Terror in Norway: How Can We Continue from a Point of Utter Despair?
Promoting a Dignity Culture, not Just Locally, but Globally

The first draft of this paper was prepared for the 17th Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies 'Enlarging the Boundaries of Compassion,' in Dunedin, New Zealand, 29th April – 1st September 2011

Introduction

On 22nd July 2011, Norway suffered two sequential terrorist attacks against its civilian population, the government, and a political summer camp in Norway. This tragedy has shocked Norway to the point that even mentioning the name of the 32-year-old perpetrator Anders Behring Breivik was being avoided for a while and ABB was being used to refer to him. He was first regarded as right-wing terrorist and later, in an initial evaluation, diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia. A second evaluation began on 13th January 2012.[1]

The guiding questions of this paper are the following: What should be done after such atrocities have occurred? How can one continue from a point of utter despair? What can a society do to help its members? What can a society do to help prevent repetitions of similar acts of violence in the future?

In my work, I use a wide geohistorical lens that encompasses the entire history of the species *Homo sapiens*. It has been argued that large-scale models sometimes explain details more clearly and parsimoniously than when only the details themselves are studied.[2] The lens that I use helps explain how and why destructive cultural, social and psychological scripts from the past still permeate human activity, from the level of the individual to that of nations, and why they are being detected, rejected and transcended much too slowly.

The paper begins with a personal message that honours the feelings of those who are left in shock and despair after the 22nd July 2011. It then embeds right-wing extremism into a larger geohistorical context. The paper then highlights insights that might be drawn from such a large-scale contextualisation. It then lists a number of recommendations relevant to preventing similar atrocities in the future:

(1) Cool down
(2) Allow for imperfection

---

[1] See also a summary at www.tv2.no/nyheter/innenriks/dette-er-hele-sammendraget-av-rapporten-om-breivik-3651164.html. Randi Rosenqvist, one of the most influential forensic psychiatrist in Norway, was very hesitant as to the validity of the initial diagnosis of insanity, see 'Mama's Boy and Mass Murderer: Experts Disagree on Psychological State of Norwegian Killer,' by Gerald Traufetter, 23rd December, 2011, www.spiegel.de/international/europe/0,1518,805635,00.html. 'Breivik skal vurderes på nytt,' by Målfrid Bordvik , *ABC Nyheter*, 13th Janary, 2012,
www.abcnyheter.no/nyheter/2012/01/13/breivik-skal-vurderes-pa-nytt.

[2] Cosmologist Max Tegmark, for instance, defends his *ultimate ensemble* hypothesis by saying that an entire ensemble is often much simpler to explain than one of its members. See for a recent publication, Tegmark, 2008.

(3) Place malleability over rigidity
(4) Strive for unity in diversity
(5) Nurture *one* global family

The paper recommends global dialogue as one path to preventing future atrocities. It supports Jonas Gahr Støre, the foreign minister of Norway, who made a compelling case for open dialogue, even when values diverge, in an attempt to build greater security for all.[3] The paper then models this recommendation through quoting a dialogue on dignity and humiliation.

The paper concludes with presenting the World Dignity University as one among many initiatives that aim to nurture a global dignity culture.

A personal message

May I begin this paper by quoting from the messages that I sent out to friends and colleagues immediately subsequent to the 22nd July 2011 atrocity (it is important to note that the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, of which I am the founding president, launched its World Dignity University initiative[4] on 24th June 2011 in Oslo, less than a month prior to the attack):

Just now, we are all shocked and profoundly saddened that Norway, where we just had the most peaceful launch of our World Dignity University initiative, on 24th June 2011, has been struck by such violence on 22nd July, not even a month later.

The rose-processions of 25th July in Norway gave everybody courage. They highlighted that the future lies in mobilising responsible citizenship, in citizens standing together in solidarity.

The tragic events of the 22nd July of 2011 showed that extremist violence, of whatever background, and in whichever part of the world, hurts us all, the entire human family. Today, there is no place on this globe that is not affected by what happens in the rest of the world, be it that people are opening up to and being enriched by cultural diversity, or closing themselves off and lashing out with violence. The conclusion must be that we have to work locally and globally and that dignity must become a movement, a culture, a spirit, not just in a few localities, but all over the world. And this is precisely what the work of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network and World Dignity University initiative is about. Joining hands, nurturing a culture of mutual care, of dignity, locally and globally, is what we need to invest our energy in. Even though we cannot undo harm that has happened in the past, we will, hopefully, help contribute to preventing more harm being perpetrated in the future.

We read in *New York Times*: 'Thomas Hegghammer, a terrorism specialist at the Norwegian Defense Research Establishment, said the manifesto [written by Behring Breivik] bears an eerie resemblance to those of Osama bin Laden and other Al Qaeda leaders, though from a Christian rather than a Muslim point of view. Like Mr. Breivik's manuscript, the major Qaeda declarations have detailed accounts of the Crusades, a pronounced sense of historical grievance and calls for apocalyptic warfare to defeat the

---

[3] Jonas Gahr Støre, November, 2011, www.ted.com/talks/jonas_gahr_store_in_defense_of_dialogue.html.
[4] See for the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network www.humiliationstudies.org, and for the World Dignity University initiative www.worlddignityuniversity.org.

religious and cultural enemy. 'It seems to be an attempt to mirror Al Qaeda, exactly in reverse,' Mr. Hegghammer said.'[5]

In other words, we have here a narrative of humiliation, namely the Al Qaeda narrative, mirrored by a right-wing narrative, both narratives advocating (and carrying out) violence as a 'solution,' or more precisely, as a 'prevention' of more humiliation being feared to occur in the future.

Violence as prevention of imagined future humiliation reminds of much more destructive, but otherwise very similar constructions, namely the ones of Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany and the Hutu extremists in Rwanda: genocide as 'prevention' of humiliation being feared in the future (feared by Hitler from the 'World Jewry' and by Hutu extremists from the former Tutsi elite, respectively).

I am rather taken aback by the level of comments in the media and on the Internet, simply declaring the perpetrator to be an 'aberration.' One of those comments is to be found on 'Breivik's Video Manifesto.'[6] I suggest that we need much more intelligent analyses than simply declaring him 'a faggot.'

I think that we, in our work, have the responsibility to create and disseminate narratives that respect the grievances that stand behind violent narratives, yet, that we need to lead them into the direction of the dignity of a Nelson Mandela, rather than the direction of terror, genocide, and war.

Again, I think that what happened in Oslo and on Utøya is not just a Norwegian 'problem,' and not just an aberration, but a call that we, as humankind, have to show much more civic responsibility. The dignity of *unity in diversity* is the path to go, I believe, rather than *uniformity in division*. One camp trying to achieve 'strength' through inner uniformity, pitted in hostility against an 'enemy' who responds in kind (Christian versus Muslim, for example) causes dangerous fault lines that divide the world. Global interdependence, and the need for global cooperation in the face of global challenges require that we understand that narratives of hostile division bring ruin to all of us, from whatever background such narratives may originate.

Let us be in Norway now, all of us, from all around the world, with our hearts and our tears, yet, let us understand that here we face a global responsibility, for all of humankind!

Embedding right-wing terror into a larger geohistorical context

I wrote the first draft of this paper in New Zealand, while reading about the history of its two islands.[7] I learned that the first inhabitants, when they arrived, found rich food resources. Yet, soon they diminished them—the Moa bird, for example, was hunted until extinction. Then, a warrior culture emerged and wars between tribes became frequent.
This timeline reminds of the history of the human species as a whole: *Homo sapiens* migrated from Africa and populated planet Earth until, at some point in time, wild food no longer was as abundant as

---

[5] See www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/world/europe/24oslo.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=tha2.
[6] See www.twitvid.com/EXJWW.
[7] See, for example, Metge, 1976.

before. This began to occur roughly 10,000 years ago. Wherever constraints became palpable—*circumscription* is a word used in anthropology[8]—a win-win frame of abundance transformed into a win-lose frame of scarcity, and the so-called *security dilemma* and, in its wake, systematic war emerged.

Anthropologist William Ury drew up *a simplified depiction of history*, drawing on *anthropology, game theory* and *conflict studies*. He describes three major types of society: *simple hunter-gatherers, complex agriculturists*, and the present *knowledge society*. In the first period, simple hunter-gatherers lived in a world of coexistence and open networks, where conflicts were negotiated, not solved by coercion (it is important to note that this argument is not to be confused with the concept of the "noble savage"). The abundance of wild food represented an expandable pie of resources. People were not yet forced into opposition by win-lose paradigms. With the onset of complex agriculture, however, the time of coercion began. Closed hierarchical pyramids of power, on land representing a fixed pie of resources and a win-lose frame, people were pushed into systemic antagonism governed by strict rules. Contemporary knowledge society, in contrast, again resembles the hunter-gatherer model, insofar as the pie of resources—knowledge—in essence is infinitely expandable. This fact entails the potential for win-win solutions. Tightly knit hierarchical structures can be replaced by open networks, as espoused by our earliest ancestors. Negotiation and contract can replace command lines, and coexistence finds conditions that allow it to become the primary strategy. See Table 1[9]:

A Simplified Depiction of History

Type of Society: / Conditions:	Simple hunter-gatherers	Complex agriculturists	Knowledge Society
Basic resource	Expandable pie (wild foods)	Fixed pie (land & power)	Expandable pie (knowledge)
Basic logic of conflict	Both-gain or both-lose	Win-lose	Both-gain or both-lose
Basic form of organisation	Open network	Closed pyramid	Open network
Basic form of decision making	Negotiation	Orders	Negotiation
	↓	↓	↓
	Coexistence	Coercion	Coexistence

Table 1: A simplified depiction of history[10]

Riane T. Eisler, social scientist and activist, has developed a *cultural transformation theory*. She uses the term *dominator model* for what Ury calls a *closed pyramid model* of society.[11] Throughout the past millennia, most societies around the globe, while otherwise widely divergent, followed the closed pyramid or dominator model rather than the model of *partnership* or *open networks*.

---

[8] Latin circum = around, scribere = to write, circumscription means limitation, enclosure, or confinement. The terms territorial or social circumscription address limitations in these respective areas. See, among others, the work by Carneiro, 1988, the "father" of *circumscription theory*.

[9] This paragraph is adapted from Lindner, 2006, pp. 23–24.

[10] Ury, 1999a, p. 108.

[11] Eisler, 1987. See her most recent book Eisler, 2007.

In one of my books, I describe my narrative as follows (I use the Weberian *ideal-type* approach, which allows analysis and action to proceed at different levels of abstraction.[12]):

In my work, I use Ury's historical periods as a starting point, and then include pride, honour, and dignity. I label the first 95 percent of human history, when hunting and gathering dominated and circumscription did not yet set limits for migration, as the *period of pristine untouched pride*. I call the past five percent of human history, the period of complex agriculturalism, the *period of ranked honour*. As will become clearer in the subsequent chapters, the human rights vision for the future of humankind could be labelled as a future of dignity, or, more accurately, a *future of equality in dignity for all*.

Today, through the weakening of the tragic security dilemma, space opens to undo the culture of the past 10,000 years and return to the pristine pride that characterised the first 95 percent of human history (only that we can no longer speak of *pristine* pride, because it has been mutilated by 10 millennia of humiliation), equality in dignity is the new hoped-for future. At the current point in time, humankind finds itself in a transitional phase similar to the one it traversed 10,000 years ago, a transition from one set of conditions to a radically different set of conditions. Ten millennia ago, this adaptation occurred haphazardly. Nowadays, we can and must consciously co-create this adaptation and make it much more constructive.[13]

The year 1757 is an interesting marker for the transition from *unequal* worth to *equal* worth gaining mainstream visibility, at least in the English-speaking realm. In the English language, in the year 1757, 'to humiliate' appears in the encyclopedia for the first time with the meaning 'to lower or to depress the dignity or self respect of someone.' Formerly, humiliation was used as pro-social means to 'show underlings their due lowly place.' The first sentence of Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states, 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.' In the context of human rights ideals, 'to be humiliated' is to be demeaned beyond the rightful expectation that basic human rights will be respected. Clearly, the transition is not complete. The traditional practice of regarding humiliation as a pro-social lesson to teach humility is still widely used, yet, humiliation is increasingly regarded as an anti social violation of dignity.

As reported above, forensic psychiatrists diagnosed Anders Behring Breivik's right-wing norm-orientation as delusional. For the sake of the argument in this article, the validity, or lack of validity, of this diagnosis is of lesser importance. This article wishes to focus how to prevent similar occurrences in the long-term future as a society, rather than on overcoming the immediate trauma.

There are two main ways to address tragedies as the one that happened on 22nd July 2011: First, a society can try to exonerate itself from culpability and put the burden of guilt on the perpetrator alone, or, second, a society can accept that most perpetrators act from within their social contexts, which means that

---

[12] Please read about ideal types in Coser, 1977:

Weber's three kinds of *ideal types* are distinguished by their levels of abstraction. First are the *ideal types* rooted in historical particularities, such as the "western city,' "the Protestant Ethic," or "modern capitalism," which refer to phenomena that appear only in specific historical periods and in particular cultural areas. A second kind involves abstract elements of social reality—such concepts as "bureaucracy" or "feudalism"—that may be found in a variety of historical and cultural contexts. Finally, there is a third kind of *ideal type*, which Raymond Aron calls "rationalizing reconstructions of a particular kind of behavior." According to Weber, all propositions in economic theory, for example, fall into this category. They all refer to the ways in which men would behave were they actuated by purely economic motives, were they purely economic men, Coser, 1977, p. 224.

[13] Lindner, 2010, p. 9.

everybody is called on to become more active in preventing fellow citizens going down the same violent path in the future. Both approaches have valid motivations. In the first period, when the trauma is acute and mourning is all-consuming, it is difficult to accept one's own responsibility and to think long term. Later, when shock and sadness have become less overwhelming, self-reflective and long-term approaches become psychologically more possible. What is advisable, is to refrain from evading social and societal responsibility by hiding behind the first reaction.

This paper is written in the spirit of the second approach. Focus on the person of Anders Behring Breivik, focus on his status as a legal subject, is therefore of lesser importance for this paper. This does not mean that the discussion of his status of legal sanity is regarded as unimportant; it is simply not the main focus of this paper. It is clearly very important to make sure that a society does not declare an unaccountable perpetrator to be legally sane simply to create a lightning rod for feelings of disgust and revenge, and it is equally important that a society does not declare a legally sane individual to be insane in the way dictatorships declare dissent to be insane. Clearly, it would not be advisable to make extremist ideology seemingly harmless by individualising its destructiveness through the misuse of psychology or psychiatry, be it by declaring an unaccountable person sane or vice versa.

Depending on the results of the second evaluation, Behring Breivik might be declared legally responsible and may be sentenced to prison, or he might fall within the country's definition of criminal insanity and will not be sentenced to prison. This paper makes the argument that revolving only around these two alternatives, as important as they are, can preclude attending to what is more relevant to consider in the long run for society at large, namely its responsibility for the *Zeitgeist* it creates and exposes its members to.

There will always be individuals who are ready to resort to violence; this risk can never be brought to zero by any society. However, what can be achieved is the decrease of the probability that violence-prone people find social and ideological contexts that feed on and escalate their disposition. Humiliation narratives and humiliation entrepreneurs exploit vulnerable people. Therefore, extremist narratives, and entrepreneurs of such narratives require society's prime attention.[14] Social psychologists Alexander S. Haslam and Stephen Reicher suggest 'an interactionist approach to tyranny that explains how people are (a) initially drawn to extreme and oppressive groups, (b) transformed by membership in those groups, and (c) able to gain influence over others and hence normalise oppression.'[15]

When people set out to buy into ideologies, they do so from various individual psychological dispositions.[16] When right-wing ideology is available for people to identify with, when it is allowed to grow in significant niches of society, it is open to being used by those thus inclined. If it were either unavailable in the social arena, or more sincerely debated and delegitimized in the middle of society, it would be less attractive to be used by potential extremists.

For the sake of this paper, I differentiate *extremists* from *moderates*. The most significant fault line, to my view, does not run between ideologies but between degrees of extremism. Extremists would be those who are absolute in their willingness to stand by what they regard as the only truth and who are willing, or even see it as their duty, to defend this truth and their in-group against 'enemies,' and if necessary by force. Moderates, in contrast, would be those who would avoid even using the term *enemy*.[17] There is left-wing and right-wing extremism, religious extremism—many identifications can become extreme and

---

[14] See *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict*, Lindner, 2006.

[15] Haslam & Reicher, 2007. I thank Reidar Ommundsen for making me aware of this article.

[16] See a related discussion by Per Anders Madsen in 'Fratatt all premissmakt: Kommentar,' *Aftenposten*, 30th November 2011, www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kommentarer/Fratatt-all-premissmakt-6710984.html#.TxKohIGy-Ag. I thank Nora Stene for making me aware of Madsen's position.

[17] See *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict*, Lindner, 2006.

inscribe themselves into a frame of *uniformity without diversity* rather than *unity in diversity* (see more further down).

The core questions that needs to be asked by Western societies, not just in Norway, is the following: In which ways do we, as societies, contribute to creating extremism rather than moderation? What can we do to foster moderation? This question can be broken down into many others: What does 'democracy' mean? Do we wish to live in a world where politicians, in their desire to be elected, have a tendency to heat up confrontation and create simplistic dichotomies and partisan camps where nuanced and differentiated discourse would be needed? Or, what does 'the market' mean? Do we want to live in a world where confrontation and violence receive more attention than integration because 'sex and violence' is what 'sells'? Have the media contributed to exacerbating the political, cultural and religious divides within Western societies and the world at large? How can media be deployed to enrich, rather than inhibit, dialogue?[18]

What I call extremism and moderation here have a long history that is profoundly connected with the above-presented historical transition from the dominator to the partnership model. If the right-wing ideology that Behring Breivik acted on is being analysed from within the psychology of the partnership model, then he may be understood as lacking empathy,[19] and as displaying an extreme, even delusional norm-orientation.[20]

However, viewed from within the honour norm-orientation of the dominator model, as it was mainstream during the past millennia almost all around the globe, the perspective is different. A perpetrator like Behring Breivik is not necessarily seen as lacking empathy, but as applying empathy as prescribed by the dominator model, namely empathy for a perceived in-group that has to be protected against an enemy out-group.

In other words, as long as the security dilemma was strong, it acted as a push towards extremism. The strong-men dominator culture evolved in its context. In many segments of world culture it still remains mainstream, while its grip has weakened in Western societies, at least partly. Also in Western societies, the traditional strong-men culture is still salient, not necessarily openly, but as 'hypocrisy' and 'double standards,' or hidden in certain rules of democracy and the market, even in certain interpretations of human rights ideals.[21] Particularly national pride is still steeped in traditional honour culture, also in the West. George W. Bush's policies, for example, were embedded into the American *Southern Honour* culture that historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown describes in his work.[22]

I would suggest that it is useful to dare embarking on an experiment, even though it might be very painful, and analyse Behring Breivik's motives from within the dominator model. The Japanese Samurai or the traditional Maori warrior in New Zealand could serve as illustration, or, as a contemporary example, also the culture of the Taliban in Afghanistan could help envisioning it. If we inscribe Behring Breivik's actions into a Taliban context, it appears to be not only consistent but also 'acceptable.' Indeed, this is the cultural-psychological frame that Behring Breivik chose for himself. He describes himself as someone who heroically protects his own people from being weakened by outside intruders and 'inner enemies, who open them our doors.' His definition of love is not that of a Mahatma Gandhi or Nelson Mandela.

During my doctoral field work in Rwanda, I understood that killing can be done out of loyalty and love. In my book on *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security*, I write about the complexity of love:

---

[18] Freedman & Thussu (Eds.) 2011.

[19] Baron-Cohen, 2011. I thank Finn Tschudi for looking at explanations of the *lack of empathy*.

[20] I thank Finn Tschudi for recommending Tomkins in this context. See, among others. Tomkins, 1962.

[21] Lindner, 2012.

[22] Wyatt-Brown, 2005, p. 2.

One such complexity is that love is not only constructive; it can also be very destructive. I studied the 1994 genocide in Rwanda for my doctoral research on humiliation. Hutu *génocidaires* were forced, by their superiors, to choose between two loves—their love for their Hutu group (and their own lives) and their love for their immediate family and neighbors. Many chose the first love and killed their Tutsi spouses and neighbors: love can give life, but it can also kill.[23]

I am acutely aware that contextualising Behring Breivik's motives in this way is almost unbearable, psychologically, within Norway, as of yet. Yet, stepping into the shoes of a cultural outlook that a Taliban might share, offers significant advantages, so significant that they might merit enduring the pain. Creating simplistic dichotomies between those who are guilty and those who are not, and then using the guilty as 'externalised containers,' for relieving hatred and desire for revenge, can lead us to miss important lessons. Avoiding these lessons is not advisable. Extremist right-wing violence can be de-pathologised by embedding it into a larger historical transition. Doing so enables us, globally and locally, to identify the lessons that need to be learned in the long run. Focusing only on the perpetrator as individual can lead us to miss those lessons.

Lessons to be learned

There are many lessons to be learned from embedding right-wing terror into a larger geohistorical context.

One of the lessons is that in times of increasing global interdependence, stress increases. If Behring Breivik had grown up among the Taliban, he would have been socialised into the dominator model and it would not come as a surprise if he later in his life acted upon it. Yet, Behring Breivik grew up in a very different context, a social context that required that he develops a much more difficult outlook and behaviour, namely that he is respectful of and engages with complex diversity rather than trying to purify dichotomies of black versus white. As it seems, he did have Muslim friends earlier in his life, but grew more fearful of them and hostile over time. At some point, his 'carrying capacity' for complexity seems to have been overstretched.

Complexity, indeed, is difficult to respect and live with. Complexity can become a cause of stress, rather than of enrichment. This is why the *contact hypothesis* does not always work, or the idea that bringing people together will turn them into friends.[24] Particularly in the beginning, it is unsettling and feels unsafe. It is like swimming, in contrast to clinging: to feel secure when swimming requires training, and clinging to fixity may at times feel safer. Stress often leads to psychological handicaps, for example, what is called *tunnel vision* and *decision fatigue*.[25] In a context of stress, scapegoats might be sought, and remnants of bygone and less complex, more simplistic models may be evoked. The simplistic black versus white dogmas of the dominator model are easier to live with than the complexities of the partnership model.

---

[23] Lindner, 2010, p. xxviii

[24] The so-called *contact hypothesis*, or the hope that contact will foster friendship, is valid at the aggregate level, according to a meta-analysis by Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006. I thank Daniel J. Christie for making me aware of this study.

[25] Do You Suffer From Decision Fatigue?' by John Tierney, August 17, 2011, www.nytimes.com/2011/08/21/magazine/do-you-suffer-from-decision-fatigue.html?pagewanted=all.

If past-oriented fundamentalisms were truly bygone, they would not be available to be used and bought into. Yet, the old scripts have not yet fully lost their legitimacy, even not in Norwegian society. Many versions of past-oriented fundamentalism fall into this category, ranging from completely non-violent to very violent manifestations. The lesson to learn, for society, is to differentiate between narratives of traditional honour and narratives of equality dignity, recognise that both cannot co-exist,[26] and strengthen the latter. The example of so-called honour killings is particularly useful to show the normative irreconcilability at the heart of the clash between traditional and new paradigms: 'The girl must be killed' is regarded as a sad but unavoidable duty in the context of traditional honour in many parts of the world, while 'the girl must *not* be killed' is the guiding sentence in the context of equality in dignity. In other words, at the core of the transition from a ranked honour based world toward an unranked human rights based world we do not have complexity or gradual transformation. We have a stark binary 'either—or,' either the girl dies or lives. One cannot kill the girl and have her live or vice versa. One has to decide. One has to take an unequivocal stance. Human rights defenders wish to respect other cultures, and this is important. Yet, they cannot be true to themselves if they believe that the traditional paradigm can coexist with the new one. They cannot avoid conflict. Yet, this is precisely the conflict Western societies often attempt to overlook or push under the carpet. More dangerous even is to sell out dignity for the sake of new cloaks of the traditional dominator world, such as submission under the domination of 'the market.'

Another lesson, therefore, is to understand how such a wide-spread global submission under the domination of 'the market' could come about. The abuse of the concept of freedom is discussed in my most recent book titled *A Dignity Economy*.[27] When freedom is defined as 'absence of rules and limits' (rather than as 'level playing field for all'), and as 'might is right,' it does not take long before those with power become dominators and a culture of power and domination becomes legitimised. In this way, a misguided definition of freedom, albeit inspired by the same motives as the human rights movement, and at first glance consistent with it, undermines its own goals. In such situations, empathy is devalued by the very system, and lack of empathy is no longer only an issue of deranged individuals. It is encouraged by the culture at large.

The domination of the market not only ravages the planet's resources, it also cannibalises the values of human conviviality. Solidarity is sold out qua system, including the care of the less privileged and vulnerable. Hence, another lesson to learn is that in times of increasing economic pressure, when individuals and countries are pitted against each other in a local and global race for survival, not only does stress increase. Rather than nurturing the partnership model, spiralling economic pressure that is seen as unavoidable Darwinian 'struggle for survival of the fittest' that should unfold 'in freedom,' the dominator model is pushed to the fore ever more, between groups and between individuals. When everybody tries to get ahead of everybody else in a race to the bottom, empathy employed in the service of exploiting others' Achilles heals will be seen as a strength, empathy for the sake of solidarity beyond one's immediate in-group will be regarded as a weakness.

The most important lesson to be learned for global and local societies, to my view, is to appreciate that the transition from the traditional normative universe of honour to the new normative universe of human dignity is proceeding in such a haphazard way that feelings of humiliation compound, and that it would be beneficial to carry this transition forward in a more coordinated manner, globally and locally. The traditional world of honour condones the ranking of people into higher and lesser beings, while the human rights order of equal dignity for all rejects this. As mentioned earlier, both arrangements cannot coexist, they are mutually exclusive, at least at their core. One cannot rank people and not rank them at the same time. Like in the case of driving, one can have either left-hand driving or right-hand driving, but not both.

---

[26] Lindner, 2010, p. 86.
[27] Lindner, 2012. See also Berlin, 1958.

If a country's leadership is too weak to carry out a clean transition from one system to the other, and some people continue to drive on the left side while others begin to drive on the right side, the mere incompatibility will lead to accidents. Currently, humankind allows for precisely such accidents. And the accidents that are bound to occur multiply feelings of humiliation on all sides.

Feelings of humiliation abound when from the point of view of one world view, the respective other world view is seen as evil. For human rights defenders, for example, people seem wicked, and even disturbed, who condone that lesser beings (women, for example) need to be dominated by higher beings (men, for example); witnessing the ways of dominators infuses hopelessness, despair and rage in human rights defenders. And vice versa. Those who condone the view that it is divinely ordained and nature's law that superiors are placed above inferiors, will oppose human rights ideals, because, for them, human rights ideals poke holes into the very rock of what they regard as true morality (Behring Breivik, at some point of his life, began joining this camp).

Reasons of 'national security' and 'national stability' often cause the powerful in the world, the national elites, even those who otherwise advocate human rights, in practice, to side with the dominator world view. As mentioned above, abusive definitions of 'freedom' exacerbate this inconsistency. Double standards abound, delegitimizing human rights ideals, and thus contributing to throwing the transition back rather than helping it forward. The result is that all sides feel that the other side humiliates the core of their most cherished moral sentiments and demeans their most noble motives. All are at impasses that traumatise everybody.

Such impasses provide fertile ground for a 'war on terrorism' on one side and 'heroic resistance of freedom fighters' on the other side. And this struggle forecloses what the world needs most to turn globalisation into something humane and fair, namely cooperation and joint caring for the survival of all of humankind and its planet.

What now? Where might we go?

In times of crisis, a wide range of remedies and preventive interventions may be promising and should be considered. The following list enumerates some of the points that seem particularly relevant:

(1) Cool down
(2) Allow for imperfection and uncertainty
(3) Place malleability over rigidity
(4) Strive for unity in diversity
(5) Nurture *one* global family.

Cool down

(This section is adapted from *Making Enemies*, Lindner, 2006, pp. 152-154)

According to psychologist Ervin Staub (1989), the atrocities perpetrated in Nazi Germany were possible because bystanders stood idly *by* instead of standing *up* and getting involved.[28] There are many ways to illuminate and explain why so many people stood by. Among others, the *hot short-term coping system* needs attention, since it is detrimental to long-term self-interest. Psychologist Peter T. Coleman explains:

---

[28] Staub, 1989.

Many of the coping mechanisms that act to protect and insulate individuals and communities from the psychological damage and stress of protracted trauma (such as denial, suppression, projection, justification, etc.) impair their capacity to process information and function effectively (Lazarus, 1985). Thus, the ability to make sound, rational decisions regarding a conflict (such as cost/benefit assessments and a thorough consideration of alternatives and consequences) is adversely affected by the need to cope with the perceived threats associated with the conflict (through a denial of costs, glorification of violent strategies, and dehumanization of the other).[29]

Stress has the potential to undermine self-control, and people exposed to traumatic stress are not at their optimum in terms of balanced thinking and rational protection of their own interests. The probability will increase that people lash out in counterproductive ways.

I spoke with American Muslims during the summer of 2003. Here is a summary of what I heard:

America needs to cool down. American feelings after 9/11 run hot. Lawyers learn to win debates; they become indignation entrepreneurs, scoring points at the other party's expense. Many Americans seem to have become indignation entrepreneurs since 9/11.

Clearly, confrontational kinds of discourse are often harmless. Many media programs are built around combative discourse styles, particularly in American contexts, because confrontation provides a platform for the American ideal of assertive 'lone hero' individualism and because 'it sells.' In such contexts, the adversarial atmosphere is not meant to crush the opponent. The setup resembles a culture-reproducing and money-making game. Also in the academic realm, combative conversational styles such as 'debate' are used, in this case to increase intellectual clarity, assuming (falsely, I believe) that combat serves clarity.

However, those styles are not always harmless.[30] They can contribute to heating up emotions unnecessarily. If used in the absence of arbiters, the effects can be devastating, rendering the social atmosphere aggressive and unsafe. Common ground is not sought when indignation is the goal. When indignation entrepreneurs abuse and taunt out-group members to score points, victims of such abuse feel insulted and humiliated. When cooperation is needed, combative communication styles make it more difficult or even preclude it. Thus, American nervousness, combined with a desire for 'assertiveness,' has made the world less safe, both nationally and internationally. The rifts caused by unabated indignation entrepreneurship are deep, both within American society and globally.

What is the antidote? The antidote is maturity, maturity at all levels, from the individual to the social and societal level. Mature individuals recognise their limitations under stress and engage in and train for cooling. More beneficial than confrontation is *constructive controversy* or what Aristotle called *deliberate discourse*, meaning joint discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of proposed actions aiming at synthesising novel solutions embedded in creative problem solving. Psychologist Carl Rogers has developed a *client-centered therapy* and *student-centered learning*, where a person does not judge or teach another person but facilitates another's learning. Researcher Mary F. Belenky calls for *connected knowing* rather than *separate knowing*.[31] In connected knowing 'one attempts to enter another person's frame of reference to discover the premises for the person's point of view.'[32] Sociologist Jürgen Habermas

---

[29] Coleman, 2003, p. 17.
[30] Johnson, Johnson, & Tjosvold, 2000, p. 66.
[31] See Belenky, Bond, & Weinstock, 1997, Belenky, 1997, Clinchy, 1996.
[32] Clinchy & Zimmerman, 1985.

advocates *public deliberation*.[33] We should *grapple* with issues.[34] The concept of *nudging* is important.[35] Morton Deutsch has discussed extensively *persuasion strategies* and *nonviolent power strategies*.[36] *Listening into voice* is how psychologist Linda Hartling calls it. Sociologist Seymour M. Miller recommends *let-it-flow thinking* rather than *verdict thinking*.

Often, people are too involved to cool down, therefore, third parties have the responsibility to step in. Third parties—parents, therapists or the wider community, including the international community—are those who carry the responsibility to initiate and support cooling processes wherever they are needed. Current world politics are all too often hot and would very much benefit from cooling down. All who have matured, as did Nelson Mandela, and who have renounced extremism and embraced moderation carry this responsibility. The first task for these third parties is to extend empathy, compassion and understanding to all those affected, and facilitate cooling strategies as described by Mischel and De Smet, such as taking time-outs, using better self-regulatory strategies, improving stress management, and reframing the meaning of the situation and one's goals.[37]

Police or physicians who are too close to the 'case,' are taken off the case. This ought to be considered also for the leaders of our world. People who are too hot need to take themselves off the case or be taken off the case by others. They should not be allowed into leadership positions. Bystanders have to protect the world against 'hot' leaders. United Nations institutions such as the World Court and International Criminal Court are instruments that have become available recently to help protect the world from 'overheated' leaders.

There are leaders, however, who are more than just overheated; Adolf Hitler may be taken as an example. Some are caught in cycles of humiliation from childhood on, perhaps obsessed with humiliation.[38] People with malignant narcissism personality traits must be prevented from entering into leadership positions by global and local bystanders. People with these traits require therapy, not leadership responsibilities. Bystanders who are aware of this phenomenon need to campaign for more public awareness. Conflict is not the problem, the problem is when people are not able to 'wage good conflict.'[39]

When reading about Behring Breivik, I was reminded of Rudolf Hess, a prominent Nazi politician who was Adolf Hitler's deputy in the Nazi Party during the 1930s and early 1940s.

Rudolf Hess's state of mind from the date of his landing in Scotland in 1941, throughout the years of his imprisonment in England, and during his trial in Nuremberg, has been the subject of speculation by historians, fiction writers and conspiracy theorists ever since. Prior to his trial Hess was examined by a commission of psychiatric experts from the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and France. The report of the British delegation, which included Lord Moran, concluded that he was 'unstable' and exhibited the characteristics of a 'psychopathic personality' but that he was not 'insane in the strictest sense' and he was subsequently deemed fit to stand trial. Moran's own file relating to the matter is held by the

---

[33] See, among others, Habermas, 1989, Habermas, 1985, Habermas, 1981, Habermas, 1962.

[34] On November 16, 2011, writer and peace scholar Janet Gerson took me to Zuccotti Park and The Atrium in New York City, where most of the Occupy Wall Street activities took place. Janet shared with me her doctoral research and I thank her for reminding me of the significance of the notion of *grappling*. See www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelinpics11.php.#OWS.

[35] As to the concept of *nudging*, see, among others, Thaler & Sunstein, 2008.

[36] Deutsch, 2006.

[37] Mischel & De Smet, 2000.

[38] Lindner, 2006, chapter 7: The Humiliation Addiction, pp. 127–140.

[39] This term was coined by Miller, 1986.

Welcome Library. It contains correspondence, clinical notes on Hess by J.R. Rees and Moran's own notes (Ref: PP/CMW/G.3/2).[40]

As the example of Rudolf Hess shows, a certain cultural context 'invites' people with psychological mindsets to resonate with them. Contemporary culture is not exempted. Behring Breivik resonated with right wing extremism. Others resonate with what could be called 'market extremism.' 'Are Corporate Leaders Egotistical Psychopaths?[41] is only one heading among many that highlights another brand of extremism that borders on pathology.[42]

The damage flowing from the accumulated stress overload that results from extremisms of all brands has reached mainstream research. 'Focus More to Ease Stress,' is the title of an article from the Harvard Medical School.[43]

Another task, clearly, is to remove underlying systemic causes for stress wherever possible. The problem is not so much that there are psychopathic personality traits around, but that they find anchoring places in society, in ideologies that foster extremism.

Inappropriate global economic arrangements, for example, require the global community to envision changes. In contexts where poverty and wealth are defined and manifested within an unsophisticated and cruel money-dominated world, and the gap between those who can participate and those who cannot increases, the ground is fertile for humiliation entrepreneurs to play the pied piper, fertile for people to be caught in feelings of humiliation and be drawn towards self-destructive depression or other-destructive violent retaliation, at micro, meso and macro levels.[44] When a system pushes people into despair, mayhem should not come as a surprise.

Effective cooling is a precondition if the global community wants to develop a strong social fabric, strong enough so that we can face up to its global challenges. At present, such cooling is happening haphazardly. This process can be optimised by systematic attention from the international community to reducing unnecessary causes of stress through more appropriate ideologies and institutions, while at the same time creating social and psychological resilience in the face of unavoidable causes of stress, such as the increase of complexity in an ever more interdependent world.

Allow for imperfection and uncertainty

As mentioned earlier, extremism often is associated with purifying dichotomies of black versus white, of friend against enemy. Brené Brown is a scholar in the field of social work. She wrote a book titled *Gifts of Imperfection: Let Go of Who You Think You're Supposed to Be and Embrace Who You Are* (Brown, 2011).

She started with two questions: What is the anatomy of human connection? And how does it work? After studying 'the best and worst of humanity,' she had learned that 'nothing is as important as human

---

[40] 'Rudolf Hess and the Psychiatrists,' 28th January 2010, by Jennifer Haynes, wellcomelibrary.blogspot.com/2010/01/rudolf-hess-and-psychiatrists.html.

[41] See www.youtube.com/watch?v=6MWpxH-RlFQ.

[42] See more in Lindner, 2012.

[43] "Focus More to Ease Stress," *HEALTHbeat Archive*, 6th December 2011, www.health.harvard.edu/healthbeat/focus-more-to-ease-stress. I thank Karen Hirsch for making me aware of this article.

[44] Lindner, 2012.

connection and I wanted to know more about the ins and outs of how we develop meaningful connection' (p. 128).

Linda Hartling is the former associate director of the Jean Baker Miller Training Institute of Wellesley College, where the *relational-cultural theory*[45] was developed in reaction to the dominance of the individualistic perspective and in favour of a relational analysis of psychological development.[46] Hartling recommends Brown's book (in a personal me**s**sage, May 29, 2011): 'The author offers insightful ideas about compassion, courage, connection, shame, and perfectionism, for example, she emphasises that "...imperfections are not inadequacies." Furthermore, the book includes observations useful for understanding the impact and dynamics of humiliation. Ultimately, the author is advocating for her concept of "Wholehearted Living."'

Brown writes, 'When we spend a lifetime trying to distance ourselves from the parts of our lives that don't fit with who we think we're supposed to be, we stand outside of the our story and hustle for our worthiness by constantly performing, perfecting, pleasing, and proving' (p. 23), while it is love and belonging that lives inside our story.

The problem, however, is that 'when we don't claim shame, it claims us' (p. 56):

Perfectionism is a self-destructive and addictive belief system that fuels this primary thought: If I look perfect, live perfectly, and do everything perfectly, I can avoid or minimise the painful feelings of shame, judgment, and blame… Perfectionism is addictive because when we invariably do experience shame, judgment, and blame, we often believe it's because we weren't perfect enough. So rather than questioning in the faulty logic of perfectionism, we become even more entrenched in our quest to live, look, and do everything just right (p. 57).

If we want to experience connection, staying vulnerable is a risk we have to take. Brown writes: 'I think we should be born with a warning label similar to the ones that come on cigarette packages: Caution: If you trade in your authenticity for safety; you may experience the following: anxiety, depression, eating disorders, addiction, rage, blame, resentment, and inexplicable grief' (p. 53).

Brown's work is relevant to terrorism insofar as particularly the male gender role norms, or those rules and standards that guide and constrain masculine behaviour as they evolved in the context of the security dilemma, call for attention. The human need for 'love and belonging' collides with the male need for 'emotional control, primacy of work, control over women, and pursuit of status.'[47] Terrorism is heavily informed by gender scripts; it is a male-dominated enterprise, with only a few women participating, and they do so in support of it. Particularly right-wing terror strongly connects with traditional male norms. Unsurprisingly, Behring Breivik regards himself as a warrior, a male warrior.

Sociologist Paul H. Ray's and psychologist Sherry Ruth Anderson identified three main cultural tendencies: firstly *moderns* (endorsing the 'realist' worldview of *Time Magazine,* the *Wall Street Journal*, big government, big business, big media, or past socialist, communist, and fascist movements); second, the first countermovement against moderns, the *traditionals* (the religious right and rural populations); and third, the most recent countermovement, the *cultural creatives* (valuing strong ecological sustainability for the planet, liberal on women's issues, personal growth, authenticity, and anti–big business).[48] In the United States, traditionals comprise about 24–26 percent of the adult population (approximately 48

---

45 See, for instance, Jordan & Hartling, 2002; Jordan, Walker, & Hartling, 2004; Miller & Stiver, 1997; and Walker & Rosen, 2004.

46 See also Wheeler, 2000.

[47] Brown, 2011, p. 52. For more information, see, for example, Mahalik et al., 2003.

[48] Ray & Anderson, 2000.

million people), moderns about 47–49 percent (approximately 95 million) and cultural creatives are about 26–28 percent (approximately 50 million). In the European Union, the cultural creatives comprise about 30–35 percent of the adult population. Ray and Anderson describe that the cultural creatives movement started out as two separate branches, initially pitted against each other in hostility—those who turn their attention inward to gain new levels of consciousness through meditative and spiritual means, and those who turn it outward as activists who go out and demonstrate in the streets—and that these two branches are now merging into a single new large movement. Increasingly, people understand that peace within is only the beginning: now it also is time for action. Part of that action will be to take those who resist the cultural creatives—the traditionals and the moderns—into the future in ways that avoid violence.

Terrorists have attempted to force a society back into the past or forward into a new future. As in the case of right-wing terror, terrorist acts intend to push a society back into the norms of what Ray and Anderson call the traditionals, while in the case of left-wing violence perpetrated by the activist branch of the cultural creatives movement, a new future is the aim.

In both cases, the traditional male script is influential, even though it creates severe internal inconsistencies in the second case of left-wing ideology. Nicaragua may serve as an example for the strength of the traditional male role script, even if it creates glaring contradictions at the core of its ideological context. 'Revolutionary commandantes,' as they called themselves, sexually abused women, since commandantes saw it as the duty of girls to serve them in the name of the revolution. Naïve and idealistic women from Europe were especially willing victims, and they were complicit in suppressing reports—supposedly to 'protect' the revolution—thus collectively avoiding to face up to this inconsistency.[49] Also the German Red Army Faction, RAF, which grew out of the student protest movement in Germany called the *68er-Bewegung* (movement of 1968), created this inner inconsistency: 'Wer zweimal mit derselben pennt, gehört schon zum Establishment' ('having sex with the same woman more than twice, means that you are part of the establishment').

To conclude, it is particularly the traditional male role script, if brought 'to perfection,' that stands in the way of what Brown calls wholehearted living. Wherever the traditional male duty of keeping control over women is salient, violence is not far away. 'I can go to bed with whomever I want, this is none of your business' ('Ich kann schlafen, mit wem ich will, das geht Dich gar nichts an') was the very sentence that triggered a brother to kill his sister: Hatun Sürücü was a Kurdish woman living in Germany who was murdered at the age of 23 by her own youngest brother, Ayhan Sürücü.[50]

Behring Breivik was a perfectionist, and this particularly with respect to the traditional male role. In his manifesto, Behring Breivik identifies feminists as his 'enemies' because they 'have destroyed the nuclear family, encourage sexual promiscuity and are Islam friendly.'[51] Behring Breivik did not have sex for years, protecting his body 'as a temple.'[52]

Brown's wholehearted living, her emphasis on imperfection and vulnerability, in the service of love and belonging, are antithetical particularly to traditional male norms. These norms must therefore be the primary field of attention for a society that wishes to heal and prevent future terrorist violence.

---

[49] Der Spiegel, 1998.

[50] 'Verlorene Ehre: Der Irrweg der Familie Sürücü,' film by Matthias Deiß und Jo Goll, 2011, www.phoenix.de/content/phoenix/die_sendungen/verlorene_ehre/426017?datum=2011-12-22.

[51] 'Gro representerer alt det Breivik hater,' *Nettavisen*, 3rd August, 2011, www.nettavisen.no/nyheter/article3202136.ece.

[52] ‚Gutachten zu Attentäter Breivik: 243 Seiten Wahnsinn,' by Gerald Traufetter, *Der Spiegel*, 3rd December.2011
    www.spiegel.de/panorama/justiz/0,1518,801323,00.html.

Also Columnist Suzanne Moore recommends that we embrace uncertainty instead of falling for fake certainty, and also she connects this argument to gender scripts:

> Too many nights I have watched economists on television being treated with undeserved reverence. 'Economics is largely a made-up pseudo-science!' I want to scream. After all, it has been almost entirely useless in predicting the mess we are in. Indeed, by coming up with grotesque calculations whereby rich people's investments were effectively risk-free and financed by the jobs and homes of the poor, many economists were cheerleaders pre-crisis.
> …
> What is valued is certainty. What is devalued in such a world is uncertainty. Those who aren't sure are weak. Poor. Faithless. Uncertainty is often worrying and feminised. Real men know real things.
> …
> Not so long ago, George W Bush said that if America 'shows uncertainty and weakness in this decade, the world will drift towards tragedy. This will not happen on my watch.' Apart from war, this 'certainty' helped to produce the debt crisis.[53]

It is certainty that we need to worry about, Moore explains, as extreme ideologies prosper in these uncertain times. She recommends the work of philosopher Gianni Vattimo, analyst Nassim Taleb, sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, and of phycisist John Butterworth who acknowledges that also 'science has nothing to fear from uncertainty.'

Place malleability over rigidity

(This section is adapted from 'Harmony as Dignity and Protection from Humiliation,' by Evelin Lindner for Leo Semashko on 21st July 2011[54])

Philosopher Agnes Heller, in her *theory of the consciousness of everyday life*, describes how the masculinist models of consciousness objectify world order and obfuscate that reality is fluid and continuously malleable. She analyses how masculinity, on an ordinary, everyday level, reproduces itself through the interplay of individual consciousness and social structures.[55] Philosopher and social critic Ivan Illich has written on the commoditisation of language, the tendency to use nouns instead of verbs.

Static definitions, concepts, or institutions that are inspired by the rigidity of Newtonian mechanics, may create hardness where softness would be more appropriate and therefore more effective—as in the case of water being stronger than stone. Life is fluid and continuously malleable. Reality is a process. If we try to 'nail down' processes of life, if we press them into inappropriateness.

Is there a better way? Quantum physics or biological growth processes may often be more suitable models if we wish to design social and societal structures. The concept of the *reflective equilibrium* offers a way out. Philosopher Otto Neurath's metaphor of a ship may serve as an illustration. In former times, scientists assumed that science was only science if it found dry docks or at least pretended that dry docks existed. Today, we understand that we must be more humble and accept and live with the fear-inducing uncertainty that human understanding of the world is limited. There is no dry dock. What we may think of

---

[53] 'Why Pretend We Know Everything? It's Time to Embrace Uncertainty,' by Suzanne Moore, *The Guardian*, 14th December 2011, www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/dec/14/why-pretend-we-know-everything. I thank Kamran Mofid for making me aware of this article.
[54] Lindner, 2011.
[55] Heller, 1984.

as certain will always be threatened by yet undiscovered insights and lessons-learned. The solution is to circle through the reflective equilibrium and create understanding and action out of this movement. This means continuously rebuilding the ship while at sea. It means creating just enough structure so that the ship can float, never too much rigidity, since this would make the ship get stuck and sink. Stability is dynamic.

Seymour M. (Mike) Miller is an economic-political sociologist and activist. He speaks about 'verdict thinking versus let-it-flow thinking' that reminds of Belenky's concept of connected knowing and Rogers' humanistic approach to psychology mentioned earlier:

Many people when confronted by an issue, question, the unknown, leap to judgment. Yes-No presents as the choice; immediate judgment, decision, verdict is the response. The result is the situation is not examined, thought about, explored. The verdict stops thinking before the issue is investigated, mulled over, explored in possibly several directions. Creativity is blocked—an answer, a verdict of yes-no, dominates and ends the process of exploration.

Verdict thinking can be the mode of operation for true believers, the comfortable in their comfortable thinking, those who have been discouraged from confidence in their ability to think for themselves, the intellectually lazy…. That is—most of us.

I am aware of this outlook because I am often accused of asking too many questions rather than offering an immediate verdict, my opinion, on a suggested way of thinking. Of course, asking questions can be a put-down way, trying to show that a suggested way of thinking is inappropriate, ineffective, undesirable. But questions can be a way of letting ideas flow, be generated, extended, modified, lead to additional ways of thinking, opening up rather than closing down possible creativity.

Let-it-flow thinking is not common, little encouraged in educational institutions and even less promoted in most employment and political activities. Much of verdict thinking is based on what are regarded as formulas---if a recommendation seems out of sync with the formula in that field, then immediately reject it. That outlook saves time and blocks discomfort (e.g., pushed to revise or reject one of our reliable, intellectually easing outlooks).

How to promote let-it-flow thinking? Make clear that your raising of a question is an exploration, not a way of refuting a proposition. (E.g., 'I'm not clear on how that proposal would deal with this issue' rather than 'That proposal wouldn't deal with this issue.' Or, 'If we assume that your proposal would work, what should we be thinking about a follow-up step?' Or, 'Does that way of thinking challenge some of our assumptions?')

Important in moving beyond verdict thinking is the gaining of enjoyment in exploration. Why should geographical exploration (e.g., tourism) be enjoyable and idea, intellectual, political exploration be regarded as a no-no?

Strive for unity in diversity

(This section is adapted from 'Harmony as Dignity and Protection from Humiliation,' by Evelin Lindner for Leo Semashko on 21st July 2011[56])

Today's approaches to consensus building need to be optimised. Traditional consensus building processes like *ho'ho pono pono, musyawarah, silahturahmi, asal ngumpul, palaver, shir, jirga* will need to be studied in more depth in the future. Today's approaches, including contemporary concepts of democracy, are still permeated by an excess of rigidity. Asking people to vote 'yes' or 'no' may lead to the manifestation of dualism where nondualism would be more fitting. In an ever more interdependent world, dependence versus independence are outdated notions. Interdependence connects two entities, O

and O, in a nondualistic way, ∞. *Dualism*, in contrast, means merging them into one entity, ◉, or separating them into two isolated entities, O|O. Dualism means *either* separation *or* merging; *either* agreement *or* disagreement; *either* one *or* two. *Nondualism* means separation *and* connection; agreement *and* disagreement; one *and* two.

Muneo Yoshikawa is an expert in intercultural communication. He developed the *nondualistic double swing* model, whereby unity is created out of the realisation of differences. He shows how individuals, cultures, and intercultural concepts can blend in constructive ways. This model can be graphically

visualised as the infinity symbol, or Möbius strip (∞). For this model, Yoshikawa brought together Western and Eastern thought. He drew on Martin Buber's idea of 'dialogical unity—the act of meeting between two different beings without eliminating the otherness or uniqueness of each'—and on *Soku*, the Buddhist nondualistic logic of 'Not-One, Not-Two,' described as the twofold movement between the self and the other that allows for both unity and uniqueness. Yoshikawa calls the unity that is created out of such a realisation of differences *identity in unity*: the dialogical unity does not eliminate the tension between basic potential unity and apparent duality.

Both Behring Breivik and Ayhan Sürücü act on fear of local and global diversity. They wish for the traditional compartmentalised world of local uniformity, pitted against the rest of the world in 'secure' division. This is also the make-up of extremism.

Many theoretical approaches and empirical findings can be drawn upon to illustrate this argument. Leon Festinger (1919–1989) was an American social psychologist, who developed the *theory of cognitive dissonance*. In a context where diversity is being interpreted as dissonance, uniformity would be sought to avoid dissonance. Such a context would nurture extremism, while a culture that acknowledges diversity as a source of enrichment can foster moderation.

Social identity theory is a hotly discussed field.[57] Sonia Roccas and Marilynn B. Brewer show how identity structures become more inclusive and tolerance of out-groups increases when *social identity complexity* is acknowledged and accepted.[58] In other words, a context where social identity complexity is

---

[56] Lindner, 2011.

[57] Tajfel's (1981) *social identity theory* proposes that the social part of our identity derives from the groups to which we belong. He suggests that we, by favoring attributes of our own groups over those of out-groups, acquire a positive sense of who we are and an understanding of how we should act toward ingroup and out-group members. See Tajfel, 1981, Tajfel, Fraser, & Jaspars, 1984, Tajfel & Turner, 1986. See for more literature, for example, Howitt & Billig, 1989, and Tajfel (Ed.) 1978, Tajfel et al., 1971, Tajfel, 1978a, Tajfel, 1978b, Tajfel, Fraser, & Jaspars, 1984, Turner, 1982.

[58] Brewer & Roccas, 2002 show how membership in many different groups (multiple social identities) can lead to greater social identity complexity, which, in turn, can foster the development of superordinate social identities and global identity (making international identity more likely in individualist cultures). See also Shelly L. Chaiken's

accepted would be beneficial for a culture of moderation to grow.

Philosopher Arne Johan Vetlesen recently lectured for the Norwegian Academy of Science on 'evil as a perspective on the events of 22 July.'[59] He described what he calls 'philosophical insanity,' a state of being, where a person, like Anders Behring Breivik, has deprived himself of the opportunity to be contradicted, and how this process has destroyed both him and turned him into a destructive force for society at large.

Sociologist Mark S. Granovetter[60] did research on strong or weak social ties. He builds on Tönnies' differentiation of *Gemeinschaft* versus *Gesellschaft*,[61] explaining that in a *Gemeinschaft* people have strong ties and thoroughly share norms. Such settings are easily disrupted by even minimal dissent, while having many weak ties to a number of people would provide more space for individual autonomy and diversity. To follow Granovetter, a society that encourages its citizens to build wide networks of social connections would also foster moderation.

When I discussed this with psychologist Reidar Ommundsen, my former doctoral advisor, he sent me an article titled 'Beyond the Banality of Evil' by social psychologists Alexander S. Haslam and Stephen Reicher.[62] This is the abstract:

> Carnahan and McFarland critique the situationist account of the Stanford prison experiment by arguing that understanding extreme action requires consideration of individual characteristics and the interaction between person and situation. Haslam and Reicher develop this argument in two ways. First, they reappraise historical and psychological evidence that supports the broader 'banality of evil' thesis—the idea that ordinary people commit atrocities without awareness, care, or choice. Counter to this thesis, they show that perpetrators act thoughtfully, creatively, and with conviction. Second, drawing from this evidence and the BBC [British Broadcasting Corporation] Prison Study, they make the case for an interactionist approach to tyranny that explains how people are (a) initially drawn to extreme and oppressive groups, (b) transformed by membership in those groups, and (c) able to gain influence over others and hence normalize oppression. These dynamics can make evil appear banal but are far from banal themselves.

Psychologist Philip Zimbardo carried out the famous Stanford prison study, where college students were assigned randomly to be either guards or prisoners in a simulated prison. The study was halted after only six days because the guards adopted their role with too much brutality. Zimbardo describes what Haslam and Reicher call 'individual characteristics' when he explains that the prison guards could be divided into three categories: (1) those who sided with the prisoners, (2) those who were strict but fair, and (3) a few, who actively humiliated their prisoners.[63]

---

work, showing that people who are more open to discrepant evidence tend to make more accurate predictions— Chaiken, 1980, Chaiken, Gruenfeld, & Judd, 2000.

[59] 'Den filosofiske galskapen,' by Arne Johan Vetlesen , universitas.no/kultur/56829/den-filosofiske-galskapen. 'Terrorsiktede Anders Behring Breivik har fratatt seg selv muligheten til å bli motsagt. Denne prosessen har ødelagt ham, skal vi tro filosof Arne Johan Vetlesen.'

[60] Granovetter, 1973.

[61] Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) was a major contributor to sociological theory and field studies. Tönnies is best known for his distinction between two types of social groups — Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft.

[62] Haslam & Reicher, 2007.

[63] Zimbardo, 1989.

Inversely, in a war, not all soldiers are equally 'heroic.' Males, in their role as servants to the security dilemma, are drilled and drugged into anger. Military psychology addresses this topic. *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society* is a telling book title.[64]

A person drafted into war may be part of all three groups of Zimbardo's study. There will be those who go to war as a personal sacrifice even though not personally inclined, in case they are convinced of its necessity—many have felt that defeating Hitler was a duty, if ever so painful. Then there will be those who simply do their duty. Third, there will be others who instigate war because war is what their psyche demands—Adolf Hitler might have belonged to the latter group.

Also the Behring Breiviks of this world could belong to all such categories. If convinced of the necessity of war or what they would define as war-like action, they might embark on it against their inclination. I have personally spoken to people who regarded Osama Bin Laden as belonging to this group and who identified with his mission because they admired him for what they regarded as his moral purity and legitimacy. At the other extreme, people who are attracted to violence might embark on violence and then justify it as legitimate war. Hooligans, for example, use the thin veneer of football rivalry for violence.

What is important to conclude is that violence, even though never likely to go down to zero, will at least decrease in a context where it is delegitimized. This is the case when 'reasons' for war are either absent, or debated in the public realm in ways that remove any legitimacy from them.

What we learn is that neither individual nor situational characteristics are at work alone. They are both important, and they interact. Philip Zimbardo argues that since the Inquisition, we have been dealing with problems at an individual level—the individual with his or her propensities and culpability—and that the influence of the situation was ignored.[65] With his work he wishes to show how 'a system' can create 'a situation,' which brings 'good' people to behave 'badly.' In their article, Haslam and Reicher decry that Zimbardo's situational approach has since been overemphasised. Clearly, both analyses are important, the analysis of the situation and of the individual. They should not be pitted against each other but complement each other, and acknowledged as being interactive. Devaluing one approach for the other would maintain a culture of combat, in the spirit of uniformity without diversity.

A society, per definition, has the capacity to shape systemic frames that create situations. If a society wishes to nurture a culture of unity in diversity, of dignity and moderation, it is well advised to focus on creating systemic frames that create situations that advocate and manifest unity in diversity. The aim must be to deprive people inclined to embark on violence of as many fertile grounds as possible to do so.

Philosopher Michel Serres advocates *métissage*, or intermingling, mixing and blending.[66] Eliminating and isolating is not the way to grasp *the real* but by combining, by putting things into play with each other, by letting them interact. Serres uses the metaphor of the 'educated third' or the 'third place' where a mixture of culture, nature, sciences, arts, and humanities is constructed. Peace educator Michalinos Zembylas explains this educated third as blending together multiple heritages, as inventor of knowledge, as eternal traveller who cares about nature and his/her fellow human beings.'[67] Philosopher Kwame

---

[64] Grossman, 1995.

[65] In BBC World News *HARDtalk* with Stephen Sackur, April 23, 2008, news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/hardtalk/7362773.stm.

[66] Serres, 1997.

[67] Zembylas, 2002, ijea.asu.edu/v3n3/.

Anthony Appiah calls for 'contamination.'[68] No to purity, tribalism, and cultural protectionism, is his message, and yes to a new cosmopolitanism. Philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas highlights *the Other*, whose face forces us to be humane.[69] Terms such as métissage mean that both 'I' and the 'other' are changed by our contact. Peace educator Werner Wintersteiner builds on Lévinas and uses the term of métissage in his *Pedagogy of the Other*.[70] Wintersteiner suggests that the basis for peace education in the future must be *the stranger*, and that we must learn to live with this *permanent strangeness* as a trait of our postmodern human condition and culture.

In all cultures, in-group and out-group ethics vary. The *scope of justice* has been described by psychologist Peter T. Coleman as follows, 'Individuals or groups within our moral boundaries are seen as deserving of the same fair, moral treatment as we deserve. Individuals or groups outside these boundaries are seen as undeserving of this same treatment.'[71]

Human rights ideals of equality in dignity for all could be described as 'global in-group ethics' that follow the *ingathering* of humanity that shrinks the world to the extent that its formerly divided inside spheres coalesce, or, as it is also called, globalisation: "For the first time since the origin of our species, humanity is in touch with itself" said anthropologist William Ury.[72]

Nurture one global family

(This section is adapted from 'Harmony as Dignity and Protection from Humiliation,' by Evelin Lindner for Leo Semashko on 21st July 2011[73])

Arne Næss was among the most renowned Norwegian philosophers. His position is that 'there are no murderers; there are only people who have murdered.'[74] He invited convicted murderers from prison into his philosophy class at Oslo University to demonstrate to his students that even murderers deserve and need to be dignified. He explained this point at the 2nd Annual Meeting of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies.[75] He was convinced that as long as people feel less than fully human, there is no reason for them to care that they have hurt others or society. Only individuals can admit to a crime, feel guilty, and show remorse, who feel secure in their connection to humanity.[76]

As alluded to earlier, throughout the past millennia, humankind lived in a compartmentalised world, continuously afraid of its neighbours, since neighbours could quickly turn into enemies. It was a mistake, for example, to believe that Adolf Hitler could be appeased. He had decided on war and killing. Simply wishing for peace with him was not a valid strategy. Political scientists describe this situation as the *security dilemma*. There was no escape, 'si vis pacem para bellum' or 'if you want peace, prepare for war,' was the definitorial motto. An enemy did not deserve the same rights as a friend or neighbour, an

---

[68] "The Case for Contamination," by Kwame Anthony Appiah , *The New York Times,* January 1, 2006, www.muhlenberg.edu/mgt/provost/frg/humanities/AppiahContamination.pdf. Se also, among others, Appiah, 2010, Appiah, 2006, Appiah, 2005.

[69] Lévinas, 1985.

[70] Wintersteiner, 1999.

71 Coleman, 2000, 118.

[72] Ury, 1999b, p. XVII. William Ury is a member in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, see www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board.php.

[73] Lindner, 2011.

[74] Lindner, 2009, p. 50.

[75] 12th–13th September 2003, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme de l'Homme, Paris, www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/annualmeeting02.php.

[76] See related work by Zehr, 1990, Zehr, 2002.

enemy was not a fellow human being, not a fellow citizen. The enemy had no right to equality in dignity and rights. The enemy was to be killed, or, if not, then at least captured and humiliated into subservience. Humiliating inferiors was seen as legitimate; it was regarded as necessary to prevent inferiors from rising up and becoming enemies. The masculinist culture that Agnes Heller describes, is deeply embedded into the security dilemma. It is a culture of 'we against them,' of in-group uniformity without diversity, pitted in division against out-groups of the same make-up. Rather than unity in diversity, there is uniformity in division.

Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) rejects this notion of an enemy in its first sentence, among others by including all human beings into *one* single in-group and removing the notion of enemy out-groups: 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.' Gandhi said: 'There is no path to peace. Peace is the path.' In a human rights context, humiliation is antisocial, it is a violation of dignity and rights. 'To humiliate' is to transgress the rightful expectations of every human being and of all humanity that basic human rights will be respected.

Are human rights ideals utopian? A window of opportunity opens up for their true realisation the more the fact is understood and embraced that we are one single human family on a tiny planet which we inherit from our children. This window of opportunity invites the spirit of unity in diversity. It opens space for a non-utopian global dialogue about a more dignified future for all of humankind, a future without humiliating structures and institutions. Philosopher Avishai Margalit calls this a *decent* world.

If we, as a human family, grasp this window of opportunity, then there is a chance for a future where 'good' and 'bad' neighbours can live together, where police may be needed, however, where the notion of 'enemy' and 'warrior' is no longer required. The capacity of people to feel humiliated will find space to translate into a Mandela-like path of building social and societal structures that no longer systemically humiliate but dignify. And this will increasingly be done not by fighting against old structures, but by working for a future of dignity. As mentioned above, working *for* something new is much more harmonious and effective than the old paradigm of fighting *against* enemies and foes.

This window of opportunity is currently left largely unused. The security dilemma is being kept alive artificially, among others to for the sake of maintaining wealth and investment. As a result, division crowds out unity. The 'Arab street' brought about a dignity revolution. The global street, the citizens of this world, must now bring about a global dignity *refolution* (refolution is a term coined by Timothy Garton Ash to connote a mix of reform and revolution). This movement places dignity before profit and capitalises on the potential of globalisation to truly transcend the old fragmentation of our world.

To sum up: We need to find a way to sit together in a global dialogue and reflect on how we, jointly, as one human family, can organise our affairs on our home planet so that our children will find a world worth living in.

Modelling dialogue

In my work, I advocate deep paradigm shift, not from one rigid paradigm to another, but away from rigidity altogether. Away from monolithic fixity toward co-created fluid processes. Away from inflexible edifices toward organic coming-into-being, growing like trees grow. Away from monolithic institutions toward a global movement that is co-created by people and their energy of passion and enthusiasm. Away from a combative dominator world, into which people are installed like little cog-wheels, toward global partnership that allows rich diversity to flourish.

This paper exemplifies this approach. It seems fitting to include a dialogue, since joint dialogical exploration is what I recommend. The author of the message further down is an exceptional thinker and activist from Africa. He wrote the message further down on 29th July 2011.

Message from an African author

Hi Evelin,

I was profoundly hurt that the attacks found place because there might be no excuses for such acts in an attempt to change the society through wiping out fellow human beings from the face of the earth. Many young people from ethnic minorities who strongly believe in equality and justice and who consider themselves as part and parcel of the Norwegian society are killed or injured during the attacks.

It become evident that communities whatever ethnic background and traditions should stand together to promote a culture of peace and tolerance. I have been involved in organising a meeting for the Minister for Integration to meet various representatives from migrant and refuge communities in Oslo; thus giving to him the opportunity to express his concern for further involvement in strengthening community cohesion and inviting various segments of the population to contribute in problem solving.

I really hope that many good things will come out of this catastrophe. The terror attacks have brought to the surface issues that were difficult to bring on the table because of existing positive prejudices about Norway that might pose problems when addressing cross-community issues.

One of those positive prejudices is what has been designated as a core value during the launching of the WDU. It has been difficult in any ways to express a concern when the choice of Norway to launch the WDU refers to a unique tradition of 'Equality in dignity' in Norway. The last terror attacks in Norway shake the presumption of Norway's tradition of 'Equality in dignity'. The terrorist might well be solely responsible for planning and executing the attacks but he has been well fuelled by a pervasive and growing climate of hate.

By building on the above mentioned prejudice it might sound as if Norway has a lot to teach to other countries about dignity and tolerance. I am not so sure about it. But what I am sure about is that Norway has a lot to learn from other communities about dignity and promoting tolerance. No country has the privilege of dignity or barbarism. Norway is not an exception in that matter.

This positive prejudice among many others - like the Norwegian Model as an export article - has made it difficult to address the growing climate of hate and challenges related to building a multiethnic society because we are always confronted with that false evidence of a unique cultural heritage that exempts Norway from shaking off the shackles of humiliations and hate. The country's recent history tells us a story of discrimination, forced assimilation and humiliating policies towards groups and communities (Sámi people, Jews during 2. World war, national ethnic minorities and immigrants).

May be we have different perception about that and I may admit that the use of the positive prejudice as an argument for launching the WDU has hampered my commitment. Not much is being done in Norway to address the growing climate of hate or challenging right-wing extremists compared to any other country in Europe. I find it difficult to contribute in branding Norway as a nation with a pronounced tradition of 'Equality in dignity'. As a black African I have a different experience and perception on that.

Just the fact that migrant and refuge communities felt relief from the fact the attacks were not committed by Islamist groups or members of the minority communities reveal an untold story of fear and humiliation. I cannot imagine how life should be in case the perpetrator was an immigrant or an Islamist group. That would lead to further strengthening of the positive prejudices and reinforce the climate of hate and humiliation that can be also tied to the branding of Norway as an exception in a world marked by violent conflicts and chaos.

We need to do something in Norway but we might reduce our impact if we presume that there is an inherent and strong tradition of 'Equality in dignity'. What needs to be done in Rwanda or in Egypt is exactly what is also needed in Norway, that is to say to promote a culture of peace and tolerance.

It would not be easy to talk about it before but now is the time. We will not be defeated by fear and violence!

 I wish you a good day and remain blessed!

With love!

Evelin Lindner's reply

My very very dear friend!

I am so deeply touched and happy by your message!

Please allow me to share it with our WDU core team, since this discussion is vital for us all!

I resonate with each and every of your reflections and hesitations! I do share them all! I am as worried with respect to the Norwegian cultural heritage as you, afraid that its ideal of *likeverd* is not strong enough to stand up against the pressure of 'the market' and will be sold out, thus giving space to other cultural traditions that undermine it! I always try to make that clear, however, I must apologise to you that I seem not to have made it clear enough! I beg you to help me make that clearer in the future! This misunderstanding hurts me deeply!

Allow me to reflect a bit. You know that I was a medical doctor. Imagine you stand in front of a terminal ill patient. In some cases, you have to tell the patient to write his/her will and enjoy his/her last days before death. In other cases, you have to say: 'Yes, with a very high probability, you mat die very soon, however, there is hope. If you collect all your strength together and stand up, you might survive!' This patient has a small chance to survive, simply by being told this. If you were to treat him/her as 'hopeless case' he/she would die, since your 'diagnosis' is not just a description, but also functions as a self-fulfilling prophecy. A positive message has the power to be self-fulfilling and help the patient survive.

To my analysis and experience, humankind is this patient. Humankind is on a path to its demise. In this situation, we have to be very careful and deliver diagnoses that are self-fulfilling in a constructive sense. In such a situation, it is helpful to frame situations positively and not negatively. Framing situations negatively may even be suicidal.

From my point of view, a global culture of prioritising profit maximisation (to say it simplified) has corrupted Norway as much as the rest of the world (and, clearly, also Norway has a tradition of unequal dignity alongside traditions of equal dignity). The kind of globalisation that is brought by this kind of culture (priority given to profit maximisation) increases the potential triggers for hostility, everywhere in the world, in many ways. Extremist acts, where feelings of humiliation are responded to with violent acts of humiliation, are to be expected to increase in such a climate, on all sides. This is a profoundly dangerous situation, which can easily contribute to us, as a human family, hastening our demise. As you see in the US, dynamics of humiliation hamper the cooperation that the country sorely needs. Likewise, globally, the cooperation we need (just think of climate change), will be hampered if we are not able to overcome such dynamics of humiliation.

Being aware of this situation, I look around in the world and find that many cultures have heritages that partly help in such situations, and others aspect of their heritages that may make the situation worse. The list is long, as you say. Your tradition of creating social cohesion in your community in Senegal is something the entire world needs to learn from. However, today's Senegal is not conscious of this, the mainstream population, and their elites simply follow the 'experts' that have been educated in Paris (as you shared with me). In a sense, Senegal is being corrupted as Norway is being corrupted. Also Norway has pockets of heritage that are similar to your tradition of cohesion (dugnadsånd, for example), and these pockets of heritage are being pushed aside by today's global cultural pressures.

In a situation, where humankind as a whole is in danger, what should we do? As with a terminally ill patient, we have to highlight the resources we have, as a human family. These resources are embedded in your tradition in Senegal, as they are embedded in the tradition of dugnad and likeverd in Norway. In a situation, where humankind is in danger, we need to be very careful and be cautious with overly highlighting the fact that all helpful traditions, wherever they may be found, are currently being corrupted and are in danger of being destroyed. We have to say to humankind: 'Look, here is Senegal, here is Norway, and they have traditions that we, as humankind, need to learn from if we wish to survive.' We should refrain from saying; 'Look, here is Senegal, here is Norway, they do not have anything left anymore from what they ever had as useful cultural heritages, in fact, they may never have had any of them!'

In the same spirit, I am not saying that 'Norway' is a paradise and should teach the rest of the world (and I am so sorry that this interpretation, even though I try to avoid it at all cost, still seems to be understood in this way, please help me with this, my dear friend!), what I am rather saying to Norway, and to the world, is: 'Look, Norway, look, humankind, here we have a heritage, let us learn from it, let us, together re-invigorate it! Let us disallow any influences, from whatever sources, global or local, to push these heritages aside!'

My dearest friend, I am sorry for burdening you with such a long message, however, your thoughts are so important! I am not sure whether I could make myself clear, therefore, I beg you to help me! Please know, and I confirm it, that I deeply resonate with each and every word you wrote!

I SEND YOU ALL MY LOVE AND DEEPEST OF GRATITUDE FOR YOUR WONDERFUL CARE!

Evelin

Linda Hartling's reply

Thank you, thank you, dear friend, for your profoundly thoughtful message!

I'm delighted that we can share this with our WDU core team because we need to keep your reflections, dear friend, in the forefront of our thinking!

Dear Evelin, thank you SO MUCH for your insightful thoughts in response to our dear friend's valuable points! As you say, dear Evelin, 'many cultures have heritages that partly help... with other aspects of their heritages that may make the situation worse.' The United States is an excellent example of this.

We need to make it clear that the World Dignity University (WDU) initiative is focused on compassionate collaboration and dignifying dialogue that encourages a perpetual process of mutual learning and re-evaluation. The WDU will always be 'a collaborative work in progress,' always evolving. Conversations like your discussion below will help us learn how to grow in a more mutually dignifying way!

THANKS again, dearest friend, for sharing your thoughts and reflections!

Thanks to both of you for your crucial conversation! I'm SO GLAD we can work together to clarify what we mean as we work together to encourage more dignifying practices.

Sending both of you my highest regards and admiration!

Linda

Concluding words

Physicist Paul Raskin is the founding director of the Tellus Institute. It has conducted over 3,500 research and policy projects throughout the world on environmental issues, resource planning, and sustainable development. Paul Raskin's seminal essay 'Great Transition' has had widespread international influence. Raskin thought about 'hope and history' (in a personal communication):

Dear Friends,
Aristarchus of Samos posited a sun-centered solar system in the 3rd century BCE, way ahead of its time. The heliocentric perspective did not take root until Copernicus reintroduced it in the more resonant historical context of emergent modernity, eighteen hundred years later.
Around the time of Aristarchus' precocious Copernicanism, the Stoics were advancing the equally revolutionary theme of universal citizenship. Socrates echoed the concept: 'I am not an Athenian or a Corinthian, but a citizen of the world.' Like heliocentrism, however, the cosmopolitan idea was premature, unable to thrive in a world dominated for millennia by fractious states and fractured ideologies.
Now, well into the onset of the Planetary Phase of Civilization, at last the subjective ideal of global citizenship resonates with the objective imperative for identity and polity to embrace its new and proper sphere, Earth. This convergence of dream and need sets in motion an historic dynamic that can enable a movement for a Great Transition to rise, if we can seize the moment. The possibility and the urgency are reasons enough to take courage and together quicken our steps.
May our circles widen – and paths cross – in the New Year.
Best wishes to you all,
Paul.[77]

If we accept the scenario Raskin describes, if we accept that we, as humanity, face significant global challenges, that we must cooperate globally to achieve ecological and social sustainability, and that feelings of humiliation, since they inhibit dialogue, must be avoided and healed, the next step is to think of how to nurture a global culture of dignity. The World Dignity University (WDU) initiative is one of the paths to a culture of global cooperation for ecological and social sustainability.

The World Dignity University initiative has several core elements:

• **The usefulness of dignity**: The United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.' The core of human rights ideals is equality in dignity. This is not only morally desirable, it is also useful. A culture that emphasises equal dignity is useful, among others, because such a culture prevents and heals humiliation and makes cooperation more agreeable. Recent research shows the importance of equality for health and stability, both at individual and community levels.

• **The need for global action**: Today, we, as humanity, face major global problems, and therefore we need to promote a culture of equality in dignity globally. We cannot tackle our global problems effectively when dynamics of mutual humiliation inhibit the dialogue and cooperation that is needed. The World Dignity University will promote a global culture of dignity. This entails that the World Dignity University

---

[77] Paul Raskin in a personal communicatin , 30th December 2011.

contributes to the human right to education to be realised globally, also in those parts of the world that are not reached now.

• **The need for global organisational structures:** We envisage our World Dignity University to be a multi-local and global movement without head quarters. Our experience with the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network indicates that such an approach is the most resilient. However, we find it appropriate to launch the WDU idea from Norway, due to its *likeverd* tradition. A global movement in which all contribute to the common good is more resilient than a rigid institution that is dependent on a few sources of funding, and/or has profit maximisation as its goal. This also opens up space for the ideal of academic freedom.

• **Norway** is one of the few places in the world from where a culture of equality in dignity can be launched in a credible manner, and this fact has not changed after 22nd July 2011, on the contrary, it was rather strengthened. *Likeverd* is a Norwegian cultural heritage, unlike in almost all other countries in the world, where hierarchy, or inequality in dignity, characterises cultural history. Already neighbouring Sweden has a much more hierarchical culture than Norway. The *likeverd* ideal is a resource that Norway has, and this resource is essential if we want to cooperate globally. And a resource entails responsibility. Thus, Norway has a responsibility to bring the ideal of equality in dignity to the world.

The *likeverd* ideal is visible in many contexts in Norway. The Scandinavian model of economy (see, for example, ESOP research) deserves more attention in the rest of the world. Gender equality is achieved to a higher degree in Norway than in most of the rest of the world, including the regions of Europe that share the same Protestant background as Norway. One of the best research centres on Europe is located in Norway (see ARENA; the subsidiarity principle is important to realise equality in dignity and this is applied, among others, by the European Union). Crown Prince Håkon of Norway, with his colleagues, has launched the Global Dignity Day.[78] These are just a few examples.

It was very fitting to launch the World Dignity University when the University of Oslo celebrated its 200 years jubilee. The University of Oslo was planned 200 years ago with an extremely high level of ambition, which speaks to the level of ambition of the World Dignity University. See ''Kunne fått verdens mest moderne universitet.''[79]

• **Dignity must be advocated in dignified ways**: It is humiliating to get something pushed down one's throat, even if it is something that would otherwise be very welcome. It would be humiliating, for instance, if Norway were to push Norwegian culture on the rest of the world. It is important to avoid this. The World Dignity University aims at advocating learning about equality in dignity in dignified ways. The organisational structure of the World Dignity University expresses equality in dignity, through, for example, a focus on the unity in diversity principle, on the network model, and on flexible process. The World Dignity University invites all interested parties into a movement, a process of collaborative creativity and co-creation. It avoids duplicating existing efforts and nurtures multi-local and global synergy. It helps realise the human right to education that leads to greater dignity for all, promotes academic freedom, and bridges the gap between theory and practice.

• **Evelin Lindner**, Ph.D.s, has special legitimacy to be the initiator of the World Dignity University, since she comes from a displaced family who is deeply affected by trauma from war and displacement. Her motivation is to work for a better and more dignified world. For almost 40 years, Evelin has lived

---

[78] See www.globaldignity.no.
[79] See www.apollon.uio.no/vis/art/2011_1/artikler/visjoner_1812.

globally, and in the last 10 years she has invited like-minded scholars and activists of first rank from all over the world into the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network (HumanDHS). About 1,000 people have been personally invited so far (this number is increasing every day), about 4,000 people are on the mailing list, the web site www.humiliationstudies.org, for which she is the webmaster, is read by more than 40,000 people from more than 180 countries around the world each year, and it comes up on top when one searches on Google.[80]

With respect to Norway being the launching platform for the World Dignity University initiative, Evelin cannot be suspected of simply wanting to promote Norwegian interests. Her personal background gives her the legitimacy to point out Norway to the world and make the world aware that Norway has a resource, *likeverd*, that the rest of the world will benefit from. And she can also remind Norway to take its own responsibilities seriously.

Evelin is aware of the criticism that, obviously, just as any other place on Earth, also Norway is not a perfect place. It did not require a 22nd July to prove this point. Therefore, she calls for an attitude of humility on all sides. However, we cannot wait for Norway to be 'perfect' before we proceed. Norway can recognise and work with this criticism without foregoing to value and use the cultural resources it after all possesses. Norway's cultural resources are important and must be used to create synergy together with all other cultural resources from all around the world that foreground dignity (the African *ubuntu* philosophy, for instance).

• **Linda Hartling**, Ph.D., is the World Dignity University Director. She conducted the earliest research assessing the experience of humiliation, is an expert on relational-cultural theory. She is the past Associate Director of the Jean Baker Miller Training Institute at the Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College (Boston, Massachusetts), the largest women's research center in the United States.

• **Richard Slaven**, Ph.D., is the World Dignity University Business Director. He is a former Business Administrator for the Martin Fisher School of Physics at Brandeis University (Boston, Massachusetts), with decades of experience managing millions of dollars in grants and operating budgets.

• **Ulrich (Uli) Spalthoff**, Dr. rer. nat., is the World Dignity University Director of Project Development and System Administration. He is the former Director of Advanced Technologies at Alcatel-Lucent in Germany and France, mentoring start-ups and consulting high-tech companies in IT, telecommunication and semiconductor industries from countries all over the world.

• **Michael Britton**, Ed.D., Ph.D., is the World Dignity University Director of Global Appreciative Culturing. He is a practicing psychologist and scholar who conducted interview research with retired U.S. military commanders/planners who had dealt with nuclear weapons during the Cold War, exploring their experience of the moral responsibilities involved. He has lectured internationally on the implications of neuroscience for our global future, and provides training for conflict resolution specialists on applications of neuroscience to their work.

• **The first potential World Dignity University professors** are among the 270 members of HumanDHS Global Advisory Board (see www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board.php). The World Dignity University web site www.worlddignityuniversity.org will always grow and evolve. Moodle is installed as online teaching platform. The first step was to launch the idea on 24th June 2011 in Oslo and to invite you, and anyone who shares our values and is interested, including the entire HumanDHS

---

[80] See a video invitation from Evelin at www.youtube.com/watch?v=qGyPwHC5JdU.

network, to contribute with your/their ideas. Dignity implies that the World Dignity University must be created in cooperation, in the spirit of unity in diversity, it must grow from people who come together and contribute with their knowledge and experience.

We invite everybody who shares our values to envisage contributing to the World Dignity University initiative. The first step would be for you to reflect on your interests and work and consider how they relate to the notion of dignity. Then you could create a video dialogue with a trusted counterpart (see an example at www.youtube.com/watch?v=eZ8u-iHW3MA), where you present your reflections on why you think that dignity is important and what you would perhaps wish to contribute to a World Dignity University initiative.

Jonas Gahr Støre, the foreign minister of Norway, was mentioned at the outset of this paper. In November, 2011, in a TED talk in Geneva, he said that what troubles him most, is the 'deficit of political dialogues,' the deficit of our ability to understand modern conflicts as they are. [81] Diplomats are trained to deal with problems between states. But the picture is changing. Traditional tools of diplomacy fail in times when so-called 'groups' are the actors, groups that emerge within states from the bottom up, amplified by technology. Social, religious, political, economic, and military realities give rise to such groups that represent different interests in their countries, which then spill over to other countries, thus turning their conflicts into everybody's interest. The question is: How to talk and when to talk? After 9/11, people were divided into 'those who are with us' versus 'those who are against us,' and many groups were labelled terrorists. And who would talk to terrorists!? The last decade, therefore, was a lost decade. As Støre formulates it, 'we spent more time establishing why we should not talk to others' than why we should talk.

The International Committee of the Red Cross, ICRC, is neutral and they do talk, therefore they know more than diplomats. However, Støre suggests, we do not have to be neutral to talk. Talking is not agreeing. Talking has many forms, it can be done at a diplomatic or political level. He, as a foreign minister, advises his diplomats to talk to everybody. The Arab Spring shows how damaging it was for diplomats to follow the wishes of authoritarian leaders to refrain from talking to groups they disliked. Now the Muslim Brothers are an important political force in Egypt, legitimised through elections, and diplomats are insufficiently knowledgeable about them. It would not be a solution, in this situation, to continue disconnection and reject the choice of the majority, after first having preached democracy. Talking is the solution. Engagement and principled dialogue is the solution.

Clearly, the point is not to be naive. One cannot always talk, sometimes one has to walk away, sometimes one has to fight. Støre believes that Libya was necessary. But if we do not talk, we will foster radicalisation, he warns. Increasingly, solutions are not military, but political. When Nelson Mandela came out of prison, times were much more promising. It is a pity, Støre bemoans, that during the subsequent decade, the world failed to follow him. If Mandela had told his people to fight, his people would have fought and the world would have felt that their fight is just. But his message was that oppressors are also a human being, that dialogue is not the strategy of the weak but of the strong.

Støre concludes his TED talk by warning that dialogue is not easy. And since it is necessary, we have to learn the communication skills needed to engage in it. If we want to convince others, we have to be open. Diplomats cannot do this alone. Civil society is needed. The fight against landmines and cluster bombs would not have been possible without engaging with civil society. They were taken into the negotiations, they brought their knowledge, including the knowledge of the victims. The important survival issue of our times, climate change, will only be solvable in this manner.

Støre ends by asking: What makes people trust each other? More communication! We have to build a bigger 'we' by creating more dialogue. We must improve our skills of communicating! We must talk!

---

[81] Jonas Gahr Støre, November, 2011, www.ted.com/talks/jonas_gahr_store_in_defense_of_dialogue.html.

At the end of this paper, I would like to invite everybody to watch Inga Bostad, Vice-Rector of the University of Oslo. She spoke on 26th August 2011 about the terror attacks in Oslo and Utøya. Like Jonas Gahr Støre, she encourages and urges everybody to engage in dialogue. See her impressive and intense message on YouTube.[82]

This paper calls for dialogue not only locally, but globally. It calls for all of us to create a *postindividual consciousness,*[83] a *unity consciousness*[84] or a *planetary consciousness.*[85] The reason for why this is so important is that the more we, the human family, feel and act as *one* family, as *one* 'we,' the more we will be able to cooperate on the solution of the myriad global challenges we face. We will make irrelevant the security dilemma that pits us against each other in fear and we will make manageable the global commons' dilemma that keeps us from preserving our planet. The old doctrine that talking is equal to legitimising or agreeing is part of a world that is almost bygone, and that we must help go by fully as fast as we can. It was a world in the grip of the security dilemma where friends were pitted against enemies. Global dialogue between neighbours, where neighbours may agree or disagree, is the path toward the future. This is also the core of the human rights message: 'all human beings are born free and equal in dignity in rights,' not just some selected human beings are born free. All human beings on this planet are legitimate members of the human family. Some of us need to be stopped from perpetrating violence, yet, there are no aliens, no subhumans, and noone loses their right to be treated humanely. Human rights conventions declare that there is only *one* human family.

Welcome to building a truly global community of like-minded people who create a decent global society!

Reference List

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2005). *The Ethics of Identity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* New York: Norton.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2010). *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen.* New York: Norton.

Baron-Cohen, Simon (2011). *The Science of Evil: On Empathy and the Origins of Cruelty.* New York: Basic Books.

Belenky, Mary Field (1997). *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind.* 10th anniversary edition. New York: Basic Books.

Belenky, Mary Field, Bond, Lynne A., and Weinstock, Jacqueline S. (1997). *A Tradition That Has No Name: Nuturing the Development of People, Families, and Communities.* New York: Basic Books.

---

[82] See Inga Bostad on www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbOBj_UJt2Y. Lasse Moer video-taped Inga Bostad's message on 26th August 2011.

[83] Heard, 1963.

[84] Hollick, 2006 and Hollick & Connelly, 2011. I thank Sigurd Støren for making me aware of this work. Sigurd Støren, Malcolm Hollick, and Christine Connelly are members in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, see www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board.php.

[85] See the list of the Laureates of the Planetary Consciousness Award 1996—2004 on www.clubofbudapest.org/laureats-planet-consc.php.

Berlin, Isaiah (1958). *Two Concepts of Liberty.* Oxford: Clarendon, an Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958.

Brewer, Marilynn B. and Roccas, Sonia (2002). Social Identity Complexity. In *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, pp. 88-106.

Brown, Brené (2011). *The Gifts of Imperfection: Let Go of Who You Think You'Re Supposed to Be and Embrace Who You Are.* Center City. MN: Hazelden.

Carneiro, Robert Leonard (1988). The Circumscription Theory: Challenge and Response. In *American Behavioral Scientist, 31* (4), pp. 497-511.

Chaiken, Shelly L. (1980). Heuristic Versus Systematic Information Processing and the Use of Source Versus Message Cues in Persuasion. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, pp. 752-766.

Chaiken, Shelly L., Gruenfeld, Deborah H., and Judd, Charles M. (2000). Persuasion in Negotiations and Conflict Situations. In Deutsch, Morton and Coleman, Peter T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice.* (pp. 144-165) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clinchy, Blythe McVicker (1996). Connected and Separate Knowing: Toward a Marriage of Two Minds. In Goldberger, Nancy Rule, Tarule, Jill Mattuck, Clinchy, Blythe McVicker, and Belenky, Mary Field (Eds.), *Knowledge, Difference, and Power: Women's Ways of Knowing.* (pp. 205-247) New York: Basic Books.

Clinchy, Blythe McVicker and Zimmerman, Claire (1985). Growing Up Intellectually: Issues for College Women. *Work in Progress, No. 19.* Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Coleman, Peter T. (2000). Power and Conflict. In Deutsch, Morton and Coleman, Peter T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice.* (pp. 108-130) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, Peter T. (2003). Characteristics of Protracted, Intractable Conflict: Toward the Development of a Metaframework-I. In *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 9* (1), pp. 1-37.

Coser, Lewis A. (1977). *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context.* 2nd edition. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Der Spiegel (1998). Nicaragua: Die Sex-Affären Der Commandantes! Totgeschwiegen! Weil Das Sonst Dem Gegner Helfen Könnte! In *Der Spiegel, 31, July 27*, pp. 128-132.

Deutsch, Morton (2006). A Framework for Thinking About Oppression and Its Change. In *Social Justice Research, 19* (1), pp. 7-41.

Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (1987). *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (2007). *The Real Wealth of Nations: Creating a Caring Economics.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Freedman, Des and Thussu, Daya Kishan (Eds.) (2011). *Media and Terrorism: Global Perspectives.* London: Sage.

Granovetter, Mark S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. In *American Journal of Sociology, 78* (May), pp. 1360-1380.

Grossman, Dave (1995). *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Habermas, Jürgen (1962). *Strukturwandel Der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen Zu Einer Kategorie Der Bürgerlichen Gesellschaft.* Neuwied, Germany: Luchterhand.

Habermas, Jürgen (1981). *Theorie Des Kommunikativen Handelns, Band I, Handlungsrationalität Und Gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung, Band II, Zur Kritik Der Funktionalistischen Vernunft.* Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, Jürgen (1985). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1, Reason and the Rationalization of Society, Volume 2, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Habermas, Jürgen (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Haslam, Alexander S. and Reicher, Stephen (2007). Beyond the Banality of Evil: Three Dynamics of an Interactionist Social Psychology of Tyranny. In *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33* (5), pp. 615-622.

Heard, Gerald (1963). *The Five Ages of Man.* New York: Julian Press.

Heller, Agnes (1984). *Everyday Life.* London: Routledge.

Hollick, Malcolm (2006). *The Science of Oneness: A Worldview for the Twenty-First Century.* Winchester, UK: O Books.

Hollick, Malcolm and Connelly, Christine (2011). *Hope for Humanity: How Understanding and Healing Trauma Could Solve the Planetary Crisis.* Winchester, UK: O Books.

Howitt, Dennis and Billig, Michael G. (1989). *Social Psychology: Conflicts and Continuities: An Introductory Textbook.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Johnson, David W., Johnson, Roger T., and Tjosvold, Dean (2000). Constructive Controversy: The Value of Intellectual Opposition. In Deutsch, Morton and Coleman, Peter T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice.* (pp. 65-85) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jordan, Judith V. and Hartling, Linda M. (2002). New Developments in Relational-Cultural Theory. In Ballou, Mary and Brown, Laura S. (Eds.), *Rethinking Mental Health and Disorders: Feminist Perspectives.* (pp. 48-70) New York: Guilford Press.

Jordan, Judith V., Walker, Maureen, and Hartling, Linda M. (2004). *The Complexity of Connection.* New York: Guilford Press.

Lévinas, Emmanuel (1985). Responsibility for the Other. In Lévinas, Emmanuel (Ed.), *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo.* (pp. 93-101) Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

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

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009). *Emotion and Conflict: How Human Rights Can Dignify Emotion and Help Us Wage Good Conflict.* Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, Greenwood.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2010). *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security: Dignifying Relationships From Love, Sex, and Parenthood to World Affairs.* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Security International, ABC-CLIO.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2011). *Harmony As Dignity and Protection From Humiliation.* Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012). *A Dignity Economy: Creating an Economy Which Serves Human Dignity and Preserves Our Planet.* Lake Oswego, OR: Dignity Press.

Mahalik, James R., Locke, Benjamin D., Ludlow, Larry H., Diemer, Matthew A., Scott, Ryan P. J., Gottfried, Michael, and Freitas, Gary (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. In *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4* (1, January), pp. 3-25, psycnet.apa.org/journals/men/4/1/3.pdf.

Metge, Joan (1976). *The Maoris of New Zealand: Rautahi.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, Jean Baker (1986). *Toward a New Psychology of Women.* 2nd edition. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Miller, Jean Baker and Stiver, Irene P. (1997). *The Healing Connection: How Women Form Relationships in Therapy and in Life.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Mischel, Walter and De Smet, Aaron L. (2000). Self-Regulation in the Service of Conflict Resolution. In Deutsch, Morton (Ed.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice.* (pp. 256-275) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Tropp, Linda R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90* (5), pp. 751-783.

Ray, Paul H. and Anderson, Sherry Ruth (2000). *The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People Are Changing the World.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Serres, Michel (1997). *The Troubadour of Knowledge.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Staub, Ervin (1989). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, Henri (Ed.) (1978). *Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies in Intergroup Behavior.* London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, Henri (1978a). *Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* London: Published in cooperation with European Association of Experimental Social Psychology by Academic Press.

Tajfel, Henri (1978b). The Social Psychology of Minorities. In Minority Rights Group International (Ed.), *Minority Rights Group International Report No. 38.* London: Minority Rights Group International.

Tajfel, Henri (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, Henri, Flament, C., Billig, Michael G., and Bundy, R. P. (1971). Social Categorization and Intergroup Behaviour. In *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, pp. 149-178.

Tajfel, Henri, Fraser, Colin, and Jaspars, Joseph Maria Franciscus (1984). *The Social Dimension: European Developments in Social Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, Henri and Turner, John C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In Worchel, Stephen and Austin, William G. (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* (pp. 204-227) Chicago: Neston-Hall.

Tegmark, Max (2008). The Mathematical Universe. In *Foundations of Physics, 38* (2), pp. 101-150.

Thaler, Richard and Sunstein, Cass (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth and Happiness.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tomkins, Silvan Solomon (1962). *Affect Imagery and Consciousness (Volumes I - IV).* New York: Springer.

Turner, John C. (1982). Towards a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group. In Tajfel, Henri (Ed.), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations.* (pp. 15-40) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Walker, Maureen and Rosen, Wendy (2004). *How Connections Heal: Stories From Relational-Cultural Therapy.* New York: Guilford Press.

Wheeler, Gordon (2000). *Beyond Individualism: Toward a New Understanding of Self, Relationship and Experience.* Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.

Wintersteiner, Werner (1999). *Pädagogik Des Anderen: Bausteine Für Eine Friedenspädagogik in Der Postmoderne.* Münster, Germany: Agenda.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram (2005). *The Changing Faces of Honor in National Crises: Civil War, Vietnam, Iraq, and the Southern Factor.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins History Seminar, Fall 2005.

Zehr, Howard (1990). *Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice.* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

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

Zembylas, Michalinos (2002). Of Troubadours, Angels, and Parasites: Reevaluating the Educational Territory in the Arts and Sciences Through the Work of Michel Serres. In *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 3* (3, March 17) ijea.asu.edu/v3n3.

Zimbardo, Philip G. (1989). *Quiet Rage: The Stanford Prison Study [Video].* Stanford, CA: Stanford University.