by coming down, does not only lose privileges but also gains something. At the same time, the underling, by rising up, does not only gain, but also loses, for example, the security of not having to decide. Mandela formulated it well: both whites and blacks were being oppressed under apartheid, and that both were liberated.

Noel Mordana - Evelin met with two groups and the group that was more resistant to what she had to say was the more advantaged group. This is relevant to witnessing.

Judith Thompson - I was struck by the very last thing that she said about the Moratorium on Humiliation and the potential for slogans to change thinking. There is potential for having this phrase spark thoughts in public, time to popularize and organize the public.

Ariel Lublin - It is an example of moderates engaging the extremists.

Arnie Mendell talked about role play and how intense the confrontations can become in workshops, almost to physical violence. It's a controlled way to confront our own extremist feelings. If we are going to go beyond intractable conflicts, we have to go beyond the models.

Jill Strauss - I was thinking about the oppressor and not just the oppressed. What happens when the roles switch? When it is not a duality, not an "us or them"? When we are all "them"?

Morton Deutsch - It is a system - not just a "humiliated" or a "humiliator." If you are going to deal with it, you have to deal with both simultaneously. This is one way of preventing violence.

IV. Conflict and Humiliation: The Simplicities of Reversing Destructive Conflict presented by Maria Volpe

The context I am referring to is intractable conflicts between faculties at universities - for example, at some institutions a female faculty may be referred to as "girl." It is not the difficult issues (as we would normally expect), but it is little things, electrical outlets, keys - all these have led to significant intractable conflicts.

ⁱ M. Deutsch and M. E. Collins, *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951); cited in E. Aronson, T. D. Wilson, and R. M. Akert, eds., *Social Psychology*, Fourth Edition (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002), 494.

ⁱⁱ D. G. Myers, *Social Psychology*, Third Edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1990).

ⁱⁱⁱ M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif, *Groups in Harmony and Tension: An Integration of Studies on Intergroup Relations* (New York: Octagon, 1966), 271-295.

^{iv} Myers, *Social Psychology*.

^v G. W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954); cited in Brewer, "The Psychology of Prejudice," 429-444.