

# Sustainable Peace Survey

Evelin Lindner, April 2015

Written in response to the following invitation (see [http://lichen.intuitionanalytics.com/peace\\_survey/#/](http://lichen.intuitionanalytics.com/peace_survey/#/)):

Dear Expert,

We are extending you an invitation to participate in this project in recognition of your work and expertise in the fields of peace and conflict. The main goals of this project are to:

- Use the scientific evidence from a wide range of disciplines to identify factors that influence sustainable peace.
- Create a shared understanding of the relationships between the main factors influencing sustainable peace and their relative importance.
- Build on this evidence to identify effective interventions, measurable goals, and indicators for sustainable peace.

We have developed an interactive survey to gather perspectives on the meaning(s) of ‘sustainable peace’. The survey was designed with the aim to capture unique perspectives. It will take you approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the core questions of this survey. You will also have the choice to answer optional questions and elaborate on certain areas. Our hope is that you will find this survey relevant and worth your time.

This survey is only the first step towards better understanding the key factors, disciplinary perspectives, and themes that are relevant to sustainable peace. Beyond your participation today, we also hope for your involvement in the subsequent phases the project. At the end of this survey, you will have the opportunity to let us know if you would like to receive additional information. You will also be able to request a copy of the final report on the findings of this survey. All responses will be kept anonymous.

Thank you for participating.

Very best,

Peter T. Coleman, Columbia University

Beth Fisher-Yoshida, Columbia University

Joshua Fisher, Columbia University

Douglas P. Fry, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Larry S. Liebovitch, Queens College, City University of New York

Kyong Mazzaro, Columbia University

Santiago Ortiz, Moebio Labs

Philippe Vandebroek, shiftN

## Contents

1. A metaphor for ‘sustainable peace’ .....	2
Evelin Lindner: .....	3
2. Definition of ‘sustainable peace’ .....	4
Evelin Lindner: .....	4
3. Key elements .....	6
Evelin Lindner: .....	7
6. Scholarly Research .....	8
Evelin Lindner: .....	8
7. Relevant disciplines .....	8
Evelin Lindner: .....	8
8. Background Information .....	9
9. Get more information .....	10
Evelin Lindner: .....	10
10. Receive report .....	10
Evelin Lindner: .....	10
11. Misunderstandings .....	10
Evelin Lindner: .....	10
12. Contact information of other possible contributors .....	11
Evelin Lindner: .....	11
13. Comments and recommendations .....	11

### The concept of ‘sustainable peace’

The term ‘peace’ comes from the Latin pax (agreement, tranquility, absence of hostility). The most common definitions of peace refer to a state of tranquility or quiet, freedom from disturbance, or a time of concord. The term ‘sustainability’ is derived from the Latin sustinere (tenere, to hold). Sustain can mean ‘maintain’, ‘support’, or ‘endure’. In ecology, sustainability refers to how biological systems remain diverse and productive. In more general terms, sustainability is the endurance of systems and processes.

### 1. A metaphor for ‘sustainable peace’

Please describe how you understand the concept of ‘sustainable peace’ by making use of a metaphor. Feel free to list any images, ideas, and associations that you find to be linked to, or help explain the meaning of sustainable peace.

## **Evelin Lindner:**

I suggest using two metaphors, that of traffic lights and that of a garden.

To start with the first, in my work, I sometimes use traffic as a metaphor to illustrate ways of organizing society. Traffic lights are meant to serve the common good by creating a level playing field. Equal dignity for all means that every driver has the same rights before traffic lights; the size of the vehicle, its color, and its price do not affect the driver's status or rights, neither whether the drivers like or dislike each other.

Traffic lights can be 'hijacked' by power elites so that only a few big cars get through even at red traffic lights, creating an atmosphere of fear and terror. Apartheid would be an example for this state of affairs, which can also be called structural and systemic humiliation. This strategy goes one step further when a traffic system is used to terrorize all participants into becoming part of a big war machinery that carries terror also into neighboring territories. In the case of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi Germany, for instance, it manifested as a campaign of mass homicide that ultimately was also suicidal.

It would be a misunderstanding to believe that dismantling all traffic lights in the name of freedom would bring peace; it would simply produce new forms of hijacked traffic rules, because it opens all floodgates for *might* to become *right*.

The traffic metaphor can also illustrate why a society cannot build rules that manifest the human rights ideal of equality in worthiness (equal dignity for all) and at the same time create rules that manifest unequal worthiness (*higher* beings presiding over *lesser* beings): a country has to decide for either right-hand or left-hand driving, unless it wishes for accidents. It is not possible to realize both versions at the same time, at least not without accidents-by-design, it is also not possible to allow for a slow transition from one to the other, where everyone has the freedom to do what they prefer. It is either domination or refraining from domination, it is either the manifestation of the dominator model of society, or of the partnership model (Riane Eisler's coinage), it is either cooperation for the sake of competition for domination, or cooperation for the sake of cooperation.

The metaphor of a garden can be used to fill the traffic metaphor with real life. The *ideal-type approach* conceived by sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920) differentiates levels of abstraction and distills and highlights core essences of phenomena, while recognizing the significance of complex details at more peripheral levels. The metaphor of traffic illustrates that left-hand driving versus right-hand driving is a core feature of every country's traffic system – and that focusing on this core aspect in a discussion on traffic does not deny that traffic also entails myriads of other, more complex details.

The ideal-type concept manifests the unity in diversity principle and demonstrates how it can be operationalized through the *subsidiarity principle* of layering. *Subsidiarity in politics* means that local decision making and local identities are retained to the greatest extent possible, and that only higher level tasks are centralized. *Nested governance structures*, *holarchy*, or, in brain research, *regulatory pyramids*, are other names for this concept.

This is how gardens thrive. The image of a garden brings life and color to the abstraction of the traffic metaphor. It shows that, while the constitutive and regulatory traffic rules of society might follow a narrow Newtonian machine concept, these rules must create space for the flourishing and replenishment of living eco- and socio-systems of ever-changing organic growth that are characterized by much fuller and richer diversity than Newtonian thinking alone would permit.

To maintain sustainable peace, world society would need to co-create a global garden. This means co-creating a global traffic system and taking great care that it serves the common good, that it allows all to live united in equal dignity within the planetary boundaries. Great care would need to be taken to avoid permitting these traffic rules to be hijacked, be it under the banner of overt tyranny or the banner of ‘freedom’ for might to become right. To do this at a global scale is of crucial importance, since in a compartmentalized world, the danger of attacks from neighbors, also called the *security dilemma*, makes the *commons dilemma* almost insurmountable. In a divided world, peace lasts only until the next war.

Only a globally united society can sustainably tackle the two threats that commons face: attackers from outside and free-riders from within, both of whom hijack traffic rules for their own advantages. Only in a globally united world are attackers from outside eliminated per definition – there is no ‘outside’ anymore – and free-riders, exploiters, and violent people who threaten from within can be contained in joint global cooperation. Only in a globally united community can such connective activities such as loving care, cooperation, and reconciliation be invested into care for all within planetary boundaries, rather than into only strengthening ‘us’ against ‘them’ in competition for domination. Only in a globally united community can Morton Deutsch’s crude law of social relations unfold its full potential and is no longer stopped where the security dilemma starts: ‘cooperation breeds cooperation, while competition breeds competition.’ Only a globally united community can truly manifest the path to peace through ‘waging good conflict,’ rather than conflict in a divided world risking the creation of cycles of humiliation and thus ever greater divisions.

Terms such as ‘national security’ or peace defined as ‘calm and quiet’ are embedded in a world where no garden can flourish sustainably. The term ‘national security’ betrays a world that is divided, where peace lasts only until the next war. Terms such as ‘calm and stability’ betray that stability may be obtained through means of structural humiliation.

Peace is only sustainable when the world unites as a living garden where constitutive and regulatory rules enshrine and protect everybody’s respectful cooperation in dialogue and partnership, both between people, and with their environment. This is ‘human security,’ this is peace with dignity, or, more precisely, with respect for equality in dignity, where the humiliation dynamic, the strongest force that can disrupt relationships, can be prevented and healed.

## **2. Definition of ‘sustainable peace’**

From the perspective of your discipline, please give your definition of sustainable peace.

### **Evelin Lindner:**

I have lived globally for the past forty years, and wherever I go, all over the world, people speak of peace, love, harmony, reconciliation, forgiveness, and conflict resolution. I have learned to qualify these terms very carefully, because, basically, they entail connotations at their core which stand in diametrical opposition to each other.

There are two definitions of sustainable peace around, the first is less ambitious and less sustainable, and the second definition is more ambitious and more sustainable. The first one is widely mistaken as the only ‘realistic’ definition, even though, under present-day circumstances, it is ever more unrealistic and even counter-productive. Under present-day circumstances, only the second definition is truly realistic.

The first definition is part of the dominator model of society. Peace means keeping one's enemies safely at bay and one's own people firmly down – at present, North Korea, for instance, applies this script overtly, others do so more covertly, even hiding it behind human rights rhetoric. The second definition is part of the partnership context, where peace means respectful dialogue between equals. From the second point of view, the peace and quiet of successful oppression is just another word for masked violence, as systems of apartheid illustrated and North Korea still does. Another word would be structural violence, including structural humiliation.

The first definition of peace accepts that the world is compartmentalized and fragmented, and it is based on the expectation that this will always remain like this. This definition takes the Hobbesian 'state of anarchy' as an unchangeable 'given' for global society. In a compartmentalized world, the security dilemma forces bloody competition to the fore even where nobody is interested in going to war. War can simply emerge out of mutual distrust. The security dilemma is tragic because its logic of mistrust and fear is inescapable: 'igitur qui desiderat pacem, praeparet bellum' is the advice given by Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus, a writer of the Later Roman Empire. It means in English: 'therefore, who desires peace, prepare for war.' Peace with potentially threatening neighbors is sought through deterring them from attacking, and this is done by way of armament and a balance of terror. Peace within is sought through keeping calm, quiet, and stability, which, in turn, favors dominator societies built on structural humiliation.

The security dilemma evolved throughout the past millennia under the motto 'if you want peace, prepare for war,' and in this context, indeed, 'the best defense is a good offense.' Even the most peaceable leader could not withstand this logic. Even more, this setup fosters less peaceable leaders, since, as soon as power elites have gained privileges, they may develop an interest in artificially prolonging or even intensifying the security dilemma to maintain these privileges. They will seek peace by emphasizing fear or even stoking fear, so as to be able to respond by arms races and deterrence through 'a balance of terror.' In such a context, Gandhi's alternative tenet of 'there is no path to peace – peace is the path' faces accusations ranging from 'naïveté' to 'appeasement,' and 'lack of patriotism,' and it might bring its advocates even into prison or on the gallows for 'high treason.'

Gandhi's tenet of 'there is no path to peace – peace is the path' is the motto of the second definition of peace, the path of Nelson Mandela, Paulo Freire, Morton Deutsch, and all like-minded thinkers and leaders. It can only be realized in a globally united world. At the present juncture in human history, where global interconnectedness is ever increasing, it is the only realistic and feasible path, because it is this interconnectedness now that provides the arena for exploitation, oppression, and war. Yet, millennia of familiarity with the first condition, a divided world, make it difficult for people to realize the novelty of today's situation. Many people overlook how historically unparalleled present times are and to which degree lessons from history do not apply as before. Present-day technology and scientific insight, for the first time in human history, make global dignity community building feasible, which in turn, can weaken the security dilemma and make it manageable.

The security dilemma can get weaker when not only heads of states or few diplomats play a role, but more actors create webs of mutual trust across borders, and even borders change their nature, from enforcing uniformity in division to allowing for unity in diversity. When the human world community defines and structures itself in global unity in diversity, the factual underpinnings for the security dilemma disappear and a global culture of peace can emerge, a culture where all unite to protect unity from degrading into uniformity and prevent diversity from becoming division. This is the unparalleled historic promise of *ingathering*, as anthropologists

call the coming-together of humankind. Globalization is destructive when it serves global plundering – global dictatorship is a recipe for the absence of peace as much as global anarchy. Globalization is constructive when its citizens wake up from age-old submissiveness, hear Paulo Freire’s message of *conscientization*, and jointly bring about a great transition. In a globally interconnected world, peace is only sustainable when care is taken to maintain unity in diversity globally, so that it can also flourish locally.

Windows of opportunity to create a global human dignity community stood open several times during history, for instance, before World War I, after World War II, and now, after the Cold War. Before WWI, Bertha von Suttner wrote her novel book *Die Waffen nieder*, or *Lay Down Your Arms!*, for which she received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1905. After World War II, the human rights convention was signed that invites all human beings into one family of equal dignity and rights. After the Cold War, a new window opened, which is still waiting to be used: bold steps wait to be taken now. The image of the Blue Planet gives a visible face to this historical window of opportunity that may not stay open for long.

A world in the grip of the security dilemma degrades unity in diversity, since facing division with out-groups pushes unity into uniformity within. Throughout history, cultural heydays that were characterized by high degrees of unity in diversity where therefore rare. Yet, from the Shiraz of poet Hafez’ in Persia to the Moorish Kingdom of Granada, we do have glimpse of how truly sustainable peace can look like. Respect for the equality in dignity of all involved is at the core of such unity in diversity, which means abstaining from inflicting humiliation and giving serious attention to feelings of humiliation so as to prevent and heal them. Not only was such cultural blossoming rare in human history, also most present-day cultural contexts fail to socialize their citizens into the values and skills necessary to achieve it. It requires considerable effort to envision, embark on, and apply dignifying communication styles that can connect in dialogue rather than keeping monologues apart.

To contribute to convening a global dignity community is the very aim of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network. For almost forty years, I personally have ‘tested’ the hypothesis of whether it is possible to approach all human beings on this planet as family, and I can attest that there is a profound human eagerness to connect, if met with respect. These are ‘thick attractors,’ to use the language of Peter Coleman’s dynamical systems theory.

Widely accepted buzzwords such as investor confidence, economic growth, or job-creation are sign-posts of a world that binds its newly emerging interconnectedness up in systemic constraints that produce ecological overshoot – the planet’s carrying capacity is increasingly being overstretched – including a burgeoning military-industrial-media-academic complex. A global citizens movement is the only force that is large enough to face the global scope of present-day challenges and use newly emerging global interconnectedness to co-create a world of unity in diversity rather than maintaining a world of division without unity.

### 3. Key elements

Different areas of science identify different elements associated with peaceful individuals, groups, societies, ecosystems, etc. In the next section, we are interested in knowing your scientific perspective on the key elements of sustainable peace.

Based on your scientific perspective and on the empirical evidence available to date, please make a list of the most relevant 2 or 3 key elements of sustainable peace you have found to be

most relevant. If you wish to list more than 3 key elements, you can do so. Please add each factor in the boxes on the left and specify:

The level of importance of each key element by adjusting the sliding scale

Any explanation or clarification regarding each factor (optional)

Whether or not elements are barriers to (inhibitors) or enablers (catalysts) of sustainable peace. Under different conditions, a certain element may be an enabler or inhibitor, if that is the case please list the element as ‘both’ and provide details about the relationship in the description box

Barrier

Both

Enabler

0

If you wish to elaborate on the relationships between the key elements you have listed, you can click on the button below and complete an optional interactive section.

### **Evelin Lindner:**

- Acknowledging human nature as *Homo amans* and *homo cooperans* (enabler of prime importance):

The security dilemma in combination with the correspondence error have erroneously established a belief in human nature as *Homo dominator* and *Homo economicus*.

- Global unity in diversity (enabler of prime importance):

Global unity in diversity is waiting to be realized as a globally *imagined community* (Benedict Anderson’s coinage, with the Blue Planet as prime visualization), underpinned by technology (global means of communication and transportation), and the intentional co-creation of global constitutive and regulatory rules (as a process with continuous feedback mechanisms, rather than as static implementation).

- Dignity communication skills – *dignicommunication* skills (enabler of prime importance):

Dignicommunication starts with being aware that the prime aim of communication is to establish connections rather than simply conveying information or distributing orders, thus heeding in all relationships the insights that were gained in research on marital satisfaction, namely, that one criticism must be outweighed with several expressions of recognition and appreciation (see, e.g., John Gottman’s work), which means, among others, avoiding humiliating others. Furthermore, *listening into voice* (Linda Hartling’s coinage) means emphasizing *connected knowing* rather than *separate knowing* (Mary Belenky’s coinage), and choosing affirmative and connective terminology such as *Lifeism* (identity with life) and *ThriveAbility*, rather than negations such as ‘non-violence’ or ‘non-killing’ (negations draw attention to what they wish to decry and risk being misunderstood, unknowingly, as a call for what they want to avoid; to engage the human motivational system in a beneficial way, we need to shift from a psychology of negation and avoidance to a psychology of thriving). Dignicommunication requires *social identity complexity* skills (see, e.g., the work of Marilyn Brewer, Michel Serres, or Kwame Appiah), an *incremental* theory of intelligence rather than an *ego-oriented* performance orientation (see, e.g., Carol Dweck’s work), a Buberian and Lévinasian *I-Thou* orientation that highlights the *Other*, whose *face* forces us to be humane. This needs to be combined with the *Big Love* (Lindner’s coinage)

that builds on Gandhi's notion of *satyāgraha*, a term assembled from *agraha* (firmness/force) and *satya* (truth-love). Part of dignicommunication is to *wage good conflict* (Jean Baker Miller's coinage), where conflict is welcomed as opportunity to enrich unity in diversity, which means refraining from using violence as well as resisting denying conflict. The word conflict comes from Latin verb *flectere*, to bend, to curve. In conflict, discord displaces concord and may lead to confrontation. The word confrontation entails the Latin word *frons* which means forehead. In confrontation, foreheads are placed against each other, in opposition, and benefit from jointly turning toward the challenges that a conflict brings to light, solving it in cooperation rather than confrontation.

## 6. Scholarly Research

Finally, we are interested in knowing more details about your disciplinary perspective and the scholarly research you find most relevant.

From your scientific perspective, please list any relevant scholarly research or references that shed light on the conceptualization of or the elements associated with 'sustainable peace'.

### **Evelin Lindner:**

With my colleagues, I build a theory of dignity and humiliation that is transcultural and transdisciplinary, entailing elements from fields such as history, social philosophy, political science, sociology, criminology, anthropology, psychology (clinical, cultural, community, social psychology), and neuroscience, while drawing on lived experience.

## 7. Relevant disciplines

Please list and weigh the importance of relevant disciplines or areas of expertise that are essential to understand the elements, drivers, and barriers associated to sustainable peace.

### **Evelin Lindner:**

With my colleagues, I build a *theory of dignity and humiliation* that is transcultural and transdisciplinary, entailing elements from fields such as history, social philosophy, political science, sociology, criminology, anthropology, psychology (clinical, cultural, community, social psychology), and neuroscience, while drawing on lived experience.

All disciplines are equally important. However, I see a few 'blind spots':

On my global path during the past forty years, on all continents, I have lived with people from all walks of life, from indigenous communities in the rainforests to city dwellers in the world's slums and palaces. Underneath many layers of diversity, I have learned to distinguish two core ways of being-in-the-world: the first approach is based on the view that human worthiness is ranked – it is seen as natural or divinely ordained order that *higher* beings preside over *lesser* beings – while the second approach sees worthiness as un-ranked – this is the human rights ideal of equal dignity for all.

The first approach, the domination/submission approach, is increasingly becoming dysfunctional at the present historical juncture, it becomes counter-productive and even suicidal.



Also my personal experience indicates that the second approach is better suited for a dignified future for humankind.

Yet, I observe two blind spots in the group of people who embrace the second worldview, one pertaining to communication skills, and the other to the question of global governance. As to communication skills, psychology is one important discipline covering this field, a field that needs to be liberated from being seen as unimportant, 'soft,' and 'feminine.'

As to global governance, anthropology and psychology may need to deeply self-reflect to liberate themselves and also other fields, such as political science and economics, from any complicity in *governmentality* (Foucault's coinage), complicity in serving existing power arrangements rather than the common good.

## **8. Background Information**

Lastly, we would like to gather some background information about you, which will be kept confidential.

### **Name:**

Evelin Lindner (my middle name is Gerda, so you could also write Evelin G. Lindner, or Evelin Gerda Lindner)

### **Affiliations and email addresses:**

- Founding President of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS, [www.humiliationstudies.org](http://www.humiliationstudies.org)), and Co-founder of the World Dignity University initiative (WDU, [www.worlddignityuniversity.org](http://www.worlddignityuniversity.org), see also [www.youtube.com/watch?v=qGyPwHC5JdU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qGyPwHC5JdU)), including Dignity Press, with imprint World Dignity University Press ([www.dignitypress.org](http://www.dignitypress.org))

- Affiliated with the University of Oslo, Norway, the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights ([www.humanrights.uio.no](http://www.humanrights.uio.no)), and the Department of Psychology ([folk.uio.no/evelin/](http://folk.uio.no/evelin/), [e.g.lindner@psykologi.uio.no](mailto:e.g.lindner@psykologi.uio.no))

- Affiliated with the Morton Deutsch International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution (MD-ICCCR) as part of the Advanced Consortium on Cooperation, Conflict, and Complexity (AC4, [ac4.ei.columbia.edu](http://ac4.ei.columbia.edu), [egl2109@tc.columbia.edu](mailto:egl2109@tc.columbia.edu)), Columbia University, New York City

- Affiliated with the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, [www.msh-paris.fr](http://www.msh-paris.fr)

- Teaching globally ([www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php))

- See lectures on dignity and humiliation given at the University of Oslo in Norway since 2009 (in English and Norwegian) at [www.sv.uio.no/tjenester/kunnskap/podkast/index.html](http://www.sv.uio.no/tjenester/kunnskap/podkast/index.html) (search for Lindner)

- Several awards, nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize (2015)

### **Discipline(s) or area of expertise:**

Sustainable Peace Survey, Evelin Lindner, 2015

Medical Doctor, Psychologist, Dr. med., Dr. psychol., Transdisciplinary Scholar in Social Studies and Humanities

## **9. Get more information**

This is a multi-year project that will involve the commissioning of science briefs and a series of expert workshops that will take place at Columbia University in New York. Would you be interested in getting more information about ways to continue your participation in this initiative? If so, we will contact you.

**Evelin Lindner:**

Of course I would love receiving a final report on the findings of this survey!

## **10. Receive report**

Would you be interested in receiving a final report on the findings of this survey?

**Evelin Lindner:**

Of course I would love receiving a final report on the findings of this survey!

## **11. Misunderstandings**

Are there any myths or misunderstandings around the term ‘sustainable peace’ you would like to highlight?

**Evelin Lindner:**

What some might call misunderstanding, others call the ‘only true’ conceptualization. A person, who defines peace as ‘if you want peace, prepare for war’ will label Gandhi’s definition of peace as a foolish misunderstanding, or worse. And vice versa. In a compartmentalized, fragmented, and divided world, the first position will have its legitimacy. The second understanding of peace, namely, Gandhi’s tenet that peace is the path, is feasible only in a more united world. Therefore, to realize the second kind of peace, it is insufficient to simply call for it and accuse others of misunderstanding, without working for global convergence in globally shared cooperative stewardship and care for all social and ecological relationships.

After forty years of global living, from my point of view, the core misunderstanding that humankind falls victim to at the current juncture of human history, or, more precisely, the core oversight or lag of understanding, is to be found in the lack of attention for the fact that none of our forefathers was able to see anything comparable as, for example, the Blue Planet from the astronaut’s perspective. None of our predecessors was able to fathom in the same way as present-day *Homo sapiens* that we are one single family living on one tiny planet. None of our founders

of religions, philosophies, or empires had access to the vast amount of knowledge about the universe and our place in it that we possess today.

However, accusing people of misunderstanding who have difficulties grasping the novelty of our historical situation, would only demonstrate outdated communication skills, a lack of *dignicommunication* skills, the very skills that are needed to manifest Gandhi's kind of peace.

## **12. Contact information of other possible contributors**

Please share the names and contact information of any scholar, practitioner or policymaker who you feel could significantly contribute to this initiative to better understand sustainable peace.

Name

Discipline

Affiliation

Contact info (optional)

### **Evelin Lindner:**

Please see the Global Advisory Board of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, [www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board.php](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board.php), and also its Global Research and Education Teams, as well as its Global Core Team, [www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/whoweare.php](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/whoweare.php).

## **13. Comments and recommendations**

Please share any comments or recommendations regarding this survey.

Thank you for your participation!