Human Nature and Dignity:
If We Continue to Believe in the Evilness of Human Nature, We May Be Doomed

Book proposal

Evelin Lindner
Medical Doctor, Psychologist, Dr. psychol., Dr. med.
2019

Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies
www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php

Abstract:
Which future for humankind is feasible? Is human nature capable of manifesting the *Homo amans* scenario and the partnership model of mutuality, or are we stuck with the dominator model of *Homo dominans* and an eternal culture of war and exploitation? Can we embark on building a future of dignity, or is there no point in even trying? Perhaps we should simply push as many people as possible out of the lifeboat, as the planet punishes us for overusing its resources? Or can we survive all together? What are the facts we know about human nature?

Contents

PREFACE

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 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 give it a try? Maybe there is a chance, but only if we give it our all? Do we dare?

Evelin Lindner

Tighten or loosen the grip, less domination and more partnership, or more domination and less partnership: that is the question. At present, competition for domination is the name of the game all over the world, and this state of affairs is regarded as unavoidably "natural" by many, as being in line with the laws of nature. For those who adhere to this view, winning in this struggle of competition, being on top of a submissive rest, is the only way out of crisis.

What if this strategy is suicidal, particularly in an interconnected and finite world? If it is suicidal, do we, as humans, have the ability to change our trajectory? Even if, can we change it fast enough? What is our human nature capable of, and what is it incapable of? Where are our limits?

These are perhaps the most important questions we have to think about in times of existential global challenges. Should we fight over these questions? Or should we, all of humanity together, ask these questions with a sober and balanced mind in cooperative exploration?

Should not our most existential questions deserve our most globally concerted and most serious and measured attention?

Imagine, through a miracle, there would be a world lacking any systemic push for violence and war. Imagine humanity being united in the aim to implement global institutions that protect the planet as our social and ecological commons. Would we humans have the psychological capacity of living without enemies? Would we be able to honor peaceful institutions with peacefully behavior? Or would we always, even under the best circumstances, have an inner need for enemies? Would we turn to cooperation only for the sake of attracting allies for our fight against competitors and enemies?

In other words, can we allow ourselves to be truly optimistic about human future or do we have to settle for pessimism? Do we have to lower our level of ambitions and call it optimism when we think we can make the best of a bad situation? In my view, these are the single most important questions to ask in times of crisis and opportunity, and the answers to these questions should guide our quest for how we define optimism or pessimism.

All over the planet, I give talks and lectures. Usually, lively conversations ensue afterwards. Most topics are talked about in a relaxed manner — explorations and reflections are shared in a friendly atmosphere. There are two exceptions. Two issues, unlike any other, heat up feelings and make people upset or even outraged. One or two people in the audience usually speak up in public or approach me in private after my lecture, and it can happen that they are outright furious at me. It is as if I had personally hurt them, betrayed them, either that they see me guilty of dangerously negligent ignorance, or that they think I try to willfully mislead them.

One of those two hot spots is equal dignity. Doubters believe that I want to erase hierarchy and diversity and force everybody into sameness. My standard reply is that this would be a profound misunderstanding of my message. On the contrary, equal dignity can only flourish when diversity is protected, and for this aim hierarchies are needed, hierarchies of responsible care, of good parenting so to speak.

The other point of contention is human nature and whether it is fundamentally "evil or good." In this book I hope to share my reflections on this second point of contestation. As the first point is sometimes presented by the same person, it indicates that these two themes are connected.

I got my first taste of this dynamic when anthropologist William Ury gave a keynote lecture with a message that was similar to mine, this was in 1999 in Belfast, Northern Ireland.[1] I was flabbergasted at the level of wrath Ury had to endure after his talk. It took me years to get used to similarly heated attacks after my talks. In the beginning, I was simply surprised. Then I was shocked. Until I began to expect this criticism. Now, it makes me want to write this book.

What should be our answer to this question: Is our species an antisocial or a prosocial animal?[2] In the eyes of the people who get angry at me, I fail to sufficiently acknowledge the evilness they see at

the core of human nature, the human "desire to dominate" that will always keep human nature in its grip,[3] the human *animus dominandi*,[4] the "inherent will to power."[5] Their view is that humans are part of the eat-or-be-eaten world of living creatures and that human nature therefore is predominantly antisocial in its essence, imbued with an aggressive territorial sense — *Homo homini lupus est* (man is wolf to man). In the Anglophone world, some refer to the work of Napoleon Chagnon,[6] others take out Steven Pinker's book *The Blank Slate*.[7] Some are angry at me because they think I am promoting the "blank state" hypothesis of human nature, others are angry because they think I reject it, and for the wrong reasons.

The common denominator of all criticism is perhaps best subsumed as *aggressionism*, the philosophical theory that sees human aggressiveness as the only real cause of war and violence, a position that has informed much evolutionary thought about human nature.[8] I am sometimes advised by my critics to leave out the hope and optimism that I draw from my interpretation of early human history, because this hope, I am warned, is dangerously illusionary. My work on dignity and humiliation is path breaking and highly intelligent, I am told, but I undermine it with my misguided view on human nature and my narrative of how human nature came to be shaped.

I have encountered these reactions many times, and I am always open to critical arguments and ready for self-criticism. Yet, something else has never seized to astonish me: Why can this topic not be calmly reflected on? Why is it such a hot button? Why is so much hotter an issue than other topics? How come that the question of human nature heats up people's blood so much? Why does it elicit so much hostility and even hatred? How come that it brings out utterly "un-academic" ax-grinding and mud-slinging? Where does this gut-level hatred come from that surrounds this question? How come that hurtful cycles of humiliation get triggered — even among otherwise coolheaded and dispassionate researchers?

Are not all hypotheses equally interesting? Personally, I am open to all — I have no fear of acknowledging evilness and am not afraid of acknowledging goodness, if this is what it is. Personally, I simply lack the gut-level reactions of others and it makes me wonder. Perhaps the reason is that I was born into a displaced family and that this displacement has created a certain detachment in me, placed me into a somewhat removed point of view, an outsider's vantage point?

Through writing this book, I hope to understand why this hostility exists. The book is planned as an inquiry into the deep narrative that underlies the topic of human nature.

I suspect that the survival of humankind on planet Earth may depend on how the story of human nature is narrated. I consider the topic of human nature, with all its intriguing aspects, to be perhaps the most important topic for humankind, and therefore deserving of at least the same curiosity and eagerness as any other question. Furious defensiveness is much too insincere an investment. And cycles of humiliation are a dangerous divestment. On a sinking ship, it does not speak of a serious effort of survival to simply get frenetic.

Perhaps we are a species that is intrinsically set to self-destruct, either intentionally or as an unintended byproduct of good intentions, and we might die out. If we do, it will be after a much shorter time on Earth than the dinosaurs and planet Earth will continue without us. If we are able to learn, then there is a chance that we might find a way into a dignified future on this planet.

What are the odds for humankind to succeed with a transition that is strong enough to usher in a dignified future?[9] Is not this an interesting question for academics and everybody else to consider in an atmosphere of dignified mutual respect?

I have so far not yet met another person who lives as globally as I do. For more than forty-five years, on all continents, I have collected experiences and insights that underpin my message with a substance that few, perhaps nobody, has been able to gather before, a substance that encompasses the entire globe. I am doing much more than "traveling the world," I am living in the global village, and, as

Evelin Lindner

a result of this global life, I am now neither a Western nor non-Western person. I see it as my responsibility, my duty, and therefore my life project, to use the privileges I have been offered in life, together with the technological opportunities of our times, to understand our world with all its aspects. I had the privilege of enjoying an affordable high-level education, I am lucky to carry a passport that opens all doors, and I am fortunate to live in times where technology makes truly global living possible. Given all these privileges, I strive to understand the core messages of the various fields of academic inquiry, and to reconstruct them from the perspective of dignity and humiliation. So far, I have done so, for instance, with war, genocide, and terrorism (2000, 2017),[10] international conflict (2006 and 2009, translated into Chinese in 2019),[11] gender and security (2010),[12] and economics (2012, translated into Brazilian-Portuguese in 2016).[13]

At present, all around the world, I observe academia being pulled ever more forcefully into a nexus of corporate and national interests. Not least the funds for research increasingly depend on this nexus. Philosopher John Dewey's insight from 1931 is more valid now than ever — there is no "immaculate conception of philosophical systems."[14] It is therefore important for me to clarify at this point that I go to extreme lengths to protect my academic freedom and independence and that all of my work, including my books, are free of any national or corporate interest funding. As founding president of a global movement for dignity,[15] I am not employed anywhere, I am not part of any particular interest context, and this includes making severe financial sacrifices. This radical commitment to academic freedom is informed by my global identity that compels me to serve the interest of all humankind rather than the interest of a selected sub-group. I define the entire human family as my family, and this in more than a theoretical way, it is my thoroughly lived reality.

Not only William Ury, also psychologist Steven Pinker is much more widely known than me, and since reactions to their work are more visible in the public realm than mine, this gives me the opportunity to use their stances to clarify mine. *Better Angels* is one of Pinker's bestsellers and the question of human nature is at the core of his book.[16]

"Better angels of our nature" is an expression that U.S. President Abraham Lincoln used in his first inaugural address he delivered in 1861.[17] Pinker describes the better angels of human nature as empathy, self-control, moral sense and reason, in short, everything that steers us away from our "inner demons" that drive us to violence, predation, dominance, revenge, sadism, or ideology.

My narrative diverges from Pinker's insofar as I speak from a slightly different vantage point in at least two ways. First, a Harvard professor cannot possibly achieve four decades of global life experience, as he has to stay put in one place much of the time, in Pinker's case at Harvard University. Second, my global life has moved me toward transdisciplinarity to an even greater extent than Pinker. I have turned my attention farther into the past than he does — to the very beginnings of modern *Homo sapiens*, far beyond the past twelve millennia, and, as I am educated both as a medical doctor and as a psychologist, I see my role not only as a researcher who establishes a diagnosis and perhaps prognosis, but also as a therapist who recommends certain treatments for the future. As a result, I narrate the human journey on planet Earth both in similar and in different ways as compared to Pinker and his critics, and while I am altogether closer to Ury's approach, my intuitions and insights cross-cut all camps.

My global experience is perhaps what sets me apart most. My global life design grew out of a traumatic family background of displacement, which inspired me to want to learn about human nature by becoming part of as many cultural contexts as practically doable, learn as many languages as possibly learnable, and develop a deep gut feeling for how people in different cultures define life and death, conflict and peace, love and hate, altogether how they live life and conceive of human nature. After more than four decades of global practice, my anchoring is neither monocultural, nor bicultural, nor multicultural, it is global. When I look at humankind's journey on planet Earth, I do so from a vantage point that could be called galactic. Phrases such as "abroad" or "overseas" or "us versus them"

Evelin Lindner

make no sense in my personal life world. *Abroad*, to me, means another planet, and *them* would mean visitors from another galaxy approaching *us*, the human family on planet Earth. Through my global life, I have learned to see the world from many angles, from the perspective of Europe, Asia, the Arab World, the Global North, and the Global South. I am embedded into the prisms of identity and frameworks of reference through which life and the world appear from all these vantage points.[18] Another factor that widens the range of my perspectives is that I am privileged to be born as a woman into a context that gave me the opportunity to become familiar with both the traditional male and female cultural socialization scripts.[19]

All this led me to use ever wider psycho-geo-historical bird's eye lenses,[20] ranging from the origins of modern humans to the predictable distant future. I attempt to include everything from archaeology to anthropology into my analysis, from psychology to sociology, from political science to history, from philosophy to physics, and to learn from the works of all scholars who attempt similarly wide overviews.[21]

In this book I hope to be able to share many of my questions, insights, and reflections, and consider many tentative suggestions. The following insight is perhaps the most important:

What if the choices that we as humankind face at the present historical juncture are so novel, so unparalleled, so overwhelming, that we cannot fathom them?

We live in times where, for the first time in human history, choices that were unthinkable before are not just hypothetical but real. From what I can see, the window of opportunity for this unprecedented situation is condensed in the image of the Blue Planet from the astronaut's perspective, and it is the one image that is most significant, and, at the same time, most overlooked. The enormous novelty of our situation and thus its potential seems to stay hidden, covered by a multitude of foreground noise. And, even where this window of opportunity receives attention, it seems too difficult to envision using it. Maybe business-as-usual is preferred simply because it is familiar, even if it is suicidal.

Here are the choices I see: After the end of the Cold War, in a world that is globally interconnected more than ever before — Steven Pinker calls it the period of "New Peace" — do we still need to race for domination over people and resources? Do we still need to avoid war through deterrence? Do we still need collective defense alliances? Do we need war on terror? Do we need weapons? Who compels us to need them? Is it human nature? Does human nature doom us to collective suicide and nothing can be done?

Why not sit together and create totally different *constitutive* rules of engagement? Why should we be satisfied with existing *regulatory* rules and hope that they can be sufficiently tweaked? Can we imagine a world without borders and without military forces, only with rule-of-law institutions that keep individual dominators from undermining the global commons? Can we imagine a world of shared global commons, of global unity in diversity, collectively protected and replenished? Can we imagine globally inclusive cooperation? Could we make such a world work? Or can we only imagine cooperation for the sake of ever more effective domination over "enemies"?

Perhaps it would not work? Perhaps only an Orwellian world is possible, where dominators compete until one has gained world domination, has enslaved the rest and is free to plunder and exploit the planet and its inhabitants at will?

Never in human history did we, the human family, have as real an opportunity as now to test that question. Never before did we have present-day's opportunities to intentionally create circumstances for peace and dignity to reign systemically.

Clearly, I am not the first to ask questions such as these, all our ancestors asked them, all our philosophers, all our poets, all our children. There is an ever increasing amount of literature that addresses related questions, among them the anthropological literature in peace studies that researches the universality and inevitability of war versus the chances for peace, that looks at the causes and

Evelin Lindner

effects of war and peace and its biological versus cultural explanations, and that inquires about tribal warfare versus that of states and its impact within and among tribes.[22] Political scientist Glenn Paige founded the Governing Council of the Center for Global Nonkilling to advocate for a global human community in which the killing of humans is absent, including any threats to kill, weapons designed to kill, justifications for using them, and conditions of society that depend on the threat or use of lethal force.[23]

In my doctoral dissertation, *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*, I applied the medical approach of diagnosis and therapy to the new field of humiliation studies.[24] By doing so, I follow Johan Galtung, principal founder of the discipline of peace and conflict studies, who uses the triangle of diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy as well. He begins with diagnosing the empirical, factual, objective, and observable, then he turns to prognosis or the making of critical future projections based on the past, and, finally, he engages in the design of therapy, a value-oriented creation of the future.

In medicine, architecture, and engineering, the criterion of being scientific is practicality, the core question is: Does it work?[25] Our present time's core question is: Would it work to sit together and create totally different constitutive rules of engagement for humankind on Earth? Can we build constitutive rules that protect, nurture, and replenish social and ecological peace, globally and locally? And, if it works, would we be able to live in such a world? Or would we have an inner urge to destroy it, an urge so overwhelming that no police force, local or global, could contain it?

This is the diagnosis of our the state of the world in 2019 in one paragraph: We have an industrial-scale use of chemical pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, food production has become a branch of global industry, we rely on fossil fuels and accelerate climate change, we transform fresh water into a depleting resource and we cause the mass extinction of other life forms.[26] The demand for natural resources of humanity is more than fifty percent larger than what the natural systems are able to regenerate,[27] "not only are we in ecological overshoot, drawing down our life-sustaining stock of natural capital and putting social cohesion at risk because of growing inequality and related social stresses, but we are no doubt in 'financial overshoot' as well."[28] The internal contradictions within the flows of capital that have precipitated recent crises contain the seeds of systemic catastrophe.[29] Already in 2013, hurricanes, quakes, tornadoes have displaced 22 million people, three times more than wars, and this due to climate change and an explosive urbanization.[30] In 2019, the UN refugee agency UNHCR reports that displacement has doubled in twenty years, that global forced displacement tops 70 million, and that the number of refugees, asylum-seekers, and internally displaced people worldwide exceeds the aftermath of the Second World War, when the number of refugees was estimated at 55 million.[31] As peace researcher Johan Galtung warns, direct violence is not the only problem, structural violence is "killing even more."[32]

What is the prognosis? Can we technologize our way out of our ecological crises? Will we be able to radically change our behavior? Will we be able to fight less, consume less? Can we dignify our way out of our social crises?

We are doomed, this is one possible prognosis. Stephen Emmott, professor of computational science at the University of Oxford, offers the following view, "The problem is us ... We urgently need to do — and I mean actually do — something radical to avert a global catastrophe. But I don't think we will. I think we're fucked."[33] The founding president of the Schumacher Center, Robert Swann, identifies an unjust and unsustainable economic system as the root cause of war and therefore as the first candidate in need of radical change. "Our Earth is in crisis; our communities are in crisis. At the heart of these twin issues is an economic system that treats land, air, water, and minerals — our common inheritance — as commodities to be bought and sold on the market. An economic system distributes the income from that inheritance to a relatively few 'owners,' whose wealth increases disproportionately as a result, leading to social disruption."[34]

<div align="center">Evelin Lindner</div>

A middle position is taken by Danny Dorling, professor of geography at the University of Sheffield. For Dorling, people like Emmott are "the embodiment of angry pessimism." Dorling calls for *practical possibilism*, in resonance with Hans Rosling, Swedish professor of international health and development.[35] Rosling's life mission was to highlight optimism, yet, even he listed five risks that we "should worry about," all of which have either arrived by now or are looming: global pandemic, financial collapse, a new world war, climate change, and extreme poverty.[36]

The most optimistic prognosis is that of "rational optimists" such as science writer Matt Ridley, who hopes that "greed will prevail."[37] Ridley stands for the view that business-as-usual will be a successful path into a dignified future. Yet, also Ridley has a caveat, namely, the human propensity for hostility. "Generally speaking the more cooperative a species is within groups, the more hostility there is between groups."[38] Ridley admits that the human propensity for hostility constitutes a far greater danger than climate change, the exhaustion of raw materials, or any other disaster scenario.[39]

In conclusion, when we look at the prognosis of even the most radical optimist as Matt Ridley, we acknowledge that his optimism depends on global cooperation — in short, there is no space for any form of optimism in absence of global cooperation.

This is precisely the conclusion I have come to after forty-five years of global experience. In this situation, the most important question is this:

Can global cooperation succeed? What stands in the way? What is the most significant obstacle to cooperation?

These are the very questions I asked myself after the first twenty years of my global living project, when I felt I had learned enough about the world to address them. My intuitive answer was: Cycles of humiliation are the most significant obstacle to cooperation. Through my work as a clinical psychologist I had learned that humiliation is the strongest force that creates rifts between people and breaks down relationships, and that this becomes even more significant wherever human rights ideals of equality in dignity have become salient. I also thought of the history lessons at school about the Versailles Treaties after the First World War, how they were intended to humiliate Germany, teach it humility and make it harmless, and how this backfired, ultimately resulting in more war.

My prognosis, in a nutshell, is that we, the global community, have passed too many tipping points already by now to be able to "save the world." However, we can at least attempt to do our best in addressing our global problems optimally. Yet, again, we can only succeed with that task if we engage in global cooperation. In that situation, cycles of humiliation become the limiting factor. This is why humiliation needs to be studied and taken into account in radically new ways. A dangerous expectation gap opens when people get into ever closer connections through globalization and learn about their inequality, while they at the same time learn about the human rights message that all humans are members of a united family who are equal in dignity. When respect is expected, while disrespect is experienced, a humiliating dignity gap opens, and what I call dignity humiliation arises as an extraordinarily strong force.[40] When environmental crises come on top, they amplify this dignity gap.

As for therapy, so far, the world has too few "Mandelas" who could lead a global movement for constructive dialogue for partnership in the face of dignity gaps rather than going down the familiar path of violence for domination. The therapy must entail attention to the salience of the dynamics of humiliation, it must prevent and heal such cycles, so that dignified and dignifying ways of global cooperation can arise.

Let us round up this preface with wise words from renowned physicist Michio Kaku:

The generation now alive is perhaps the most important generation of humans ever to walk the Earth. Unlike previous generations, we hold in our hands the future destiny of our species, whether we soar into fulfilling our promise as a type I civilization [meaning a civilization that succeeds in

Evelin Lindner

building a socially and ecologically sustainable world] or fall into the abyss of chaos, pollution, and war. Decisions made by us will reverberate throughout this century. How we resolve global wars, proliferating nuclear weapons, and sectarian and ethnic strife will either lay or destroy the foundations of a type I civilization. Perhaps the purpose and meaning of the current generation are to make sure that the transition to a type I civilization is a smooth one. The choice is ours. This is the legacy of the generation now alive. This is our destiny.[41]

Are we doomed? Or not? Perhaps it is our very view of human nature that keeps us from truly trying? What if our doubts about human nature operate as a self-fulfilling prophecy that stands between us and a decent future? What if we could embark on an unprecedented new experiment and it had a chance to work? What if it had a chance to work, but only if we were to invest all our energy into it?

"Pessimism is a luxury one can afford only in good times, in difficult times it easily represents a self-inflicted, self-fulfilling death sentence," this was the conclusion I drew in 2004 after having spent three days listening to Joseph, an Auschwitz survivor. Had he nurtured pessimism, he would not have survived. He was alive and well, able to speak with me, only because he had invested all he had, all his soul and all his mind, into survival, even though he had no hope.

Should we, humankind, give all we have to a new vision of human nature and human future?

Evelin Lindner

INTRODUCTION

There are no passengers on spaceship earth. We are all crew.
— Marshall McLuhan

Let me begin with a short true story that highlights the deadly dilemma in which the question of human nature may be caught. Imagine you live in Norway in the year 1944. It is the time of the Second World War. Norway is occupied by Nazi Germany. A Norwegian women, let us call her Solveig, has fallen in love with a German soldier. She is in bliss. Her parents are admirers of German culture, of Schiller, Goethe, and Beethoven. Martin, the German soldier stationed in their village, is a very polite, highly educated and decent young man. Why should Solveig not fall in love with him?

Norway, 1945. The Second World War is over. Norway is liberated from Nazi occupation. Solveig is unprepared for what happens to her now. She is being publicly humiliated. Her hair is shaven off her head to shame her. She is paraded through the streets with her shaved head. She has lost her honor.

Why has she lost her honor? Is not the ability to love a wonderful thing? No, not always, as it seems. Solveig has crossed an unforgivable line: The love for your country must always trump any temptation of loving your enemy — a neighbor you can love, but if you love your enemy, as much as the Bible may recommend it — you are worse than the enemy: you are an unpatriotic traitor. This was the world that came down on Solveig.

Solveig was pregnant. She fled to Germany, to Martin's family. She waited for him to come home. He never came. In the last days of the war, he was killed. Solveig raised her son with the help of her in-laws in Germany, unhappy, always torn, throughout all her entire life, wanting to return to her homeland Norway. Yet, as punishment for being a traitor, women like her had their Norwegian citizenship removed and for many decades after the war were not allowed back home. *The Friendly Enemy: Wehrmacht Soldiers in Occupied Europe*, is the telling title of a book written about the "friendly enemy" dilemma that so cruelly destroyed Solveig's life.[1]

Is not this an unbelievable story? Simply for having fallen in love with a decent young man, Solveig went from good to evil, from being a well-liked member in her friends' circle to being an evil outcast. She was a deeply loving woman with a generous heart, a thoroughly good-natured human being, liked by her peers. Suddenly, her love was her crime, having loved made her evil.

This little vignette is meant to wet the reader's appetite to delve into the question of human nature. What is evil? What is good? Is Solveig good or evil? For Solveig, this question became one of life or death. At some point, she was ready to commit suicide, not just because the others had ostracized her. There was a deeper reason — she feared that she was perhaps evil after all, perhaps she had overlooked demons in her heart that would now endanger her son. Perhaps she was a bad person after all, perhaps her inner nature was rotten? Would she be able to give a life of decency to her son?

For humankind, the question of our human nature is at the core of our chances for a decent survival on planet Earth.

In the preface for this book, the following questions were asked: How is it possible that the topic of human nature heats up people's blood so much? Why does this theme bring out so much ax-grinding and mud-slinging? How is it possible that it may even trigger vicious cycles of humiliation among otherwise dispassionate researchers?

Perhaps the question of human nature underpins our identity as humans too deeply? Perhaps, when it is time to step down from arrogated superiority, when it is time to learn humility, our hubris makes us mistake the need for humility as humiliation? Perhaps the dynamic of humiliation represents one of the major traps in which our concept of human nature is caught? Perhaps we modern humans cannot let go

of overestimating our own power, significance, and impact because it would be too humiliating to admit that we are not in control of our environment? It would perhaps be too humiliating to concede that the opposite is true, that we must be in dialogue with nature, even at its service, unless we want to end up being at its mercy? How come we are in awe at our self-determined inventive genius, while much of what we do is the result of external conditions and our adaptations to them, and only a few of our adaptations are intelligent, while others might even be catastrophic, at least in the long run?

The book is envisioned to have three parts and has had many working titles.[2] The first part shall address the distant past, the second the recent past, and the third the future. Peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos admonishes, "Academic books tend to end their chapters too conventionally." [3] To honor his request, each chapter of this book will end with a provocative query, a why question for in-depth reflection and research, so as to inspire dialogue that is both dignified and dignifying — to inspire *dignilogue*, as Gomes de Matos calls it.

The Modern Human Superiority Complex

It took the Catholic Church three hundred years to regret their conduct toward Galileo Galilei. His heliocentric view was too humiliating a concept for the Church to consider and he was condemned for heresy by the Inquisition. Could it be that we still suffer from a human superiority complex today, of an inflated anthropocentric sense of worth? Maybe not just the Church, we collectively have difficulties to come down from a misplaced sense of supremacy? We resist what we should embrace, we mistake due humbling for undue humiliation, we fail to come down to due humility? We go too far in our resistance against undue humiliation when we also resist due humility? Worse, perhaps we have even damaged the very concept of humility when we defined humiliation and humiliated humility as violations, perhaps we have neglected to nurture dignified and dignifying humility? Our "sense of exceptionalism has made us arrogant, imperiously dismissing any dependence on our natural setting."[4]

Our significance as humans has been under fire in many arenas lately. Under pressure, we have taken little doses of humility here and there, but we may have to take larger doses and that fast. Once it was too humiliating to let go of the proud Ptolemaic geocentric view that the Earth is at the center of the universe and that all heavenly bodies revolve around us, and it took three hundred years to accept the fact. Physicist Werner Heisenberg predicted that the philosophical consequences of quantum physics will eventually be more significant for humanity than its technical possibilities.[5] Recent news may be even more difficult to stomach: not only are we humans not at the center of the solar system, not only is our solar system not at the center of our galaxy, not only is our galaxy not at the center of our universe, present-day physicists inform us of even more humiliating news: the universe we know is perhaps a random fluctuation? In 2012, the Higgs boson was discovered, and its mass strengthens the so-called multiverse theory.[6] If that is true, it means that Einstein's dream of "naturalness," the dream of the laws of nature being sublimely beautiful, inevitable, and self-contained might have to go? Humankind faces the harsh prospect that the laws of nature in our present world may just be an arbitrary, messy outcome of random fluctuations in the fabric of space and time.[7] The multiverse theory is disheartening particularly for physicists, as it is impossible to enter into parallel universes to study the real fundamentals of our natural laws. The multiverse theory closes doors for research. The *raison-d'être* of entire physics departments gets threatened.

Human hubris manifests itself in many places, and the call for humility gets louder. The article "Neandertal Demise: An Archaeological Analysis of the Modern Human Superiority Complex," carries this call even in its title.[8]

Where does our hubris come from? Social psychologists offer the so-called correspondent inference theory, which indicates that our mind has a tendency to believe that other people do what they do

Evelin Lindner

because it is "in their nature" and overlook that they might have been forced by external circumstances to act against their will and inclinations, in other words, that sometimes, we do what we do *in spite* of our inner wishes, not *because* of them.

Perhaps we humans suffer from the correspondence bias with respect to human nature? Perhaps our superiority complex is a product of this bias? What if the past five percent of *Homo sapiens*' history — the past twelve millennia or so — have unraveled as they did not *because* of human nature, but *in spite* of it? Perhaps we became dominators during those past five percent of human history as a result of tragic dilemmas that were imposed on us and forced us into destructive adaptations? More even, what if these destructive adaptations also taught us this very bias? Perhaps this bias would be absent or weaker without our dominator conditioning, perhaps it is the result of learning in a context of tragic adaptations?

Around the time of the Neolithic revolution an era of emergencies unfolded, of formerly unknown confrontations — *circumscription* kicked in[9] — and human nature came under pressure to the point that a vicious cycle was set in motion. It began with circumscription bringing people increasingly into confrontations, this then brought the correspondence bias to the fore, which, in turn, increased confrontations further, so that appreciation for partnership and dialogue was crowded out by the dominators' pride in their ability to compete for supremacy. By now, this hinders us to acknowledge that all this happened in spite of human nature and not because of it. Dominator pride tainted our view on human significance, we became proud of our ability to stand tall against adversity, including adversity we imagine originates from the evilness of human nature. Fast forward to present times, our hubris craves the concept of evilness, it hinders us to acknowledge that all this happened in spite of human nature and not because of it, our hubris craves that we imagine evil so we have an enemy worth fighting. Just like our belief in the evilness of human nature, also our hubris is, however, not innate, it is learned, and this represents good news: given appropriate circumstances, we can unlearn both hubris and dependence on evilness.

Male identity became predicated on the warrior ethos in this context and we learned to glorify arms. As a result, we resist disarmament now, we fear that without weapons in our hands we would become "humiliatingly female." Furthermore, too many people's livelihoods depend on the arms industry directly or indirectly.

Or, even more complex, perhaps our mental architecture would collapse without domination, perhaps the news that domination is nonadaptive in an interconnected world can no longer reach us? What if too many people are co-opted and blinded through their dependence on a double-standard corporate-political nexus? We still live in times where the corporate-political elites presently in power maintain domination, either by advocating for it openly, or they use human rights and partnership rhetoric as a cover. Wherever human rights ideals are held dear, the argument of the evilness of human nature is what is left for dominators to justify continued domination. Phrases such "humans are naturally violent" or "humans are naturally greedy" come from the mouths of free-marketers, "to justify some static, reductionist view of 'human nature' that, luckily for them, seems to preempt the need for activity — for why would one invest social and political energy or organization into curing economic and social problems if they are the result of a convenient 'human nature'?"[10]

Or, as mentioned before, perhaps the choices that humankind faces at the present historical juncture are simply too novel and therefore too scary to fathom? Maybe we would be able to leave behind old dominator pride if we were more aware of the feasibility of alternatives? Humankind faces choices that were unthinkable before and are not just hypothetical but real now. As physicist Michio Kaku pointed out, the presently living generations carry more responsibility than any other generation ever alive on planet Earth.[11]

Here is the choice: The Cold War is over, the world is globally interconnected as never before, we have knowledge and tools as never before. Do we still need to limit our choices to the motto *If you*

Evelin Lindner

want peace, prepare for war[12]? Do we need to continue worshipping the present-day extension of *If you want wealth, exploit the rest*? Indeed, we live in times where we, the human family, for the first time in human history, could choose to sit down together and reframe everything. We have the knowledge and the tools.

Perhaps the novelty of this situation is too big a challenge for us to fathom? Perhaps we overlook its significance because it is so immense? Perhaps we duck the task because the opportunity to successfully embark on it is too fantastic?
At this cross-road, perhaps our accustomed belief in the evilness of human nature is what stands in the way most? Maybe our conviction that distrust is obligatory and trust impossible is our main problem? And, as a result, we prefer business-as-usual because it is familiar, even if it were suicidal? We simply fear leaving behind the familiar? And we allow the few who profit from business-as-usual to increase and exploit this fear?

Many may get angry at this point and call out: You are dangerously misled if you deny human evilness and believe in human goodness! We are in dire need of the military, because lust to dominate drives humans and any weakness will be exploited! War, violence, killing, terror, torture, all this will always be with us and we'd better be prepared! The race for global resources follows the same logic and cannot be regarded as a charity enterprise, because others will get to the world's resources if not we get to them first! Ours is a world where the motto *If you want peace, prepare for war* is the only choice we have! This motto rightfully also defines the love of Solveig as evil!

I readily admit, if this were true, I would be foolish. In a situation, where real peace, even if only short-lived, is only possible through military strength, it would be dangerously naïve to promote peace through military weakness. Indeed, followers of this position can point at much evidence. I am writing this paragraph in Norway, at the mouth of the Oslo fjord, where Adolf Hitler's battle ship Blücher steamed up during the night of April 8, 1940, completely unexpectedly. The King of Norway had only a few hours to flee, and Norway was occupied from then on for the rest of the duration of World War II. Norwegian novelist Sigrid Undset wrote, "When Norway was ripped apart by the Nazis in 1940, peace-loving Norwegian citizens were mentally and militarily unprepared for the relentless assault which devastated their country and their souls."[13] Likewise, at present, the global scramble for resources ranges "from the Arctic to war zones to deep ocean floors, from a Russian submarine planting the country's flag under the North Pole to the large-scale buying up of African farmland by Saudi Arabia and other food-scarce nations."[14]

My view is that the correspondence bias hinders us to see what many peace organizations around the world see, namely, that humans can do better than only deter war and out-dominate each other. We can follow Mahatma Gandhi's words of *There is no path to peace. Peace is the path*. I stand for peace-through-peace advocacy rather than peace-through-arms advocacy. Peace-through-peace advocates claim that we can do more than achieving the absence of war or negative peace, that we can attain positive peace. Pioneer educator Betty Reardon introduced comprehensive peace education in 1988,[15] and the *culture of peace* program was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on October 6, 1999.[16] This is the context in which Solveig's love is not evil.

For peace-through-peace promoters, peace-through-arms defenders are guilty of instigating war where peace would be possible. Nobel Peace Laureate Mairead Maguire said in a keynote address at the Sarajevo Peace Event on June 6, 2014, "We must not be satisfied with improvements and reforms, but rather offer an alternative to militarism, which is an aberration and a system of dysfunction, going completely against the true spirit of men and women, which is to love and be loved and solve our problems through co-operation, dialogue, nonviolence, and conflict resolution."[17]

Evelin Lindner

Social scientist and social activist Riane Eisler has developed a cultural transformation theory in which she describes how otherwise widely divergent societies all around the globe applied what she calls the *dominator* model of society rather than the *partnership* model.[18] I call the first model also *Homo dominator* scenario, and the second the *Homo amans* scenario. *Homo amans* is the loving human being, the one who manifests human nature's essence as love, *ens amans*.[19]

If we call the peace-through-war side the dominator camp, then its members accuse the peace-through-partnership camp of a naïve lack of preparedness, while the partnership camp fears that too enthusiastic preparedness for domination will create what it wants to deter.

Who is right? The dominator camp or the partnership camp? Both sides are exasperated with the other. True to its spirit, the dominator side adds ridicule and humiliates the other side, thus alienating those they want to convert, yet, also defenders of the goodness of human nature often undermine their own message by disseminating it in combative and humiliating ways. Both sides feel that the other is complicit in increasing the odds of horrid things to happen — violence, torture, terrorism, genocide, and war.

Human nature — or, more precisely, its conceptualization — is at the core of this confrontation. The dominator camp would have a point if the hypothesis were correct that human nature drives domination intrinsically no matter what, no matter which external circumstances and pressures it is exposed to. The partnership camp has a point if the extrinsic hypothesis is valid and humans are capable of refraining from domination if circumstances allow for it.

The question remains: If circumstances were open for a world free of systemic pressure toward violence and war, would we humans be capable of cooperating with each other? Or would we always, under all circumstances, compete for domination? Would we always reserve cooperation only to in-groups in the service of competition with out-groups? Can we allow ourselves to be optimistic about human future? Or do we have to settle for pessimism? Do we have to call it optimism when we make the best of a bad situation?

These are the single most important questions to ask, in my view, and the answers to these questions should guide our quest for how we define optimism or pessimism.

These questions are more important than whether statistics of violence have increased or decreased (as is the topic of Steven Pinker's book mentioned above), even though such statistics undoubtedly are important. Statistics of violence fail to differentiate between these hypotheses, as violence can be seen to occur because of human nature or in spite of it, and the same statistics can be interpreted in ways that underpin all hypotheses.

Imagine a world without borders, a world of rule-of-law institutions that keep individual dominators from undermining the global commons, a world where dignity reigns systemically.[20] Never before did the human species have present-day's opportunities to intentionally create such circumstances. Would that work? Or not? Perhaps only an Orwellian world is possible, a world where dominators compete until one of them has gained world domination and is free to loot the resources of this planet, its social and ecological resources?

When we look at the past five percent of human history, then the Orwellian outcome appears to be most probable. Yet, what if the first 95 percent of human history, by far the longest period in which our souls and minds were formed, support the Gandhian path? As mentioned before, perhaps the past five percent of our history unfolded as they did in spite of human nature and not because of it?

Do we dare to test this question? Perhaps the risk is too high and we want to give up halfway rather than aim to do our best? Perhaps we want to stop at negative peace and are even proud of it, denying

Evelin Lindner

that we lack the courage to try positive peace? Perhaps we grew so proud of domination that we accept structural violence and even praise ourselves for it as it looks so much more peaceful than open violence at first glance? Indeed, we can safely concede together with Steven Pinker that "expansion of interaction — through means of communication and transportation — with rights and obligations, has created vast zones with less direct violence."[21] Yet, as peace researcher Johan Galtung warns, without equity, inequality and structural violence are "killing even more," only more silently.[22]

What should we do?

As mentioned above, in my work, I apply the medical approach of diagnosis, prognosis and therapy.[23] In search of a diagnosis, let us listen to Stephen Emmott, professor of computational science at the University of Oxford. "The problem is us … We urgently need to do — and I mean actually do — something radical to avert a global catastrophe. But I don't think we will. I think we're fucked."[24]

Are we fucked? What if only our view of human nature stands in the way? Perhaps, as our beliefs about human nature have a self-fulfilling effect, we create what we believe?

Present-day politics in the United States of America represent a laboratory for such reflections. Gun rights activists fear oppression and emasculation and associate the Gun Control Act of 1968 with the Nazi gun control law.[25] Conservative Bill O'Reilly explains, "No matter what society does, there will always be mass murder."[26] If he is right, then it is only consequent to deadlock any gun control debate and assert, "There are no 'good guns.' There are no 'bad guns.' Any gun in the hands of a bad man is a bad thing. Any gun in the hands of a decent person is no threat to anybody — except bad people."[27]

Yet, maybe this view of human nature is a self-fulfilling prophecy? More even, perhaps some even wish for this prophecy to fulfill itself? When the ethos of the lone hero has become a cherished ethos, as it has in the United States of America, it would lose its anchorings if the threat lessened. Heroes need fear to remain heroes, and self-fulfilling prophecies that maintain fear are welcome.

Is it true that society at large cannot influence gun-related mortality rates? Firearm-related mortality rates for high-income World Health Organization Member States show that mortality rates in the United States are double as high as in the next country on the list.[28] Perhaps these statistics indicate that it is indeed possible for society to influence the rate of mass killings? *Bowling for Columbine* is a 2002 American documentary film by Michael Moore where he explores this question.[29]

We can all agree that there will always be would-be dominators around who see commons as assets waiting to be plundered. Researchers tell us that we can expect about half of the population to be made up of "saints" and "loyalists," and about a third by "ruthless competitors."[30] Many of us will also agree that in a globally interconnected world, protecting the planet as humankind's commons is a question of dignified survival for humanity. All players need to cooperate in a joint effort to protect planet Earth as a shared commons. Whoever endangers the commons as a free-rider needs to be reined in by the majority.
The question is thus: Can would-be dominators be hindered by society at large to take power and sacrifice human survival?

We know that indigenous societies have succeeded in reining in dominators in the past.[31] Economist Elinor Ostrom proved through her research that this is possible even for larger groups — she received the Nobel Prize for Economics 2009 for this work.[32] If early foragers knew how to rein in greedy free-riders without resorting to violence, then, indeed, such knowledge can be restored.[33] Research also shows that different framings can change the ratio, while a "Wall Street" framing increases the share of dominators, a communal framing encourages the loyalists.[34]

Does the field of psychology have relevant answers? Unfortunately, psychology as a discipline has a problem. Since its inception, it attempted to appear as a quantitative endeavor, modelled on physics, while qualitative psychologists were marginalized,[35] even though the qualitative methods in

psychology "meet the demands of the methodology of the natural sciences more truly than do the methods of mainstream quantitative methodology."[36] Early empiricists such as John Locke (1632–1704) and David Hume (1711–1776) responded to Isaac Newton's mechanical physics for the "outer" extended world, with what Hume thought of as a corresponding physics of the mind. Hume wrote a *Treatise of Human Nature*.[37] Locke differentiated *primary* and *secondary* qualities, whereby primary qualities comprised everything that is independent of observers (such as extension, number, and solidity), or the "objective reality" that natural scientists such as Galileo and Newton demonstrated to be nothing but matter in motion. Locke's secondary qualities pointed at the subjective mind, they were subjective effects in observers in the form of experienced colors, tastes, and smells.

With psychologists such as Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow, humanistic psychology emerged in the middle of the twentieth century, in dialogue with philosophies of existentialism and phenomenology.[38] Humanistic psychology responded with optimism to Sigmund Freud's more pessimistic psychoanalytic theory and B. F. Skinner's behaviorism, it responded with emphasizing an inherent human yearning for self-actualization and creativity.

When we want to understand this humanistic view on human nature, we can look back to Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374), an Italian scholar and poet whose rediscovery of Cicero's letters is often credited with initiating the fourteenth-century Italian Renaissance and the founding of Renaissance humanism. Historian Jacob Burckhardt (1818–1897) shaped the view of the Renaissance as the period in Italy between the fourteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries when the modern spirit of individuality emerged after having been stifled in the Middle Ages, while present-day historians have a more nuanced view and do not see it as a single, time-bound culture.[39] The intellectual basis of the Renaissance in Europe was a version of humanism that derived from classical Greek philosophers such as Protagoras and his view that "man" is the measure of all things.

After forty-five years of global experience, I can attest to the "inherent human yearning for self-actualization and creativity" with its bright sides and its dark sides. My personal definition of humanism is the yearning for self-actualization and creativity in dignified humility rather than as expression of arrogant hubris. Many of my religious friends reject the notion of humanism as arrogant atheism, as they see it as human hubris of wanting to be godlike. Indeed, some designs of modernity hold on to the term humanism as self-denomination while they include rather hubristic assessments of humanity's ability to critique existing conditions and to find better forms of existence. Self-described anti-humanists Jean-François Lyotard and Michel Foucault saw in humanism the dark side of the Enlightenment, namely, concepts of human nature that serve as pretext to humiliate those considered as less than human.[40]

Allow me to end this section with sketching three scenarios. The first two scenarios illustrate assumptions about human nature that discourage people to work toward a more just and sustainable global order. The first scenario comes from medieval Christianity, where the misery and worthlessness of *Homo viator*, the "wayfarer," was stressed, whose duty it was to accept with obedient humility that life on Earth is per definition nothing but suffering. "Ruling elites found it convenient for their underlings to believe in such a worldview because it made it easier to bond them into ranked collectives. At best, rewards could be expected in the afterlife."[41] A German saying goes as follows, "Sagt der König zum Bischof: Halt Du sie dumm, ich halte sie arm", translated, "Says the king to the bishop: You keep them dumb, I keep them poor." Discourse analyst Michael Karlberg confirms, "If humans are presumed to be living out transitory lives en route to a destination of eternal salvation or damnation, and if this earthly existence is nothing more than a way of separating the saved from the damned, and if the entire process is about to reach an apocalyptic conclusion — then how does the construction of a more just and sustainable global civilization become imaginable or desirable?"[42] In other words, by promising happiness after death as a reward for obedience here and now, power elites can keep people from working for change before death.

Evelin Lindner

The second scenario uses a very similar strategy when it promises triumphant rescue at the hands of a few elites in some distant future. If our survival as a species "is little more than a set of social and ecological engineering problems that will be solved by an elite scientific class," Karlberg warns, then "what would motivate the struggle and sacrifice required to bring it about?"[43]

The first two scenarios represent what international relations specialist Stephen Purdey calls "a deep hole" — "our profligate behavior as a species is deplorable and will be justly rebuked."[44] We live in times of emergency, Purdey observes, but "Politicians don't get it. Captains of industry don't get it. Civil society is restive but so far hasn't caused the transformative change we know is necessary".[45] Purdey is unconvinced of the promises of optimists who "point to myriad 'green shoots' of change that may one day reach a critical mass, propelling us onto the path of planetary sustainability."[46] Purdey warns, "The business-as-usual trajectory is inexorable, quickly leading to multiple converging socio-ecological crises."[47] Also religion cannot prevent the disintegration of modern industrial society, Purdey fears "violence and ugliness (as happened on Easter Island) that often accompanies societal collapse".[48] Purdey sees the only role of religion in helping us "find a way to understand, to make sense of, what we have done and are doing so we can face a turbulent future with courage and grace".[49]

Here is the third scenario, the scenario into which my life work is embedded. In a situation where "the quest for meaning is an underdeveloped aspect of the modern human experience," Purdey suggests, "a new effort to 'make sense' of a bad situation may very well hold useful surprises for us, revelations or even an epiphany, a shared awakening to the meaning of the life-and-death struggle in which we are now engaged."[50]

I follow Purdey's call for an epiphany, and I see that humanism may make a useful comeback. Historian Jörn Rüsen recommends humanism in the sense of Kant's categorical imperative, according to which humans are not means for the purposes of others but endowed for their own purposes and dignity.[51] He considers it possible to envision a kind of humanism that is able to inform a sustainable future for humanity, one that would incorporate cultural differences in the process of globalization bound by certain conditions. It would supplement the image of humanity with the potential for inhumanity that has come to the fore in the twentieth century; it would be open-minded about the assertion that human and civil rights are universally valid and rather take into account their historicity and their nature as a developmental process; it would overcome the ethnocentric elements in humanistic anthropology by critically recognizing the diversity of traditions and cultural diversity; it would humanize reason in intercultural discourse; and, last, it would reintegrate nature into the self-conception of humans as cultural beings.[52] It would also find ways to counter "derivations" such as concepts of transhumanism and posthumanism that go too far when they see humans as an unfinished product of biological evolution in need of optimization through genetic engineering or mind- and intelligence-enhancing drugs and diets, or as obsolete and outdated altogether, to be superseded by artificial intelligences and robots as new driving forces in evolutionary history.[53]

I resonate with legal and political scientist Peter Cornelius Mayer-Tasch that there is a fundamental difference between scientific developments and findings and human submission to them, I follow his call for the preservation of humanistic self-determination and responsibility.[54] The acceptance of the unpredictability of human life, the mortality, frailty and fallibility of humans, is the precondition for a self-determined development of human dignity in the humanistic sense. It is only through the interplay of the experiences of the dark sides of life as well as its bright sides that moral affirmation and negation as well as compassion and responsibility can emerge. According to Mayer-Tasch, the posthumanist program is an aberration for humanists who are grounded in moderation, since the realization of meaning is reserved for the human body, soul, and spirit, the one to design and program machines. For Mayer-Tasch, we humans can walk upright in the face of an ever more uncertain future only if we build on humanistic valuations and attitudes.[55]

Michael Karlberg calls for a great transition that "entails, in part, a semiotic transition in underlying

assumptions about human nature and the codes that inform them."[56] I have coined the term *dignism* (dignity + ism) to dignify our concept of human nature and to show a meaningful vision for the future that is worth working for — independent of whether humankind is still in hospital or already in hospice.[57] This is how I describe dignism:

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

The Author's Biography and Methodology[58]

Peace: It does not mean to be in a place where there is no noise, trouble or hard work. It means to be in the midst of those things and still be calm in your heart.
— Unknown source

For the past decades, I have dedicated my life to learning about human nature. To that end, I have made the world my university and my life my method. My global life is an experiment in the service of testing human nature. My aim is to acquire a deep gut feeling for what we humans are capable of in war and love, what our outer limits are when we engage in con- and de-struction, how far we can go in evil and good, in malign and benign. Why do we do what we do? Because we want it, or because we are forced to? If we are forced, what forces us? For the past forty-five years, all around the world, I have explored whether mutual trust is possible, and, if yes, under which circumstances.

The symbolic dimension of power, as Pierre Bourdieu called it, is the capacity of meaning-creating systems to make domination seem normal, and this is done by way of distortion, misrepresentation, and totalizing narratives.[59] "The hidden order of such politics lies not just in its absences, but its appeal to common sense and its claim to being objective and apolitical. Culture in this sense becomes the site of the most powerful and persuasive forms of pedagogy precisely because it often denies its pedagogical function," affirms also scholar and cultural critic Henry Giroux.[60]

My life-long aim has been to see through this denial and understand its dynamics, not just in one or two or three world regions, but worldwide. I was born in 1954, into a family that is deeply scarred by the two World Wars, particularly World War II. The trauma that engulfs my family is a never-ending "normality" for them. In hindsight, I believe that this suffering gave my life its direction. "Never again" became central to my life, and "how can we build a sustainable bio- and sociosphere for global human family in the future." Already as a schoolgirl, I was interested in all of the world's cultural expressions and languages, and I eventually learned to familiarize myself (to various degrees) with many languages, among them key languages of the world. My aim was to become part of as many and as diverse cultural contexts as possible, not just "visit" or "study" "them." I wanted to develop a gut feeling for how people in different cultural realms define life and death, conflict and peace, love and hate, and how they look at "others."

When I finished school, I studied psychology first and then medicine, but mainly used both studies for my own anthropological explorations. It took me ten years and during those years, I studied and worked in New Zealand, China, Thailand, Malaysia, Israel, West Africa, USA, Germany, and Norway, as a student of psychology and medicine. I graduated in psychology in 1978, and in medicine in 1984,

both from Hamburg University in Germany. In 1994, I gained my doctorate in medicine from Hamburg University, and my doctorate in psychology from Oslo University, Norway, in 2001.[61]

From 1984–1987, I worked as a clinical psychologist and psychological counselor at the American University in Cairo, and from 1987–1991 I had my own private practice in Cairo. I offered clinical psychology and counseling in English, French, German, Norwegian, and, after some years, also in Egyptian-Arabic. My clients came from the most diverse cultural backgrounds, many from the expatriate community in Cairo, such as Americans, Europeans, Scandinavians, Palestinians, and citizens of other African countries, as well as those from the local community, both Western-oriented and traditionally-oriented Egyptians. Part of my work was "culture-counseling," meaning that foreigners working in Egypt asked me for support in understanding Egyptian and Arab culture and Islam. My doctoral thesis in psychological medicine in 1994 systematized this quest and addressed the topic of quality of life in a comparative manner by examining how the notion of a "good life" is being defined in Egypt and in Germany.

In 1991, I found myself again in Europe. Perplexed by what I felt was a lacking sense of what I called "global responsibility," I founded the NGO Better Global Understanding in Hamburg, Germany, in 1993, and organized a festival with about 20,000 participants under the motto of global responsibility.[62] In 1994, I stood as candidate for the European Parliament, again motivated by the wish to promote global understanding.

My present work on dignity and humiliation grew directly out of my global quest. By now, I look back on forty-five years of learning how to be a global citizen — starting when I was twenty — and these were no easy years. Particularly hurtful were my vain attempts to integrate having a family into my global life mission, they got ever more exhausting as I approached the age of forty.[63] Altogether, renouncing old yearnings and beliefs, building a global identity, making the planet my home, not just theoretically but in practice, was hard work.[64] It was (and still is) like building a ship while at sea — philosopher Otto Neurath used the ship metaphor aptly in his work.[65]

In 1994, I met Betty Reardon, the "mother of peace education," and in 2001, I also met Morton Deutsch, the "father" of the field of conflict resolution. I was deeply touched by the encouragement that they extended to me, together with Andrea Bartoli and Peter Coleman, also based at Columbia University in New York City. They encouraged me to found an institute (or center or global network) for humiliation studies and affiliate it, among others, with Columbia University's Conflict Resolution Network.[66]

In this way, I became the founding president of a worldwide dignity movement, a global transdisciplinary fellowship of concerned academics, practitioners, activists, artists, and others, who collaborate in a spirit of mutual support to understand the complex dynamics of dignity and humiliation.[67] Initially, we developed a long list of tentative names for our initiative (from institute to center or global network to fellowship or movement), among our suggestions was "Global Network of Humiliation Studies," "International Humiliation Studies," or "Humiliation Watch." We finally homed in on *Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies* (HumanDHS).[68]

We are currently around 1,000 personally invited members from all continents, and our website is being accessed by between 20,000 and 40,000 people from more than 180 countries each year since its inception in 2003. In 2011, we launched our World Dignity University initiative[69] and our publishing house Dignity Press that has published many books since 2012.[70] We wish to stimulate systemic change — globally and locally — to open space for mutual respect and esteem to take root and grow, thus ending humiliating practices and breaking cycles of humiliation throughout the world. Our aim is to invite all academics and practitioners to contribute to our HumanDHS fellowship who are interested in furthering dignity in the world, to bring academia and practice together in innovative ways, helping to nurture a world of equal dignity by preventing and avoiding cycles of humiliation.

Evelin Lindner

We organize two conferences per year, we gather for one conference at a different global location each year, which has led us to Europe (Paris, Berlin, Oslo, Dubrovnik), Costa Rica, China, Hawai'i, Turkey, Egypt, New Zealand, South Africa, Rwanda, Chiang Mai in Northern Thailand, Indore in Central India, and the Amazon in Brasil. Then we come together a second time each December for our Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University in New York City, with Morton Deutsch as our honorary convener. We have held more than 30 conferences all around the world since 2003.[71]

Since we wish our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies fellowship to be multi-local and global, we have expanded our affiliations globally to many universities and institutions. We have no "headquarters" in the classical sense, rather, the local affiliations of our network members all around the world represent our global headquarters. We have a Global Advisory Board, Global Core Team, Global Education Team, and Global Research Team.

In a sense, my laptop represents our globally mobile headquarters, as I am working day and night on building our fellowship and our activities, while writing books and articles, teaching, and giving lectures. We invite our HumanDHS network members to declare their homes to be Dialogue Homes for Dignity, and these homes are also my homes.[72] The planet is thus my home, not only in theory but in practice, and the human family is my family. Wherever I go, I search for three gifts: (1) a loving context in a family home (I avoid hotels), (2) a mattress, since I work with my laptop on my knees, (3) if possible, a reliable online access, since I am the web master of our HumanDHS website and the nurturing of our work is done via digital means.

I feel that I have learned extremely valuable lessons on my path, lessons that are relevant not least for scientific inquiry. I have learned that human beings all over the globe share deep commonalities and that we are much less divided than is often assumed by those who are residents in the usual ghettos — be they the local suburb or the international frequent traveler expatriate ghetto. As long as one "visits" "others" as a tourist, for business, diplomacy, or for fieldwork, as long as one defines others with labels such as "exotic," one remains "outside."

Over the years, my intuition grew that, basically, all human beings yearn for connection, recognition, and respect, and that its withdrawal or denial, experienced as humiliation, may be the strongest force that creates rifts between people and breaks down relationships. I concluded that the desire for connection, recognition, and respect unites us human beings, that it is universal and can serve as a platform for contact and cooperation. I began to see that many of the rifts that we observe around the world stem from the humiliation that is felt when recognition and respect are lacking. Ethnic, religious, or cultural differences do not create rifts by themselves, on the contrary, diversity can provide the source of mutual enrichment — under the condition, however, that diversity is embedded within relationships that are characterized by mutual respect. It is when this respect and this recognition are failing, that those who feel humiliated are prone to highlight differences in order to "justify" rifts that were caused not by these differences — but by humiliation.

I began developing this intuition already when I began working as a clinical psychologist with individuals and families in Germany from 1980 to 1984. My experience indicated that humiliation is of foundational importance in human relations — both as an act and an experience — and that cycles of humiliation may permeate people's lives with all-consuming intensity. Psychiatrist Aaron Lazare illustrated this in his article "The Unforgivable Humiliation — a Dilemma in Couples' Treatment."[73] New research in neuroscience confirms humiliation as the most intense of human emotions.[74] Later, particularly during my time in Egypt, I understood how relevant these dynamics are also at group levels, even at macro levels, between nations and whole world regions. The example of the Treaties of Versailles and their humiliating effect on Germany after World War I is but one example.

Over the years, I increasingly felt that the severity of rifts caused by humiliation calls for research. I started designing a research project on humiliation in 1995/6 and conducted it at the University of Oslo.

Evelin Lindner

I began in 1997 and concluded in 2001 with a doctoral dissertation that was anchored in social psychology while reaching into anthropological psychology, philosophy, sociology, and political science. The initial working title was *The Feeling of Being Humiliated: A Central Theme in Armed Conflicts. A Study of the Role of Humiliation in Somalia, and Rwanda/Burundi, Between the Warring Parties, and in Relation to Third Intervening Parties*.[75] Throughout the main phase of the four years of research, I carried out 216 qualitative interviews, addressing the history of genocidal killings in Somalia, Rwanda, and Burundi. From 1998 to 1999, I conducted these interviews in Africa (in Hargeisa, the capital of Somaliland, in Kigali and other places in Rwanda, as well as in Bujumbura, the capital of Burundi, in Nairobi, Kenya, and in Cairo, Egypt). From 1997 to 2001, I conducted interviews also in Europe (in Norway, Germany, Switzerland, France, and in Belgium). Since 2001, I am adding other parts of the world, such as Southeast Asia and South America, as well as the United States of America.

The initial research questions were: What is experienced as humiliation? What happens when people feel humiliated? When is humiliation established as a feeling? What does humiliation lead to? Which experiences of justice, honor, dignity, respect and self-respect are connected with the feeling of being humiliated? How is humiliation perceived and responded to in different cultures? What role does humiliation play in aggression? What can be done to overcome the violent effects of humiliation? Where can I observe cases of humiliation? If humiliation played a role after World War I for Germany, is humiliation as relevant in more recent cases of war and genocide, such as Rwanda, Somalia, Cambodia, and so on? Is humiliation also relevant for relationships at higher macro-levels, for example between "civilizations" or cultural regions such as described by political scientist Samuel Huntington in 1996?

In my research, I am radical with respect to guiding ideals and values. In my opinion, research should be conducted to gain insights for the benefit of all of humankind in a context of academic freedom, rather than academic freedom being sold out for the benefit of a few particular interests, be they national or corporate. I walk by the bronze head of philosopher John Dewey at Teachers College at Columbia University every November and December when we organize our annual "Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict,"[76] and I thank him for saying that "the dogma of the immaculate conception of philosophical systems" is ridiculous.[77] Also molecular biologist Robert Pollack is based at Columbia University, where I had the privilege of meeting him for the first time in 2004. Present-day brain research shows that "the direction of scientific research is driven by private demons, not public needs," Pollack warns, and he advises "scientists and others to abandon the notion that there is any such thing as the disinterested pursuit of truth. Instead, they must strive for a therapeutic self-awareness of their unconscious agendas and work for larger goals than personal immortality."[78]

I am a radical follower of Pollack's advice. I am investing all my energy and time to reach a degree of selfless humility that enables me to walk my talk by experimenting with my own life design to the very limit of what is practically and psychologically attainable, while maintaining the most far-reaching self-criticism possible.

I am indebted to peace philosopher Howard Richards for his advocacy of critical realism. Critical realism is a philosophical approach to understanding science that connects Enlightenment with post-modernism insofar as it concurs with Enlightenment that not everything is self-referencing text, while at the same time appreciating post-modernism for exposing that the Enlightenment was not a discovery of eternal truth but a moment in the history of culture.[79] This is Richards' advice, "Acknowledging the existence of physical realities is a step toward acknowledging the need to change social realities so that they in turn will change physical realities, which will then in turn change social realities again — hopefully, if all goes well, favoring non-authoritarian authority by making a society's norms more respectable and more respected because the norms are working better at a physical level."[80]

Evelin Lindner

Since forty-five years I follow Richards's advice with my global life. Finally, after having acquired a gut feeling for our entire human family, I feel I can leave behind "apprenticeship" and enter "adulthood." I will work until my last moment, I will never "retire" from my mission, never retire from "being me."[81] Since 1997, I work on modeling the experiences of dignity and humiliation by building what could be called a theory of humiliation.[82] Through this work I have in many ways contributed to creating a new multidisciplinary field in the academic landscape, precisely *dignity and humiliation studies*. This field is an entry point into broader transdisciplinary analysis rather than "single interest scholarship."

Humiliation, this is the insight, permeates everything, from micro to macro level, from global and local political realms to the inner workings of organizations and corporations, to our private lives, even reaching into every person's inner dialogue and how we frame our selves. Dignity is the antidote, dignity as courage to nurture mutuality and partnership in loving care and solidarity.

PART I — THE FIRST 95 PERCENT OF MODERN HUMAN HISTORY: HOW HUMAN NATURE WAS "GOOD"

In 2011, Harvard University's Steven Pinker proclaimed that "we may be living in the most peaceful era in our species' existence."[1] In 2012, Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, made the stark opposite claim, namely, that today's world has become "more dangerous than it has ever been."[2]

Who is right? One of them, or all, or none? What are the facts? Steven Pinker argues that we have overlooked a long-term worldwide reduction in all forms of violence during the past 12 millennia — including war, genocide, slavery, torture, cruel and inhumane punishments, as well as the physical abuse of children and the mentally ill. The enduring forces for peace that he identifies are the monopoly of violence, commerce, feminization, cosmopolitanism, and and an increased reliance on reason. These forces have worked to counteract the "inner demons" of human nature — predation, dominance, revenge, sadism, and ideology.

Political theorist Michael Walzer reminds us that knowledge construction is a moral and ethically reflective, transformative, and formative process.[3] Let me paraphrase and summarize the predominant narrative I encounter whereever I go on my global path. The narrative often starts with pride over *Homo sapiens* being a great inventor and having learned to take control over nature, including our own:

> We gave ourselves the name *Homo sapiens*, with *sapiens* meaning "intelligent, rational, judicious, and sensible." We invented tools and, most importantly, agriculture, which enabled us to feed a surplus of mouths and build great cities and civilizations. Already early civilizations saw foragers as primitive people, similar to wild animals. Indeed, in the book *Early Civilizations*, we read "if egalitarianism was known, it was as a feature of some of the despised, barbarian societies that existed beyond the borders of the 'civilized' world."[4] Great civilizations survived when they were able to develop superior weapons to defend themselves against attacks from barbarians or rival civilizations. Men, in particular, acquired significance and excelled as warriors. In recent history, it was particularly white colonizers who identified with the right to dominate and civilize primitive savages. Also today, being a real man means priding himself of being able to recognize and contain the primitive barbarian instincts that linger in all of us and that can break through the veneer of civilization at any time. True men have the strength to stand up, rather than meekly duck, to whatever outer and inner demons might raise their ugly head. We, as humans, can be proud that we have learned to keep peace through firm control, be it through superior military deterrence (Army general Martin Dempsey's position) and through social and societal containment (Steven Pinker's position). If the view is correct that violence has decreased, this shows that we are on the right track and simply have to continue, both with military deterrence and all other forms of containment. Also if violence were to rise, this would likewise underpin that we are on the right track, only that in that case we would have to increase and improve our efforts. From the perspective of military deterrence, sinking or rising statistics for violence are not that relevant. The greatest danger comes from people who naïvely wish away demons and believe that fewer weapons can bring peaceful global partnership. If such feel-good slogans were to win out, this would be reason for genuine pessimism, not just for arms lovers and arms producers, but for any government/corporate effort engaged in maintaining control for the best of everybody. Pessimism would also be warranted if human nature were so evil that all of humankind deserves to die out no matter what we do. Yet, if only the weak die out and the strongest survive, this would bring us back to optimism, at least for the strongest, as it could work as an incentive to become strong and stay strong.
>
> This is a position I often encounter in the Anglo-American world, and it ends with: Every man has to stand up against the threat that a world dictatorship will emerge that suppresses freedom and

forces the world's population into the uniformity of slavery. It is an illusionary dream to believe that all of humankind can ever become unified enough to protect freedom and diversity for all and build institutions of true global partnership. The very best we can hope for is a world where every man stays strong and fights for his and his family's freedom. American exceptionalism means to protect American freedom and, preferably, give the rest the freedom of choice between Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola.

This narrative is repeated in other parts of the world, only with different chosen peoples as agents, who, like, for instance, the Islamic Ummah, so far build more on aspirations motivated by a grand past than on a presently existing empire.

Like for Steven Pinker, also for economist, educator, and peace activist Kenneth Boulding the main hope for humanity lies in knowledge. What is it that determines our subjective knowledge of what we believe to be true and what we will act on? *The Image* is a book by Boulding that provides an integrative and holistic theory of the creation and transformation of knowledge.[5] Boulding teaches that knowledge is organic, that it grows and accumulates, that it is a series of images built up as a result of past experiences. "Images are revised as new information is received. In fact, the meaning of new information is the change it produces in the image."[6] "The growth of knowledge is anti-entropic; it brings order out of what was previously chaos. And, unlike other resources, knowledge is not used up." How ideas, images, and concepts are nurtured, sustained, and transformed is at the core of inquiry in transformative peace education pedagogy.

Both sides — the dominator camp, and the partnership camp — create knowledge. They engage in image creation, image protection, and image repair. As may be expected, both fall for circular reasoning and confirmation biases when they select proof that supports existing views and relegate what does not fit to the category of "untypical exception." Both sides have an interest to justify their existence and may be tempted to read statistics very selecticvely. Peace organizations, as they often suffer from underfunding, may want to hype statistics of violence to make a case for their raison-d'être. Also the arms industry, in fear of obsolescence, may do the same to justify the production of more arms. Yet, even the inverse skewing of statistics can be useful for both camps. If war and violence have decreased, the dominator camp may want to attribute this to successful deterrence through arms and societal containment and control strategies, while the partnership camp may argue that the efforts of peace organizations are to be thanked for the success. Both camps will ask for support to continue on the same path.

Again, it is somewhat unimportant whether the statistics of war and violence show an increase or a decrease, all sides can argue that they need continued support for their strategies, either to *make* the numbers small or to *keep* them small.

The difference lies in *how* to respond or prevent violence and war. It can be done either by employing the paradigm of domination, namely, negative peace through counter-domination, or by creating a different reality informed by a different paradigm, namely, positive peace through peace partnership. The dominator camp has a valid *raison-d'être* if the problem is caused by an intrinsic human urge for domination no matter what, if war is ancient and innate, if war and violence will reign as long as there are human beings and the only hope is to contain them. The partnership camp, on the other side, has validity, if the problem is extrinsic, and malign circumstances can elicit violence and benign circumstances can elicit kindness, because then it would make sense to try to create a world with constitutive rules that make benign behavior more likely.

Again, if the situation is analyzed in this way, pessimism and optimism, rather than linked to increasing or declining numbers of war and violence, can be attached to the potential for a new paradigm to work or not to work. *The Human Potential for Peace* is Douglas Fry's title of a book I resonate with.[7] The only optimism that deserves its label from this vantage point is the optimism that

the human family potentially has the strength to embark on a historically unparalleled experiment of building global institutions that secure the dignity of unity in diversity among its members, and protect and replenish the limited resources of our planet.

What if this experiment has a chance to work? What if it has a chance to work, but only if we put all our energy into it? Should we not try and give it all we have? Perhaps human nature can manifest peace without deterrence? If yes, this would provide grounds for the highest level of optimism. If human nature is evil under certain circumstances and good if circumstances are different, we could embark on creating circumstances that enable positive peace and require fewer containment and control deterrents. Then, anthropologist Margaret Mead would be right that war is a recent cultural innovation, an "invention" that could also be "un-vented."

In contrast, if human nature is evil in essence, set on destruction no matter what, another, more modest kind of optimism would be warranted, if we could show that we are able to produce enough arms, strong enough military deterrence systems, and strong enough state monopolies of violence to secure the absence of war and violence. If war is an ancient and innate "biological necessity," as the *deep roots theory of war* indicates, named thus by science writer John Horgan, then the invention hypothesis would be dangerously foolish.[8]

What if our views of human nature stand in the way of the first scenario? What if dichotomies such as "man the killer ape versus man the noble savage" stand in the way? If noble savage, is it civilization that made people savage? If savage savage, does civilization need to become noble? Or are these dichotomies misleading? Perhaps certain conditions can make some noble and others savage and certain kinds of civilization can increase moral nobility and others undermine it? To try our best chances, perhaps we could begin to leave behind dichotomies such as "noble savage versus killer ape"?

What about dichotomies such as "war versus peace"? Or "violence versus pacifism" or "violence versus nonviolence"? Again there would be two scenarios, one the *Homo dominator* scenario, and the other the *Homo amans* scenario. If the *Homo dominator* scenario were the only game in town, then talk of pacifism and nonviolence would reflect the dreams of blue-eyed people who lack the guts to face reality, a reality that indicates that peace is only attainable through the threat of war. Pacifism and nonviolence would represent foolish appeasement.

If the *Homo amans* scenario is feasible, then the very belief that it is impossible would work as a self-fulfilling prophecy that would indeed make it impossible. In that case, overcoming this disbelief would be crucial and manifesting a truly unified human family would be a feasible goal. The design of therapeutic institutions and police would be required to contain individuals who might be led to violence, perhaps not so much by nature but by physical or mental trauma. Marshall Rosenberg worked as a peace leader in the most volatile areas of the world and was the creator of *nonviolent communication*, a conflict resolution approach centred on compassion. His words were, "Sometimes we need to use force to restraining others using violence, to prevent violence, but not in the form of punishment to make them suffer".[9]

A suitable dichotomy would perhaps rather follow the familiar lines of *just* war versus *injust* war thinking,[10] and, analoguously, envision "just force" versus "injust violence," and "just nonforce" versus "injust nonforce." "Just force" points at the monopoly of violence embedded in the rule of law, and Gandhi's path would mean "just nonviolence." On the other side, there is "unjust" criminal violence and then the "unjust" version of nonviolence, namely, that of standing *by* where standing *up* would be needed.[11] Example for the latter would be when police fails to protect its citizens or the world community fails to prevent genocide and ecocide.

Which future for humankind is feasible? Is human nature capable of manifesting the *Homo amans* scenario and the partnership model of mutuality, or are we stuck with the dominator model of *Homo*

Evelin Lindner

dominans and an eternal culture of war and exploitation? Can we embark on building a future of dignity, or is there no point in even trying? Perhaps we should simply push as many people as possible out of the lifeboat, as the planet punishes us for overusing its resources? Or can we survive all together? What are the facts we know about human nature?

This question will be the theme of the first chapter in the first part of this book.

PART II — THE PAST 5 PERCENT OF HUMAN HISTORY: HOW HUMAN NATURE APPEARED TO BE "EVIL"

Evelin Lindner

PART III — THE FUTURE: HOW WE CAN LEARN HUMBLE DIGNITY

Evelin Lindner

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS: THE MOMENT IS NOW

Evelin Lindner

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Evelin Lindner

REFERENCES

Boulding, Kenneth E. (1956). *The image: Knowledge in life and society*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Brinkmann, Svend (2017). "Humanism after posthumanism: Or qualitative psychology after the 'posts'." In *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, pp. 1–22. doi: 10.1080/14780887.2017.1282568. www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14780887.2017.1282568.

Burckhardt, Jacob (1860). *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*. Basel: Schweighauser. www.deutschestextarchiv.de/book/show/burckhardt_renaissance_1860.

Burckhardt, Jacob (1878). *Die Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien*. Stuttgart, Germany: Ebner und Seubert. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=pst.000009794313.

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (1970). "A theory of the origin of the state." In *Science*, *169* (3947), pp. 733–38. doi: 10.1126/science.169.3947.733.

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (1988). "The circumscription theory: Challenge and response." In *American Behavioral Scientist*, *31* (4), pp. 497–511. doi: doi: 10.1177/000276488031004010

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (2000). "Process vs. stages: A false dichotomy in tracing the rise of the state." In *Alternatives of Social Evolution*, edited by Nikolay Kradin, Andrey Korotayev, Dmitri Bondarenko, Victor de Munch, and Paul Wason, pp. 52–58. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (2010). *The evolution of the human mind: From supernaturalism to naturalism – An anthropological perspective*. Clinton Corners, NY: Eliot Werner.

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (2012). "The circumscription theory: A clarification, amplification, and reformulation." In *Social Evolution and History*, *11* (2, September), pp. 5–30. www.sociostudies.org/journal/articles/148694/.

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (2018). *The checkered history of the theory of circumscription*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse.

Chagnon, Napoleon A. (1968). *Yạnomamö: The fierce people*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Chagnon, Napoleon A. (2013). *Noble savages: My life among two dangerous tribes: The Yanomamö and the anthropologists*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Collazzoni, Alberto, Cristina Capanna, Massimiliano Bustini, Paolo Stratta, Marzia Ragusa, Antonio Marino, and Alessandro Rossi (2014). "Humiliation and interpersonal sensitivity in depression." In *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *167*, pp. 224-27, doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2014.06.008. http://www.jad-journal.com/article/S0165-0327%2814%2900369-3/abstract.

Dewey, John (1931). *Philosophy and civilization*. New York: G.P. Putnam.

Di Leo, Jeffrey R., Henry A. Giroux, Sophia A. McClennen, and Kenneth J. Saltman (Eds.) (2013). *Neoliberalism, education, terrorism: Contemporary dialogues*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Dorling, Danny (2013). *Population 10 billion: The coming demographic crisis and how to survive it*. London: Constable.

Drolshagen, Ebba D. (2009). *Der freundliche Feind: Wehrmachtssoldaten im besetzten Europa*. München, Germany: Droemer.

Eisler, Riane, and Douglas P. Fry (2019). *Nurturing our humanity: How domination and partnership shape our brains, lives, and future*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (1987). *The chalice and the blade: Our history, our future*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Emmott, Stephen (2013). *Ten billion*. London: Penguin.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2014). *Globalization: The key concepts*. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury.

Evelin Lindner

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2016). *Overheating – An anthropology of accelerated change*. London: Pluto Press.

Fehr, Ernst, and Simon Gächter (2002). "Altruistic punishment in humans." In *Nature*, *415* (6868), p. 137. doi: 10.1038/415137a.

Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. 3rd revised edition. New York: Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (1957a). "La recherche scientifique et la psychologie." In *Des chercheurs Francais s'interrogent: Orientation et organisation du travail scientifique en France*, edited by Jean Édouard Morère, pp. 173–201. Toulouse: Collection Nouvelle Recherche no. 13, reproduit en Michel Foucault, *Dits et Écrits*, Paris: Gallimard, 1994, tome I. pp. 137–158.

Foucault, Michel (1957b). "La psychologie de 1850 à 1950." In *Histoire de la philosophie européenne, tome II: Tableau de la philosophie contemporaine*, edited by Denis Huisman and Alfred Weber, pp. 591–606. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, reproduit en Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits*, Paris, Gallimard, 1994, tome I, pp. 120–137.

Foucault, Michel, and Madeleie Chapsal (1966). "S'affranchir de l'humanisme." In *La Quinzaine litteraire*, *5*, p. Interview with Michel Foucault by Madeleine Chapsal. https://issuu.com/capucine/docs/laquinzainelitteraire5.

Fry, Douglas P. (2006a). *The human potential for peace: An anthropological challenge to assumptions about war and violence*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fry, Douglas P. (2006b). *The origin and nature of human conflict management*. St. Louis, MO: Paper presented at 'Man the Hunted: The Origin and Nature of Human Sociality', Scientific Symposium at the 2006 American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) (AAAS – Annual Meeting, America's Center, Level Two, Room 232, 16–20 February 2006, St. Louis, MO, php.aaas.org/meetings/MPE_01.php?detail=837.

Fry, Douglas P. (2007). *Beyond war: The human potential for peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fry, Douglas P. (2009). "Anthropological insights for creating nonwarring social systems." In *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, *1* (2), pp. 4–15. doi: 10.1108/17596599200900008.

Fry, Douglas P. (Ed.) (2013). *War, peace, and human nature: The convergence of evolutionary and cultural views*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fuglestvedt, Ingrid (2018). *Rock art and the wild mind – Visual imagery in Mesolithic Northern Europe*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Galtung, Johan (2002). "The epistemology and methodology of peace studies." In *Tromsø papers no. 1*. Tromsø, Norway: University of Tromsø and Transcend.

Girard, René (1982/1986). *The scapegoat*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. French original *Le Bouc émissaire*, Paris: Grasset, 1982.

Giroux, Henry A. (2011). *Zombie politics and culture in the age of casino capitalism*. New York: Peter Lang.

Giroux, Henry A. (2014a). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Chicago: Haymarket.

Giroux, Henry A. (2014b). *The violence of organized forgetting: Thinking beyond America's disimagination machine*. San Francisco: City Lights.

Haas, Jonathan, and Matthew Piscitelli (2013). "The prehistory of warfare: Misled by ethnography." In *War, peace, and human nature: the convergence of evolutionary and cultural views*, edited by Douglas P. Fry. Chapter 10, pp. 168-90. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hahn, Robert A., Oleg Bilukha, Alex Crosby, Mindy T. Fullilove, Akiva Liberman, Eve Moscicki, Susan Snyder, Farris Tuma, and Peter A. Briss (2005). "Firearms laws and the reduction of violence." In *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *28* (2), pp. 40-71, doi:

10.1016/j.amepre.2004.10.005. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2004.10.005. http://www.ajpmonline.org/article/S0749-3797(04)00285-5/abstract.

Harré, Rom (2004). "Staking our claim for qualitative psychology as science." In *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *1* (1), pp. 3–14. doi: 10.1191/1478088704qp002oa.

Harvey, David (2014). *Seventeen contradictions and the end of capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heisenberg, Werner (1971). *Physics and beyond: Encounters and conversations*. New York: Harper and Row, German original *Der Teil und das Ganze: Gespräche im Umkreis der Atomphysik*. München, Germany: Reinhard Piper, 1969.

Horgan, John (2012). *The end of war*. San Fransisco: McSweeney's.

Howell, Signe, and Roy G. Willis (Eds.) (1989). *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives*. London: Routledge. Papers originally presented at a conference held in June 1986 at the University of Edinburgh.

Hume, David (1738–1740). *A treatise of human nature*. London: John Noon. www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/4705.

Jenkins, Tony (2014). *Theoretical analysis and practical possibilities for transformative, comprehensive peace education*. Trondheim, Norway: Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology Management, Department of Education, doctoral dissertation.

Kaku, Michio (2005). *Parallel worlds: A journey through creation, higher dimensions, and the future of the cosmos*. New York: Doubleday.

Karlberg, Michael Robert (2014). *Meaning, religion, and a great transition*. Boston, MA: Great Transition Initiative. www.greattransition.org/publication/meaning-religion-and-a-great-transition.

Kirschenbaum, Howard, and Valerie Land Henderson (Eds.) (1990). *Carl Rogers: Dialogues: Conversations with Martin Buber, Paul Tillich, B.F. Skinner, Gregory Bateson, Michael Polanyi, Rollo May, and others*. London: Constable.

Klare, Michael T. (2012). *The race for what's left: The global scramble for the world's last resources*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Leask, Phil (2013a). "Humiliation as a weapon within the party: Fictional and personal accounts." In *Becoming East German: Socialist structures and sensibilities after Hitler*, edited by Mary Fulbrook and Andrew I. Port. Chapter 11. New York, Oxford: Berghahn.

Leask, Phil (2013b). "Losing trust in the world: Humiliation and its consequences." In *Psychodynamic Practice*, *19* (2), pp. 129-42, doi: 10.1080/14753634.2013.778485. doi: 10.1080/14753634.2013.778485. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14753634.2013.778485.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (1993). *Quality of life: A German-Egyptian comparative study*. Hamburg, Germany: University of Hamburg, Department of Psychological Medicine, English summary of doctoral dissertation in medicine (in German), *Lebensqualität im ägyptisch-deutschen Vergleich. Eine interkulturelle Untersuchung an drei Berufsgruppen (Ärzte, Journalisten, Künstler)*. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (1996). *The feeling of being humiliated: A central theme in armed conflicts. A study of the role of humiliation in Somalia, and Great Lakes Region, between the warring parties, and in relation to third intervening parties. Outline of research project*. Oslo: Doctoral project, University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, The Norwegian Research Council, Department of Multilateral Affairs, The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. See also the French edition *Le sentiment d'être humilié: Un Thème central dans des conflits armés. Une étude du rôle de humiliation en Somalie et Burundi/Rwanda, parmi les partis belligérants, et par rapport aux tiers partis intervenants*. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000a). *The psychology of humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, doctoral dissertation. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000b). *What is a good life — Comparison between Egypt and Germany*. Paper presented at the Middle East Virtual Community (MEViC), first MEViC online Internet conference, 2000, on the basis of Lindner's doctoral dissertation in medicine, 1994. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2001). *On globalisation and quality of life*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, submitted for Habilitation to the Department of Psychology, University of Regensburg, Germany. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006a). *How becoming a global citizen can have a healing effect*. Tokyo, Japan: Paper presented at the 2006 ICU-COE Northeast Asian Dialogue: Sharing Narratives, Weaving/Mapping History, February 3-5, 2006, International Christian University (ICU), Tokyo, Japan, www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php#gallagher.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006b). *To my children and the children of the world*. Brisbane, Australia: The Promise Club, initiated by Kerry Bowden. www.thepromiseclub.com/evelin.html, www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2007a). "The evolving family: Giving life to the human family." In *The offerings book on women and birthing*. Chapter 2, pp. 38-41. Redwood City, CA: Offerings Publications, www.offeringspublications.com/publications/TheEvolvingFamily/The_Evolving_Family.pdf, see a long version written in 2006 on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php#ruelas.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2007b). *How the human rights ideal of equal dignity separates humiliation from shame*. Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, 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, London: Praeger, Greenwood.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2010). *Gender, humiliation, and global security: Dignifying relationships from love, sex, and parenthood to world affairs*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012). *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). *Bringing dignity to globalisation: A psychologist's personal experience as a global citizen - Evelin Lindner's global life*. Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies. Book proposal created in response to an invitation by Louise Sundararajan, Series Editor of the Palgrave Studies in Indigenous Psychology. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2020). *A global life design: Reflections and a chronological description*. Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/09.php#chronology.

Loewenstein, George (2007). *Exotic preferences: Behavioral economics and human motivation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Margalit, Avishai (1996). *The decent society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mayer-Tasch, Peter Cornelius (2011). "Quo vadimus? Versuch einer Ortsbestimmung zwischen Humanismus und Metahumanismus." In *Humanismus. Sein kritisches Potential für Gegenwart und Zukunft*, edited by Adrian Holderegger, Siegfried Weichlein, and Simone Zurbuchen, pp. 475–92. Basel, Switzerland: Schwabe and Academic Press Fribourg.

Morgenthau, Hans J. (1946). *Scientific man versus power politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neurath, Otto (1932/1933). "Protokollsätze." In *Erkenntnis*, *3*, pp. 204–14.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1887/2013). *On the genealogy of morals*. Translated by Michael A. Scarpitti. London: Penguin. German original *Zur Genealogie der Moral: Eine Streitschrift,* Leipzig: Verlag von C. G. Naumann, 1887.

Ostrom, Elinor (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, Elinor (2010). "Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems." In *American Economic Review*, *100* (3), pp. 641–72. doi: 10.1257/aer.100.3.641.

Otten, Marte, and Kai J. Jonas (2013). "Humiliation as an intense emotional experience: Evidence from the electro-encephalogram." In *Social Neuroscience*, *9* (1), pp. 23-35, doi: 10.1080/17470919.2013.855660. doi: 10.1080/17470919.2013.855660. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2013.855660.

Paige, Glenn D. (2009). *Nonkilling global political science*. 2nd revised English edition. Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling, www.nonkilling.org/pdf/nkgps.pdf.

Piketty, Thomas (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, French original *Le capital au XXIe siècle*, Paris: Seuil, 2013.

Pinker, Steven (1995). *The language instinct: The new science of language and mind*. London: Penguin.

Pinker, Steven (1997). *How the mind works*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Pinker, Steven (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. London: Penguin Books.

Pinker, Steven (2011). *The better angels of our nature: Why violence has declined*. New York: Viking.

Pinker, Steven (2018). *Enlightenment now: The case for reason, science, humanism, and progress*. London: Allen Lane.

Pollack, Robert Elliot (1999). *The missing moment: How the unconscious shapes modern science*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

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.

Raskin, Paul D., Tariq Banuri, Gilbert Gallopín, Pablo Gutman, Albert Hammond, Robert Kates, and Rob Swart (2002). *Great transition: The promise and lure of the times ahead*. Boston, MA: Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), Tellus Institute, report of the Global Scenario Group. www.gtinitiative.org/documents/Great_Transitions.pdf.

Raskin, Paul D. (2016). *Journey to Earthland: The great transition to planetary civilization*. Boston, MA: Tellus Institute. www.greattransition.org/publication/journey-to-earthland.

Reardon, Betty, and Dale T. Snauwaert (2011). "Reflective pedagogy, cosmopolitanism, and critical peace education for political efficacy: A discussion of Betty A. Reardon's assessment of the field." In *Factis Pax: Online Journal of Peace Education and Social Justice*, *5* (1), pp. 1-14.

Reardon, Betty A. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, Betty A. (2000). "Peace education: A review and projection." In *Routledge international companion to education*, edited by Bob Moon, Miriam Ben-Peretz, and Sally Brown. Chapter 23, pp. 397-425. London: Routledge.

Reardon, Betty A. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Reardon, Betty A., and Alicia Cabezudo (2002). *Learning to abolish war: Teaching toward a culture of peace*. New York: Hague Appeal for Peace, www.haguepeace.org/index.php?action=resources.

Richards, Howard, Catherine Alum Odora Hoppers, and Evelin Gerda Lindner (2015). *Beyond Foucault: The rise of indigenous subjugated knowledges – Dialogues with Howard Richards, Catherine Odora Hoppers, and Evelin Lindner*. Pretoria, South Africa: Inspired by the lecture series Against Foucault given by Howard Richards in Pretoria, South Africa, in 2013. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/videos.php#foucault.

Ridley, Matt (1996). *The origins of virtue: Human instincts and the evolution of cooperation*. London: Penguin.

Ridley, Matt (2010). *The rational optimist: How prosperity evolves*. New York: HarperCollins.

Rogers, Carl R. (1977). *Carl Rogers on personal power*. New York: Delacorte Press.

Rogers, Carl R., Harold C. Lyon, Reinhard Tausch, and Karin Lyon (2014). *On becoming an effective teacher: Person-centered teaching, psychology, philosophy, and dialogues with Carl R. Rogers and Harold Lyon*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Rüsen, Jörn (2011). "Traditionsprobleme eines zukunftsfähigen Humanismus." In *Humanismus. Sein kritisches Potential für Gegenwart und Zukunft*, edited by Adrian Holderegger, Siegfried Weichlein, and Simone Zurbuchen, pp. 307–24. Basel, Switzerland: Schwabe and Academic Press Fribourg.

Rüsen, Jörn (2013). *Approaching humankind: Towards an intercultural humanism*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, V&R Unipress.

Scheler, Max (1923). *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie*. Bonn, Germany: F. Cohen, neu aufgelegt als Titel von 1913 *Zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Sympathiegefühle und von Liebe und Hass*, Halle, Saale: Max Niemeyer, www.sdvigpress.org/dox/101173/101173.pdf.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2014). *The anthropology of peace*. Paper written for *Diogenes*, forthcoming.

Starn, Randolph (1998). "Renaissance redux." In *The American Historical Review*, *103* (1), pp. 122–24. doi: 10.1086/ahr/103.1.122.

Staub, Ervin (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Syse, Henrik Preben, and Gregory M. Reichberg. *Ethics, nationalism, and just war: Medieval and contemporary perspectives*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.

Trigger, Bruce G. (1993). *Early civilizations: Ancient Egypt in context*. Cairo, Egypt: American University in Cairo Press.

Undset, Sigrid (1942). *Return to the future*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Ury, William (1999). *Getting to peace: Transforming conflict at home, at work, and in the world*. New York: Viking.

Ury, William (2000). *The third side: Why we fight and how we can stop*. New York: Penguin.

Ury, William (2007). *The power of a positive no: How to say no and still get to yes*. New York: Bantam.

Van Ummersen, Claire, Jean McLaughlin, and Lauren J. Duranleau (Eds.) (2014). *Faculty retirement: Best practices for navigating the transition*. Stylus Publishing.

Villa, Paola, and Wil Roebroeks (2014). "Neandertal demise: An archaeological analysis of the modern human superiority complex." In *Public Library of Science (PLoS) ONE*, *9* (4), pp. e96424, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0096424.

Vogel, William, and Aaron Lazare (1990). "The unforgivable humiliation: A dilemma in couples' treatment." In *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *12* (2), pp. 139–51. doi: 10.1007/BF00892492.

Wacquant, Loïc J. D. (2005). "Symbolic power in the rule of the 'state nobility'." In *Pierre Bourdieu and democratic politics: The mystery of ministry*, edited by Loïc J. D. Wacquant. Chapter 7, pp. 133-50. Cambridge: Polity.

Waller, James (2002). *Becoming evil: How ordinary people commit genocide and mass killing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walzer, Michael (1977). *Just and unjust wars: A moral argument with historical illustrations*. New York: Basic Books.

Walzer, Michael (1993). *Interpretation and social criticism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, The Tanner Lecture on Human Values, delivered at Harvard University, November 13 and 14, 1985. http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/w/walzer88.pdf.

Wilkinson, Richard G. (2005). *The impact of inequality. How to make sick societies healthier*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Wilkinson, Richard G., and Kate Pickett (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Allen Lane.

Winkler, Adam (2013). *Gunfight: The battle over the right to bear arms in America*. New York: W. W. Norton.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) (2014). *Living planet report 2014: Species and spaces, people and places*. London: World Wildlife Fund (WWF), wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/all_publications/living_planet_report/.

Yonetani, Michelle (2014). *Global estimates 2014: People displaced by disasters*. Geneva, Switzerland: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and Norwegian Refugee Council, www.nrc.no/arch/_img/9184209.pdf.

Preface

[1] "Keynote Dialogue: In conversation with William Ury, Co-Author, *Getting to Yes*, USA, Geraldine McAteer and Jackie Redpath from Northern Ireland together with speakers from Bosnia, Israel, and South Africa," at the launching of the Co-existence Intiative of the State of the World Forum in Belfast, Northern Ireland, in May 2–9, 1999.

[2] See, among others, Ridley, 1996.

[3] See, among others, Waller, 2002.

[4] See, among others, Morgenthau, 1946.

[5] See Nietzsche, 1887/2013.

[6] See Chagnon, 1968. See for a more recent publication, Chagnon, 2013. I thank Robert Carneiro for explaining to me the intricacies of the controversies surrounding Chagnon's work. It is a privilege to have Robert Carneiro as esteemed member in the global advisory board of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies fellowship.

[7] Pinker, 2002. His first two popular books are Pinker, 1995, 1997. See also his more recent books, Pinker, 2011, 2018.

[8] See for anthropological perspectives, Howell and Willis, 1989.

[9] See, among others, Raskin, et al., 2002.

[10] *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany* was my doctoral dissertation in social psychology at the Department of Psychology of the University of Oslo, Norway, in 2000. *Honor, Humiliation, and Terror: An Explosive Mix — And How We Can Defuse It with Dignity* was my fifth book, and it came out in 2017 in Dignity Press, in its imprint World Dignity University Press, with a foreword by Linda Hartling, director of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies. Please see more chapters and papers in full text on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

[11] *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict* was my first book on dignity and humiliation and how we may envision a more dignified world, characterized as a path-breaking book and honored as

Evelin Lindner

"Outstanding Academic Title" for 2007 in the USA by the journal *Choice*. It came out in 2006 in Praeger, with a foreword by the father of the field of conflict resolution, Morton Deutsch. The book discusses dignity and humiliation and how we may envision a more dignified world. It first lays out a theory of the mental and social dynamics humiliation and proposes the need for "egalization" (the undoing of humiliation) for a healthy global society. It then presents chapters on the role of misunderstandings in fostering feelings of humiliation; the role of humiliation in international conflict; and the relationship of humiliation to terrorism and torture. It concludes with a discussion of how to defuse feelings of humiliation and create a dignified world. Please see more details on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/book/01.php.

Emotion and Conflict: How Human Rights Can Dignify Emotion and Help Us Wage Good Conflict was my second book. It is about dignity and how realizing its promise can help improve the human condition at all levels—from micro to meso to macro levels. The book came out in Praeger in 2009, with a foreword by the father of the field of conflict resolution, Morton Deutsch. It uses a broad historical lens that captures all of human history, from its hunter-gatherer origins to the promise of a globally united knowledge society in the future. It emphasizes the need to recognize and leave behind malign cultural, social, and psychological effects of the past. The book calls upon the world community, academics and lay people alike, to own up to the opportunities offered by increasing global interdependence. See www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/book/02.php.

[12] *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security* was my third book, published by Praeger in 2010. Archbishop Desmond Tutu kindly contributed with a foreword (asked for a prepublication endorsement, he kindly offered to contribute with a foreword). The book rounds off with an afterword by Linda Hartling, in honor of Jean Baker Miller and Don Klein. For more details, see www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/book/03.php.
The book was "highly recommended" by *Choice* (in July 2010):
"In this far-ranging, sometimes brilliant book, Lindner (Columbia Univ. and Oslo Univ.) studies the social and political ramifications of human violations and world crises related to humiliation, defined as the enforced lowering of a person or group, a process of subjugation that harms or removes the dignity, pride, and honor of the other. A "transdisciplinary social scientist," the author charts how humiliation—and its antidote, love—are conditioned by large-scale, systemic social forces such as globalization. The force of this book resides in its construction of a compelling, compassionate alternative to the psychological effects of humiliation on gender and sexual relations, parenthood, and leadership. For Lindner, this alternative is not only love but also its psychological correlate, humility, both of which can become the basis of the social, political, and cultural change necessary to reform the harmful global tendency toward humiliation. Lindner's philosophy is avowedly non-dualist and rooted in ancient Eastern wisdom. A powerful follow up to her *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict* (CH, Mar'07, 44-4114), this book appears in the "Contemporary Psychology" series; it will be indispensable for psychologists, humanists, and political scientists and invaluable to policy makers. Summing Up: Highly recommended. Upper-division undergraduates through faculty and professionals. — M. Uebel, University of Texas (*Choice* is a publication of the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of the American Library Association).

[13] *A Dignity Economy: Creating an Economy that Serves Human Dignity and Preserves Our Planet* was my fourth book, the first publication of Dignity Press, published in 2012 in its imprint World Dignity University Press, with a foreword by Linda Hartling, director of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, and Ulrich Spalthoff, Director of Dignity Press. See more on www.dignitypress.org/wdu-press-books/dignity-economy. See brief endorsements on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/book/04.php#endorsement.

[14] Dewey, 1931, p. 220.

[15] Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS), is a global transdisciplinary fellowship of concerned academics, practitioners, activists, artists, and others, who collaborate in a spirit of mutual support to understand the complex dynamics of dignity and humiliation (humiliationstudies.org). We wish to stimulate systemic change, globally and locally, to open space for dignity, mutual respect and esteem to take root and grow. Our goal is ending humiliating practices, preventing new ones from arising, and fostering healing from cycles of humiliation throughout the world.

[16] See Pinker, 2011.

[17] Abraham Lincoln's First Inaugural Address, http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Abraham_Lincoln%27s_First_Inaugural_Address.

[18] See a talk by Shibley Telhami at "Identity and The Prism of Perspective: Shibley Telhami at TEDxUMD," July 5, 2014, www.youtube.com/watch?v=ywFn-G8DXk4. This is the description text: "Why is Barack Obama black? This is the question Dr. Shibley Telhami seeks to answer in this thought-provoking and insightful talk. Using his specialty, the Middle East, as an example, Dr. Telhami takes his audience on a journey, digging deep into the roots of identity and exploring how such associations and labels shape an individual's perspective."

[19] See Lindner, 2010.

[20] I am indebted to peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos for suggesting the phrase psycho-geo-historical. He wrote to me on January 3, 2012: "In characterizing your approach you say that your intention is to embbed terrorism in a large geo-historical frame, but in the spirit of your clarifying subtitle, isn't your goal also psychological? Wouldn't PSYCHO-GEO-HISTORICAL more accurately label your approach?"

[21] See, among many others, Fisher, et al., 2011, Ury, 1999, 2000, 2007. See also Fry, 2006a, b, 2007, 2009, 2013, Haas and Piscitelli, 2013. See, furthermore, Eriksen, 2014, 2016

[22] See, among others, Sponsel, 2014, or Fry, 2013.

[23] See, among others, Paige, 2009.

[24] Lindner, 2000a.

[25] Galtung, 2002, p. 17.

[26] Since I wrote the book *A Dignity Economy* in 2012, the topic of inequality has become ever more prominent. When I wrote my 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 www.youtube.com/watch?v=zYDzA9hKCNQ. See, furthermore, the Equality Trust at www.equalitytrust.org.uk. Since then, many more names have come to the fore, among them that of Thomas Piketty, 2014.

[27] World Wildlife Fund (WWF), 2014.

[28] See *Limits to Investment: Finance in the Anthropocene*, by John Fullerton, Great Transition, April 2014, http://greattransition.org/publication/limits-to-investment. I thank via Jörg Altekruse for making me aware of Fullerton's article. See more at: http://greattransition.org/publication/limits-to-investment#sthash.uhBGSQ54.dpuf.

[29] See Harvey, 2014.

[30] See Yonetani, 2014.

[31] *Global Forced Displacement Tops 70 Million: UN Refugee Chief Calls for 'Redoubled' Solidarity as Annual Global Trends Report Shows Displacement Doubled in 20 Years*, by Adrian Edwards in Geneva, UNHCR – The UN Refugee Agency, June 19, 2019, www.unhcr.org/news/stories/2019/6/5d08b6614/global-forced-displacement-tops-70-million.html.

[32] "Uniting for Peace, Building Sustainable Peace through Universal Values at the Centenary of World War I–Criminalizing War," by Johan Galtung, Keynote at the 25th International Peace Research Association Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11-14, 2014, *TRANSCEND Media Service*, August 18, 2014, www.transcend.org/tms/2014/08/uniting-for-peace-building-sustainable-peace-through-universal-values-at-the-centenary-of-world-war-i-criminalizing-war/.

[33] Emmott, 2013.

[34] "War and Peace, Climate Change & Citizen Responses," personal communication from the Schumacher Center for a New Economics, September 9, 2014, http://us5.campaign-archive2.com/?u=69d509d113032e3126c4543ce&id=3dfa2a710e&e=5017fb4435.

[35] Dorling, 2013.

[36] Rosling's term *factfulness* is commented on in 'Swansong of Hans Rosling, data visionary', by Jim O'Neill, *Nature*, 3rd April 2018, www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-03921-y.

[37] See "Crowded planet," review by Clive Cookson, *The Financial Times*, July 12, 2013, www.ft.com/cms/s/2/a7e5ba20-e7e4-11e2-9aad-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3Cq4fyzJ8. See Ridley, 2010.

[38] Ridley, 2010, p. 88.

[39] "The Rational Optimist," review by Samuel Brittan, *The Financial Times,* June 12, 2010, www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/b2cbb506-74de-11df-aed7-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3Cq4fyzJ8.

[40] See, among others, Lindner, 2007b.

[41] Kaku, 2005, p. 361.

[1] This story is adapted from the personal life story that I was told by the son of Erika in Bremen, Germany, in July 2011. All names and details in this story are changed to protect their privacy. See also Drolshagen, 2009.

[2] The first working title of this book was "Human Nature, Dignity, and Humiliation: Are We Blessed or Doomed? Is the Human Species a Superior or Inferior Species? Why Is This Question So Sensitive? How Come It Elicits Cycles of Humiliation Even within Academia?"
The second working title was: "Human Nature, Dignity, and Humiliation: Are We Blessed or Doomed? We Will Be Doomed if We Continue to Believe in the Evilness of Human Nature."

[3] Francisco Gomes de Matos in a personal communication, June 29, 2010.

[4] Stephen Purdey in his contribution to the Great Transition Network Initiative discussion titled "Journey to Earthland: Making the Great Transition to Planetary Civilization," October 24, 2016, in response to Raskin, 2016.

[5] Heisenberg, 1971. See also *Werner Heisenberg: Der Teil und das Ganze*, episode 6 of a documentary film produced by BR-alpha editor Eva Maria Steimle, www.br.de/mediathek/video/sendungen/werner-heisenberg/teil-und-das-ganze100.html#filterEntireBroadcast=false&moreMoreCount=0&tab=bcastInfo&jump=tab. ARD-alpha is a German television station owned by regional broadcaster Bayerischer Rundfunk, BR.

[6] The Higgs boson was discovered in July 2012 in the Large Hadron Collider in Switzerland, and its mass is 126 giga-electron-volts. This measurement strenghtens the multiverse theory, suggesting that the supersymmetry hypothesis might be wrong. See a very accessible description in "New Physics Complications Lend Support to Multiverse Hypothesis," by Natalie Wolchover, *Quanta Magazine*, May 24, 2013, www.simonsfoundation.org/quanta/20130524-is-nature-unnatural/.

[7] "New Physics Complications Lend Support to Multiverse Hypothesis," by Natalie Wolchover, *Quanta Magazine*, May 24, 2013, www.simonsfoundation.org/quanta/20130524-is-nature-unnatural/.

[8] Villa and Roebroeks, 2014.

[9] I use the circumscription theory of anthropologist Robert Carneiro in specific ways. Circumscription means limitation, enclosure, or confinement — from Latin *circum* 'around', and *scribere* 'to write' — and it can be territorial, social, or resource circumscription. Anthropologist Robert Carneiro is known to be the father of circumscription theory. See, among others, Carneiro, 1970, 1988, 2000, 2010, 2012, and Carneiro, 2018.

[10] "'War Is Human Nature!' and Other Unfounded Claims to Justify the Status-quo," blog by Joshua Alexander, August 9, 2013, https://weeklybolshevik.wordpress.com/2013/08/09/war-is-human-nature-and-other-unfounded-claims-to-justify-the-status-quo-part-i/.

[11] Kaku, 2005.

[12] Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus and Reeve, 2004.

[13] Undset, 1942. Undset was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1928. In her autobiography she describes her painful flight from Norway to Sweden, across Russia to Japan, and finally to the United States, describing her passion for freedom, and her vision for an unknown future.

[14] Klare, 2012.

[15] Reardon and Snauwaert, 2011, Reardon, 1988, 2000, 2001, Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002.

[16] "Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace," Resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, UN Document Number A/RES/53/243, 6 October 1999, www.un-documents.net/a53r243b.htm.

[17] "Peace Movements' Common Vision: The Abolition of Militarism," by Mairead Maguire, Nobel Peace Laureate, keynote address at Sarajevo Peace Event — June 6, 2014, Human Wrongs Watch, human-wrongs-watch.net/2014/06/15/24934/.

[18] Eisler, 1987. See her most recent book, Eisler and Fry, 2019.

[19] Scheler, 1923.

[20] See philosopher Avishai Margalit, 1996, and his concept of a decent society.

[21] "Uniting for Peace, Building Sustainable Peace through Universal Values at the Centenary of World War I–Criminalizing War," by Johan Galtung, August 18, 2014, *TRANSCEND Media Service*, Keynote, 25th International Peace Research Association Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11–14, 2014, www.transcend.org/tms/2014/08/uniting-for-peace-building-sustainable-peace-through-universal-values-at-the-centenary-of-world-war-i-criminalizing-war/.

[22] "Uniting for Peace, Building Sustainable Peace through Universal Values at the Centenary of World War I–Criminalizing War," by Johan Galtung, August 18, 2014, *TRANSCEND Media Service*, Keynote, 25th International Peace Research Association Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11–14, 2014, www.transcend.org/tms/2014/08/uniting-for-peace-building-sustainable-peace-through-universal-values-at-the-centenary-of-world-war-i-criminalizing-war/.

[23] Lindner, 2000a.

[24] Emmott, 2013.

[25] Winkler, 2013.

[26] Twenty-two-year-old Elliott Rodger killed six people in a rampage in a California college town on May 23, 2014. Bill O'Reilly, host of the political commentary program The O'Reilly Factor on the Fox News Channel, said on May 28, 2014, "No matter what society does, there will always be mass murder," www.foxnews.com/on-air/oreilly/2014/05/29/bill-oreilly-exploiting-brutal-murders-santa-barbara.

[27] Actor Charlton Heston is widely quoted to have said in an interview on Meet the Press on May 18, 1997.

[28] See, for instance, Hahn, et al., 2005.

[29] Jon Stewart, former host of the American satirical news program *The Daily Show*, went as far as to poke fun at the suggestion that there is nothing society can do to decrease mass killings. See "Murder, So Rote," Jon Stewart, *The Daily Show*, June 2, 2014, http://thedailyshow.cc.com/videos/8axdyn/murder--so-rote.

[30] See research that explores how humans develop a sense of fairness, and whether that quality is innate or learned socially, in Loewenstein, 2007.

[31] See, among others, 'The key to a sustainable economy is 5,000 years old', by Ellen Brown, *Web of Debt* & *TRANSCEND Media Service*, 2nd September 2019, https://ellenbrown.com/2019/08/30/the-key-to-a-sustainable-economy-is-5000-years-old/. See also *The evolution of cooperation: Explaining one of life's most common, complex, and paradoxical phenomena*, a white paper prepared for the Templeton Foundation, www.templeton.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Cooperation_review_fnl2.pdf. Note a description of how the slime mold *Dictyostelium discoideum* contains free-riding. I thank Francisco Gomes de Matos for showing me this article.

[32] See Ostrom, 1990, 2010. *Altruistic punishment* is a term coined by economists Fehr and Gächter, 2002. Their research is relevant for the question as to whether it is possible or not to protect commons. Their research documents that people willingly give up some of their own resources in order to punish those who behave selfishly in a group context. See also 'What a simple psychological test reveals about climate change: If

everyone's success depended on it, would you share — or be selfish?' by Dylan Selterman, *National Geographic Magazine*, June 2018 issue, www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/2018/06/embark-essay-tragedy-of-the-commons-greed-common-good/.

[33] See the work of archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestvedt, 2018. See also 'The scapegoating machine', by Geoff Shullenberger, *The New Inquiry*, November 30, 2016, https://thenewinquiry.com/the-scapegoating-machine/. Philosopher René Girard, 1982/1986, thought that the most difficult task of the contemporary world is to transcend violent scapegoating and create a non-violent basis for the social order. Girard's analysis could be seen as a recommendation to regain non-violent partnership approaches that might have been known prior to the rise of dominator societies, while thinkers beholden to the dominator model of society (Peter Thiel, for instance) may want to use Girard's analysis to refine domination.

[34] Loewenstein, 2007, p. 198:

> As the vast majority of subjects preferred higher payoffs to themselves (SELF > 0) and disliked disadvantageous inequality (NEGDIFF < 0), subjects' utility functions could be grouped into three qualitatively distinct patterns based on the sign of POSDIFF. One group we labeled saints; saints consistently prefer equality, and they do not like to receive higher payoffs than the other party (POSDIFF < 0) even when they are in a negative relationship with the opponent. People in the second group, labeled loyalists, do not like to receive higher payoffs (POSDIFF < O) in positive or neutral relationships, but do seek advantageous inequality (POSDIFF > 0) when they are involved in negative relationships. People in the third group, labeled ruthless competitors, consistently prefer to come out ahead of the other party (POSDIFF > 0) regardless of the type of relationship. In our sample, the proportions of saints, loyalists, and ruthless competitors were 24%, 27%, and 36%, respectively. The remaining 18% of subjects could not be neatly classified into any of the three categories. We suspect that the proportions of loyalists and ruthless competitors were elevated by the inclusion of the business condition, in which most subjects derived positive satisfaction from advantageous inequality, regardless of the nature of the relationship.

See also "How we learn fairness," by Maria Konnikova, *New Yorker*, January 7, 2016, www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/how-we-learn-fairness.

[35] Brinkmann, 2017.

[36] Harré, 2004, p. 13.

[37] Hume, 1738–1740. The terminus psychology was only used later, philosopher David Hartley was the first person known to have used the word psychology in English in a work published in 1748.

[38] See, among others, Rogers, 1977, Kirschenbaum and Henderson, 1990, Rogers, et al., 2014. Reinhard Tausch, a student of Carl Rogers, was my professor when I studied psychology and specialized as clinical psychologist at the University of Hamburg, Germany, 1974–1978.

[39] Burckhardt, 1860, 1878. Present-day historians have a more nuanced view, see, among others, Starn, 1998, p. 24:

> Rather than a period with definitive beginnings and endings and consistent content in between, the Renaissance can be (and occasionally has been) seen as a movement of practices and ideas to which specific groups and identifiable persons variously responded in different times and places. It would be in this sense a network of diverse, sometimes converging, sometimes conflicting cultures, not a single, time-bound culture.

[40] See Foucault and Chapsal, 1966, see also Foucault, 1957b, and Foucault, 1957a. I thank Howard Richards for reminding us of this part of Foucault's work in Lecture Five of his Against Foucault series shared in Pretoria, South Africa, see http://youtu.be/W4uzLgqul-4 on May 8, 2013. See for more Richards, et al., 2015. Richards describes Foucault as "the archaeologist of European culture," who dug up the key cultural codes of Europe at a time just prior to the early 1600s. According to Foucault, *resemblance* was a fundamental code or *épistème* governing knowledge in Europe at the time of the Renaissance. At the beginning of the 17th century, however, this came to an end rather abruptly. "We must stop for a moment at that point in time when resemblance will detach itself from its connections with knowledge (*savoir*) and disappear, at least in part, from the horizon of knowledge (*connaissance*)," Foucault 1966, p. 32. Europe's new episteme became *representation*, which reigned

throughout the classical age of the 17th and 18th centuries, until the French Revolution and the beginning of what Foucault calls *notre modernité* at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries.

[41] Lindner, 2009, p. 72.

[42] Karlberg, 2014.

[43] Karlberg, 2014.

[44] Stephen Purdey, international relations specialist and research affiliate of the Waterloo Institute for Complexity and Innovation at the University of Waterloo in Ontario, Canada, in his contribution to the Great Transition Network Initiative discussion titled "Meaning, Religion, and a Great Transition," November 21, 2014, in response to Karlberg, 2014.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Rüsen, 2011, S. 319–321. See also Rüsen, 2013.

[52] Rüsen, 2011, S. 319–321.

[53] Rüsen, 2011, S. 319–321.

[54] Mayer-Tasch, 2011.

[55] Mayer-Tasch, 2011, pp. 483 and 487.

[56] Karlberg, 2014.

[57] Lindner, 2012.

[58] This section is adapted from www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php. See more in Lindner, 2019, or Lindner, 2020.

[59] Wacquant, 2005, p. 134.

[60] "When Generosity Hurts: Bill Gates, Public School Teachers and the Politics of Humiliation," by Henry A. Giroux, *thruthout*, October 5, 2010, http://truth-out.org/archive/component/k2/item/92120:when-generosity-hurts-bill-gates-public-school-teachers-and-the-politics-of-humiliation. I thank Brian Ward for having made us aware of this article. See some of Giroux's publications: Di Leo, et al., 2013, Giroux, 2011, 2014a, b.

[61] For the medical doctorate, see Lindner, 1993. See also Lindner, 2001, and Lindner, 2000b. For the doctorate in psychology, see Lindner, 1996. See Lindner, 2000a. See full texts on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

[62] See www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/03.php. My intentions were misunderstood by the media who covered the event, they understood is as a short-term response to racist violence that had occurred a few months earlier.

[63] See, among others, Lindner, 2006b, or Lindner, 2007a and Lindner, 2006a.

[64] See the geographical and chronological description of my global life design at www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin/09.php#chronology.

[65] Neurath, 1932/1933.

[66] Columbia University's Conflict Resolution Network (CU-CRN) was founded, among others, by the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) and its Center for International Conflict Resolution (CICR) led by Andrea Bartoli, together with Peter Coleman and the Morton Deutsch International Center for Cooperation and

Conflict Resolution (MD-ICCCR) and Betty Reardon's Peace Education Program. CU-CRN was superseded by the Advanced Consortium on Cooperation, Conflict, and Complexity (AC4) in 2009.

[67] Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, HumanDHS, www.humiliationstudies.org.

[68] See how we developed our logo on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/logos.php.

[69] World Dignity University initiative, www.worlddignityuniversity.org.

[70] Dignity Press, www.dignitypress.org.

[71] See for a list of past and future conferences www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/annualmeetings.php.

[72] Dialogue Homes for Dignity, www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/dialoguehome.php.

[73] Vogel and Lazare, 1990.

[74] Otten and Jonas, 2013. See also "Humiliation May Be the Most Intense of Human Emotions," May 20, 2014, www.zmescience.com/medicine/mind-and-brain/humiliation-most-intense-human-emotion-53645/#!baGjgb. See also Leask, 2013a, b, or Collazzoni, et al., 2014.

[75] Lindner, 1996. See the full text on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

[76] See for our conference www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/annualmeetings.php.

[77] Dewey, 1931, p. 220.

[78] Pollack, 1999, see front flap of the book:

> In this book, the author explains how the human brain continually filters the present through memories and emotions of the past. It takes the brain a second to process perceptions, and, therefore, what we think is the present actually happened a second ago. In addition, painful memories are being repressed. As a result, "even the most rational, is permeated with unconscious feelings, fears, and emotions… Thus the direction of scientific research is driven by private demons, not public needs… Today science can do more good than ever before, and it can also do more harm. The time has come for scientists and others to abandon the notion that there is any such thing as the disinterested pursuit of truth. Instead, they must strive for a therapeutic self-awareness of their unconscious agendas and work for larger goals than personal immortality."

See also Lindner, 2009.

[79] Critical realism is associated with names such as philosopher Roy Bhaskar and philosopher and psychologist Horace Romano Harré — known as Rom Harré — together with sociologist Margaret Archer and Heikki Patomäki, scholar of world politics.

[80] I quote from a text that I revised on September 27, 2014, after Howard Richards' Lecture Three in his Against Foucault series shared in Pretoria, South Africa, on May 6, 2013, see http://youtu.be/OD001HfydoY.

[81] As far as I can see, the connection between "job" and contribution to society is not flexible enough in Western societies, a person who worked physically hard, should be able to transit into a less physically demanding form of contribution to society. See, among others, "Dignity in Retirement Is Not Too Much to Ask: How can we reinvent faculty retirement to benefit all parties?" by Sue Barnes, Janette Brown, and David D. Perlmutter, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 24, 2014, http://chronicle.com/article/Dignity-in-Retirement-Is-Not/150191/. See also Van Ummersen, et al., 2014.

[82] Please see background reflections developing since 2004, as short summary, and longer paper, on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php.

[1] Pinker, 2011, p. xxi.

[2] "The Decline in Global Violence Reality or Myth?" press release by the Human Security Report Project (HSRP), School for International Studies, Simon Fraser University, Harbour Centre, Vancouver, BC, Canada, March 3, 2014, www.hsrgroup.org/docs/Publications/HSR2013/HSR_2013_Press_Release.pdf.

[3] Walzer, 1993. I thank Tony Jenkins for reminding me of Walzer's Tanner lecture in 1985. See also Jenkins, 2014.

[4] Trigger, 1993, p. 52.

[5] Boulding, 1956. I thank Tony Jenkins for reminding me of Boulding's book *The Image*. See Jenkins, 2014.

[6] Kenneth E. Boulding, www.personal.psu.edu/~dxl31/research/otherstuff/boulding.html.

[7] Fry, 2006a.

[8] See Horgan, 2012, his blog at *Scientific American*, http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/about.php?author=34

[9] "Nonviolent Communication with Marshall Rosenberg — A Brief Introduction,! www.youtube.com/watch?v=DgaeHeIL39Y, uploaded on July 29, 2010, see transcript at http://www.upworthy.com/its-probably-one-of-the-best-reactions-you-can-give-to-someone-who-doesnt-like-you?c=upw1.

[10] There is a huge amount of literature about just war. See, among others, Syse and Reichberg, 2007, Walzer, 1977.

[11] Staub, 1989.