

Bringing Dignity to Globalisation: A Psychologist's Personal Experience as a Global Citizen

Evelin Lindner's Global Life

Book proposal created in response to an invitation by Louise Sundararajan, Series Editor of the Palgrave Studies in Indigenous Psychology

Evelin Lindner
MD, Psychologist, Dr psychol, Dr med
2019
www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php

Contents

Preface	1
Introduction	9
Part I: Where Does Our Mental Life Come From?	9
Chapter 1: What Is Our Human Nature?	9
Chapter 2: What Can We Learn from Our Forebears Prior to the Neolithic Revolution?	9
Chapter 3: What Do We Want to Keep from the Past Ten Millennia of Our History?	10
Part II: Experiences of Dignity and Humiliation in Our Time	10
Chapter 4: How Do Rules of Honour Impact Our Mental Life?	10
Chapter 5: How Do Ideals of Equal Dignity Impact Our Mental Life?	11
Chapter 6: What Happens When Dignity Meets Honour?	12
Part III: Can We Build a Future of Dignity for All Humanity?	13
Chapter 7: We Live in Times of Systemic Global Humiliation	13
Chapter 8: How Can We Heal and Prevent Cycles of Humiliation?	14
Chapter 9: How Can We Manifest Global Responsibility in Connected Individuality and Mutual Solidarity and Care?	15
Index	15
Reference List	15

Preface

Where do we stand, as humankind? As it seems, we have dug ourselves into a multitude of crises, both despite and because of what we call progress. At the same time, there are also immense windows of opportunity waiting to be used. So far, instead of recognising the depth of the crises and grasping the historic opportunities to exit, many choose to stay myopic.

Therefore, this book uses a wide lens – both diachronically and synchronically – to shed light on the present state-of-affairs of the human condition and to suggest a path into a dignified future. Only a wide view makes the primary problems visible that spawn secondary, tertiary, and quaternary ones. The book uses the author's global experience of more than forty years to elucidate present-day's state of human affairs – this is the synchronic lens – and it anchors this view in the path species *Homo sapiens* has walked since it emerged on planet Earth – this is the diachronic lens of *big history*.¹

The field of psychology is central to this endeavour. The author is a psychologist and a medical doctor with two Ph.D.'s, and she embraces the practice of 'global living' as a method for knowledge attainment outside of the mainstream. The author has not yet met another person with a comparable life experience. This book is written in the first person. It uses the author's psychological insights into human mental life, including critical self-reflection for psychology as a discipline and a profession.²

With her two-fold lens, the author explores the dialectics of the universal and the particular in human subjectivity, the ontological, epistemological, ethical, spiritual, and aesthetic dimensions of mental life, and, most importantly, the possibilities for a more equitable global psychology. Having lived globally for the past forty-five years, being at home on all continents, she is in a position to offer a unique appraisal of structural oppression and a distinctive view on the effects of globalisation. She can contribute with very personal insights into cultural assumptions and theoretical frameworks, including those that define the discipline, profession, and practice of psychology.

The author of this book was born into a displaced family, a family that lost their homeland Silesia in Central Europe in 1945, a family deeply traumatised by war and displacement. From a young age, *never again* was a phrase that defined her life, never again the humiliation of human dignity that has characterised the twentieth century. She grew up in Central Europe in what was West Germany at the time, and German was the language she learned when she was young. She had the privilege of a classical education of eight years of Latin in high school, together with lessons in English, French, and Russian, alongside a main focus on the natural sciences. She came to Norway for the first time in 1977, and is embedded also in this culture, now fluent, both written and oral, in German, English, French, and Norwegian. Mastering these languages implies that there is a good understanding of Dutch, Swedish, and Danish.

The author began learning Chinese at the age of nineteen, in 1973, ten years before she went to China for the first time, traveling through the entire country by train for several months when China still was a closed country, in the year 1983. In 2004, she came back to a radically different China, and in 2007, she organised her organisation's annual conference on humiliation in Hangzhou.³ She became acquainted with other Asian region as well, for example in 1981, when she worked as a medical student in hospitals in Bangkok and Kuala Lumpur, and Bahasa Indonesia came to her in Indonesia. In 2004, she arrived in Japan, living there for three years, immersing herself into Japanese culture and language.

During her seven years as a clinical psychologist in Egypt, from 1984 to 1991, the author made the culture of the Nile Delta her home and learned to read and write the Arabic script and speak Egyptian-Arabic. Already before that, during her work as a psychology student in Jerusalem in 1975, she had learned to speak basic modern Hebrew.

Her time on the Azores in 1991 allowed her to delve deeper into the Latin languages, adding Portuguese to her previous knowledge of Latin and French, opening up also for Spanish. This became particularly useful in 2012 and 2019 in Chile, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Brazil. Aside from this, she has worked in the fields of psychology and medicine in New Zealand, Australia, and the

U.S.A., as well as on a training ship on the high seas to all harbours of West Africa in 1976, prior to the container era.

In 1994, the author finalised her doctorate in medicine on the theme of quality of life at the University of Hamburg, Germany, where she compared Egypt and Germany and how intellectuals in both countries perceive a 'good life'. In 2001, she defended her doctorate in psychology at the Department of Psychology of the University of Oslo in Norway, titled *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*.⁴ In that year, also the idea was born to establish humiliation studies as a global transdisciplinary field and gather a global network of academics and practitioners who seek to bring more dignity into the world. Eventually, this fellowship was given the name Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (humiliationstudies.org). This fellowship is headed by the author together with Linda Hartling, who wrote her doctorate on humiliation already in 1995. This community is conceived as a 'seed' for a global dignity family and has grown to many hundreds of members all around the globe; a number of its members open their homes as Dignity Dialogue Homes to the rest of their fellows. The nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2015, 2016, and 2017 gave all members great courage and has been life-saving particularly for those who risk their lives to advance dignity in the world.⁵

Since 2003, the author co-organises two dignity conferences per year, with more than thirty gatherings having taken place so far. One conference is conducted in New York City each December and the other in a different location each year. Since 2003, the author has co-organised conferences in Europe (Paris, Berlin, Oslo, Dubrovnik), Costa Rica, China, Hawai'i, Turkey, Egypt, New Zealand, South Africa, Rwanda, Chiang Mai in Northern Thailand, and in Central India. Each December the second annual conference takes place at Columbia University in New York City, titled Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict.

This short overview shows the geographic and linguistic experience of the author, yet, what is more important is the particular way in which she designs her global life as a 'social sculpture'.⁶ Wherever she lives, she embeds herself for longer periods into the local social context with the aim to avoid the distance that 'guest' or 'researcher' roles often entail. Wherever she lives, she strives to become a humble family member, as for her, all people are 'family members' more than 'people from different cultures'. In that way, she truly *lives* in the world rather than 'traveling the world', or 'doing field research' in 'other cultures' – she lives in the global village and in a village one does not 'travel'. This path has profoundly transformed her as a person, with the result that she feels neither Western nor non-Western. Her vocabulary is therefore rather different from people who are used to 'live in a country' and 'have a job' and 'a professional career' in contrast to a 'private life' with 'leisure time'.

Sunflower identity is the name the author has chosen for her global unity-in-diversity identity built with fluid subsidiarity.⁷ The periphery of this identity – the nested petals of the sunflower, so to speak – represent the author's many homes in the most diverse contexts on all continents, while the unifying core of her identity – the core of the sunflower – is anchored in the humanity that all humans share. This identity is an ongoing fluid global practice rather than a rigid program or an abstract theory and the author recommends it to everyone, as all identifications are fickle, except for one – already sociologist Norbert Elias observed this in 1939: 'Only the highest level of integration, belonging to humanity, is permanent and inescapable'.⁸

With respect to scientific inquiry, the author refuses to write 'about' people, or 'study' people like they are in a zoo. One of her articles is titled, 'How Research Can Humiliate'.⁹ She abstains from treating human beings as 'cases', 'objects', 'samples', 'patients', 'clients', or 'customers',

and rather emphasises the awareness that we all are fellow human beings on a joint explorative journey on a shared home planet that is part of a universe that none of us can fully grasp.

This global life and global identity informs the author's radical commitment to academic freedom, compelling her to serve the interests of all humankind rather than favouring her own advantages or the views of certain sub-groups, including corporate or national interests. She refuses to 'market' her insights to 'buyers'. The reader will also search in vain for terms such as 'abroad' or 'overseas' in this book, or 'Middle East', or any other formulation that betrays a person's view on the world from a particular in-group perspective vis-à-vis out-groups.

The author regards her privileges as a responsibility, among them the privilege that fate gifted her when she was born into a societal context that offered her a high quality education and a Western passport. She uses these privileges to respond to humiliation not just on her own behalf but also on behalf of those who are too downtrodden, too depressed, or too overwhelmed by their struggle for survival. As she defines the entire human family as her family, this includes the 'poisoned poor' of this world.¹⁰ The author also meets the wealthy who have means to protect themselves both against being poisoned and against becoming aware that they thrive because the poor are being poisoned. She strives to wake up those who are too disconnected to stand up for dignity and who therefore stand by when acts of humiliation are committed and systems of humiliation erected. In this way, she follows psychologist Ervin Staub, who, in his work, has shown that the Nazi regime was possible only because so many people stood by.¹¹ She follows Nelson Mandela in his aim to transform systemic humiliation into systemic dignity.

In order to enter into dialogue with the people she meets, the author emphasises authenticity, and appreciates what philosopher Charles Taylor has written about the *ethics of authenticity*.¹² In war-torn regions, for example, people cannot be approached like Western students sitting in a university class room ready to fill out questionnaires. Paying money to 'informants' would not necessarily be helpful either, since data elicited in return for monetary remuneration have little trustworthy validity, even if they might be reproducible and thus have reliability. Humility and authenticity, this is the only method that can provide true validity and deserve the label 'science' in real world settings, this is the author's experience.¹³ For the author, this means being authentic about her own biography and her motives for research. It means sharing the story of her father and how deeply he was traumatised by World Wars I and II and their aftermath, how he resisted being an oppressor of other people as a young adolescent when he was forced to be soldier, and how he was severely punished and lost one arm when he wanted to make friends with people his country regarded as 'enemies'. She tells the story of how she grew up in her father's imagination of his lost homeland, how she built her 'virtual' home in his memories of the farm he was to inherit but lost when its inhabitants were forced out because the territory in which his farm was located was handed over to another country. She shares how her father had no *Heimat* anymore after displacement, no homeland, not even the hope to return home in the future. She describes how this fate almost destroyed him, how he could not smile for fifty years after the war had ended. She shares how growing up in a displaced family meant that she always felt like an unwelcome guest on this planet, never at home, always feeling foreign, belonging neither to the West in which she grew up, nor to any other place. She explains how she emerged from this painful family background with the desire to find out more about the human species, about the causes of mayhem and the possibilities of healing, how her aim was to live and work in as many world regions and cultural realms as possible in order to acquire a gut-feeling for how people in different cultural contexts view life and death, love and hatred, peace and war. She describes how all this led up to her interest in researching dignity and humiliation, and how her allegiance with dignity obliges her to invite all people she meets to become fellow co-researchers.

As part of her understanding of dignity and humiliation, the author is aware that the mere fact that she is white and carries a European passport can elicit the suspicion that she may be yet another neo-colonial dominator, another free-rider bent to exploit the good hearts and resources of the unlucky rest of humanity. Sometimes she faces 'positive racism', that is, she is given preferred treatment for being white, and she resists it unless she is sure that people do so because they feel dignified by 'a foreigner who is not born here, but loves us'. The practice of global living as a path heals wounds, including her own, not least through the fact that a global identity per definition is free of the notion of 'enemies' threatening from outside. In that way, her initial sense of not belonging anywhere moved over time into a sense of belonging everywhere.

As we live in times of multiple crises, intensified by globalisation, the author is in a privileged position to answer crucial questions. Given the fact that many of the challenges that we, as humankind, face are global and need to be addressed through global cooperation, the following question is pressing: Is the planetary community of *Homo sapiens* capable of cooperating globally like a good family and forge a future for coming generations that manifests dignity, the dignity of unity in diversity? Or are human beings psychologically dependent on enemy imageries and are therefore doomed to fight? Perhaps the Latin proverb is correct that *Homō hominī lupus est*, or 'Man is wolf to man'? What is human nature? What are the dialectics of the universal and the particular in human subjectivity?

The author's short answer to the above posed question is the following in a nutshell: Yes, it is possible to approach all human beings like good family members, yes, we human beings are capable of establishing dignifying global relationships, and no, there is no psychological need for enemy imagery. The reader will ask: If this is true, why is it then that competition for domination seems to be the prevalent mode of human behaviour on planet Earth? Why is domination over each other and over nature ubiquitous? Is not the most likely endgame of this trend a global dictatorship or the mutual annihilation of would-be world dominators rather than global cooperation in dialogue?

What are the factors that inhibit global cooperation and global dialogue? This is the next crucial question. Based on the diachronic lens that the author applies, she identifies two main hurdles. After many years of global experience, the author is no longer comfortable with distinguishing between 'different cultures', but rather foregrounds the entire journey that *Homo sapiens* has traversed on planet Earth throughout roughly the past three hundred thousand years. She discerns *Homo sapiens*' attempts to adapt to large-scale conditions and how these attempts expressed themselves differently in various world regions, both diachronically and synchronically. She appreciates anthropologist William Ury's demarcation of three ideal-type historical scenarios¹⁴ and has adapted Ury's conceptualisation to her work: The first scenario was shaped during the period of human history prior to the Neolithic Revolution, the second scenario lasted from the Neolithic Revolution until the world began to globalise, while the third scenario unfolds now, doing so in a way that necessitates radical innovation, including the taking back of earlier adaptations.

The author recognises great potential for global cooperation and global dialogue in this third scenario, yet, she sees it being hampered by two potent obstacles. During the first period, roughly the first 97 percent of *Homo sapiens*' history, our species was mobile and followed wild food that was amply available, and in this way populated most continents starting from Africa. Game theory describes this as a win-win period.¹⁵ If the planet were larger, we might still live in this way today. In this context, the human ability to cooperate in mutual solidarity evolved, an ability that represents a crucial asset today. The Neolithic Revolution demarcates the beginning of the second period, lasting roughly throughout the past three percent of *Homo sapiens*' history.

During this period, a planetary win-lose frame pushed humankind into adapting by competing for domination. What political scientists call the *security dilemma* became salient: 'I have to amass weapons, because I am scared. When I amass weapons, you get scared. You amass weapons, I get more scared'.¹⁶ In the context of a strong security dilemma, the Hobbesian fear of surprise attacks from outside one's borders is definitorial for all groups and its members, and out-group relations follow the motto of Vegetius, *If you want peace, prepare for war*.¹⁷ The security dilemma enforces cooperation and altruism within in-groups, while non-cooperation is imposed between hostile out-groups: Subordinates are required to trust their superiors and hate whoever superiors designate as enemy, since within the context of a strong security dilemma a tightly knit populace that supports a disciplined defense force is better prepared to overcome 'the enemy'. In such a context, the *scope of justice and cooperation* ends where 'we' end.¹⁸ Justice is for 'us' within our in-group, demarcated by boundaries against the 'not-we' of the out-group: 'the right within versus the wrong without'.¹⁹ Social psychology uses labels such as authoritarianism for this world view. Egalitarian aspirations persisted during this period, however, dominator societies developed elaborate systems to keep those aspirations down. The larger a group and the longer the time period, the further the institutionalisation of systems of structural violence could advance. Wherever this adaptation is still virulent today, it represents one of the two hurdles to global cooperation the author observes.

Global interconnectedness is a radical game changer, and this is amplified by the fact that it becomes ever more undeniable that the planetary ecological carrying capacity is finite. Extreme weather patterns and species extinction, to name but two crises, through being global, now breach the gap between those who are exploited and those who benefit from exploitation, because the latter find it increasingly to shield themselves. On her global path, the author observes the numerous ways in which people react to this new situation, ranging from panic to denial, mediated by the cultural-social-psychological *Zeitgeist* that had evolved prior to that new situation.

Humanity no longer enjoys a win-win or a win-lose context but is increasingly constrained by lose-lose conditions. In this novel context, not only does the old adaptation of competition for domination transmute from a path to security into a self-destructive obstacle to global cooperation, another hindrance acquires unprecedented force, too, namely, dynamics of humiliation.

While competition for domination was *Homo sapiens'* master survival strategy during the millennia following the Neolithic Revolution, this strategy outlives its usefulness the more interconnected the world grows and the more overstretched Earth's carrying capacity becomes. It is this historically unprecedented new situation that turns the millennia-old strategy of competition for domination into a counter-productive and collectively suicidal strategy: global interconnectedness in a finite context represents the ultimate deterrent for traditional power-over competition – be it power over others or over nature.

The globality of these crises calls for the blessings of cooperation to be unleashed to all of humanity rather than only to sub-groups in competition with out-groups. The new situation elevates the notion of global partnership in cooperation from wishful thinking to the only realistic strategy. In this context, human rights ideals of equality in dignity and solidarity cannot be regarded as merely a Western invention: They delineate the new adaptation necessary for global cooperation for survival. Unity in diversity is the principle that can guide the implementation of global cooperation, and subsidiarity is the way to make it work. The only realistic aim in this situation is global partnership – the author has coined the phrases *co-globelisation* and *dignism*.

In this new state of affairs, the most significant hindrance to cooperation comes from dynamics of humiliation. The author came to this insight after roughly the first twenty years of her global life. Through her work as a clinical psychologist, she had learned that humiliation is the most significant force that creates rifts between people and breaks down relationships. This insight from the micro level is in resonance with examples from the macro level, for instance, the Versailles Treaties after the First World War that show the capacity of humiliation to undermine peaceful cooperation: These treaties were intended to make Germany harmless by teaching it humility by humiliating it, and this backfired and ended in another world war. In contrast, peace was the result after the Second World War when Germany was included as a respected member in the European family.

This leads to the next crucial question: Can cycles of humiliation be healed and prevented? The author's global life indicates the following answer: Yes, healing and prevention of humiliation is possible, but only if certain conditions are in place. Humanity as a whole needs to recognise that we are one single biological species in the genus *Homo*, one single family inhabiting a tiny fragile planet. We need to appreciate that human survival is only possible if we come together and develop an entirely new level of skills and institutions that can balance global unity in diversity. While our forebears prior to the Neolithic Revolution were lucky, as cooperation in a win-win context is relatively easy to achieve, the win-lose context that followed was a strong trigger for non-cooperation. The task at hand now is cooperation in a lose-lose context, and this requires much more elevated skill levels. 'Foreign' relations become obsolete and even the improvement of inter-cultural relations is not enough, what is needed are good-enough global internal relations, good-enough global inter-human relations.²⁰ Strategies of competition for domination and notions of victory versus defeat become obsolete in an interconnected and finite context, as they lead to ecocide and sociocide. What is needed is the joint stewardship of the ecological and social foundations of human life, of humankind's commons, that is, of the gifts that planet Earth has to offer to humankind, as well as of the potential for creativity, responsibility, care, and solidarity that is enshrined in human nature.

In this situation, what is needed is that we 'harvest' the best of all cultural skills and traditions that living beings ever manifested on planet Earth. All cultural skills and traditions that have the potential to nurture unity in diversity and equal dignity in solidarity are worth identifying, protecting, and nurturing. To find and identify these skills and traditions is the author's life mission as a global citizen. She works to normalise the insight that global interconnectedness forbids the degradation of 'unity in diversity' into oppressive 'uniformity in division' and she calls for diversity to be nurtured as a source for inspiration and creativity. Small players need to be encouraged to make their own diverse positions visible in the face of big dominators rather than bow to them in anticipatory obedience. Whatever helps balance unity in diversity is valuable, whatever helps dialogue under circumstances of overshoot is worth preserving. The author's diachronic lens enables her to respectfully understand even the most brutal adaptations of the past, while her synchronic lens helps her separate understanding from condoning and respectfully condone only those expressions of diversity that enrich and unite rather than divide.

The author sees the world filled with examples of how various cultural-social-psychological preferences, skills, talents, and practices can be 'harvested' and support each other – for instance, Anglo-Saxon action orientation can complement continental European expertise in planning, while Asian nondualism and African *ubuntu* philosophies can join indigenous expertise in how to commons can be protected.

This is how the author sees humankind's current situation: We can no longer think of ourselves as sailing on a luxury cruise ship. What we thought of as a cruise ship, is a Titanic on

its way to the iceberg. And this, while we have already punched holes in the hull of the ship to use some of its planks to throw dazzling parties on the upper floor. Slowly, we realise that we are on a lifeboat, not a cruise ship. In a lifeboat, all hands are needed on deck, everybody has to contribute with what they can, nobody can 'buy' themselves out of this joint effort. Whoever tries to gain short-term personal advantages by exploiting others or ecological resources contributes to the faster sinking of the lifeboat. Infighting will make it capsize and nobody will survive.

Can we all survive on the lifeboat or will the strongest throw the rest over board? What are our odds? Can indigenous psychologies help us? Questions abound. What happens when people feel humiliated and trampled on? If dignity is an antidote to humiliation, how can dignity be promoted? What are the possibilities for such an endeavour, what are the hurdles? What does history tell us about *Homo sapiens* since it exists? What do we know about human nature, does it clash with or support such an endeavour?

In this situation, what can we do? What can rural contexts do, what can cities do, or countries? What is only achievable by the world community in global cooperation? Which cultural heritages are helpful, which not? What role does science play in this context, the academic world – including the field of psychology – art, public administration, and politics? What can 'we the people' do? What can each individual do?

This book presents the personal experiences of an author who has a background in social and clinical psychology as well as in medicine and who has lived on all continents except Antarctica for more than forty years. She observes how people on all continents now begin to see that we live in a radically new historical period. Yet, most people misunderstand the significance of this novelty. They are misled by the hope that a dazzling but unsustainable 'party of exploitation' can go on. They also overlook that for the first time in its history, humankind is in a position to actually succeed in bringing about a completely different kind of adaptation. For the first time, humanity can fully appreciate its place in the cosmos: Unlike our ancestors, we can see pictures of our Blue Marble from the perspective of an astronaut. Unlike our forebears, we understand that we humans are *one* species living on *one* tiny planet, and we can feel 'the ecology of the living' taking place within *one* circumscribed biopoetic space that is shared between all beings. We have access to a much more comprehensive knowledge base about the universe and our place in it than our grandparents ever had. We have research showing that human nature is neither 'good' nor 'evil' but social, and that human action depends on the ways constitutive rules frame relational contexts. The author dedicates her life work to nurturing creative ideas for how new constitutive rules may look like that frame relational contexts in ways that humanity may find dignity in the future.

Contents

Acknowledgments

Foreword

Preface

Introduction

Part I: Where Does Our Mental Life Come From?

Chapter 1: What Is Our Human Nature?

Chapter 2: What Can We Learn from Our Forebears Prior to the Neolithic Revolution?

Chapter 3: What Do We Want to Keep from the Past Ten Millennia of Our History?

Part II: Experiences of Dignity and Humiliation in Our Time

Chapter 4: How Do Rules of Honour Impact Our Mental Life?

Chapter 5: How Do Ideals of Equal Dignity Impact Our Mental Life?

Chapter 6: What Happens When Dignity Meets Honour?

Part III: Can We Build a Future of Dignity for All Humanity?

Chapter 7: We Live in Times of Systemic Global Humiliation

Chapter 8: How Can We Heal and Prevent Cycles of Humiliation?

Chapter 9: How Can We Manifest Global Responsibility in Connected Individuality and Mutual Solidarity and Care?

Index

Reference List

Introduction

Part I: Where Does Our Mental Life Come From?

Chapter 1: What Is Our Human Nature?

Is the human species a superior or inferior species? Are we blessed or doomed? Perhaps our inner demons make it inherently impossible to create a decent world, a world where we unite in respect for cultural and ecological diversity? Who knows, it may be dangerously foolish to dream of a dignified world for future generations, a world of dialogue, partnership, and mutual trust? Perhaps the best hope we can ever entertain is to keep the world's people under firm control? If there is no chance for global partnership, it would be catastrophic to loosen the grip of domination. However, if there is a chance, should we perhaps give it a try? Maybe there is a chance, but only if we make a serious effort?

In this chapter, the author shares her personal experiences that led her to conclude that we, as humankind, will be doomed, if we continue to believe in the evilness of human nature.

Chapter 2: What Can We Learn from Our Forebears Prior to the Neolithic Revolution?

If we look at our ancestors prior to the Neolithic Revolution, research shows that we evolved living in small groups and that we function best in contexts where we know one another face-to-face. We lived in small egalitarian groups in dialogue with our environment, and this knowledge is still around, it is the 'wisdom of the elders'.²¹ Indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan explains: 'No population in its entirety embodies one particular way of knowing',²² and rather than using the phrase 'indigenous knowledge', it may be more appropriate to say, for instance, 'knowledge systems of indigenous populations'.²³ Archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestedt adds: 'Egalitarian hunter-gatherers, especially the animists, are the best societies this world has ever witnessed', and she continues: 'This is not a reference to the Garden of Eden; it is to acknowledge that some systems are better than others in taking care of everybody's integrity, both human and animal'.²⁴

In this chapter, the author shares her personal experiences that led her to resonate with all those voices who warn against the uncritical idolisation of sedentism and complex agriculture. The author warns against the uncritical hailing of hierarchical societal structures of dominator societies as 'great civilisations'. She warns against any uncritical admiration for domination over

people and nature as 'victory', 'success', or 'progress'. A new kind historiography is needed now, a historiography that considers the fact that interconnectedness and finiteness require a different definition of *greatness*.

Chapter 3: What Do We Want to Keep from the Past Ten Millennia of Our History?

The author's seven years of working as a psychotherapist in Egypt have taught her to value so-called collectivist societies and their ability to create social cohesion among its members. At the same time, the author is not blind. She is aware of the destructive sides of collectivism and how it can spur division and oppression. She is aware that collectivism can impede the formation of trust in larger society when social bonds are engulfed in hierarchical tribal settings. The author does not wish to return to an idealised past – to say it short, she does not want to bring back the practice of foot binding and welcomes the liberation from all detrimental aspects of traditional collectivist society models.²⁵

Yet, there is a 'too little' and a 'too much', and what the author sees individualistic Western societies doing is 'too much'.²⁶ Driven by the promise of equal dignity, individualism goes too far. In the course of this process, the very solidarity has been sacrificed that was present in collectivist settings notwithstanding their divisive and oppressive tendencies. By ripping the individual out from the collective, Western societies have thrown out the baby with the bath water, so to speak, and instead of manifesting the ideal of equal dignity for all in solidarity, what has happened is atomisation.²⁷ The result is *anomie*,²⁸ anomie in the midst of rising inequality.²⁹ By now, the author observes how the global 'colonisation campaign' of Western anomie empties the world of its social and ecological resources, leaving behind ravaged habitats where disconnected loners are blinded by the illusion that they can be winners.³⁰

Part II: Experiences of Dignity and Humiliation in Our Time

Chapter 4: How Do Rules of Honour Impact Our Mental Life?

The concept of ranked honour is definitorial for the dominator model of society which characterised many, if not most, societies after the Neolithic Revolution. In the author's view, this concept was the single largest 'master manipulation' of *governmentality* (Foucault) ever perpetrated,³¹ as it gives master elites the power to define everything – from what *is*, to what *ought to be*.³² It was the fear entailed in the *security dilemma* that gave power elites the necessary leverage to convince subordinates of the concept of honour, so that superiors could ask whatever they wished from their inferiors, including their inferiors' deaths.³³ If superiors were wise patrons who had the common good at heart, they kept their deal, that is, they gave their subordinates protection in exchange for obedience. If superiors instrumentalised their inferiors' fear for ulterior motives – and this happened often – they broke this contract.

The impact of the ten millennia that followed the Neolithic Revolution was in many ways detrimental to the human psyche. Honour culture 'endangers the soul',³⁴ it is harmful in the long term also for those who benefit from it in the short term. Given that the author is a psychologist and physician, she often uses the metaphor of the body to explain her point: In an honour culture, elites – mostly men – are allowed to use the right arm, the sword arm, to devise strategies and

give orders, representing the sympathetic system of the body that prepares for flight or fight. Their left arm, the one that stands for maintenance and care, akin to the parasympathetic system, is bound behind their backs. Their subordinates – women and lowly men – suffer the inverse infliction. None can use both arms, none can reach an inner balance, none can unfold their full potential.

Honour culture has always been harmful to human nature, yet, as long as the security dilemma was strong, this damage was regarded as a price that had to be paid. Only when the security dilemma attenuates, does space open up to recalibrate culture in more benign ways.

In this chapter, the author shares her observations of remnants of the honour mindset not just in societies labelled as 'traditional', but also in societies that officially eschew such cultural orientations and subscribe to values of equal dignity and rights for all. 'Neo-liberal governmentality' operates no longer through open domination and oppression of citizens as in the past, but 'by making their subjectivity a target of influence', observes indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan.³⁵

Chapter 5: How Do Ideals of Equal Dignity Impact Our Mental Life?

In this chapter, the author offers experiences that show how the advent of human rights ideals of equal dignity for all impacts the relationship between humility, shame, and humiliation. Whenever and wherever human rights ideals become salient, those three notions seize to be interchangeable, no longer are they always on the same continuum, nor are they necessarily intertwined.

Furthermore, human rights ideals differentiate the humiliation of honour from the humiliation of dignity and make dynamics of humiliation more explosive than before. Globalisation compounds this effect by disseminating it all over the world. Since honour is ranked, also the humiliation of honour has many gradations, from mild degradation to exiling or even killing. Human rights ideals, in contrast, remove those gradation and turn humiliation into the most severe form, namely exclusion: All human rights violations exile victims from humanity entirely, all acts of degradation have the psychological impact of excluding the targeted person or group from humanity. The sense of being evicted from the human family produces intense pain and suffering, it is a deeply hurtful experience that assaults people at the core of their humanity. The author calls this type of humiliation *human rights humiliation* or *dignity humiliation*, or, even more precisely, *equal dignity humiliation*.

In the world of honour, holding down underlings is a duty, it only becomes a violation in a human rights context where equal dignity for all is the norm. In the world of honour, the *pater familias* has the duty to chastise his disobedient wife or children and expose them to routine humiliation, while human rights ideals endow every single human being with an inner core of equal dignity that ought not be held down, that ought not be humiliated. In this situation, the duty of domestic chastisement transmutes into a violation, that of domestic violence. The human rights revolution turns the formerly legitimate humbling of underlings into illegitimate humiliation, and thus also establishes the right to resist and get angry.

Globalisation then proceeds to globalise this new right to get angry. In the world of honour, only elites – not their underlings – have the right to interpret an attempt to put them down as a violation and, for instance, go to duel. A beaten wife cannot challenge her husband to duel but is expected to learn respect for his supremacy and adopt docile humility. Human rights ideals allow the beaten wife to get angry at her humiliator. And not only the beaten wife is given this right.

Human rights ideals democratise the right to become angry when put down and globalisation extends this right to millions of downtrodden people who formerly endured humiliation quietly in coerced subservient humility.

This is why the notion of humiliation becomes much more salient than before in present times, and why it emerges as a crucially important topic of research: Human rights ideals of equal dignity carry the potential to bring forth anger where there was quiet docility before. The author calls feelings of humiliation the *nuclear bomb of the emotions*.

Chapter 6: What Happens When Dignity Meets Honour?

On her global path, the author has had ample opportunity to observe how ideals of equal dignity clash with those of unequal honour. She has often faced situations of stark ethical dilemmas. So-called honour killing provides a blunt illustration: In an honour context, a raped girl might be perceived of having brought dishonour to her family and she might be killed in order to restore the humiliated family honour; in a dignity context, the very idea that killing can heal humiliation constitutes humiliation, the humiliation of the dignity of all involved. A human rights defender who faces cases of honour killing is thus caught between her desire 'to respect other cultures' and her wish 'to respect the dignity of the girl'.³⁶ A human rights defender cannot concurrently say: 'I respect the dignity of the girl, therefore she must live' and, 'I respect all cultures, including honour cultures, and therefore, if this is what honour culture prescribes, I respect that the girl must die'. 'The girl must die', and 'the girl must live' are two mutually exclusive positions. What we meet is the problem of 'intersectionality', when 'rights that supposedly flow from a particular group identity may be oppression for subgroups that have a crosscutting allegiance'.³⁷

The notions of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* are relevant in this context, as they can help unravel this ethical dilemma in dignified ways. Historical sociologist and political economist Karl Polanyi (1886 – 1964) once analysed how market relationships became disembedded from social relationships as the feudal *Gemeinschaften* of the Middle Ages disintegrated and capitalism dissolved personal bonds through arms-length transactions.³⁸ Also sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies (1855 – 1936) spoke of *Gemeinschaft* and how it differs from *Gesellschaft*.³⁹ Later, sociologist Mark Granovetter built on Tönnies' differentiation of *Gemeinschaft* versus *Gesellschaft* in his research on the question whether strong or weak social ties are more useful.⁴⁰ In a *Gemeinschaft*, people have strong ties and thoroughly share norms, a setting that is easily disrupted by even minimal dissent. Having many weak ties to a number of people, as in a *Gesellschaft*, in contrast, provides more space for individual autonomy and diversity, argues Granovetter. He therefore comes down on the side of weaker ties and *Gesellschaft*. The work of Ferdinand Tönnies, together with Mark Granovetter's network theory of 'the strength of weak ties', has inspired many scholars since. Mark Granovetter's network theory has also informed the notion of *relational mobility* used in Masaki Yuki's cultural psychology research group, as we hear from indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan.⁴¹ The author recommends to combine the best aspects from both, *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, and apply them to the entire global community. Only in this way can clashes between honour and dignity be channelled into constructive directions.

Aside from head-on clashes between honour and dignity, the author also observes partial clashes. *Cross over* is the term she uses when she sees feelings of dignity humiliation being responded to with tools from the toolkit of honour humiliation. History shows that very often

only tyrants were removed, while tyranny was kept in place, with the formerly oppressed becoming the new oppressors. It was the Hitler path so to speak, the path of open violence and the erection of systems of structural violence. Human rights ideals call for another path, one that eschews violence and introduces a second transformation after the first: after deposing a tyrant, what must follow is the dismantling of the very system of tyranny, and all this must be done with peaceful means, without violence. This is the path of a Bertha von Suttner, of a Mohandas K. Gandhi, Paulo Freire, or Nelson Mandela. Cross over is when the Hitler path is chosen to act on and heal feelings of dignity humiliation – feelings that would call for the Mandela response – when only the first part of the dignity uprising is carried out, while the second part, the peace-inducing dignifying part, falls by the wayside and is replaced by violent honour strategies.

In this chapter, the author shares her experiences with head-on clashes between honour and dignity, as well as partial inconsistencies.

Part III: Can We Build a Future of Dignity for All Humanity?

Chapter 7: We Live in Times of Systemic Global Humiliation

The author meets the deleterious effects of the *Homo oeconomicus* model of human nature all over the globe. Wherever this concept seeps in, it humiliates the core of humanity in every person and contributes to the degradation of the environment. It does so through giving primacy to *market pricing over communal sharing* (Alan Page Fiske), a prioritisation that violates dignity at all levels and in all contexts.⁴²

Apartheid was humiliation congealed into a system in South Africa. Similarly, *sociocide* and *ecocide* are systemic. Words like genocide, sociocide, ecocide, and pesticide end on the suffix *-cide* which stems from Latin *-cida* and the verb *caedo, caedes, caedere, caedi, caedum*, which means 'killing'. Sociocide is the killing of our sociosphere, of our human communities.⁴³ Ecocide is the killing of our ecosphere, of our ecological world, which we are part of.⁴⁴ Both killings amplify each other.

People who are privileged enough to live in secure Western contexts are still largely shielded from sociocide and ecocide, or they experience it mildly. The author, through living globally, avoids this shielding, and she concludes that we live in times of systemic decline where the old order is disintegrating and environmental and political disruption edge each other on.

Globalisation critics do not oppose all aspects of globalisation – they do not oppose global civil society, which can be hailed as a benefit flowing from the coming-together of humankind. What critics focus on is global systemic humiliation: when equal dignity is promised but fails, this heats up hot feelings of humiliation. By now, as the credibility of free market theories is waning, space opens for the globalisation of care, responsibility, and solidarity. Unfortunately, as the author observes, critics have so far not been able to use this window of opportunity constructively, and the anger that has accumulated in populations around the world is being taken up by populists who create hostile divisions.

Many of those in America and Europe, for instance, who were hurt by the exploitative aspects of globalisation, see the promise of unity in diversity being degraded into a reality of oppressive uniformity imposed by dictatorial Washington, or tyrannical Brussels. People in America and Europe are the most privileged among the victims of the globalisation of exploitation, and they are in a position to vote. As they vote for populists, they turn against those victims in the rest of

the world who are even more destitute and have only their feet to vote with – the poorer turn against the poorest. Populists promise ‘freedom for us from them’, thus re-creating a world of hostile fault lines in a situation where ‘freedom for all’ through a globalisation of care would be possible. Instead of unity in diversity, they create global division without unity and diversity.

The author's entire life work aims at supporting and nurturing whatever initiatives she finds around the world that can nourish a globalisation of care. She appreciates indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan's recommendation of anthropologist Alan Page Fiske's insights into communal sharing. Many indigenous communities give primacy to this as guiding principle for their social and societal life as they disallow life and society to be defined and thus impoverished by less comprehensive frameworks such as ‘equality matching’ or ‘market pricing’.⁴⁵ Sundararajan warns of the disappearance of relational values through market pricing:

All emotions are relational; our brain is not evolved to interact emotionally with strangers. Globalisation changes that. Sales clerks are trained to wear a smile for all. This is fine so far as superficial emotions go. But real emotions in the stranger context tend to become aberrant – sex with strangers is either rape or prostitution; weakness or inferiority in front of strangers turns a quotidian experience of humbling into that of traumatic humiliation. Of the four types of relational cognition that Alan Fiske delineated, Market Pricing, the type of relational transactions among strangers, has the least capacity to sustain a meaningful relationship – yet this is the type of relational context we are left with when all the other, richer relational contexts liquidify with globalisation.⁴⁶

Chapter 8: How Can We Heal and Prevent Cycles of Humiliation?

The author appreciates philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce (1839 – 1914) and his first rule of reason, namely, to always remain curious, to always keep ‘the way of inquiry’ open.⁴⁷ She resonates with Ruben Nelson from Foresight Canada, who laments ‘the insidious separation of “thinkers” and “doers” that is now causing havoc in Modern cultures’.⁴⁸ Nelson adds: ‘Put simply, if I could, I would act to overcome the fragmentation of life that marks Modernity. For example, I would reform every centre that is devoted to research so that it becomes rooted in a rich mix of its local community’.

In this chapter, the author explains the ways in which she designs her global life. Her life design has three aspects. First, it flows from a global unity consciousness, second, it involves an ethical decision to bring more dignity into the world, and, third, it is based on a personal choice to translate consciousness and ethics into practice in a way that is holistic and matches the enormity of the ethical challenge. Her life design is thus both an ethical project and a holistic methodology. *Never again* is the ethical driving force, combined with the observation that present historical times offer a unique window of opportunity to manifest a dignified world of *unity in diversity* in practice not just in theory. In this context, she nurtures the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community and World Dignity University initiative as truly global movements.

The author's life is in many ways an extreme application of the Buddhist notion of transcending self. She has so far not yet met any other person who lives this path with as much consequence. She does not expect others to follow her path too literally since it requires a considerable amount of sacrifice and a very demanding time-and-place design, but she hopes that many may draw inspiration from it.

Chapter 9: How Can We Manifest Global Responsibility in Connected Individuality and Mutual Solidarity and Care?

It saddens the author when humiliation is not healed but made worse by hate speech, for instance, by capitalism-versus-socialism hate speech. To replace the terminology of capitalism, socialism, or communism as catch words, to overcome those divisive cycles of humiliation, she has coined the term *dignism* (dignity + ism).⁴⁹ The aim is to point at the positive goals of what she calls *co-globegalisation*. This is how she describes dignism:

Dignism describes a world, where every new-born finds space and is nurtured to unfold their highest and best, embedded in a social context of loving appreciation and connection, where the carrying capacity of the planet guides the ways in which everybody's basic needs are met, a world, where we are united in respecting human dignity and celebrating diversity, where we prevent unity from being perverted into oppressive uniformity and keep diversity from sliding into hostile division.

In this chapter, the author shares her personal experiences from all around the world with respect to the necessity and possibility of manifesting a world that unites in cherishing all forms of diversity that nurture equal dignity for all. 'It takes a village to raise a child' is an African saying. Can our global village become a village that raises its children in dignity? Is the first sentence in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights a valid promise or empty rhetoric: 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights'? Can equal dignity and equal rights be the moral compass for a decent future for humankind? Or not? Is there hope for something like 'global democracy and human self-transcendence'?⁵⁰

Index

Reference List

- Atkinson, Anthony Barnes (2015). *Inequality: What can be done?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Batson, C. Daniel (2009). "These things called empathy: Eight related but distinct phenomena." In *The social neuroscience of empathy*, edited by Jean Decety and William Ickes. Chapter 1, pp. 3–15. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Press.
- Bloom, Paul (2017). "Empathy and its discontents." In *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21 (1), 24–31. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2016.11.004.
- Cantú, Francisco (2018). *The line becomes a river: Dispatches from the border*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Chaisson, Eric J. (2001). *Cosmic evolution: The rise of complexity in nature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Collins, Alan (2004). "State-induced security dilemma maintaining the tragedy." In *Cooperation and Conflict*, 39 (1), 27–44. doi: 10.1177/0010836704040833.

- Cormann, Grégory (2015). *Post-scriptum à La Misère du monde 25 ans après: Bourdieu, le peuple et son sociocide*. Liège, Belgium: Conférence dans le séminaire de philosophie sociale et politique 'Le commun et le social', Université de Liège, 5 novembre 2015.
- Decety, Jean, and William Ickes (Eds.) (2009). *The social neuroscience of empathy*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Press.
- Diwan, Ishac (2016). "Identities, values and civic participation." In *Arab Human Development Report*. Chapter 2. New York: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/idiwan/files/ch2_ahdr_-_diwan.pdf.
- Elias, Norbert (1939/1991). "Changes in the we-I balance." Translated by Edmund Jephcott. In *The society of individuals*, edited by Michael Schröter. Oxford: Blackwell. German original *Die Gesellschaft der Individuen*, 1939/1987.
- Elias, Norbert (1939/1994). *The civilizing process (Volume 1: The history of manners, Volume II: State formation and civilization)*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell. German original *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation*, Basel, Switzerland: Verlag Haus zum Falken, 1939
- Escobar, Arturo (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fiske, Alan Page (1991). *Structures of social life: The four elementary forms of human relations – communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, market pricing*. New York: Free Press.
- Fiske, Alan Page, and Walter Kintsch (1992). "The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations." In *Psychological Review*, 99 (4), 689–723. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.689. www.sscnet.ucla.edu/anthro/faculty/fiske/pubs/Fiske_Four_Elementary_Forms_Sociality_1992.pdf.
- Fiske, Alan Page (2004). "Relational models theory 2.0." In *Relational models theory: A contemporary overview*, edited by Nick Haslam. Chapter 1, pp. 3–25. London: Psychology Press.
- Fiske, Alan Page, and Susan T. Fiske (2007). "Social relationships in our species and cultures." In *Handbook of cultural psychology*, edited by Shinobu Kitayama and Dov Cohen. Chapter 11, pp. 283–306. New York: Guilford Press.
- Foucault, Michel (1979). "On governmentality." In *Ideology and Consciousness*, 6, 5–21.
- Foucault, Michel (1991). "Governmentality." In *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chapter 4, pp. 87–104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://laelectrodomestica.files.wordpress.com/2014/07/the-foucault-effect-studies-in-governmentality.pdf>.
- Frank, Robert H. (2016). *Success and luck: Good fortune and the myth of meritocracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Frug, Mary Joe (1992). *Postmodern legal feminism*. New York: Routledge.
- Furedi, Frank (2005). *Politics of fear: Beyond left and right*. London: Continuum.
- Gergen, Kenneth J. (2009). *Relational being: Beyond self and community*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glaser, Charles L. (1997). "The security dilemma revisited." In *World Politics*, 50 (1, October, Fiftieth Anniversary Special Issue), 171–201. <https://iscs.elliott.gwu.edu/sites/iscs.elliott.gwu.edu/files/downloads/cgdocs/SecurityDilemma-WP-1997.pdf>.

- Granovetter, Mark S. (1973). "The strength of weak ties." In *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (May), 1360–80. www.immorlica.com/socNet/granstrengthweakties.pdf.
- Hammond, Kenneth R. (1998). *Ecological validity: Then and now*. Albany, NY: University at Albany. www.albany.edu/cpr/brunswick/notes/essay2.html.
- Hansen, Lene (2000). "The little mermaid's silent security dilemma and the absence of gender in the Copenhagen school." In *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 29 (2), 285–306. mil.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/29/2/285.pdf.
- Harari, Yuval Noah (2014). *Sapiens: A brief history of humankind*. London: Harvill Secker. First published in Hebrew in Tel Aviv by Kinneret Zmora-Bitan Dvir.
- Harari, Yuval Noah (2015/2016). *Homo deus: A brief history of tomorrow*. London: Harville Secker. Hebrew original *The History of Tomorrow*, Tel Aviv: Kinneret Zmora-Bitan Dvir.
- Hardin, Russell (1995). *One for all: The logic of group conflict*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Herz, John H. (1950). "Idealist internationalism and the security dilemma." In *World Politics*, 2 (2), 157–80. doi: 10.2307/2009187.
- Higgins, Polly (2016). *Eradicating ecocide: Exposing the corporate and political practices destroying the planet and proposing the laws needed to eradicate ecocide*. 2nd edition. London: Shephard Walwyn.
- Jervis, Robert (1978). "Cooperation under the security dilemma." In *World Politics*, 30 (2, January), 167–214. www.jstor.org/stable/2009958.
- Job, Brian L. (Ed.) (1992). *The insecurity dilemma: National security of third world states*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Kennedy, Duncan (2002). "The critique of rights in critical legal studies." In *Left legalism/left critique*, edited by Janet Halley and Wendy Brown, pp. 178–227. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
<http://duncankennedy.net/documents/The%20Critique%20of%20Rights%20in%20cls.pdf>.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000a). *Recognition or humiliation – The psychology of intercultural communication*. Bergen, Norway: Proceedings of the ISSEI Millennium Conference Approaching a New Millennium: Lessons from the Past – Prospects for the Future, the 7th Conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas, Bergen, Norway, 14th–18th August, 2000. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000b). *The psychology of humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, doctoral dissertation in psychology.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2001). "How research can humiliate: Critical reflections on method." In *Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict, Annual Edition 2001–2002*, 16–36. jspc.library.wisc.edu, www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2007). "Avoiding humiliation – From intercultural communication to global interhuman communication." In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan*, 10, 21–38. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009). *Emotion and conflict: How human rights can dignify emotion and help us wage good conflict*. Westport, CT: Praeger, Greenwood.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda, and Desmond Tutu (Foreword) (2010). *Gender, humiliation, and global security: Dignifying relationships from love, sex, and parenthood to world affairs*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, ABC-CLIO.

- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012a). "Fostering global citizenship." In *The psychological components of sustainable peace*, edited by Morton Deutsch and Peter T. Coleman. Chapter 15, pp. 283–98. New York: Springer.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012b). *A dignity economy: Creating an economy which serves human dignity and preserves our planet*. Lake Oswego, OR: World Dignity University Press.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2019). *A global life design: Reflections and a chronological description, 2006 – 2019*. Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/09.php#chronology.
- McNeill, John Robert, and William Hardy McNeill (2003). *The human web: A bird's-eye view of world history*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Minow, Martha (1999). "Violence against women – A challenge to the supreme court." In *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 341 (25), 1927–29. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199912163412511.
- Moisi, Dominique (2009). *The geopolitics of emotion: How cultures of fear, humiliation and hope are reshaping the world*. London: Bodley Head.
- Montgomery, Evan Braden (2006). "Breaking out of the security dilemma: Realism, reassurance, and the problem of uncertainty." In *International Security*, 31 (2, Fall), 7–41. www.jstor.org/stable/4137519.
- Musah, Abdel-Fatau, and Kayode Fayemi (2000). *Mercenaries: An African security dilemma*. London: Pluto.
- Opotow, Susan (1995). "Drawing the line: Social categorization, moral exclusion, and the scope of justice." In *Cooperation, conflict, and justice: Essays inspired by the work of Morton Deutsch*, edited by Barbara Benedict Bunker and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. Chapter 11, pp. 347–69. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2015). *In it together: Why less inequality benefits all*. Paris: OECD Publishing. www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/employment/in-it-together-why-less-inequality-benefits-all_9789264235120-en#page1.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders (1899/1931). "F.R.L. First Rule of Logic." In *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce: Vol. I. principles of philosophy*, edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss, pp. 135–40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. https://web.archive.org/web/20120106071421/http://www.princeton.edu/~batke/peirce/frl_99.htm.
- Piketty, Thomas (2013/2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Belknap. French original *Le capital au XXIe siècle*, Paris: Seuil, 2013.
- Polanyi, Karl Paul, and Joseph E. Stiglitz (Foreword) (1944/2001). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*. 2nd edition. Boston: Beacon Press, first published by Farrar and Rinehart, 1944.
- Posen, Barry (1993). "The security dilemma and ethnic conflict." In *Survival*, 35 (1), 27–47. doi: 10.1080/00396339308442672.
- Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus, and Michael D. Reeve (2004). *Epitoma rei militaris*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, written possibly in the reign of Theodosius the Great, Roman Emperor from 379–395 CE, first printed edition Utrecht, 1473.
- Rai, Tage Shakti, and Alan Page Fiske (2011). "Moral psychology is relationship regulation: Moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality." In *Psychological Review*, 118 (1), 57–75. doi: 10.1037/a0021867.

- Richards, Howard (2013). "On the genealogy of morals." In *On Foucault: Non-authoritarian authority: Philosophical contributions to building cultures of solidarity* Chapter 9. Limache, Chile: howardrichards.org/peace/content/view/91/95/.
- Roe, Paul (1999). "The intrastate security dilemma: Ethnic conflict as a 'tragedy'?" In *Journal of Peace Research*, 36 (2), 183–202. doi: 10.1177/0022343399036002004.
- Roe, Paul (2005). *Ethnic violence and the societal security dilemma*. London: Routledge.
- Rose, Nikolas (1999). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self*. 2nd edition. London: Free Association Books.
- Rose, William (2000). "The security dilemma and ethnic conflict: Some new hypotheses." In *Security Studies*, 9 (4), 1–51. doi: 10.1080/09636410008429412.
- Schweller, Randall L. (1996). "Neorealism's status - quo bias: What security dilemma?" In *Security Studies*, 5 (3), 90 - 121. doi: 10.1080/09636419608429277.
- Schweller, Randall L. (2011). "Rational theory for a bygone era." In *Security Studies*, 20 (3), 460–68. doi: 10.1080/09636412.2011.599196.
- Snyder, Jack (1985). "Perceptions of the security dilemma in 1914." In *Psychology and deterrence*, edited by Robert Jervis, Richard Ned Lebow, and Janice Gross Stein, pp. 153–79. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Snyder, Jack, and Robert Jervis (1999). "Civil war and the security dilemma." In *Civil wars, insecurity, and intervention*, edited by Jack Snyder and Barbara F. Walter, pp. 15–37. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Snyder, Jack, and Barbara Walters (Eds.) (1999). *The security dilemma and intervention in civil wars*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Solovey, Mark, and Hamilton Cravens (2012). *Cold war social science: Knowledge production, liberal democracy, and human nature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sommers, Tamler (2018). *Why honor matters*. New York: Basic Books.
- Spier, Fred (2010). *Big history and the future of humanity*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Staub, Ervin (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, Ervin (1993). "The psychology of bystanders, perpetrators, and heroic helpers." In *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17 (3), 315–41. doi: 10.1016/0147-1767(93)90037-9.
- Staub, Ervin (2015). *The roots of goodness and resistance to evil: Inclusive caring, moral courage, altruism born of suffering, active bystandership and heroism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Sugarman, Jeff, Brent Slife, and Richard T. G. Walsh (2015). "Neoliberalism and psychological ethics." In *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 35 (2), 103–16. doi: 10.1037/a0038960.
- Sundararajan, Louise, and Chulmin Kim (2011). "Beyond I-You-Me: An empirically supported formulation of the triadic self." In *The American Sociologist*, 42 (2–3, September), 220–31. doi: 10.1007/s12108-010-9117-7.
- Sundararajan, Louise (2012). *Indigenous psychology: Grounding science in culture, why and how?* Anthropology in China. www.cnanthropology.com/portal.php?mod=view&aid=380.

- Sundararajan, Louise (2015). *Understanding emotion in Chinese culture: Thinking through psychology*. New York: Springer.
- Sundararajan, Louise, and Sayyed Mohsen Fatemi (2016). "Priming the mind to see its double: Mindfulness in a new key." In *Critical mindfulness: Exploring Langerian models.*, edited by Sayyed Mohsen Fatemi, pp. 145–58. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Sundararajan, Louise (2017). "Cultures, worlds, and world-views." In *The hidden worldviews of psychology's theory, research, and practice*, edited by Brent D. Slife, Kari A. O'Grady, and Russell D. Kosits, pp. 58–67. New York: Routledge.
- Suzuki, David (1992). *Wisdom of the elders*. New York: Bantam.
- Svašek, Maruška, and Zlatko Skrbiš (2007). "Passions and power: Emotions and globalization." In *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 14 (4), 367–83. doi: 10.1080/10702890701578415.
- Tang, Shiping (2011). "The security dilemma and ethnic conflict: Toward a dynamic and integrative theory of ethnic conflict." In *Review of International Studies*, 37 (2), 511–36. doi: 10.1017/S0260210510000616.
- Taylor, Charles (1992). *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Originally published in Canada in 1991 under the title *The Malaise of Modernity*, an extended version of the 1991 Massey Lectures.
- Thomson, Robert, Masaki Yuki, Thomas Talhelm, Joanna Schug, Mie Kito, Arin H. Ayanian, Julia C. Becker, et al. (2018). "Relational mobility predicts social behaviors in 39 countries and is tied to historical farming and threat." In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 115 (29), 7521. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1713191115.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand (1887). *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Leipzig, Berlin, Germany: Fues Verlag, Deutsches Textarchiv. www.deutschestextarchiv.de/toennies_gemeinschaft_1887.
- Ury, William (1999). *Getting to peace: Transforming conflict at home, at work, and in the world*. New York: Viking.
- van Hoorn, André (2015). "Individualist–collectivist culture and trust radius: A multilevel approach." In *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46 (2), 269–76. doi: 10.1177/0022022114551053. <https://alingavreliuc.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/journal-of-cross-cultural-psychology-2015-van-hoorn-269-76.pdf>.
- Wilkinson, Richard G. (2005). *The impact of inequality. How to make sick societies healthier*. London: Routledge.
- Wilkinson, Richard G., and Kate Pickett (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Allen Lane.

¹ See classic publications by McNeill and McNeill, 2003, or Chaisson, 2001. See also Spier, 2010, Harari, 2014, 2015/2016.

² See Sundararajan, 2017.

³ Ninth Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, Hangzhou, China, 13th – 16th April 2007, humiliationstudies.org/whowere/annualmeeting/09.php. See also Sundararajan, 2015.

⁴ Lindner, 2000b.

⁵ For the nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2015, 2016, and 2017, see humiliationstudies.org/whoware/evelin/142.php.

⁶ Lindner, 2019. See also the work of anthropologist Arturo Escobar, 2018, who aims at widening the scope of current mainstream design (that currently serve 'capitalist ends' – from consumer goods and digital technologies to built environments) to encompass also design's 'world-making capacity' toward ways of being and doing that are deeply attuned to justice and the Earth.

⁷ Lindner, 2012a. See also Svašek and Skrbiš, 2007.

⁸ Elias, 1939/1991, pp. 226–227.

⁹ Lindner, 2001.

¹⁰ 'The Poisoned Poor' was the title of a panel discussion in 2015 at the United Nations in New York. On behalf of the governments of Sweden and Uruguay, and in collaboration with United Nations Environment Programme, the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions and the Global Alliance on Health and Pollution, invited to an Interactive Panel Discussion 'The Poisoned Poor: Why Safe Management of Chemicals and Wastes Matters for Sustainable Development', in the UN Headquarters, New York, on March 24, 2015.

¹¹ Staub, 1989, 1993, 2015.

¹² Taylor, 1992.

¹³ Hammond, 1998. In research, the ecological validity of a study means that the methods, materials and setting of the study must approximate the real-world that is being examined. Ecological validity is not the same as external validity. A study may possess external validity but not ecological validity, and vice versa, even though improved ecological validity of an experiment usually improves also the external validity.

¹⁴ Ury, 1999.

¹⁵ Ury, 1999.

¹⁶ See Herz, 1950. Barry Posen, 1993, Russell Hardin, 1995, and Rose, 2000, discuss the emotional aspects of the security dilemma and how they play out not just between states, but also between ethnic groups. See Collins, 2004, Hansen, 2000, Jervis, 1978, Job, 1992, Musah and Fayemi, 2000, Posen, 1993, Snyder, 1985, Snyder and Walters, 1999, and Schweller, 2011. See for the *critical turn* in international relations theory, the notion of positive security and the so-called Copenhagen School, among others, Roe, 1999, 2005. I appreciate political scientist Jack S. Levy's 2016 course 'Theories of war and peace' at Rutgers University, <http://home.uchicago.edu/~mjreese/CurrentStudents/LevyPS522.pdf>. He recommends, among others, Glaser, 1997, Montgomery, 2006, Schweller, 1996, Snyder and Jervis, 1999, and Tang, 2011.

¹⁷ Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus and Reeve, 2004.

¹⁸ See, among others, Opatow, 1995. See, furthermore, 'Why we fight: The psychological ties that bind us together and that tear us apart', Science Brief by Emile Bruneau, *Psychological Science Agenda, APA*, December 2017, www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2017/12/why-fight.aspx. Emile Bruneau is an expert on the neuroscience of peace and conflict and he and his colleagues found that empathy has two important 'ropes in the psychological tug-of-war': out-group empathy goes together with pro-social inter-group tendencies, while in-group empathy leads to the opposite outcome, namely, anti-social inter-group tendencies. A person's general empathic abilities are irrelevant for this split between out-group and in-group empathy. See also Batson, 2009, Decety and Ickes, 2009, or Bloom, 2017.

¹⁹ Gergen, 2009, p. 394.

²⁰ Lindner, 2007.

²¹ Suzuki, 1992. I thank Linda Hartling for making me aware of David Suzuki's book *Wisdom of the Elders*.

²² Louise Sundararajan in a personal communication, 19th October 2018.

²³ Louise Sundararajan in a personal communication, 22nd October 2018. Sundararajan acknowledges that 'sloppy use' of the term 'indigenous' is widespread. Also the term 'Aboriginal' may not be respectful. Rather, the intention must be, so Sundararajan, 'to avoid the mistake of using people as a symbol for one's own values ('Women' as a symbol of purity, the 'indigenous' as a symbol of our lost virtues, and so on), thereby denying the humanity of the other'.

See also 'Why Native Americans do not separate religion from science', by Rosalyn R. LaPier, *The Conservation*, 21st April 2017, <http://theconversation.com/why-native-americans-do-not-separate-religion-from-science-75983>.

²⁴ Ingrid Fuglestedt in a personal communication, 17th October 2011.

²⁵ It was an honour to have Ishac Diwan, 2016, come to the pre-launch of this book at Columbia University in New York City on 5th December 2018, and comment on the advantages and disadvantages of collectivist settings.

²⁶ See among others, van Hoorn, 2015.

²⁷ See also Tamler Sommers, 2018, who makes a similar argument. I thank Bonnie Selterman for making me aware of this book.

²⁸ Sociologist Émile Durkheim (1858 – 1917) formulated the concept of *anomie* to help describe the new relationship between the individual and economic society during the nineteenth century Industrial Revolution. Now, it describes the general alienation of individuals on the road to the 'new way'. We saw the rise of this feeling in turn-of-the-century films *Office space* (1999), *American psycho* (2000), and *Fight club* (1999).

²⁹ Since I wrote the book *A dignity economy* (Lindner, 2012b), the topic of inequality has become ever more prominent. See a longer overview in endnote 1 of chapter 11 in my 2017 book *Honour, humiliation, and terror*.

When I wrote the book, everybody told me about Richard Wilkinson's and Kate Pickett's work. See, among others, Wilkinson, 2005, and Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009. See also <https://youtu.be/zYDzA9hKCNQ>. See, furthermore, the Equality Trust at www.equalitytrust.org.uk. Since then, more authors have become household names, such as Stiglitz, 2012, Thomas Piketty, 2013/2014, Atkinson, 2015, or Frank, 2016. See also a publication by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2015, for why all benefit from more equality.

Evidence has accumulated that 'inequality damages family life by higher rates of child abuse, and increased status competition is likely to explain the higher rates of bullying confirmed in schools in more unequal countries'.

³⁰ 'Cigna study reveals loneliness at epidemic levels in America', www.cigna.com/newsroom/news-releases/2018/pdf/new-cigna-study-reveals-loneliness-at-epidemic-levels-in-america.pdf. In the 1980s, 20 per cent of Americans said they were 'often lonely', and this figure has doubled 2018. Suicide rates are at a 30-year high in America, and depression rates have increased tenfold since 1960, not only as a result of greater reporting.

³¹ Foucault, 1979, 1991. See also Rose, 1999.

³² See a discussion in Lindner, 2009, chapter 8: How we can reinvent our contexts.

³³ Sociologist Frank Furedi offers an overview over the recent literature on the sociology of fear where he also refers to sociologist Norbert Elias, who identified fear as a main mechanism through which 'the structures of society are transmitted to individual psychological functions', Elias, 1939/1994, p. 326. See Evelin Lindner, 2019

'The only thing we have to fear is the 'culture of fear' itself', by Frank Furedi, *Spiked*, 4th April 2007, www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/3053#.WyZN5YoyUkI. See also Furedi, 2005, and Moisi, 2009.

³⁴ Cantú, 2018. 'Francisco Cantú: "This is work that endangers the soul"', interview by Ursula Kenny, *The Guardian*, 18th February 2018, www.theguardian.com/books/2018/feb/18/francisco-cantu-line-becomes-river-interview-former-us-border-patrol-agent. Francisco Cantú, third-generation Mexican American, living in Tucson, Arizona, worked as a U.S. border patrol agent between 2008 and 2012. His job included tracking migrants in the Sonoran desert, which separates Mexico from the U.S. Plagued by nightmares, he abandoned the Patrol for civilian life.

³⁵ Sugarman, et al., 2015, p. 113. Sundararajan quotes Sugarman as saying that when rationality of the economic order prevails over that of democracy, we have neo-liberalism, or, as Solovey and Cravens, 2012, would say, we have capitalistic democracy.

³⁶ Lindner, 2000a. See Fiske, 1991, Fiske and Kintsch, 1992, Fiske, 2004, Fiske and Fiske, 2007, Rai and Fiske, 2011.

³⁷ Kennedy, 2002, p. 207: 'For example, black feminists face the nationalist assertion of a black male right to 'discipline' black women and of a black community right to freedom from majority or state interference with this practice'.

See also Frug, 1992, or Minow, 1999.

³⁸ Polanyi and Joseph E. Stiglitz (Foreword), 1944/2001. See also Richards, 2013.

³⁹ Tönnies, 1887.

⁴⁰ Granovetter, 1973.

⁴¹ Louise Sundararajan in a personal communication, 16th October 2018. See Thomson, et al., 2018, and Granovetter, 1973.

⁴² Lindner and Desmond Tutu (Foreword), 2010.

⁴³ 'Sociocide is the intended wounding-killing of a society by eliminating the prerequisites for a live, vibrant, dynamic society', writes peace researcher Johan Galtung, in 'Sociocide, Palestine and Israel', *TRANSCEND Media Service*, 8th October 2012, www.transcend.org/tms/2012/10/sociocide-palestine-and-israel/ (italics in original):

Sociocide, the killing of a society's capacity to survive and to reproduce itself, should become equally and prominently a crime against humanity. A society is a self-reproducing social system. So are human beings, with our basic needs for survival, wellness, identity, freedom. Society is also an organism, with a lifespan far beyond that of individuals. For humans to survive as humans, their basic needs have to be met. For that to happen the society has to survive. For the society to survive the basic social prerequisites must be met:

- for *security*, against violence, killing, wounding the members
- for economic *sustainability*, against their starvation, illness
- for *identity* culturally, a meaning with life, against alienation
- for *autonomy* politically, to be a master of their own house.

As society unfolds, so do humans, and vice versa. Life breeds life.

This also holds for nomadic societies based on hunter-gatherers. Monasteries are incapable of self-reproduction biologically when based on one gender, but are highly viable societies based on recruitment.

Under modernity, identity is carried by the *nation*, with four characteristics: an *idiom*, a *religion-world view*, a *history* – of the past, present and future – and *geographical attachment*. *Time, space*, with the means to communicate and something to believe is crucial.

Under modernity the state is the key executor of all the above.

Sociocide is the intended wounding-killing of a society by eliminating the prerequisites for a live, vibrant, dynamic society.

Sociocide molests the human members. In the longer run, lethally. *Sociocide* is what Western, and not only Western, colonialism has done for centuries, denying others their autonomy, imposing their own identity – language and world-view – moving others out of their own historical dialectic and into history as Western periphery, denying them the land they are attached to with their hearts and minds. And their bodies for security and sustenance, for food, water, health.

See also Cormann, 2015.

⁴⁴ Higgins, 2016.

⁴⁵ Sundararajan, 2012.

⁴⁶ Louise Sundararajan in a personal communication, 29th October 2012. See also Sundararajan, 2012.

⁴⁷ Peirce, 1899/1931. See also Sundararajan and Kim, 2011, and Sundararajan and Fatemi, 2016.

⁴⁸ Ruben Nelson, director of Foresight Canada, in his contribution to the Great Transition Network (GTN) discussion on the topic of 'Thinking Globally, Acting Locally?', 17th January 2019.

⁴⁹ Lindner, 2012b.

⁵⁰ Martin, 2018a.