

# Avoiding Humiliation - From Intercultural Communication to Global Interhuman Communication

© Evelin Lindner

Lecture at the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR)  
Japan, Reitaku University Tokyo Kenkyu Center, June 9, 2006

Evelin G. Lindner, M.D., Ph.D. (Dr. med.), Ph.D. (Dr. psychol.)  
Social Scientist

-----  
Founding Manager of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS,  
<http://www.humiliationstudies.org>),  
anchored at the Columbia University Conflict Resolution Network, New York,  
furthermore affiliated with the University of Oslo, Department of Psychology (see  
<http://folk.uio.no/evelinl/>),

Senior Lecturer at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in Trondheim,  
Department of Psychology (see <http://psyweb.svt.ntnu.no/ansatte/>),  
and affiliated with the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris  
-----

## Contents

Abstract .....	2
Introduction .....	2
My personal experience as prism into the world.....	4
Focusing on cultural diversity is crucial .....	10
Be aware of cultural differences.....	11
Celebrate cultural diversity .....	12
Focusing on cultural differences can also be malign .....	14
Uncontaminated purity? Cleansing!.....	17
Unquestioned ranking? Mutilation! .....	18
Blind loyalty? Mayhem! .....	20
Constructing a new inclusive and diverse global culture.....	21
How to go about: Task orientation, not ego orientation.....	24
How to go about: Beware of tacit knowledge .....	24
Where to go: From honor to equal dignity for all .....	27
What to avoid: Malign sameness .....	29
What to avoid: Malign diversity .....	30
What to achieve: Respect the individual .....	33
Outlook.....	35
Guiding principle 1: Respect the individual.....	35
Guiding principle 2: Allow for contamination.....	36
Guiding principle 3: Build a sunflower identity .....	37
Guiding principle 4: Deconstruct existing cultures, build a diverse global culture .	39
The skills we need.....	41
Some guidelines for implementation .....	47
Reference list.....	49

### Abstract

Intercultural communication has the potential to fertilize transformative learning due to its power to unsettle us. This lecture suggests that we may go beyond being unsettled *ourselves* and let the very *field of intercultural communication* be unsettled. This lecture puts forward the proposal to inscribe *intercultural communication* into *global interhuman communication*. We suggest founding a new field, the field of Global Interhuman Communication.

Intercultural communication is a field that has a particular responsibility to discuss how this process can be guided fruitfully. In this lecture, it is proposed that we explore whether and how the notion of cultural entities can be deconstructed, and whether and how the focus of the study of cultural realms could be transferred from the group to the individual. Perhaps, the new paradigm of interhuman communication could embrace communication, globally and locally, as a kind of flexible navigation done by individuals with mixed identities who follow fluid negotiable guidelines instead of fixed group identities dictating rigid rules.

Currently, cycles of humiliation strain the social fabric of communities around the world and culture is deeply involved. Culture can be the result of humiliation, and culture can humiliate. More so, the very fact that millions of people on our globe live in abject squalor, while a minority indulges in luxury, humiliates the humanity in all of us. The world's ecological and social problems have no passport but belong to the entire planet – they are not confined to one or several cultural realms and therefore cannot be solved with traditional cultural scripts. This is a historically new situation. No history lesson can be of help, and traditional cultural solutions are not necessarily suitable. Humankind needs to build a new inclusive and diverse global culture that selectively employs all the useful and functional aspects of our commonalities and our differences. This is because both, our commonalities and our differences entail benign and malign aspects.

In this lecture, it is recommended to use human rights as sifting tool to decide which commonalities and differences are to be regarded as benign – deserving to be included into a future global culture – and which are not. It is not possible to be neutral. Intercultural communicators cannot avoid asking questions such as: Who receives our support, power elites who manipulate people to be loyal underlings in supposedly “pure” cultures? Or do we support the new vision of equal dignity for every single human being on planet earth?

Experts in intercultural communication, in their capacity as professional bridge builders, are particularly well placed to initiate and facilitate the building of a new global culture that is inclusive and diverse and serves the larger common good.

### Introduction

The field of humiliation studies has emerged only very recently. In 2001, the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS) network was founded as a global consortium of academics and practitioners with the aim to create a new multidisciplinary

field that bridges academia with practice, and incorporates scholarship from anthropology, history, philosophy, political science, social psychology, and sociology (see <http://www.humiliationstudies.org>).

Currently, the phenomenon of humiliation is rapidly gaining visibility and significance, both in our lives and for academic inquiry. Expectations of opportunity rise as people come closer together, both physically and digitally, in a globalizing world. Coupled with the spread of the human rights message, any attempt to lower the expectations of any one group becomes a humiliating offence against all groups and humanity in general. The first sentence in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads, “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”

Even though the phenomenon of humiliation is on the rise due to the shrinking of the world and the emergence of the human rights movement, the phenomenon itself has always been around. Yet, academic attention to study the phenomenon has been lagging behind. Everybody knows the story of the man who searches for his lost keys under a lamp post. Asked, he explains that he lost his keys somewhere else, but looks under the lamp because this is the only place where there is light. In search of explanations for the bad shape of the world, both ecologically and socially, academia needs to install new lamp posts in the dark, so to speak, and when it does that, it finds the phenomenon of humiliation and its rising significance.

This lecture takes one particular field in academia, namely intercultural or crosscultural communication, and attempts to probe whether research of humiliation is relevant (see online texts on <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoware/evelin02.php>). Currently, cycles of humiliation strain the social fabric of communities around the world and culture is deeply involved. Culture can be the result of humiliation, and culture can humiliate. Separate cultural identities are sometimes constructed as a response to humiliation, and under certain circumstances cultural practices can have hurtful and humiliating effects. The notion of culture can be used in several ways, some benign and some hurtful. For example, it can be used in a neutral *descriptive* way; this is when we observe and describe cultural differences in the world. However, the concept of culture can also be used *prescriptively*; this use is entailed in exclamations and questions such as, “I am not sure to which culture I belong, I feel so lost!” Or, “Are you really part of our culture?” Or, even stronger, “You are mistaken in believing that you belong to ‘us’!” While the descriptive exploration of the concept of culture is benign, necessary, and in need to be augmented, applying it in prescriptive ways may have malign effects. I believe that the field of intercultural communication, in both its academic and practical orientations, carries a responsibility to discuss these malign effects so as to avoid inadvertently heightening them.

More so, the very fact that millions of people on our globe live in abject squalor, while a minority indulges in luxury, humiliates the humanity in all of us. The international community, the global bystander, including every citizen, carries a responsibility for counteraction, for building a *Global Culture of Peace* harnessed in global institutional structures that ensure a decent and dignified life for all. Intercultural communication is a field that carries a particular responsibility to discuss how this process can be guided fruitfully.

### **My personal experience as prism into the world**

I was born into a displaced family from Silesia in Central Europe. My initial identity was: “Here where we live we are not at home, it is not our culture, but we cannot return home either; the place where we come from is no longer available to us and, since Silesians are now scattered, Silesian culture will die with our parents; we belong nowhere; we live in a limbo, we are no full human beings.” In other words, my early identity represented a kind of “minus-identity,” or “no-culture identity.” I felt that I did not fit into mainstream definitions of a “full” human being. My parents were mourning the loss of their *Heimat* (“homeland”), their culture was fading away, and where was my home and my culture? I was born into a question mark. The question mark was the only realm that I could call “my culture.”

If my story were an exception, it would be irrelevant for others, and would not merit serving as an example for this lecture. However, in times of globalization, a growing number of people are being touched by my experience and might be interested in knowing about the subsequent solution that I found.

In his new book *The World is Flat*, Thomas Friedman (2005) underlines my view that identity will increasingly be difficult to define. To prepare for his book, he traveled all around the globe, and he concludes that we will be facing *multiple identity disorder* in the future:

...when the world starts to move from a primarily vertical (command and control) value-creation model to an increasingly horizontal (connect and control) creation model, it doesn't affect just how business gets done. It affects everything – how communities and companies define themselves, where companies and communities stop and start, how individuals balance their different identities as consumers, employees, shareholders, and citizens, and what role government has to play. All of this is going to have to be sorted out anew. The most common disease of the flat world is going to be multiple identity disorder... (Friedman, 2005, p. 201).

There are many voices similar to Friedman's. Claire Kramsch (2001), for example, reminds teachers who teach English to speakers of other languages: “Intercultural communication will have to deal with shifting identities and cross-cultural networks rather than with autonomous individuals located in stable and homogeneous national cultures” (Kramsch, 2001, p. 205).

Today, after having lived a global life for several decades, my identity no longer is a minus-identity. It is not a mono- or multi-cultural identity either, but a global identity. I no longer agonize: “Where do I belong? Here *or* there?” I happily announce that I belong here *and* there – I belong everywhere and to myself. I have liberated myself from the need to belong to a particular place on planet Earth or a particular culture. Today, to me, it seems utterly ridiculous and absurd to invest so much energy and emotional suffering into trying to “cut up” our frightfully tiny and fragile planet Earth that so pitifully floats in a vast universe into even tinier pieces. When I am asked about “my country,” I reply, “My country is planet Earth.”

The core of my global culture is defined by historically new insights, particularly one insight that our forefathers had no access to, namely that we are all part of one single family of humankind who jointly has to care for a tiny fragile home planet. None of our

forefathers could see pictures of our blue planet taken by astronauts from space. This is new. Therefore, the global culture that I am part of and that I try to give life to, is new, too. No history lesson helps us. The world's ecological and social problems have no passport but belong to the entire planet; they are not confined to one or several cultural realms and therefore cannot be solved with traditional cultural scripts. Dreaming of splendid undisturbed isolation for separate cultural realms all happily looking inwards is no longer an option. The suffering around the world is too great as that we can look inwards and do nothing. Letting 12 million children die before they reach the age of five, each year, from poverty and preventable diseases, is as atrocious as killing 6 million people in the Holocaust. We need to find ways that alleviate this suffering. We have to find long-term solutions for the entire world rather than just short term cover-ups for some parts of the world. I believe that we need a new global culture that includes traditional cultures in constructive ways. Not least in my personal life, I try to learn the skills that humankind needs to tackle these new global challenges.

In other words, my global experience, though borne out of a painful refugee background, is perhaps useful as a prism to see into the future of a globalizing world. My initial minus-identity forced me into embracing the globe as my home in a more thorough way than most other people would do, and it pushed me into sensing humankind's challenges for the future more starkly than many of those would do who had a luckier personal background than me.

Being global does not mean that I wish to promote one single uniform global culture – on the contrary. Embedded into my identity as a global citizen, implanted into my love for all humankind and its home planet, is my wish to strengthen cultural diversity around the world, and my desire to deeply appreciate all cultural achievements (combined with my skepticism of all cultural mis-achievements). I do not attach myself to any particular cultural realm wholesale, but pick what is functional and ethical and deconstruct what is not. The principle fault lines that I draw are not between “cultures” (Japanese, American, etc.), but between the useful and less useful contributions to our world from all cultural realms.

To formulate it differently, being a living creature, of the species *Homo sapiens*, is primary for me – I am hungry or satisfied, tired or awake, happy or unhappy, I feel loved or unloved, and I feel appreciated or humiliated. This is my essence. It is here that I say “I am,” namely “I am a human being.” All the rest is secondary and does not describe my essence. For example, it is not my essence that I am born female, and the passport that I carry does not define my fundamental nature either. I therefore reject saying sentences such as “I am [a woman], or “I am [a national of x-country].” I strive for unity in diversity, also in my personal identity, and describe myself as “a human being, born female into a specific historical situation, a human being who has developed fond connections with many people, beneficial cultural practices, and places all around the world (in that order) and a critical stance toward those people and practices that cause humiliation.”

I heard Japanese identity being described as an onion: outer layers may seem cosmopolitan, but when you come to the core, there is a “Japanese” essence. In contrast, I believe that at the core we all are human beings. To me, identity is like a sunflower (it makes the qualitative difference between core and periphery clearer than the image of an onion does) – the core represents my essence as a human being, and three layers of petals

are my various connections with a) people, b) benign cultural practices, and c) places around the world. I believe that only such a sunflower definition of identity gives global cooperation and peace a chance over global fragmentation and violent conflict. I strongly suggest that for diversity to be benign, it needs to be embedded into unity.

There are many other images and metaphors that we might play with to illuminate this point, apart from the onion or sunflower. Marriage may serve as another guiding metaphor. Marriage works best when both partners are very clear about where they differ, and when they take these differences as starting point for creating a third entity, their partnership. The project of partnership fails when partners hold on to irreconcilable differences (something which humankind cannot afford, since it is forced to live together on a tiny planet), and the project of partnership fails just as much when one partner merely abandons his or her stance and buys into the other's definitions.

What I describe here in a few sentences, took me a lifetime to develop and think through, not just intellectually, but also emotionally, and in practice. In the course of this process, I became aware that our yearning for fixed identity markers may lead us into deeply destructive and humiliating experiences. For example, while living in Egypt (1984-1991), I met many Western women who converted to Islam and took the veil, some proudly, as an act of liberation from the male gaze, others meekly, as a way to more subservience. I love Egypt, but do I want to follow their example? Is the veil part of Islam or "Egyptian culture"? Some claim that it is, or ought to be, part of Islam and Egyptian culture, others reject that notion. What about female genital cutting? Is this practice part of the essence of any culture? In sum, while I deeply appreciate the gifts Egyptian culture gives to the world, for example Hassan Fathy and his re-invention of traditional Egyptian architecture, there are other aspects in Egyptian culture that I feel have rather hurtful and humiliating effects. In other words, what I always ask myself, is the following: What is the essence of "a culture?" What concept of culture is, or ought to be, at the basis of constructive intercultural communication?

A Somali friend, living in Denmark, and a staunch critic of female genital cutting, shouted at me, "Please do not respect Somali culture! It humiliates its women!" (at the International Congress of Somali Studies, August 6-9, 1998, in Turku, Finland). Ayaan Hirsi Ali from Somalia, until recently Member of Parliament in Holland, would most probably paraphrase and say, "Islamic culture humiliates its women." How do we respond? What signifies constructive intercultural communication in these cases?

Until 1991, I worked as a clinical psychologist (among others in the Middle East 1984-1991), and was confronted with many complicated cases, including what is called honor killings. Imagine, a mother approaches you and explains that her daughter was raped and has to be killed to prevent family honor from being humiliated since the rapist will not marry her. As a human rights defender, you stipulate that marrying a raped girl off to her rapist, let alone killing the girl, is equivalent to compounding humiliation, not remedying it. The mother, in turn, regards your attitude as condescending, as humiliating for her cultural beliefs. In sum, we face several layers of honor, dignity and humiliation. What position do we take when we think of intercultural communication in such as case? Whose honor or dignity do we protect? And which arguments do we use?

The following example describes how even the mere exploration of differences can become rather malign, for example, simply through reification. Women, according to Gilligan (1982), speak in a moral voice of caring, whereas men have a culture of justice.

Janet Shibley Hyde (2005) explains that meta-analyses disconfirm this argument. There is strong evidence for the so-called *gender similarities hypothesis*. Still, Gilligan's ideas have permeated American culture. The stereotype of women as caring and nurturant and men as lacking in nurturance has been reified. Hyde (2005) explains the cost: Many men believe that they cannot be nurturant, even in their role as fathers. For women, says Hyde, the cost in the workplace can be enormous. "...women must present themselves as competent and agentic to be hired, but they may then be viewed as interpersonally deficient and uncaring and receive biased work evaluations because of their violation of the female nurturance stereotype" (Hyde, 2005, p. 589-590).

To conclude, the examples touched upon so far raise questions such as: Do we wish to give equal legitimacy to all cultural definitions and practices that we observe around the world? Some might be the result of misleading reification, some might violate human rights; what do we do with them and how do we design intercultural communication around them? In Gilligan's case, she suggested differences too starkly, and reifying her research results created differences that were not there. Cultural practices that violate human rights, such as female genital cutting, surely are a reality in many parts of the world – we are not mistaken when we describe them – however, they introduce a related problem, namely whether traditional practices that we observe, automatically are practices that we wish to preserve.

Since 1996, I am developing a *Theory of Humiliation (TH)* where I inscribe the notions of pride, honor, dignity, humiliation, and humility into current historic and cultural normative transitions – see, for example, Lindner (2006b). My initial fieldwork focused on Rwanda and Somalia and their history of genocidal killing. European history served as a backdrop – it is often assumed that the humiliation of the Germans through the Versailles Treaties after World War I was partly responsible for the Holocaust and the Second World War. I suggest that at the present historic juncture two forces bring humiliation to the fore in unprecedented intensity: "globalization" (or the *coming-together of humankind*) is the first force, and the *emerging human rights movement* is the second. I propose that we have to develop new ways of communicating with each other globally in order to solve global problems (as well as local problems, which are increasingly intertwined with global problems).

I call for new ways of communicating with each other globally in order to solve global problems (as well as local problems, which are increasingly intertwined with global problems). Solving problems requires cooperation, which in turn, is aided by respect for equal dignity, and hampered by dynamics of humiliation. All cultures need to contribute with their experiences and lessons learned, and intercultural communicators have a pivotal role to play. And not least Japanese culture can teach the world a lot.

Intercultural communication has its roots, among others, in the very pragmatic need of companies to function internationally. Globalization has been strongly driven by the corporate sector growing beyond national borders. Many intercultural communication experts work as consultants for companies and are therefore bound by their employer's *moral boundaries* (Opatow (1995); Coleman (2000)). If the employer allows for child labor, for example, the intercultural communication expert working with this company is expected not to ask questions. The employee has several options, options that are inscribed between two extreme poles. One pole would indicate that she agrees that it is not the employee's role to think about her employer's moral preferences. The opposite

pole would indicate that she quits her job in protest. Many alternative reactions could be placed in between these poles, for example, she could try to convince the management to change their ways. A professor of intercultural communication has already much more space to move than a consultant, since she earns her livelihood from an institution that has academic freedom enshrined in its value frame.

When we think back to Nazi-Germany, we believe that German neighbors ought to have stood up and not stood by when their Jewish neighbors were transported away (Staub (1989)). We deem it to be deeply immoral to treat some lives as being worth less. So far, however, humankind repeats Germany's failings and is not standing up adequately at the global scale. Six million people died in the Holocaust. Today, about twelve million children die each year before they are five years old, of preventable diseases and poverty. At present, the global village is a ramshackle village (Jackson, 1990 9183 /id}, filled with humiliation – millions of poor watch a few rich wallow in wealth, all suffer from environmental degradation that could have been avoided, and local cycles of humiliation endanger everybody. In former times, poverty was fate and nobody cared. In a moral framework of human rights, in contrast, every human being is deemed as deserving of circumstances that enable them to build dignified lives. Gaps between rich and poor that were regarded as normal before are now felt to be obscene and humiliating for everybody's humanity.

In the spirit of "standing up," wider moral boundaries are called for. This lecture wishes to stimulate reflection as to the width of the moral boundaries and moral responsibilities of a student, professor, or consultant of intercultural communication.

Some intercultural communicators might believe that they can escape such difficult questions; however, nobody can avoid making moral statements. The various definitions of the very term "culture" disguise value statements – with "culture" being nothing less than the definitorial underpinning of the field of intercultural communication. Usually elites, particularly in hierarchically organized societies, for example, define as "our culture" the "benevolent care of patrons over grateful underlings," while the underlings might be violently opposed to such a definition of "our culture." A Somali woman, living in Denmark, and a staunch critic of female genital cutting, shouted: "Please do not respect Somali culture! It humiliates its women!" (at the International Congress of Somali Studies, August 6-9, 1998, in Turku, Finland).

Not only our moral responsibility is at stake here, but also the validity of knowledge itself and its usefulness for practice. Renowned philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas warns that monetary and bureaucratic systems currently invade the communicative potentials we hope should help us understand our lifeworld and that this invasion distorts them without us being aware – he speaks of the *colonization of the lifeworld* (Habermas (1987)). Habermas breaks down the concept of "knowledge constituting interests" into the technical, practical, and emancipatorial interests of knowledge. Kurt Lewin (1890-1947), often called the father of modern social psychology, introduced to social psychology the "Lewinian way of thinking," by stipulating, among others, that theory has to be useful for social practice (Deutsch (1999)).

This lecture suggests that we take the emancipatorial interests of knowledge, as highlighted by Habermas, seriously, and employ them for the Lewinian call to make theory useful to practice. Perhaps it is our moral responsibility to engage in deeper

emancipatorial inquiry, and this not only in theory, but also in practice? If we do that, it means unleashing creativity for building a new global culture.

Every act of intercultural communication is permeated by value choices, and this lecture wishes to draw the reader's attention to this fact. Since we cannot escape this predicament, it might be advisable to think it through and gauge our options. What is at stake are ultimate questions such as outlined by the University in Toronto in their proposal to found a new school, the McLuhan School. In their proposal they enumerate why we need new approaches, not least in the academic world, see Smith (2005):

Ultimate Questions: What makes a life worth living? How should we view — and treat — the “other”? On what principles should society be organized? What should be lived for? fought for? What matters, ultimately? The core of civilization is at stake: fundamental values, inalienable commitments, unshakable beliefs. Classically, such questions were shouldered by religion; but most religious traditions are founded on ancient natural philosophies, unprepared for radical scientific progress — and concomitant changes in our understanding of symbols, meaning, and interpretation consequent to the development of information technologies. Moreover, many answers proposed by the religious right are contrary to fundamental academic values. We in the university need answers of our own. We must demonstrate a public, progressive, intellectual (modern or postmodern), scientifically-enabled, multicultural world-view that can deal squarely with issues of ultimate significance. This is especially urgent given science's continuing domestication of issues traditionally taken to be sacred: *consciousness, fidelity, altruism, sexual preference, memory, identity, self*, etc. (Smith, 2005, p. 4).

This lecture is inscribed into those ultimate questions enumerated above. It is inscribed into present peace movements, such as the fields of *Peace Education* and *Peace Linguistics*, or the *Culture of Peace* movement, a global movement that is developing within the framework of the *International Decade (2001-2010)*. The Charter of the United Nations, 1945, professes: “We the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.” The Culture of Peace is defined by the United Nations as follows:

The Culture of Peace is a set of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations (UN Resolutions A/RES/52/13 : Culture of Peace and A/RES/53/243, Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace). For peace and non-violence to prevail, we need to:

- foster a culture of peace through education by revising the educational curricula to promote qualitative values, attitudes and behaviours of a culture of peace, including peaceful conflict-resolution, dialogue, consensus-building and active non-violence. Such an educational approach should be geared also to:
  - promote sustainable economic and social development
  - promote respect for all human rights
  - ensure equality between women and men

- foster democratic participation
- advance understanding, tolerance and solidarity
- support participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge
- promote international peace and security  
([http://www3.unesco.org/iycp/uk/uk\\_sum\\_cp.htm](http://www3.unesco.org/iycp/uk/uk_sum_cp.htm))

This lecture discusses the role of culture and identity in a world of diverse cultures which are all under the influence of the two transformative forces of our time, globalization, and the human rights movement. It is argued that, in order to avoid potentially destructive effects, we have to strongly promote *global interhuman communication* as overarching paradigm for *international relations* and *intercultural communication*. We suggest founding a new field, the field of “Global Interhuman Communication.”

This lecture wishes to open up Global Interhuman Communication as a new field of endeavor for intercultural communicators, a global field, and it will therefore not focus so much on the practices of intercultural communication. The point of departure for this lecture is that intercultural communicators are bridge-builders, and that their expertise is not only essential within their very field, but is needed also for the larger task of building a new global cultural framework that can inform new and more beneficial cultural practices and institutions, globally, but also locally.

I call upon intercultural communicators to invest some of their time and their creativity into building a larger and more beneficial frame for the world than has hitherto been realized. A more beneficial frame would not only promote social and ecological sustainability for humankind, and strengthen the validity of our scientific endeavor, but also improve the very context within which intercultural communicators work. Envisaging such a task first requires making a pause, taking a step back, and reorienting our priorities. Facilitating this reorientation is the aim of this lecture.

This lecture is organized in four parts that all address the question as to how currently existing cultural knowledge systems can be made fruitful for constructing a larger global cultural frame that protects cultural diversity in the service of the common good of humanity. In the first section, the importance of protecting cultural diversity is highlighted. The second part addresses the potential dangers that may emanate from accepting cultural idiosyncrasies too blindly. The third section discusses how we can construct a new inclusive and diverse global culture. The fourth part ponders the principles, skills, and guidelines we need for such a task.

### **Focusing on cultural diversity is crucial**

When I speak about the need for humankind to build a new global culture, I face many criticisms. I am accused of wishing to force the world into cultural uniformity and sameness, I am suspected of blindness to the fact that cultural diversity must be respected and celebrated, and I am reproached for overlooking the extent of damage that can occur when we are unaware of cultural differences.

My response is that, on the contrary, at the core of my vision of a global culture is precisely the insight that studying and celebrating cultural differences is crucial and that

this endeavor deserves much more attention from the world and academia than is given to it so far. However, what I add is that for difference and diversity to be benign a certain ranking must be introduced: common interest must be placed over difference. When a marriage falls apart, and there is a divorce, the ex-partners can move out and never meet again. In the case of humankind, this is no option. America, for example, has no other planet to move to when it has enough of China, or vice versa. Humankind has no choice but to learn to cooperate so as to build a sustainable home for all, notwithstanding any possible mutual dislike or wishes for “divorce.”

Please let me first address the significance of studying cultural differences.

### **Be aware of cultural differences**

Being insensitive to or ignorant of culture differences and being inept in intercultural communication can lead to painful consequences, as I have experienced myself. When I first came to Japan in 2004, I participated in a seminar on the history and use of kimonos. About forty Japanese and non-Japanese women were attending. I was asked why I was interested in this topic. I explained that I was the founding manager of a global network of scholars and practitioners, Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, and that we have a project, called the World Clothes for Equal Dignity as part of our work. I pointed out that all information could be found on

<http://www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/clothes.php>. I left the seminar confident and satisfied with myself. Later I learned that my message had been misunderstood. I had been too enthusiastic. Some Japanese participants thought that I was a kind of missionary, trying to enlist them for a sect. Subsequently, I was effectively ostracized by the group and never contacted again. This shocked me deeply. Had I been a manager of a foreign company with the aim to make business in Japan, it would have been this company’s ruin. My intercultural ineptitude would have cost dear.

Robert M. March (1996) describes a similar example. An English manager wanted to thank a young Japanese employee for her diligent work with a trip to the parent company office in England. To his astonishment, she was not happy. She eventually explained that she suspected him of having a “hidden agenda,” namely wanting to create an obligation in her so that she would stay in the company. For the English manager this was pure paranoia. Luckily, she explained her behavior, because otherwise their attempt of intercultural communication would have remained mis-communication.

Every reader can add to this list. In the Middle East, I experienced superb hospitality. When one of my Middle Eastern friends came to the United States, he grew very bitter, feeling intentionally humiliated, when his American hosts failed to treat him in the way he expected. His American hosts, on their part, were utterly ignorant of his suffering. The result was a complete breakdown of their relationship. Or, an American friend went to work in Europe. Due to his tough-guy language, of which he was very proud but which was entirely misplaced in his new environment, he was discretely kept out of all decision-making. This led him to the bitter conclusion that Europeans were secretive power-abusers; his life in Europe was sorely soured.

Clearly, what we learn from these examples is that it is of utmost importance to know about cultural differences, and to learn how to tackle them. But what is culture and what are cultural differences? A neutral description is that culture is “the integrated pattern of

human knowledge, belief, and behavior that depends upon man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations;" and it also means "the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group" (Merriam Webster Online, 2005).

Numerous categorizations of cultural differences have been undertaken, and the readers of this journal know all about them. There is no need to make long lists in this lecture. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), for example, have developed a six dimensional categorization of cultures. Geert Hofstede (2005) carried out research on IBM employees around the world and developed a classic systematization of culture dimensions. Initially he detected four dimensions of culture, *power distance*; *uncertainty avoidance*; *individualism* (versus *collectivism*); and *masculinity* (versus *femininity*). Later Hofstede included a fifth dimension, namely *orientation in time*, either long-term or short-term. Smith and Bond (1999) hypothesize that "cultural uncertainty avoidance is related to greater formality in relationship, masculinity to greater task-orientation, power distance to greater hierarchy, individualism to greater superficiality, and long-term orientation to greater competitiveness" (Smith and Bond, 1999, p. 18). The list of valuable explorations of cultural differences is much longer, but let us stop here, because this is not the focus of this lecture.

In sum, it is indeed crucial to learn about cultural differences in order to enable people around the world to constructively engage with each other. Particularly in the face of global problems which need global cooperation and collaboration for their solution, ineptitude in intercultural communication can tip the balance towards humankind's demise.

Let me now briefly touch upon why celebrating cultural diversity is so important.

### **Celebrate cultural diversity**

Maintaining biodiversity is crucial for the survival of humankind. Among the most recent important success stories is a new revolutionary antibiotic drug that researchers have isolated from South African soil after screening 250,000 natural product extracts for their antibiotic potential.

Likewise, the cultural diversity that Homo sapiens has created on planet Earth is vital. Consider, for example, *ubuntu*, the traditional African philosophy for living together and solving conflict in an atmosphere of shared humility. Michael Jesse Battle (1997) describes how Desmond Tutu's (1999) work with the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* drew on ubuntu. Finn Tschudi (2006) explains, "Tutu tells us that *ubuntu* can be used to describe a personal quality: A person with ubuntu is open and accessible for others, primed with a certainty deriving from the experience of belonging to a larger unity. This unity is degraded when others are humiliated, or otherwise treated as less worthy" (Tschudi, 2006, p.1).

Or, another example. Whenever I am in New York, I never feel lonely, human contact is always at hand. What makes New York feel so welcoming, is the sense of shared humanity and experience, as if we all had just arrived with the ship at the Statue of Liberty, like early immigrants. In 2005, I sat in a restaurant in New York for breakfast, enjoying the New Yorker's easy-going way of connecting. A woman whom I had never met before came up to me and commented my long hair and told me about her

experiences with long hair. We spoke for a few minutes and she moved on. Then the door opened and a group of German tourists came in. They sat down and eventually one of them began to struggle trying to take pictures where the entire groups would be captured. I got up and offered my assistance: I was willing to take a picture of the entire group. The result was astonishing. First, the group pretended not to have heard me, even though I had spoken loud enough and in perfect German. They looked down and away from me, like little children who are afraid of strangers, or as if they feared I was to steal their camera. Some risked some suspicious glances at me. Finally the most courageous person among them got up and accepted my offer, with a grim expression on her face. I felt pity for them. I thought, “What a culture!” Whenever I spend time in world regions that emerge from a history of fixed and rigid hierarchical societal structures with a high power distance, I seem to meet this sad motto: “Don’t infringe on my territory!?” Everybody around the world with similar leanings would benefit, I believe, from learning from the unobtrusive, effortless, almost elegant atmosphere of inclusiveness that so many New Yorkers are able to create.

Also Japanese concepts for connection and togetherness *uchi* (“inside”) an in-group have the potential of serving as cultural blue-prints for a future global culture of humankind. This is because, globalization, a buzzword with many meanings, signifies, among others, the *ingathering* of the human tribe – this is the correct anthropological term – into one single in-group. It means that humankind emerges from a past where in-groups faced out-groups. Japanese *uchi* cultural scripts could be very helpful in this process (while, clearly, traditional cultural paradigms that teach how to keep out-groups out would be counterproductive in this context).

Haru Yamada (1997), in her book *Different Games, Different Rules: Why Americans and Japanese Misunderstand Each Other*, offers a number of useful paradigms for a sustainable *uchi* of the future global village:

- *wa* (harmonious integration of the group)
- *nemawashi* (collective decisionmaking)
- *uchiawase* (“sounding out”)
- *sasshi* (anticipatory guesswork)
- *haragei* (silent communication)
- *amae* (sweetness)
- *ninjo* (human emotion or compassion)
- *seishin* (selfless spiritual strength)

Also the global corporate sector will benefit from learning Japanese cultural concepts. Ryuzaburo Kaku, now honorary chairman of Canon, the Japanese technology company, promotes conviviality or *kyosei*: “All people, regardless of race, religion or culture, harmoniously living and working together into the future” (quoted from the web site of the company Canon, <http://www.canon.com/about/philosophy/>).

Indeed, intercultural rights are part and parcel of human rights. Gomes de Matos (1997) has called for *intercultural rights* to join the notion of *linguistic rights* as officially proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights at an international conference in Barcelona in 1996.

Cultural diversity, in order to be protected and celebrated, indeed requires more recognition for minorities, the harbingers of diversity. However, many so-called “minorities” have experienced marginalization, violent oppression, and extermination. The rise of the downtrodden from humiliation is at the core of research on humiliation. Not all oppressed groups succeed in acquiring the label of *minority*. As long as underlings are utterly powerless, they are also voiceless. It requires a certain amount of resources and ideological support to acquire the label of minority and muster the strength of voice that is necessary to call for respect for *our* culture.

In the course of my work on humiliation, I met Ole Henrik Magga, the outstanding voice of the Sami in Norway; I met Victoria Tauli Corpuz of the Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education in the Philippines); I met Haruzo Urakawa Ekashi, a doyen of the Ainu in Japan; and I am familiar with the Human Rights Museum in Osaka, a museum that has been initiated by *Hisabetsu buraku* “discriminated communities,” descendants of pre-modern outcast hereditary occupational groups, such as butchers, leatherworkers, and certain entertainers (see also [www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/purity](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/purity)).

To sum up this section, indeed, it is of utmost importance to focus on cultural diversity, not just be being aware of it, but also by celebrating it. Like biodiversity, cultural diversity offers riches that are lost wherever diversity is lost.

### **Focusing on cultural differences can also be malign**

As we saw, the concept of culture is fruitful when used descriptively, and more research is urgently needed. But when reified and applied as a prescription, problems arise. The belief that one ought to “have a culture,” or “belong to a culture,” introduces pain that otherwise would be absent, most poignantly the pain of not belonging. For instance, in Japan, children with one Japanese and one non-Japanese parent often are called *haafu* (“half”). “Half” suggests that such a human being is not a full human being, but only half a human being, not belonging fully to each of his or her parental cultures. Why not “double”? (Adair Linn Nagata’s comment, March 5, 2005.)

Clearly, in-group/out-group differentiations do create a reassuring sense of belonging, security, and trust, and they make life simpler. We often treat outsiders with a grain of suspicion and screen them carefully for whether they are trustworthy or not. This is tedious; exempting insiders from this scrutiny saves time and energy. We furthermore usually extend more rights to our in-group members than to outsiders. There are two kinds of morals, an “*inside* moral” and an “*outside* moral.” What *my* people deserve is not the same as what *your* people deserve. The reach of morals is also called the *scope of justice*. Peter T. Coleman (2000) defines it 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” (Coleman, 2000, p. 118).

In the past, prior to the emergence of the concept and reality of *One World*, this represented a helpful arrangement. However, in a globalizing world, it increasingly turns into an unhelpful one. When the world is becoming *one single global village*, and no longer contains *many villages* pitted against each other in fear of attack (*International*

*Relations Theory* calls this the *Security Dilemma*), the world can no longer be conceptualized by ways of our forefathers. The myth that “a culture” can be “ours” and not “yours” and that this drawing of borders can bring us safety, turns into a hazardous myth. And the belief that in-group members are more trustworthy than outsiders might turn out to be a fallacy. My son, in my own home, might get into bad company through the internet and develop into a monster, while the foreigner walking through my neighborhood might be entirely harmless.

The same critical analysis may be directed at our use of status. Apart from differentiating people and practices horizontally into being *in* versus *out*, we often also rank vertically into *higher* versus *lower* status, both within cultural realms and vis-à-vis others. Not always does the “foreign” out-group, for example, signify *less* status, sometimes it means *more*. In Japan, for instance, French culture is regarded very highly. Shops, particularly, fancy French names. And almost nowhere in the world are brand names so well accepted as in Japan. In short, some aspects of Western culture, particularly French culture, are regarded as *higher*. Undoubtedly, there is a certain amount of satisfaction that can be drawn from feeling “higher,” for example by wearing clothes of “higher” status. However, is it reasonable that women pay for higher status with the health of their feet? Is it worth replacing traditional indigenous interior design and architecture, in Japan as much as in the rest of the world, with Western unsightliness? We will come back to this example later. Again, the question is to what extent culture is, or ought to be, a fixed concept that forms the essential core of one’s identity and serves as a predetermined starting point for intercultural communication, or whether we treat culture as a social construct entailing certain cultural practices that are beneficial and other practices that are not beneficial.

I believe that we need to deconstruct the concepts defining the cultural realms we live in very carefully, and reconstruct them anew. Jack Mezirow (1991) developed a *Transformation Theory of Adult Learning*. The transformation process is theorized as occurring in 10 phases typically brought about by a *disorienting dilemma*, which unsettles our fundamental beliefs and values into question. Adair Linn Nagata (2006) describes to what extent intercultural communication can have unsettling effects, and that therefore the study of intercultural communication is particularly suited to stimulating transformative learning:

Studying intercultural communication exposes us to different ways of thinking, feeling, and doing. Our usual ways of being are likely to be called into question as we engage with people who speak different languages and have different ways of life. Our growing realization as we study other cultures that there is more than one valid and acceptable way to be human may provoke new and unsettling questions and open possibilities we never considered (Nagata, 2006, p. 41).

Transformative learning is not easy. However, the reward is worth it. In “Reframing Conflict: Intercultural Conflict as Potential Transformation,” Beth Fisher-Yoshida (2005) explains how intercultural conflict can be the source of learning and mutual enrichment, made possible by the fact that the people involved are different. However, what is needed for people to reap such rewards, are mainly two skills, a) self-reflexivity, and b) the mastering of negative emotions. As to a), Nagata (2005) exquisitely describes the concept

of self-reflexivity and how her concept of bodymindfulness can help to achieve it. Self-reflexivity requires taking a step back, looking at oneself and the world from a distance (in my case, distance was introduced into my life not least through my painful family background of being displaced and not belonging). As to b), Jacqueline Wasilewski (2001) most insightfully explains that the ability to constructively channel and manage negative emotion is the “gatekeeper” of communicative effectiveness, particularly in an increasingly interconnected world that requires superior communication skills for tackling the negative emotions that are bound to be elicited in intercultural encounters.

I myself have ample experience with the pains of transformative learning. I lived through many disorienting dilemmas which called my fundamental beliefs and values into question. I was caught in intercultural conflict even within myself. For example, I was born into the cultural definition of a “good woman” being the subservient supporter of her husband – this is my mother’s belief – and deep inner conflict was the result when I aspired to being a “bad woman” (in the old sense), a female partner who is equal to her male counterpart. To start with, this inner intercultural conflict of mine was invisible to me, later it became hurtful – it basically cost me 10 years of my life – however, eventually, I learned a lot.

What always helped me overcome the trauma of failing and learning was my inner distance with its affordance of a wider horizon. When I look back, I remember how this distance manifested itself during my early lifetime without me being aware of it; only much later did I understand its value. When I was six, some developmental psychologists came to our school to measure child development. They asked us to paint a man on a chair. I painted him in perfect perspective; nobody else did. The researchers accused me of lying about my age, since they were certain that nobody that young could paint in perspective. For me it was not an achievement; I just “saw.” Later, when I was 16 or 17, we had a philosophy class at school. The topic was meta-language. We could choose to have the end of term exam in this class, or in the geography class. All my class mates chose the geography exam, even though it required lots of learning by heart. I was the only one to take the philosophy exam. I did not need to prepare for it; I merely “saw.” It was clear to me what was meta-language and what not. I got the highest grade. Later, when I studied medicine, I finished the hardest exam, the so-called Physicum, with grades that were among the highest at the national level. What I did, was make little films in my head, dynamic spherical models of all bodily processes. As a result, again, I “saw” how these processes worked. I always was particularly good in reading maps or turning images of spherical objects in my head. In all cases, clearly, something in me enabled me to look at the world from afar and above, seeing connections and patterns that otherwise would be lost in detail. As I said earlier, I believe that the source of this ability was the initially very painful refugee identity of not-belonging into which I was born. I did not “need” intercultural communication to get unsettled. From my perspective, little of what was “normal” for other people in my host environment was “normal” to me. My world was full of question marks, where others felt sure. I never was settled, I was born into unsettlement. What was painful first, however, later helped me deal with trauma.

What I would like to suggest, however, is that we not only allow *ourselves* to be unsettled, but that we go one step further, that we also let the very *field of intercultural communication* be unsettled. I propose that we explore whether and how the notion of cultural entities can be deconstructed, and whether and how the focus of the study of

cultural realms could be transferred from the group to the individual. Perhaps the new paradigm of intercultural communication could cease being conceptualized as being based on in-group/out-group relationships (where out-groups are either suspected or admired), no longer would it be communication between fixed entities with fixed rules, but a kind of flexible navigation done by individuals with mixed identities who follow fluid negotiable guidelines.

To recapitulate, I have lived through many of the dilemmas that Mezirow describes. I do not “have” one culture, nor two, nor three, but navigate in a fluid web of many cultural stimuli. And there are many people like me. In fact, nobody is “pure.” Worse, the thought of purity – at least when introduced at the wrong level of analysis – introduces a heap of problems. So, I believe that the field of intercultural communication must be careful not to nurture dangerous myths, among them the myth of cultures representing isolated containers each with its separate cultural purity. Not only is this conceptualization missing human reality, cultural practices can furthermore be the result of humiliation, and they can humiliate. Intercultural communication needs to be more than accepting of the status-quo. It needs to be emancipatorial.

### **Uncontaminated purity? Cleansing!**

The winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1938, Pearl S. Buck, felt very much “Chinese,” but, to her chagrin, was identified and dehumanized as “American” at some point. More recently, another writer, Orhan Pamuk, a leading Turkish novelist, explained (in a BBC World *HARDtalk* interview on April 24, 2006), that he regards himself as a Turkish patriot. Still, in 2005, he faced criminal charges for insulting the Turkish nation. He had spoken to a Swiss newspaper about the Armenian genocide and the treatment of Kurds in Turkey. He almost went to prison. Yet another renowned novelist, Carlos Fuentes, said (in a BBC World *HARDtalk* interview on April 6, 2006) that he regards himself as a Mexican and deeply loves his country. Yet, his critics contest his stance. They deny him his identity by pointing out that he lives in London, that he grew up as a child of a diplomat all over the world, and that he therefore is an outsider who has no right to speak for Mexico.

These examples are rather mild. However, what about the Jews in Nazi-Germany, who felt to be “German” and could not believe that they were to be exterminated. Those who did not leave Germany in time were killed. Mendes-Flohr (1999) explains how the advocates of a Jewish Renaissance in Germany imagined the “and” between the two components of their identities as a bridge between them (Mendes-Flohr, 1999, p. 90). Their vision was slaughtered in the mayhem of the Holocaust. “Mixed” meant “polluted,” a pollution that had to be “cleansed.” Sometimes, even moderation is perceived as pollution. When the genocide began in 1994 in Rwanda, moderate Hutus, those who opposed the genocide, were the first to be killed by their extremist Hutu brothers and sisters. The Hutu extremists set out to “cleanse” Rwanda from its Tutsis and those Hutus who opposed this.

Mary Douglas (1984) addresses the topic of purity in her book on *Purity and Danger*. Ohta Kyoji, Chief Curator of the Human Rights Museum in Osaka, Japan, added a further twist to this issue (in a personal conversation, February 7, 2005). He explained how the idea of impurity and pollution is linked to discrimination when people who are doing

“cleaning” work, even if it is “spiritual cleaning” (certain types of entertainment), are perceived as being “polluted” by the “dirt” they clean away and how they are then excluded from society.

To sum up, the concept of purity easily leads to humiliation, at least for those, who accept human rights as moral framework. Being excluded, being exterminated, being treated as a lesser being, is not what human rights teach. Human rights extend equal dignity to all humankind.

### **Unquestioned ranking? Mutilation!**

As discussed earlier, the pleasure from cultural status markers may be paid for by mutilation. The Chinese cultural practice of foot binding, now outlawed, may serve as stark example. In China, mothers who bound their daughters feet, bought into Chinese culture and its definition of beauty. Still today, mothers, who have their daughters’ genitals cut and sown up, do so because they accept cultural beliefs that sanctify this practice; also in this case it makes their daughters beautiful, honorable, and marriable. In these examples, beauty and being eligible for marriage, high aims, “require” painful mutilation.

The list of “beautifiers” that actually damage health is long. There are rumors that Emperor Taishō (1879-1926), for example, suffered poor health both physically and mentally from lead poisoning, supposedly caused by the powder makeup his wetnurse used. Chinese foot binding reminds of the – fortunately bygone – European practice to make women faint by forcing them into a “wasp waist.” The Japanese kimono for men gives them ample space to move and to breathe, unlike their female counterpart. Smoking or eating fatty and sugary food – practices that fortunately are on the way out these days – equally used to combine the promise of status with health damage. The design of furniture is not exempt: The chair’s function, for example, was to give status – the chair elevates the chairperson over the others to lead a meeting – however, if used all day, a chair brings but back pain. Many aspects of the design of houses and flats follow suit, in the past as much as today.

Newtonian physics and their application was a great success – who can doubt the miracle that humans suddenly could build trains, cars, and airplane. Unfortunately, however, this success gave status to what I call the *machine paradigm* (versus the *animal paradigm* or *living creature paradigm*). Everything had to become rectangular and operate like a clock. Human beings had to become machines. Babies, for example, had to be fed by schedule. Nestlé and Ross laboratories developed white powder and plastic nipples. John Watson (1928) famously wrote, in his books *Psychological Care of Infant and Child*, that kissing your child goodnight equaled overindulgence. A brief bow and hand shake before turning off the light would be the correct way to love your child. The machine paradigm has dominated many realms of life since its inception and caused intense harm where the mere acknowledgement that human beings are served better by conceptualizing themselves as living creatures would have prevented it. I remember how I was struck by this dynamic as a medical student; such simple problems as sleeplessness, for example, are often merely caused by a mislead application of the machine paradigm that overlooks that human beings better seek resonance with their biorhythms.

Or, let me give you an even more personal example. My father grew up on a farm and, as he explained to his children (me and my younger siblings), he knew how to treat animals well. He explained to us how important it is to build a relationship with animals, how you have to learn to observe them, communicate with them, and give them time. My father applies what I call the animal paradigm, both to himself and to others. It entails approaching others carefully, being aware that sometimes things take time, that there are biorhythms, and that you have to “feel” your way. My mother grew up in a city. She learned to apply the machine paradigm. She expects herself and others to work like Newtonian machines, in line with the mechanization of the industrial world that seemed so superior to animal performance. Everything should work fast and on time, as if buttons can be switched, everything should be rectangular, life and people should function according to machine-like rules, “unpolluted” by slow and fuzzy rhythms. To conclude, like foot binding, the machine paradigm is associated with higher status, however, at the expense of our health.

How is it possible that we are ready to pay with painful mutilation for the promise of higher status? French sociologist Raymond Boudon (1989), in his work, asks how individuals come to adhere to false or apparently irrational beliefs, and how it is possible that such beliefs become collectively accepted as true (see also the concept of “urban legends”). Psychoanalyst Arno Gruen (1992) gives an explanation for why false beliefs are transmitted through generations; according to him, children relinquish autonomy in exchange for the “love” for those on whose power they depend. He theorizes that later in life this self-betrayal results in self-hatred and rage, which, according to Gruen, lies at the very root of evil.

Japan has important lessons to contribute. Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney (2002) explains how it was their sincere quest for aesthetics, beauty, and higher meaning that doomed brilliant young students to “volunteer” to die as tokkotai pilots. Those who volunteered, were the idealistic and earnest ones, those who did not try to evade what they perceived to be their noble duty, namely to die (unlike some of their comrades who managed to survive the war by holding on to less lethal tasks in the military). Many believed that a new peaceful world would rise from the ashes and that their sacrifice would help. Like in the case of foot binding, they hoped to attain a higher level of beauty and nobility, through what they conceived as their noble sacrifice to the world, and in exchange, they gave everything they had, their lives. The only “gain” they indeed did secure was a substantial financial compensation for their families, since tokkotai pilots were promoted to a higher military rank than they otherwise would have held.

Ohnuki-Tierney draws on the concepts of *méconnaissance* (misrecognition) and *naturalization* that are used, among others, by Roland Barthes, Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault. I label practices that resemble foot binding, at least when carried out in human rights based contexts, as *voluntary self-humiliation*, a self-humiliation that I believe ought to be discontinued. Human rights enshrine dignity, equal dignity for everybody that ought not be humiliated, demeaned or denigrated. Self-mutilating, making oneself weak, so as to fit into a system of underlings and masters, does not concur with human rights. On the contrary, to my view, being made weaker and smaller, so as to become a more acceptable underling, represents a violation of human rights when carried out voluntarily on oneself as much as when perpetrated by others against one’s will.

### Blind loyalty? Mayhem!

Instead of accepting “evil” as “unexplainable,” or short-cutting to explanations such as “pathological narcissism,” or proposing an innate “desire to dominate” – all rather daunting diagnoses without much chance of healing – perhaps humans have a “desire to relate” – see, for example, Jordan, Walker, and Hartling (Eds.) (2004). Jean Baker Miller and her colleagues at the Jean Baker Miller Training Institute (JBMTI) emphasize *connection* and *mutuality* as part of their *Relational-Cultural Theory (RCT)*. Feelings of humiliation emerge when recognition fails, and “evil” represents one of the possible outcomes of disappointed expectations.

In some cases, ironically, a commonality that all humans share, namely to feel hurt when humiliated, might be at the root of dividing them – dividing them into supposedly different cultural realms. Liah Greenfeld (1996) explains that Eritrean cultural identity may be a response to humiliation from Ethiopia. During my fieldwork in Somalia, the same dynamic was at work. Once united in a dream of “Greater Somalia,” the north, Somaliland, now claims independence; their southern brothers humiliated them to a degree that is unacceptable, they say. Similarly, many East Germans currently reinvent a nostalgic East German culture. East Germans expected to be reunited with West Germany as equal partners; instead West Germans arrogantly annexed East Germany, many feel. Therefore, many East Germans now wish to culturally separate from arrogant West Germans (you see t-shirts in the street saying “We want the wall back!”). Thus, cultural differences may sometimes not be primary, but secondary, constructed as a reaction to humiliation. In the process, unquestioned loyalty to such constructions may be demanded from in-group members with the explanation that humiliation from outside needs to be fended off.

Vamik Volkan (2004) has developed a *Theory of Collective Violence*, which he puts forth in his recent book *Blind Trust: Large groups and their leaders in times of crisis and terror*. He explains that a *chosen trauma* that is experienced as *humiliation* and is *not mourned*, leads to the feeling of *entitlement to revenge* and, under the pressure of *fear/anxiety*, to *collective regression*.

In the course of my fieldwork on the Rwandan genocide (1998-1999), I heard stories of Hutu *genocidaires* who were in hiding in Kenya and needed psychotherapy because they could not eat without seeing the small fingers of children on their plates. Instead of facing punishment, they became “insane.” Many Hutus had been forced to kill their own families, their Tutsi spouses and Tutsi-looking children, to show their allegiance to the Hutu cause. The International Panel of Eminent Personalities confirms: “Hutu women married to Tutsi men were sometimes compelled to murder their Tutsi children to demonstrate their commitment to Hutu Power. The effect on these mothers is also beyond imagining” (The International Panel of Eminent Personalities to Investigate the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda and the Surrounding Events (2000), chapter 16, paragraph 4).

Hitler for Nazi-Germany, Slobodan Milosevic for a dream of “Greater Serbia,” or the extremist Hutu elite in Rwanda, all fed on humiliation narratives that pushed people to perpetrate mayhem which ultimately also ravaged their own lives. Germans, Serbs and Hutus were asked to defend “their culture” from the imagined threat of being humiliated and annihilated, by humiliating and exterminating the supposed aggressor.

Or, here is an example from Africa. *Sangoma*, *Muti*, or the practices of South African traditional healers and witchdoctors, regard the killing of living creatures, animals and

people, their painful screams, and their body parts to be a potent magic to wake up the ancestors' spirits and be heard by them (<http://www.factnet.org/cults/Sangoma/index.html>). Witchcraft murders abound, carried out cruelly, so as to elicit the desired screams.

To conclude, mayhem can be motivated – not by “unexplainable” hatred – but by loyalty, loyalty to our in-group, to “our culture.” Humiliation, if constructed as a group grievance, may link loyalty and enmity in ways that bring catastrophe to whole world regions.

Intercultural communicators are bridge-builders. Nobody is better placed to identify the malignant effects of biases, explain them to the world, and think up better ways. This lecture engages in this very global explanation and communication effort, thus opening up a new field of activity for intercultural communicators.

### **Constructing a new inclusive and diverse global culture**

At the 2005 Aoyama Symposium on International Communication, entitled “Exploring the Current Status and Future Direction of International Communication as a Field of Study” (Aoyama-Gakuen University, Tokyo, March 5, 2005), Richard Evanoff told the following story. Richard, himself from a Western background, is married to a Japanese wife. When their first child was born, his wife wanted to have the child sleep between them, explaining that Japanese culture indicates more than kinship, namely “skinship.” The concept of skinship follows the kanji pictogram of a river (three parallel lines), with the wife and husband on the sides, with the child in the middle. He, Richard, in contrast, wanted the children to sleep alone in their own room. The couple found the following way out of their seemingly irreconcilable positions: their children do not sleep between them, but alongside his wife. In other words, between themselves, together, Richard and his wife developed new norms and new processes.

Evanoff (1998), in his article “A Constructivist Approach to Intercultural Ethics,” insightfully presents us with a map that we can use to build a new global culture. There are two extreme poles between which we have to navigate, the extreme *realist* pole on one side, and the extreme *idealist* pole on the other. Evanoff explains how traditional empiricism, following John Locke, has tended to see the human mind as a blank slate on which nature inscribes itself. This is the fundament for the realist approach to ethics which believes that moral truths and values can be directly discerned in nature. Evanoff writes:

According to this view it should be possible for people to reach universal agreement on ethical matters regardless of any cultural differences that may exist between them by simply looking at nature—that is, at either the natural world or “human nature”—and seeing what is the case. This view is prevalent in the West and it also informs much of the debate on global issues in international forums such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization (Evanoff, 1998, p. 84).

In contrast, the idealist approach to ethics regards moral truths and values as culturally determined. There is little or no common ground between different cultural realms with

their diverse histories of conceiving ethics that could lend itself to meaningful dialogue. Jean-Francois Lyotard (1984), French postmodernist warns that it would merely introduce another round of oppression for minorities, if we impose totalizing metanarrative that supposedly represent uniform standards of truth or value.

I agree with Evanoff's proposal of a third, interactive approach. Meaning, value, aesthetic beauty, and knowledge, do neither belong exclusively to the realm of objective reality as standing outside of all human perceptions and valuations, nor are they just the property of subjective mental processes. There is an interplay: actors and objective reality interact, not directly, but mediated through humanly constructed meanings.

I wish to promote the use of Nagata's self-reflexivity, and Mezirow's transformative learning for brainstorming, in the spirit of Evanoff's interplay strategy, all over the world, on the design of a new global culture. I suggest we need a new global culture that includes all useful and functional aspects of cultural commonalities and cultural differences. Both, commonalities and differences entail benign and malign aspects. The new global culture should include all benign traditional cultural practices from the diversity of all cultural realms on the globe, be it Japanese, or Egyptian, or Chinese, or French cultural practices, many of which are currently choked by Western uniformity. On the other side, this new culture should also welcome all commonalities that bring humankind together, as there is, for example, everybody's desire to be recognized. In contrast, it would be advisable, I believe, to refrain from including differences that are so irreconcilable that they would split the common ground that humankind needs in order to coexist on planet Earth (sentences such as the following, for example, are dangerous: "My religious beliefs represent the only truth and you deserve death if you don't accept them"). I recommend furthermore that we do not include those cultural practices that resemble bygone Chinese foot binding, an outflow of the common human readiness to place status over health. Another malign commonality is the human proclivity to react with feelings of humiliation, when recognition fails, and to translate these feelings into retaliatory acts of humiliation. Finally, so as to decide which commonalities and differences are benign, human rights may be employed as a "sifting tool" – deserving to be included into a future global culture – and which are not. I will explain later why I think that human rights indeed are a suitable tool.

Hans Skjervheim (1976), a seminal Norwegian thinker (1927-1999), gives us the following larger frame for our project. He writes:

...there are two antagonistic philosophical currents that stir the intellects of our day. On the one hand we have the naturalistic-positivistic-pragmatic trend in modern thought, on the other the phenomenological-existentialistic trend. They are even geographically distributed. In the Anglo-American world and Scandinavia the former trend is dominating, the great names being Russell, Carnap, Wittgenstein, James, Dewey, Hagerstrom. In Germany and France as well as in the Spanish-speaking world the latter trend dominates, there the great names are Husserl, Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre, Scheler, Merleau-Ponty. Both trends are in sense more "climates of opinion" than definite schools of thought (Skjervheim, 1976, p. 186).

In positivistic tradition, *knowledge* is viewed as a *commodity*, an absolute and universally true object that one can possess and that can be separated from the knower. Natural sciences, based on the positivism of the mid-nineteenth century, still use this view widely, even though the “wave particle duality” in physics signifies that even within the context of natural sciences the perspective of the researcher cannot be separated from the data observed.

More recently, knowledge has been defined as a relational phenomenon belonging to a community. Authors such as Garfinkel, Bourdieu, Habermas, Berger and Luckmann, and Glaser and Strauss argue that knowledge, and what we call reality, should be understood as *socially constructed*. These authors claim that it is impossible to define knowledge universally; it can only be defined in practice, they posit, in the activities of and interactions between individuals. Berger and Luckmann (1966), in *The Social Construction of Reality*, made the point that we do not have any immediate access to “objective reality,” but that social constructs are human choices rather than laws resulting from divine will or nature.

In my article on social constructionism and logical positivism – Lindner (2000) – I discuss how positivism dethroned earlier ways of conceptualizing the world as divine order, and I ask whether this latter turn in epistemology is not but another step in the same dethronement process:

...the question may be asked whether all good logical positivists are not, at some point, compelled to understand that the perspective of the researcher must be included within the overall research endeavour, that the world can never be understood as untouched by human beings. How could anybody ever believe that research is, somehow, floating in the air, that it is not always an attempt to answer specific questions posed by particular researchers. The revolutionary approach of social constructionism may be described as a further phase in the progressive disillusionment of logical positivists who have given up their earlier attempts to be the servants of authoritative grand narratives. No less than political dictators, the “masters” of logical positivism had to acquiesce in their own dethronement (Lindner, 2000, pp. 31-32).

Some daring social scientists, at the forefront of development, have taken up the ball. *Quantum social science* is being proposed to solve the mind-body problem that represents a serious difficulty for all branches of social science and their basic ontological and epistemological assumptions. Alexander Wendt (2005) writes, “We know we have experience from, well, experience itself, but there is no apparent way to reconcile this fact with modern science. By rights it seems consciousness should not exist, and as such neither should meaning, which presupposes consciousness (Wendt, 2005, p. 10). Wendt suggests that a quantum connection, justifying a “participatory epistemology” in social inquiry, would give additional force to critiques of the subject-object distinction, such as post-modernists or feminists. “Human beings are in effect ‘walking wave particle dualities,’ not classical material objects” (Wendt, 2005, p. 7) – see also Chalmers (1996), Jahn and Dunne (1997).

In the spirit of a participatory epistemology and social construction, what do we need to know if we wish to design a new inclusive global culture? How do we start? I suggest,

that to begin with, we need *motivation* – or *anticipation*, as Kelly (1955) calls it in his *Personal Construct Theory*. Then we need clear *goals*. We also need the *optimal approach* as to how to go about. And finally, we are well advised to *become aware* of possible *pitfalls*. How should we start?

This entire lecture is geared to persuade you, the reader, to be motivated to undertake the task of building a new global culture. Let us assume that you indeed are motivated. Next, it seems, we need to develop what is called a *mastery goal orientation*.

### **How to go about: Task orientation, not ego orientation**

Motivation is often described as an internal state that initiates and maintains behaviour that is goal-directed. *Goal Orientation Theory* attempts to understand the psychological processes which accompany goals. There seem to be two kinds of goal orientations around, that have their roots in two kinds of beliefs as to the nature of intelligence and learning. Some believe that their intelligence is *fixed* (they adhere to an *entity* theory of intelligence), while others think that their intelligence is *malleable* (they adhere to an *incremental* theory of intelligence). Out of these two beliefs grow two kinds of goals, namely *ego-oriented* performance goals versus *task-oriented* learning-mastery goals.

Dweck, Mangels, and Good (2004), in a chapter on conflict resolution, explain that people with *performance* goals wish to look smart and avoid mistakes, in other words, they have an *ego* orientation and try to satisfy high expectations of others by performing well. Those with *learning-mastery* goals, on the other hand, desire to learn new things, even if they might get confused, make mistakes, and not look smart; in other words, they have an intrinsic motive towards achieving mastery in the task.

Research shows that students with mastery goals are basically more successful. Dweck, Mangels, and Good (2004) assert that they “are more likely to search for and to find successful transfer strategies than are those with concerns about validating their ability” (Dweck, Mangels, and Good, 2004, p. 43). In extension, the task of building a new culture will benefit from being approached with a *task* and *not* with an *ego* orientation.

The inappropriateness of the ego orientation becomes clear when we look at some examples. In 2005, a train accident occurred in Japan, where an ego orientation led to disaster. More than 100 people were killed and almost 500 injured when a train crashed into a house, mainly due to the train driver’s desire to cover up for earlier blunders. In 2004, a building at the Charles de Gaulle airport in Paris caved in. On June 29 1995, the Sampoong Department Store in the Seocho-gu district of Seoul, South Korea collapsed in the largest peace time disaster in South Korea history, claiming 501 lives and injured 937 more. In all cases, security considerations had been systematically overruled. The Challenger disaster in February 2003 comes to mind, as well, where NASA officials disregarded engineer’s concerns and decided to launch a doomed Columbia space shuttle that brought death to its seven astronauts. Clearly, the list is much longer.

### **How to go about: Beware of tacit knowledge**

Let us assume that we have acquired a task orientation – we are ready to do more than merely polish our ego façades, we are ready to learn and experiment – what next? I

suggest that we need to become aware of the fact that our *tacit knowledge* may contain traps and pitfalls that hamper our project. Tacit knowledge is knowledge that escapes our conscious attention, even though it is at the core of the activity of designing – be it designing a new house or a new global culture.

Let us have a brief look at examples that show the traps of tacit knowledge. Many hold to be true – without ever becoming aware of this fact – that human beings need a circumscribed geographical place and a culture to belong to. Or, others hold to be true that “man is aggressive by nature” and will never reform. Yet others think that humans cannot live without an image of an enemy against which to consolidate their identity. I believe that all these beliefs are misleading, and even dangerous. As I have explained earlier, I do just fine identifying with the entire planet and all cultures; I have no need to “cut up” the planet, on the contrary. And research shows that humans are neither aggressive by nature, nor is their health dependent on enemy imagery. To take my case again, I certainly am not “aggressive by nature” and I do not need enemies to feel strong and secure. This is just to name a few traps of our general tacit knowledge that underlies our views on life and the world.

A number of thinkers are relevant in this context, both from the earlier mentioned naturalistic-positivistic-pragmatic trend in modern thought, and the phenomenological-existentialistic orientation. As for the latter orientation, the “niche” shared by all human beings is called by Edmund Husserl the *life world* that has a *horizon*. For Husserl and Merleau-Ponty, the horizon is a constitutive ground that provides the context in and through which phenomena appear to us. According to Husserl, there are not one but many horizons that collectively help us to establish the meaning of any given situation. Heidegger’s existential philosophy, drawing on Husserl’s phenomenology and on the hermeneutic tradition, is now regarded as anticipating postmodern thought, as is Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenological philosophy. Sartre developed phenomenological and existential philosophy within a dialectical context, and Lyotard’s early works focused on phenomenology and dialectics. Thomas Scheff (1997) writes that in every society there is an

attitude of everyday life, ”a life world, which most of its members assume, indeed, take for granted, most of the time. This world goes without saying to the point that it is invisible under most conditions. Elias and Bourdieu referred to it when they spoke of the habitus, our second nature, the mass of conventions, beliefs and attitudes which each member of a society shares with every other member. The habitus is not the whole culture, but that part which is so taken for granted as to be virtually invisible to its members. As Geertz suggested... for the members of a society, the habitus is just “commonsense” (Scheff, 1997, p. 219).

Pierre Bourdieu (1977) developed a *Theory of Practice*. As mentioned earlier, Ohnuki-Tierney, in her analysis of the motives of the Japanese tokkotai pilots, draws on Bourdieu’s notion of naturalization. Bourdieu writes on the naturalization of the arbitrariness of an established order and how an entire system of schemes of perception, appreciation, and action constitutes what Bourdieu terms the *habitus*. It is this habitus, explains Bourdieu (1979), that lends order to customary social behavior by functioning as “the generative basis of structured, objectively unified practices” (Bourdieu, 1979, p. vii);

see also Bourdieu (1977), and Bourdieu and Passeron (1977). In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1977) exposes the naturalization of the “criminal character,” and in his *History of Sexuality*, Foucault (1979) analyses the naturalization of the dividing line between the “homosexual” and the “heterosexual.”

As we have seen, this naturalization process is not always benign; for example, power elites might use it to lure people into perpetrating mayhem, as Ohnuki-Thierry makes clear in her analysis of the tokkotai pilots’ fate. As alluded to earlier, Ohnuki-Tierney draws on the concepts of *méconnaissance* (misrecognition) and *naturalization* (I coined the term *voluntary self-humiliation*). The term *méconnaissance* (misrecognition) has been used in different contexts. It was first introduced by psychologist Henri Wallon (1879-1962), and Jacques Lacan (1977), his student, uses *méconnaissance* in connection with his thesis on the origin of selfhood in the image a child sees in the mirror (the *mirror stage* as a foundational step in the child becoming a subject). For Louis Althusser (1971), the unconscious is resembles ideology – the false ideas that people have about social structures. *Interpellation*, a process by which ideology addresses the individual, is always a process of *méconnaissance*.

As to the other trend in modern thought, the pragmatic trend, John Dewey (1859-1952) developed a philosophy of pragmatism and an approach of *knowledge in action* for interpreting *design as knowledge-based activity*. Apart from Dewey, Kurt Lewin, Carl Rogers, and David Kolb are other important theorists. Michael Polanyi (1962) describes *personal knowledge* as something not entirely subjective and yet not fully objective. He posits that we, without being aware of, or able to express it, use the knowledge that is tacitly embedded in our tradition and culture as an unarticulated background against which we distinguish the particulars to which we attend. Donald A. Schön (1930-1997) was another influential thinker addressing the issue of tacit knowledge in his work on the theory and practice of reflective professional learning. For him, people are designers of action. They design action in order to achieve intended consequences and monitor their actions for effectiveness. In his book *The Reflective Practitioner*, Schön (1983) describes *reflective practice inquiry* that reconsiders the role of technical knowledge versus “artistry” in developing professional excellence.

Schön shows that we use certain *organizing concepts*, often implicitly and semi-consciously, to describe social situations figuratively. For instance, we apply *generative metaphors*, meaning that we transpose concepts from one field to another, such as “disease” onto social situations. Clearly, it is important to avoid such pitfalls if we construct a new global culture; the concept of disease, for example, as discussed earlier, has been used with disastrous consequences by instigators of genocide who proclaim that some people need to be “cleansed out” and “cut out like a cancer.” What is perhaps even more basic for the task of building a new global culture is what Schön calls *frame reflection*. Schön and Rein (1994) describe how we can deconstruct taken for granted “frames” of social problems in a critical multi-party effort – incidentally, this is what I propose when I call for building a new global culture.

Related to Schön’s generative metaphors and frame reflection, is Jürgen Habermas’ notion of the *colonization of the lifeworld* that has been mentioned earlier. Habermas (1987) theorizes that what we claim when we communicate in everyday social life, goes often unquestioned, merely because it is part of an undisputed, shared lifeworld (Habermas, 1987, pp. 119-152). The lifeworld offers the commonly accepted background

knowledge within which we coordinate action. Habermas breaks down the concept of “knowledge constituting interests” into the technical, practical, and emancipatorial interests of knowledge. Habermas warns that monetary and bureaucratic systems currently invade the communicative potentials we hope should help us understand our lifeworld and that this invasion distorts them without us being aware.

Our lifeworld can also be colonized by other lifeworlds. Virgilio Enriquez (1977) separated indigenous research strategy into *indigenization from within* and *indigenization from without*. *Indigenization from without* is similar to an imposed etic approach, meaning that (Western) knowledge of psychology from dominant source cultures is used to interpret data obtained from the target culture in the third world. Today, this differentiation is at the core of *indigenous psychology* as promoted, for example, by Uichol Kim. Kim, Yang, and Hwang (2006) just published a book on indigenous and cultural psychology. Ranajit Guha’s understanding of the term *subaltern* also points to this process – see, for example, Guha and Spivak (Eds.) (1988). As mentioned before, I call it *voluntary self-humiliation* when people weaken themselves to become more eligible underlings for elites seemingly without being aware as to how much they damage themselves in return for their elite admiration.

The list of contributors to the fields of inquiry relevant to the pitfalls of tacit knowledge is much longer than here presented. Daryl Bem (1970), for example, uses the label *zero-order beliefs* for all the things we learn as children as we interact with our environment. Let us round up this section here with a personal example. Once I set out to cook a meal and put the vegetables into a steamer. An older woman who was with me was horrified. She would first cook the vegetables thoroughly in water, and then add flour and butter. She screamed at me: “How uncaring you are!” She grabbed a saucepan, in deep indignation, put flour and butter into it and started stirring with rage. I said, “What *you* do is uncaring. In the past, when people worked in the fields and needed lots of calories, what you do was right. But it is no longer.” She nodded reluctantly, but continued to stir with fervor. She could not bring herself to abandon her tacit paradigm of “love your family” being equated with “put lots of butter and flour into their food.”

To round up this section, in order to build a new culture, we need to become aware of our attachments to outdated tacit knowledge that we need to abandon. After having become aware of these pitfalls, the next step would be to view our activity of designing – be it a new house or a new culture – as an *ethical project*. Geoffrey Broadbent (1988) describes this in his book *Design in Architecture*. Bengt Molander (1993), building on Habermas through the use of *models* as forms for communicative action, interprets the creative aspect of design as an *emancipatorial* interest of knowledge (Habermas). In short, design must have a direction, preferably an ethically sound one. Let us look at this direction in the following sections.

### **Where to go: From honor to equal dignity for all**

In my work, I divide the world into two main cultural clusters, firstly, the increasingly outdated collectivist culture of honor (this is my label for social environments where human worthiness is being ranked into higher and lesser beings), and, secondly, the culture of the future, the culture of equal dignity (this is my label for a culture based on the human rights call for equal dignity for all).

The latter trend began to gain visibility about 300 to 250 years ago. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the earliest recorded use of *to humiliate* meaning *to mortify* or to lower or to depress the dignity or self-respect of someone does not occur until 1757. Up to 1757, *to humble* and *to humiliate* were used rather interchangeably. These verbs went into diametrically opposed directions in tact with the emergence of the human rights ideal of equal dignity for all. About 300 years ago other things began to change as well: an awareness of One World began to emerge, the notion of an individual self started to unfold, science as a moral project gained visibility, and it was soon time for the French Revolution and the U.S. Declaration of Independence, and, not least, the human rights idea of equal dignity for all entered mainstream stage.

Even though the transition from a culture of ranked human worthiness to a culture of equal value for all citizens initially occurred in the West, the rest of the world, including Japanese culture, was and is deeply affected by it. More so, the notion of equal dignity is far from being a purely Western concept and has anchoring points in cultural knowledge around the world; African ubuntu philosophy being but one example. Examples abound. Tan Huay Peng (2005) explains that *ni* (“you”) in Chinese was initially expressed as a pictograph of a balance loaded with equal loads on both sides. Eventually this pictograph was contracted and the pictograph for person was added, so as to depict “you” as a person who carries the same weight as I.

In Japan, the feudal Shogunate of rigid hierarchical ranking gave way in 1868, and since then a slowly meandering transition towards more equal dignity has been taking place, which permeates all walks of Japanese life. Until some years ago, for example, there was no word for equality-oriented love between man and woman; words denoted a relationship of unequal partners where she would admire him and he would find her sweet. But by combining two kanji pictograms, a new written word has been created recently that denotes precisely such an equality-related relationship. Furthermore, there are two words for husband in Japanese, *shujin* (which means master) and the more neutral *otto*. Feminists certainly do not talk about their husbands as *shujin*.

Not only Japan is part of this transition, the entire world is touched by the transition towards a culture of equal dignity, be it by opposing it or by welcoming it. For example, today’s feminists, who wish to extend equal dignity to all human beings, men and women alike, would not have designed the Chinese character for *nu* (“slave”) by depicting a woman under the hand of a master (they would not have created a character for slave altogether, of course). Placing a man over a woman fits into a bygone cultural practice of gender ranking. *Wo* (“I, me”), in the earliest form, shows two spears against each other in direct confrontation. A later transcription projected a new image, a pictograph of a hand grasping a spear, denoting that when man wields in his hand a spear, his ego emerges. It is interesting for modern psychology that the ideograph of *si* (“think”) combines the skull with the heart (skull above the heart) to produce thought.

In the past, all around the world, many societies exhibited the fixed hierarchy of worthiness that also characterized the Japanese Shogunate. A host of cultural expressions dealt with the pain of being encased into such a system. Humor was often used a solace to sooth the wounds caused by being routinely humiliated as underlings in such a hierarchical society. The Czech “good soldier Schweik” (a figure created by Jaroslav Hasek, 1883-1923) is an example of a person who resists subjugation in very subtle ways; he resists with humor, by appearing stupid, with well-hidden sabotage, and with

especially clever argumentation. The Czech population as a whole is said to have the abilities of the “good soldier Schweik.” Many call Egyptians, having been occupied for more than 2000 years until 1952, “the Czechs of the Arab World.” Conceivably, oppressed populations develop special abilities in the field of communication, abilities that cover a whole range of subtle manipulation methods, all avoiding the extremes of “either/or,” of taking up arms in futile revolts or completely losing self-respect.

Also Charlie Chaplin’s films represent archetypal expressions of how to sabotage dominating oppressors. The American art form of *Minstrelsy* points into the same direction. Minstrelsy, which was a type of performance prior to the civil war, was staged by white people who played black people. The audience came primarily from poor Irish immigrant workers, who enjoyed watching how underdogs outwitted topdogs and sometimes even beat them up. Also Japanese *kabuki* and *bunraku* theatre plots are often built around the moral dilemmas faced by underlings – see a discussion in Lindner (2006a).

In all cases, the attempt is made to undo feelings of humiliation – humor is one such way. However, what is not undone by humor, of course, is the humiliating situation itself. Human rights introduce a new solution. Human rights do not only offer to placate feelings of humiliation, they aim at undoing the very humiliating situation. Human rights promise entirely new ways out of domination and a totally new way of organizing human communities. No longer is people’s worthiness ranked, with higher beings presiding over lesser beings, human rights un-rank the old system. Since ranking and un-ranking cannot be done at the same time, every society around the world, every community, and every individual, intercultural communicators included, are forced to take a stance. Whoever engages in building a new global culture must decide which template to follow.

Rosabeth Kanter (2004) describes three layers of people in today’s world, *global people*, *national people*, and *local people*. To my experience, global people are the ones most open to building a new global culture of equal dignity for all that celebrates benign diversity and “sameness” and rejects malign diversity and sameness. The field of intercultural communication attracts global people, and I believe that therefore, among others, experts in intercultural communication are particularly well placed to initiate and facilitate the building of a new global culture.

### **What to avoid: Malign sameness**

As mentioned earlier, globalization could be taken as another word for the *ingathering* of the human tribe into one single in-group, leaving behind a past where in-groups faced out-groups. A related term is *transculturation*, describing the phenomenon of merging and converging cultures. Where transculturation impacts ethnicity and ethnic issues the term *ethnoconvergence* is sometimes used, with related terms such as *assimilation*, *homogenization*, *acculturation*. I argue for “selective converging” – for avoiding malign converging and emphasizing benign converging.

This lecture discusses the process of creating and building something new, a new global culture. Building is what architects do. Let us therefore listen to what architects have to say. Koichi Nagashima (1999), renowned Japanese architect, discusses the malign effects of blindly buying into global universalism and sameness. He describes how Japanese architecture has developed:

Internationalism in the architectural movement was dressed in an appealing garment of “universality” (which in fact meant universal in the West only). In that period when Internationalism prevailed, Japan was vigorously advancing itself with modernization in the realm of technology, industry, economic and social systems, and became militarily strong enough to take part in the First World War. Japanese concluded mistakenly that this meant being part of the (Euro-American oriented) international arena. The idea settled with naive pride that Japan had at last joined in the universal situation shared by techno-industrially advanced countries of the West. To Japan which was proud of catching up with the modern industrial technology of the West, to create architecture making full use of it meant being universal-international, modern and advanced. Hence Japan accepted Modern Architecture without questioning its local relevance. In other words, Modern Architecture that had developed in the wholesome context of Western civilization was imported simply as “Western technology”-. Therefore there was no serious query into the cultural and climatic (*fudo*) aspects, the question of **Youkon-Western** Spirit and the **Wakon-Japanese** Spirit. This is the context in which the Japanese Modern Architecture Movement was started. Sadly, even in uncolonized Japan, anything which came from “the West” was regarded as superior. Local peculiarities were looked down upon and neglected. It is said that Corder, a British architect who used to teach in Tokyo University, once seriously suggested to students that they should reevaluate Japanese traditional architecture and try to reflect it to their design but this was flatly refused by students. Even more so the colonized non-Euro-American regions of the world such as Asia, traditional architecture and other cultural assets were treated like a pair of worn out slippers, by the colonialists themselves and by the local people. Thus, while in post World War I Europe, there prevailed the attitude of trying to dilute national and regional identity, proclaiming internationalism in order to reconcile themselves with the tragic memories of the war, in Asia under the repressive colonial rule, the attitude of being ashamed of things local as retarded, became the confirmed trend (Nagashima, 1999, p. 9, bold in original).

Nagashima argues that we have to develop a *glocal community*. He estimates that what we now call nation state will become obsolete, due to globalization. He envisages that the “local community where people conduct their daily lives, and know each other by sight, may be directly connected to a virtual global community, enjoying meaningful feedback” (Nagashima, 1999, p. 9). He reckons that even though the sadly biased situation described above was ubiquitous in the non-West regions of the world throughout most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the situation is about to begin changing now.

### **What to avoid: Malign diversity**

If we agree with Koichi Nagashima that traditional Japanese architecture deserves to be revived, protected, and treated with new respect, do we wish to revive all old traditions? What about Japanese feudalism? Or Chinese foot binding? Or honor killings? Or female genital cutting? Or South African witchcraft murder? Do we wish to revive and protect those practices as well?

For example, do we wish to maintain old “diversities,” for example traditional “left-wing” versus “right-wing” political orientations? I believe that this is an important point for building a new global culture. I reckon we must abandon old left/right definitions and come together in new paradigms. Thomas Friedman (2005) writes on the fact that old right-wing/left-wing demarcations are no longer tenable:

...there is a potential here for American politics to get completely reshuffled with workers and corporate interests realigning themselves into different parties. Think about it: Social conservatives from the right wing of the Republican Party, who do not like globalization or closer integration with the world because it brings too many foreigners and foreign cultural mores into America, might align themselves with unions from the left wing of the Democratic Party, who don't like globalization for the way it facilitates the outsourcing and offshoring of jobs. They might be called the **Wall Party** and militate for more friction and fat everywhere. Lets face it: Republican cultural conservatives have much more in common with the steelworkers in Youngstown, Ohio, the farmers of rural China, and the mullahs of central Saudi Arabia, who would also like more walls, than they do with investment bankers on Wall Street or service workers linked to the global economy in Palo Alto, who have been enriched by the flattening of the world.

Meanwhile, the business wing of the Republican Party, which believes in free trade, deregulation, more integration, and lower taxes everything that would flatten the world even more many end up aligning itself with the social liberals of the Democratic Party, many of whom are East Coast and West Coast global service industry workers. They might also be joined by Hollywood and other entertainment workers. All of them are huge beneficiaries of the flat world. They might be called the **Web Party**, whose main platform would be to promote more global integration. Many residents of Manhattan and Palo Alto have more interests in common with the people of Shanghai and Bangalore than they do with the residents of Youngstown or Topeka. In short, in a flat world, we are likely to see many social liberals, white-collar global service industry workers, and Wall Street types driven together, and many social conservatives, white-collar local service industry workers, and labor unions driven together. (Friedman, 2005, pp. 221-222).

Let us deconstruct left/right demarcations, for example, by looking at the status of women in Islam. Ayaan Hirsi Ali, former Dutch parliamentarian, speaks out against treating women as secondary citizens in social contexts that define themselves as “Islamic.” Many call her “right-wing.” Is she right-wing? No, I would say. Would it left-wing behavior to “respect” Islam by “respecting” that women are treated as secondary citizens? Many within Islam argue that it is precisely original Islamic scripture that must be respected instead. Lily Zakiyah Munir (2006), Research Fellow at the Islam and Human Rights Program with Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, reports on a recent conference that considered the role of women-theologians, both Muslim and Christian. Participants worried that the status of Muslim women in many parts of the world lags behind that of other women. Participants highlighted verses from the Qur’an that reject discrimination and marginalization in the name of religion. Munir writes:

The most valuable lesson I gained from the conference is probably a deeper awareness of the wide gap between Islamic teachings and their practice in Muslim societies.

Islamic theology, known as *Tawhid* (the Oneness of God), teaches that all humans are equal before God, regardless of gender, race, ethnicity or social status. What distinguishes them is the extent to which they are God-fearing.

This teaching is supported by countless verses of the Qur'an which explicitly illustrate equality between women and men and ensure women's basic rights. On human creation, for example, the Qur'an never mentions the man's rib. It says that women and men are created from a single *nafs* (soul/substance).

Likewise, the expulsion of Adam and Eve from heaven is never blamed on Eve. The Qur'an states clearly that both were tempted by Satan and committed sin; then both repented and both were forgiven by God.

The Qur'an is clear that whoever does good deeds will be rewarded, and whoever commits sin will be punished, be they men or women. There are many more verses referring to equality between women and men, both as *abid* (creature) and as *khalifa* (God's representative on earth).

The Qur'an is so beautiful, especially in its mission to improve women's status and to bring them dignity. But what a big difference there is in reality. It is no secret that the status of Muslim women in many parts of the world lags behind other women in many aspects. They are being discriminated against and marginalised, often in the name of religion.

It is time that women's liberation theology be promoted in Islam (Munir, 2006, quoted from Common Ground News Service, May 16, 2006).

To sum up, in a new global culture we no longer want secondary citizens with bound feet and it would be counterproductive to press me, or others who join my call, into dysfunctional bygone political categories of left or right. Resisting the destruction of our social and ecological environments has nothing to do with traditional left or right leanings. Practices such as foot binding, even though they might define cultural identity for some, are as malign as pressing their opponents into left/right categorizations.

Enforcing dysfunctional cultural differences is as inappropriate as adhering to "cargo cults." The term "cargo cult" describes people who deeply misinterpret their surroundings and then elevate their misconception to a culture, or a cult. Earlier we discussed the concepts of tacit knowledge, naturalization, and misrecognition, whereby unsuitable ideas may acquire the status of guiding principles. During and after World War II, in the wake of the Pacific campaign against the Empire of Japan, vast amounts of war material were air-dropped into Melanesia in the Southwestern Pacific. This gave rise to the belief, among islanders, that this cargo was being mis-delivered – that their ancestral spirits actually had intended to give this cargo to the Melanesian people. Cult members thus staged rituals, including mock airports and landing strips, hoping that the ancestors at some point in the future would recognize their own and provide them with the much desired cargo. Still today, there exists even a Prince Phillip movement. The Yaohnanen people of Vanuatu, through a series of misunderstandings, believe that Prince Phillip, the husband of Queen Elizabeth, confirmed that he agreed that their cultural beliefs were true and that he is the personification of an ancestral spirit

(<http://enzo.gen.nz/jonfrum/gloss.html>).

We, the audience of this lecture, might feel far removed from such ideological misconceptions, however, are we? Self-reflexivity might unveil that nobody is free of such inadvertent erroneousness. I believe that there is a host of “cargo cults” that we adhere to without being aware of it. Political left/right delineations are as counterproductive as what I introduced earlier as machine paradigm – all this still permeates much of our lives.

How do we solve the dilemma of rejecting malign cultural practices while accepting benign ones? How do we define what we want to regard as malign or benign? How do we avoid that global sameness becomes as destructive and malign as outdated diversity? Could the human rights ideals that are emerging at the current point in historical time serve as a global ethical framework that we can use to gauge these questions?

In an article on interreligious and interethnic relations, Reimon Bachika (2006) writes, “The major pitfalls on the road to a world culture seen in the present context are attempts at imposing a set of values and declaring that all values are of equal significance. As for putting all values on a par, this would lead to excessive particularism and arbitrariness. This would make ‘black holes’ of cultures from which no sense of commonality can grow” (Bachika, 2006, p. 18).

In other words, both sameness and diversity entail potentially malign and benign elements. The solution for humankind is not that all become the same, or that all cling to difference. The important cleavage is not between sameness and difference, but between benign and malign elements in sameness and difference. Only the benign aspects are suitable for a new global culture.

### **What to achieve: Respect the individual**

When we speak about intercultural or crosscultural communication, we often assume that there are different cultures that entail primary cultural differences and that these cultural differences ought to be respected. But where do cultural practices come from?

I do not dispute that cultural differences should be respected. As discussed earlier, I share the stance that ethnocentrism and disrespect for cultural diversity must be overcome. But, how can we judge a situation in which tyrants say to their victims: “*Our* culture is to punish disobedient underlings and the world better accept this punishment because our underlings are part of *our* culture! *Our* culture is hierarchical and our underlings belong at the bottom.” Usually masters add, “We are benevolent and our underlings love us and thank us for our efforts to care for them.”

Some underlings may agree with their masters and enjoy their patronage. Others will protest vehemently. They may even insist: “*Our* culture is quite different; we are not part of our oppressors’ culture!” These underlings will then turn to the international community and ask for respect and protection of *their* culture under the banner of human rights. Their masters will also turn to the international community, with intercultural communicators standing in the first line, calling for respect for *their* culture, meaning their desire to force their underlings to accept oppression. Oppressed *minorities* fighting for *their* culture are usually former *underlings*. Thus, intricate configurations of oppressors and victims unfold in front of the eyes of third party observers. Women may be victims of oppression perpetrated by their families who are victims of oppression perpetrated by their national rulers who are victims of oppression perpetrated by other

states. The victims will claim to have *different cultures* and ask third parties to recognize and respect this, while the oppressors will vehemently urge third parties to keep quiet and not interfere in what they regard as *their culture*.

So, in conflicts between members of different cultures, how should intercultural communication be inscribed, where should recognition and respect be placed – with the other culture or the other person? In other words, where do we stand as intercultural communicators, on the side of the traditional culture where human worthiness is ranked (which I label the culture of honor)? Or do we side with the emerging culture of equal dignity for all, based on human rights (which I call the culture of dignity)? Who do we support, power elites who manipulate people to be loyal underlings in supposedly “pure” cultures? (“Uncontaminated purity,” “unquestioned ranking” and “blind loyalty” were the three headings that I used earlier to highlight potential malignity in cultural difference.) Or do we support the new vision of equal dignity for every single human being on planet earth?

I suggest that those who adhere to human rights values must recognize, acknowledge, and respect the other person, not his or her membership in another culture. Every individual has his or her own personal dignity. The other culture may be a cause or a product of humiliation. I suggest that intercultural communicators need to decide whether they wish to side with human rights, and if they choose to do so, they must include an analysis of power relations and probe whether past incidents of humiliation may be the source of supposed culture difference. If this is so, respect and recognition entail an obligation to heal this humiliation. Respecting culture difference for its own sake may compound past humiliations by adding further humiliation.

These reflections have been discussed quite early in the history of the human rights movement. Floyd Webster Rudmin (1991) studied the history of peace psychology. August Forel (1848-1931) was among the first psychologists who were interested in peace. He linked peace with individual human rights and called for world federalism with people as main focus and not nations. “What is needed is not the protection of the so-called nationalities, but the protection of the elementary rights of every individual, women and children included, as well as the rights of every minority existing within every nation or State” (Forel, 1937, p. 316). Also Alfred Adler (1870-1937) took a stance against treating individuals primarily as group members and argued that “national populations should not be burdened with punitive reparations and collective war guilt. Populations are misled and coerced into war, and those who volunteer, do so for reasons of immaturity and personal difficulties” (Rudmin, 1991, pp. 28-29).

These reflections are also to be found in current deliberations at the highest international levels. Mukesh Kapila, for example, was head of the UN mission in Sudan when the Darfur tragedy was unfolding. In a BBC World *HARDtalk* interview on March 28, 2006, he made the point that the individual perpetrators must be punished, not governments or countries. “Let us hurt those individuals who are responsible,” he said, “and not sanction everybody.”

## Outlook

The questions discussed in this lecture point into the following direction: Do we want to maintain those cultural definitions and practices that are created through reification? And what about those, which violate human rights? Do we wish to treat cultures as fixed “containers” with “pure” contents? What do we do with all the humiliating aspects of culture? Can the field of intercultural communication be a morally neutral field? If not, which ethical norms can guide intercultural communication? If we accept human rights as guiding moral frame, how do we integrate them into our concept and practice of intercultural communication? And do we have a responsibility to look beyond the field of intercultural communication and invest its expertise into a larger global project of culture building? If yes, how can a *decent global village* be built (following the call for a decent society put forward by Avishai Margalit (1996))?

Four guiding principles are put forward in this outlook. First, it is suggested that it would be beneficial to promote respect for the individual (rather than for the group). Second, it is proposed that it is worth making a case for contamination and fluidity (rather than purity and rigidity). Third, let us consider giving common interest priority over difference, and define this common interest by ways of human rights. And finally, fourth, it would be beneficial to “harvest” useful and beneficial cultural practices from all cultures to help us build a global inclusive culture for a decent sustainable future for our world.

Let us begin with the issue of respecting the individual over the group.

### Guiding principle 1: Respect the individual

As long as there are national passports that exclude people from access to the rest of the world, individuals have no equal rights. I feel personally humiliated when I see my friends from developing countries queue for a visa, while my Western passport gives me easy access to most countries of the world. I do not wish to respect passports that imprison people. I wish to respect people as individual human beings who are born onto planet Earth and entitled to all of it, entitled to equal rights and equal dignity. Perhaps a world passport is needed to give access to the entire globe to all its citizens.

Alexander Wendt (2003) proposes that the emergence of a world state will be inevitable:

With the transfer of state sovereignty to the global level the recognition of individuals will no longer be mediated by state boundaries, even though as recognized subjects themselves, states retain some individuality (particularism within universalism). Individuals and states alike will have lost the negative freedom to engage in unilateral violence, but gained the positive freedom of fully recognized subjectivity (Wendt, 2003, pp. 51-52).

Many are horrified and feel threatened by the idea of a world state. In April 2003, just prior to the outbreak of the 2002 Iraq war, many friends wrote to me (I summarize and paraphrase):

I agree that Iraq must be liberated. But saying Saddam Hussein has to be removed because he threatens the civilized free world is obscene. ... what is this nonsense about the free world? Everybody is free who has a passport from a rich country. A person from a rich country, even the most awful sloth and parasite, is free. But, all those poor creatures who are born in a poor country, are not free. They are restricted. They may work a hundred times harder than any rich person, but they are not free. Rich countries call them illegal immigrants and send them back home, deeply humiliated.

The idea of a world state, or of world federalism is hotly debated – see, among others, Joseph Preston Baratta (2004). In “Globalization or World Society?” Niklas Luhmann (1997) asks how academia (in his case sociology) can and ought to conceive of modern society. The list of authors who address this question is very long. To me, the point is to develop a decent world; how we get there is secondary – I do not wish to lose sight of the larger goal by bickering over details. In the past, humankind has included cities into nations, why not nations into a larger entity? If the subsidiarity principle guides this process, it should be benign because this principle gives due room to diversity and avoids global tyranny and monoculture. The subsidiarity principle is prominent in the design of the European Union and states that matters ought to be handled by the smallest or lowest competent authority, thus disseminating leadership onto different levels – unlike in traditional hierarchies, where decisions concerning all levels are concentrated at the top. What we need, clearly, are more sturdy local and global institutional structures that heed principles of good governance and transparency not just locally but also globally.

Many fear that a world federation or world state would be too monolithic and would force everybody into sameness. However, in the spirit of the metaphor of marriage that I introduced earlier, I agree with Michael Walzer (1986), who argues that it is only when difference is recognized that a larger identity can be stable. “The greater the diversity between individuals or particulars, the higher the identity or universal in which the differences meet” (Walzer, 1986, p. 65). Far from suppressing nationalism, a world state will only be possible if it embraces it, Walzer contends. Marshall R. Singer (1992) underlines the connection between autonomous separateness that gives stability to “we-ness”: “Switzerland, of course is not a federation, but rather a confederation. As far as I know it is the only example of one that has successfully survived. It has four separate official languages, very autonomous canton governments that have considerable power, and yet for reasons which may be peculiar to the history of that country, it has survived. Indeed, it is the only successful multilingual state which political scientists would describe as a nation: a place with a common identity and a common sense of “we-ness” (Singer, 1992, <http://www.tamilnation.org/conflictresolution/tamileelam/92singer.htm>).

In other words, respect for the individual, embedded into a sense of “we-ness,” might stand for a benign vision for the future of world society.

### **Guiding principle 2: Allow for contamination**

The Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle, assembled recommendations for the United States, entitled *Diversity Within Unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society*. Banks et al.

(2001) write, “*E pluribus unum* – diversity within unity – is the delicate goal toward which our nation and its schools should strive” (Banks et al., 2001, pp. 13).

How should this diversity within unity be defined? Michel Serres, born 1930, is one of the most provocative current French philosophers. He is very little known in the English-speaking world, although he is one of the best-known contemporary French philosophers. He makes the point that modern philosophy was a philosophy of “unveiling,” of “unmasking” illusions, of “exposing” hypocrisy, of winning over opponents, often accompanied by an accusatory, prosecutor-like attitude. For Serres, all this is of little merit today. He calls for *mixing* and *blending*. He suggests that it is not by eliminating and isolating that we grasp the “real” in more fullness, it is rather by combining, by putting things into play with each other, by letting things interact.

In his book *The Troubadour of Knowledge*, Serres (1997) uses the metaphor of the “educated third,” which, to Serres, is a “third place” where a mixture of culture, nature, sciences, arts and humanities is being constructed. Michalinos Zembylas (2002) explains, “This ‘educated third’ will blend together our multiple heritages and will integrate the laws; he/she will be the inventor of knowledge, the eternal traveler who cares about nature and his/her fellow human beings” (Zembylas, 2002, <http://ijea.asu.edu/v3n3/>).

Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006), a philosopher who teaches at Princeton University, makes a “case for contamination.” He says “no” to *purity*, *tribalism*, and *cultural protectionism*, and “yes” to a *new cosmopolitanism*. His work could be summarized as in Table 1:

<b>Focus of the past</b>	<b>New focus, needed for the future</b>
Peoples	Individuals
Purity	Mixture
Authenticity	Modernity
Traditions	Rights
Preservation	Contamination

Table 1: New focus, needed for the future, a short summary of Kwame Anthony Appiah’s thinking

Emmanuel Lévinas (1906-1995) was a Jewish philosopher from Lithuania, who moved to France and wrote most of his works in French. Lévinas (1985) highlights the *Other*, whose face forces us to be humane. Terms such as *métissage*, or *intermingling*, mean that both ‘I’ and the ‘other’ are changed by our contact. Werner Wintersteiner (1999), a peace educator in Austria, builds on Lévinas and uses the term of *métissage* in his *Pedagogy of the Other*. Wintersteiner claims 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. I suggest that intercultural communication can follow and be a communication of intermingled mutual connection with the other.

### **Guiding principle 3: Build a sunflower identity**

I believe that it is of vital importance to choose our priorities wisely, both for the world and for our inner lives and identities. Earlier, I mentioned the train accident in Japan on May 25, 2005. At least 106 people died, 460 were injured. What was the cause? Security

should have been the priority, and not punctuality or the fear of the driver of being reprimanded. Missing the correct ranking of priorities brought death.

My identity is built according to the principle of subsidiarity, which means that it is ranked so that higher-orders override lower-orders. The various parts of my identity are brought to scale so as to respond to the challenges of our world at the appropriate levels. As I discussed earlier, I use the image of a sunflower for my identity: the core represents my essence as a human being, and three layers of petals are my various “intermingled” fond connections to a) people, b) benign practices around the world, and 3) places. Also Marshall Singer (1998) uses the sunflower as an image for signifying that each person, rather than belonging to one single culture, participates in multiple cultures. Compared with Singer, I add the concept of ranking to the sunflower image – I rank the core of my sunflower identity over the petals, which in turn are ranked into at least three layers.

Earlier, we discussed the pitfalls of the idea of purity when it is used to artificially separate supposedly “pure” cultural realms from each other. I am tempted to permit the idea of purity for the core of my identity. Increasingly, during my life as a global citizen, I feel that there is purity in humanity, purity in what connects us as human beings. The petals feel “impure” to me, or “intermingled,” not the core of my identity as a human being.

Not only for building identity, also when we process our emotions, the ranked sunflower approach is what we ought to use, suggests George A. Bonanno (2001). In his chapter “Emotion Self-Regulation,” he explains that our brain indeed is built according to this principle. It uses regulatory feedback loops that are organized hierarchically, with *subordinate loops* embedded within *superordinate loops*. Superordinate loops tend to be linked to longer-term, abstract goals, whereas subordinate loops are associated with proximal mechanisms. Dysregulation occurs, explains Bonanno, for example, when lower-order mechanisms supersede higher-order mechanisms. “In terms of emotions, this may occur when phylogenically more immediate and automated emotional processes are instigated that temporarily override more abstracted regulatory processes” (Bonanno, 2001, p. 257). Or, to say it bluntly, drowning one’s worries in alcohol and becoming an alcoholic undoubtedly solves all problems, albeit only in the short term, and in a misguided and ultimately counterproductive way.

In order to entertain superordinate loops and avoid being stuck in subordinate loops, write Marsick and Sauquet (2000), we need to step outside of the frameworks by which we understand experience and slow down our thinking processes so that we can critically assess them. We need to get in touch with deeper feelings, thoughts, and factors that lie outside of our “current mental and sensory models” (Marsick and Sauquet, 2000, p. 398). In other words, here we link back to Nagata’s concept of self-reflexivity, achieved through bodymindfulness.

Mindful ranking is also at the core of the peace work done by Mahatma Gandhi or Nelson Mandela. It is what preserves humanity particularly in cases where this seems difficult to defend. Arne Næss, one of the most renowned Norwegian philosophers, claims, in the spirit of Gandhi: “There are no murderers; there are only people who have murdered.” He explained his point at length at the Second Annual Meeting of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (12th - 13th September 2003, Maison des Sciences de l’Homme de l’Homme, Paris, <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whowere/annualmeeting02.php>). Næss described in

rich detail how he would invite convicted murderers from prison into his philosophy class at Oslo University so as to demonstrate to his students that even murderers are human beings who deserve and need to be dignified. Their humanity deserves to be their untouched core, while only their deeds are “evil” (periphery). This does not mean underplaying “evil,” on the contrary; it means bringing evil to scale.

#### **Guiding principle 4: Deconstruct existing cultures and build a new diverse global culture**

As mentioned earlier, I lived in Egypt for seven years and was deeply saddened to see that old architectural solutions reinvented, chiefly, by the great architect Hassan Fathy were despised (fortunately, this trend it now turning in Egypt). Traditional architecture with its thick walls of lime stone and mud brick is particularly suitable for the hot Egyptian climate – houses built in this way are warm in winter and cool in summer. More even, not only functionality is gained, also the beauty of this architecture gives an unparalleled gift of humanizing aesthetics to their residents. This is only one example, the list of examples I came across all over the world is deplorably long. As discussed earlier, I use the label *voluntary self-humiliation* for all subaltern rejection of valuable local solutions, for example, in the futile hunt for Western status.

Indiscriminate admiration of outdated concepts of modernity and efficiency (the blind admiration of the machine paradigm, for example) is as regrettable as subaltern elite adoration (the slavish copying of elite lifestyles, made worse by the fact that usually the bygone concepts of elite lifestyles are copied, lifestyles that elites themselves have abandoned for long). All indiscriminate admiration easily progresses into what I call voluntary self-humiliation. More so, not only blind admiration, also blind rejection is malign. The obsessive humiliation and killing of elites or former elites, for example, and the destruction of elite lifestyle symbols is as wrong-headed as their slavish veneration. We must step outside of the master-slave dyad and evaluate the concepts of modernity and efficiency as well as elite lifestyles, in a more detached manner. If found to be functional and constructive, whatever habits, practices and products may be adopted, if not, not.

This lecture promotes the building of a new culture. Since creating and building has to do with architecture, I choose to give space to the voices of architects in this lecture. Earlier we heard Koichi Nagashima. Ashraf Salama (2005) is another architect who reflects on the paradigm shifts we need to carry out to build anew. He begins his analysis by pointing out that we need to proceed from the reductionism of the old paradigm of believing that the whole can be understood from the parts to a new paradigm holding true that the properties of the parts can be understood only from the dynamics of the whole. Salama quotes John Turner (1997) and his view that there are no parts altogether, but rather a pattern in an inseparable web of relationships. Salama then proceeds to the need to transcend the old paradigm of economy and isolation and embrace a new paradigm of ecology and integration. He points out that the old paradigm of economy and isolation rests on misguided assumptions, namely that humans have more value than nature, and that they legitimately can subdue nature, without taking responsibility for it. In the new paradigm, explains Salama, “the concept of sustainable development is conceived to value the environment alongside economic development, and to value social equity

alongside material growth. In the new paradigm, the same technology that has been employed to conquer and subdue nature needs to be employed for the benefits of nature and, in turn, for the long-term benefit of the human race” (Salama, 2005, p. 3).

Furthermore, Salama recommends that we abandon fighting nature with techno-development and rather adopt fitting eco-development with nature. He points out that the difference between techno-development (in line with what I call machine paradigm) and eco-development (what I call living creature paradigm) is the difference between a mechanical and a living organism. Technology does not make built environments, he posits, people make them. “Techno-development is based on the modernist illusion of technological determinism. It is an assault on nature” (Salama, 2005, p. 3). Salama describes the alternative paradigm of eco-development as follows:

[Eco-development] is rooted in the real need to fit human settlements within the patterns of nature. Politically, eco-development is decentralized and democratic. Socially and culturally, it reflects the diverse reality of human affairs and the tapestry of life, which makes every portion of the built environment work well. Economically, it adopts the premise that economy and ecology are both essentially to do with the flow of energy and materials through a system and that value is a social construct (Salama, 2005, p. 3).

Finally, Salama criticizes the mechanistic paradigm that is used in the educational process of architecture. He laments how education has been broken up into schools, curricula, grades, subjects, courses, lectures, lessons, and exercises. He writes, “The mechanistic orientation of pedagogy results in the treatment of students as if they were machines with the combined properties and characteristics of tape recorders, cameras, and computers” (Salama, 2005, p. 3). In contrast, the systemic paradigm focuses on grasping the relationships between the parts of knowledge. Salama explains the systemic paradigm of education as follows:

1. some subjects are best learned by teaching them to oneself
2. some subjects are best learned by teaching them to others
3. some skills are best learned through demonstration and instruction
4. some fundamentals are attained in seminar discussions guided by one specialized in the relevant area (Salama, 2005, p. 3)

Salama concludes that the way we think about our environments has indeed already changed and will have to change more. He ascertains that interdisciplinary thinking is undeniably on the rise, that economy and ecology will have to be integrated, that eco-development will have to define the future, and that systemic pedagogy will have to take the place of the old mechanistic pedagogy.

Ashraf Salama is undoubtedly a member of what Paul Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson call the *Cultural Creatives*. Based on surveys and in-depths interviews, Ray and Anderson (2000) identify three main cultural movements that characterize our time:

1. *Moderns* (the cultural movement that started about 500 years ago)
2. *Traditionals* (the first countermovement against Modernism)

3. *Cultural Creatives* (the other, more recent countermovement against Modernism, currently flowing together from
  - a. the *Consciousness Movement* (inward oriented)
  - b. the *Social Movement* (outward oriented) that both started out around 1960)

Cultural Creatives shares the views that Salama lays out. They share the conviction that a sense of personal worth and meaning in life is connected to the new paradigms Salama enumerated, and that this is a fundamental human right worth protecting. Ray and Anderson point out that at present, Cultural Creatives are not aware of the fact that they are part of a growing movement. The authors suggest that Cultural Creatives would benefit from recognizing that there are many like-minded people “out there,” open for cooperation and mutual encouragement. Ray and Anderson indicate that old-fashioned Moderns, or “realists,” will not necessarily prevail, but succumb to the new trend. The authors furthermore highlight that it is necessary for Cultural Creatives to develop innovative institutions in order to give the new movement more force and substance. Today, tell us Ray and Anderson, Cultural Creatives need institutions that can support their values, so they do not have to create support structures for themselves over and over again. “What is needed, in short, is a scaffolding for a new kind of culture” (Ray and Anderson, 2000, p. 204). Incidentally, the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network that I help grow is positioned at the core of this trend.

Intercultural communicators have a central role in building a *decent* global community (Margalit, 1996), in which institutions no longer humiliate citizens. In practice, this means working for the Millennium Goals (<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>), and for building global institutions that are based on human rights. Public policy makers need to draw on the expertise of intercultural communicators, and intercultural communicators need to insist that they be heard. Let us unleash our creativity for this end.

### **The skills we need**

Adair Nagata usually ends her Intercultural Communication Theory II class at Rikkyo University in Tokyo, Japan, with pointing out that peace begins within. She encourages her students to “cultivate your capacity to be an Everyday Peacemaker.”

Which skills do we need if we want to follow Nagata’s call? Which competencies and abilities are required to build a new culture that heeds the call for peace, both in our direct social environment, and globally? I will briefly touch upon some skills in the following paragraphs; clearly, much more should be said, but lack of space prevents it.

Obviously, Nagata’s concept of self-reflexivity stands at the beginning. We need to take a step back and look at ourselves and the world from a distance in order to gain the calm poise and mature oversight that peace making requires. Nelson Mandela is a living proof of this dignified composure in the midst of crisis and profound humiliation. In my life, a painful distance was forced upon me through my refugee background and the resulting sense of not belonging.

Furthermore, we need to nurture a local and global culture of learning and task orientation. Ego orientation instigates the covering up of mistakes. Merely safeguarding

our ego façades may lead to colossal fatalities and block reasonable conflict management. Which orientation do our nuclear engineers have? And our leaders? This is our responsibility, the responsibility of every citizen. Please see in the following sections short highlights describing the skills we need to nurture in us and in others in order to be able to shoulder this responsibility.

### ***Tolerate uncertainty***

In the chapter “Emotion and Intercultural Communication” Matsumoto, Yoo, and LeRoux (2005) develop four main ingredients to personal growth as key to successful handling of conflict, namely Emotion Regulation (ER), Critical Thinking (CT), Openness (OP), and Flexibility (FL). The authors call these psychological processes the *psychological engine* of adaptation and adjustment. The authors identify emotion regulation as the key ingredient and gatekeeper of the growth process. “If we cannot put our inevitable negative emotions in check, it is impossible to engage in what is clearly higher order thinking about cultural differences” (Matsumoto, Yoo, and LeRoux, 2005, p. 9).

Jacqueline Wasilewski (2001) asserts that dealing with negative emotion (such as bitterness) is the gatekeeper for being able to function interculturally. We must learn to tolerate uncertainty and ambiguity confidently. When we do not understand our counterpart, jumping to conclusions out of a need to “be sure” will produce failure. We have to learn to stay calm and use frustration creatively, with imagination and inspiration. What we need in this process is *curiosity, courage, and patience* (Satoshi Nakagawa, personal communication from Jacqueline Wasilewski, June 25, 2005).

Without the ability to use bodymindfulness for successful self-reflexivity, and without the ability to tolerate uncertainty, fear, and negative emotions, the additional skills that are necessary for a future culture of peace making are not attainable. For, example, without the basic skill of tolerating uncertainty, we cannot achieve the next level, namely an autonomous perspective on the world, or, what Natsume Soseki calls *shutaisei*.

### ***Stand up and not by: Shutaisei***

John W. Dower (1999), with his book *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*, can teach the world a number of important lessons learnt from Japan’s past experiences. Dower speaks about Natsume Soseki, one of the premier philosophers and novelists of modern Japan (1867–1916), who called for a spirit of “individualism” vis-à-vis the state. The novelist and essayist Sakaguchi Ango (1906-1955) affirmed that genuine *shutaisei*, or true “subjectivity” or “autonomy,” at the individual level, is required for a society to resist the indoctrinating power of the state. For Sakaguchi, each individual needs to create his or her own “samurai ethic,” his or her own “emperor system” (Dower, 1999, p. 157).

Soseki’s call for *shutaisei* links up with Ervin Staub’s call to stand *up* and not *by* in the face of injustice and atrocities. Staub (1989) argues that the significant element in the atrocities perpetrated by Hitler’s Germany was that *bystanders* stood idly by instead of standing up and getting involved.

We, the bystanders of this world, the so-called international community, are called upon to bring peace to the world. The international community needs to stand up, using an approach of genuine *shutaisei*, and help build sound global institutions that pacify the globe. Intercultural communicators, in their role as bridge-builders, carry a preeminent responsibility.

However, when we stand up, let us remember that we need to be flexible. After having learned to tolerate uncertainty, and after we have understood that we ought to stand up, we need to learn how to best construct our relationship with the world and ourselves.

### ***Make weak ties***

Mark S. Granovetter (1973) did research on whether people find jobs through strong or weak social ties and found that having *many weak ties*, instead of *a few strong ones*, offers advantages in social relationships. Granovetter builds on Tönnies' differentiation of *Gemeinschaft* versus *Gesellschaft*. Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) was a major contributor to sociological theory and field studies. In a *Gemeinschaft* people have strong ties and share norms so thoroughly that little effort is needed to gauge the intentions of others. Such settings do not allow for much individual autonomy and are easily disrupted by even minimal dissent. Granovetter suggests having many weak ties to a number of other people provides more individual autonomy.

There are many benefits to reap from weak ties, not just weak ties with other people, but also with concepts of reality. The first step to understand this point is to become aware that the ways we humans construct reality should not be essentialized; it pays to know that the ties we construct between the signified and the signifier are indeed weak. There are many examples that can illuminate these points. The Taliban blew up two enormous Buddhist statues at Bamian, in order to send a "message" of "superior Islam." This "message" could have been sent without physical destruction. Robin Cook disagreed with British Prime Minister Tony Blair on the necessity of the 2003 Iraq war. However, he did not demand that Blair step down, and neither did he plan an assassination. There was no need to destroy Buddhist statues or Tony Blair physically to send the intended messages.

I suggest that personal and cultural identity benefits from building on weak ties, in all respects. I often summarize my experience by saying that building my global identity meant learning to *swim* and not to *cling*. It meant learning that life is a process that cannot be nailed down, on the contrary, that it loses its liveliness under attempts to be cemented. Being able to connect and disconnect flexibly is at the core of my identity. I am always aware that constructing too strong ties to people, places, and concepts may become counterproductive because I would ask too much; I overburden the world with my needs for fixity at my peril. For example, my identity is not linked to memories of personal or national humiliation and I thus escape the "need" for retaliation that would set in motion cycles of violence. This does not mean that I am disloyal or unloving to my friends (or, more precisely, my global family) or the world. I deeply love my friends; I am in deep awe and wonderment before the beauty of our planet. It is exactly this love that would be destroyed if I forced the world into undue rigidity merely to serve my need for strong ties and sooth my fear of weak ties.

Tolerating the uncertainty of weak ties does not mean anomie or chaos. We still can build structure into our world. However, this structure should be well thought through; we should not merely accept certain designs just because some elites fancy them or our forefathers believed in them. Many who have attained status, copied elites, or abided by tradition, know that this does not provide a guarantee for a good life. Blindly striving for status markers or blindly following traditional practices simply is bad practice. Let us search for better principles of good craftsmanship for building a global inclusive and diverse culture.

### ***Emphasize benign commonalities and differences***

I think we need to emphasize the commonality that we are all human beings, rather than our differences. However, this does not mean that differences are irrelevant. They are extremely relevant, but secondary. I argue that we need to give more attention to both, to commonalities and differences, however, by ranking them, and by selecting only the beneficial elements. Sameness and diversity can both be put to benign or malign use.

For today's world, for example, some differences would benefit from being boosted and others from being minimized. In order to decide for a selective strategy, first, it is important to refrain from imagining differences where there are none (as some intercultural communication experts might do in order to justify their "right to exist," or some political leaders do in order to be elected, or tyrants usually do as justification for their tyranny). Furthermore, we need to refrain from reifying those differences that we do observe. Thirdly, we need to differentiate beneficial differences from less beneficial differences (and undertake the same differentiation for our commonalities).

For example, today, we have the same architecture everywhere; cities worldwide are indistinguishable in their ugliness and dysfunctionality. This is malign sameness, malign global uniformity. On the other side we have postulates of unbridgeable differences between, for example, Islamic and Western culture; this could be called malign insistence on difference. As discussed earlier, it pays to analyze power relations; often, sameness as well as difference, when defined by an elite for "their culture" are malign, and sameness and difference that serve individual quality of life are benign.

After having learned sound principles for building a global culture, we need to become more pro-active. It is not sufficient to just sit in a corner and know everything. If this knowledge is not brought into the world, it has no effect.

### ***Connect***

The term *Appreciative Inquiry* and the approach to organizational consulting and inquiry was developed by David Cooperrider (Ed.) (2000) at Case Western Reserve University. The approach is gaining wide usage among people doing organizational consulting. Donald Klein's approach to *Appreciative Being* overlaps with Cooperrider's approach, as does Lindner's view on *Appreciative Caring* (see <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/annualmeetings.php>).

How do we achieve appreciative being? Muneo Yoshikawa has developed a "double-swing" model that conceptualizes how individuals, cultures and intercultural concepts can meet in constructive ways – see Yoshikawa (1980), and Yoshikawa (1987). The model is

graphically presented as the infinity symbol, or Möbius Strip,  $\infty$ . Yoshikawa draws upon two sources, firstly on Martin Buber (1944) and his concept of dialogue, secondly on the Buddhist logic of “soku.” Buber’s idea of “dialogical unity” in *I and Thou* emphasizes “the act of meeting between two different beings without eliminating the otherness or uniqueness of each,” explains Dow (2005). A two-fold movement between the self and other allows for both a unity and uniqueness. Yoshikawa calls the unity that is created out of the realization of differences “identity in unity.” What is important is that the dialogical unity does not eliminate the tension between the contradictions between basic potential unity and apparent duality. “Soku,” the Buddhist logic of “Not-One, Not-Two” resonates with this notion of “identity in unity.”

Yoshikawa’s double-swing model relates to what Levine (1997) calls pendulation. Successful pendulation can produce solidarity and social integration; without it, we have alienation and lack of social integration. Scheff (2003) commends the idea of pendulation, through which “we swing back and forth between our own point of view and that of the other” (Levine, 1997, in Scheff, 2003, p. 10). “It is this back and forth movement between subjective and intersubjective consciousness that allows us the potential for understanding each other” (Scheff, 2003, p. 10).

Good attunement is achieved when pendulation is successful, when intersubjectivity is lived to its full potential. When pendulation succeeds, the result is a relationship of interdependency.

When we have learned to pendulate, we have achieved what Barnett Pearce (2005) calls *cosmopolitan communicative virtuosity*. Pearce believes that “modernity has been the primary force in the development of the contemporary, postmodern world, but that, as a form of communication, modernity is ill equipped to deal with the conditions that it has created” (Pearce, 2005, p. 2).

It is not enough to know about pendulation, it is necessary to indeed apply it and reach out to the Other. At the 20th Annual Conference of the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR) Japan (June 26th 2005, Rikkyo University, Tokyo), Melissa Butcher (2005) put forward two hypotheses (see <http://europacom.com/sietar/conference2005/paper-detail.pl?ID=8>). Firstly, she suggested that developing the *imaginative ability to empathize* (the ability to see oneself in other circumstances) is a key competency required to motivate and manage multicultural spaces and intercultural communication. As a second hypothesis, Butcher proposed to introduce the *maximization postulate* to intercultural interactions. The maximization postulate was put forward by Harold Dwight Lasswell (1902-1978), in the spirit of John Dewey’s pragmatic tradition, and it means that humans act in ways that leave them better off rather than out of some impersonal laws of nature or random – see, for example, Lasswell and Lerner (Eds.) (1965). Butcher posited that the promise that collaborative learning will maximize personal comfort or render better business results can be used to entice people into such learning that in turn then serves as driving force for change.

To sum up this section on the skills that we need to build a new global culture, let me contribute a bit more with my own experiences. I have discussed these issues many times with people who suffer deeply from their yearning for “home” and are caught in destructive cycles of violence, suffering, humiliation and counter humiliation. My personal life experience resembles that of many Jews who, over centuries, felt at home in their dreams of Jerusalem without ever having been there; it also resembles that of

Palestinians who feel that Haifa, for example, is their home, even though they were born in a distant refugee camp and have never set foot in Haifa. I was born into a displaced family from Silesia, which is now part of Poland. Together with millions of others, my family lost their homeland in 1945. My parents have been deeply traumatized by this loss. The loss of their homeland broke their hearts.

My personal experience of homelessness makes me identify in great sympathy with others with similar backgrounds. I could be tempted to wish to reclaim “my homeland.” But I have chosen another path. The world has become my homeland and I am a “global citizen.” I do not feel the need to fight for Silesia where my parents were born, because wherever I am, I consider my home. I am at the forefront of a growing number of people who are developing a global or at least multi-local identity and becoming citizens of the world. My home is now what William Ury calls the *global knowledge society* (Ury (1999). Practicing to be a global citizen convinced me that human beings all over the world are connected in their wish for recognition. People around the world, to me, are much less divided and different than is held to be true by those who maintain a national identity and “visit” others as tourists, for business, diplomacy, or fieldwork.

Embracing all humankind as “my family” has often been a painful process. It was (and still is) like building a ship while at sea. As I said earlier, it means learning to *swim* and not to *cling*. Developing a global identity meant that I transformed from being attached to lost land (Silesia) in pain, to connecting to the global knowledge society in joy. In other words, I have replaced a circumscribed piece of land (Silesia) with knowledge and with the entire planet Earth and all humanity. As a consequence, I do not wish to stir up resentment and ultimately war against Poland in order to “re-conquer” Silesia and reinstate the Silesian culture of my parents. Not only would the price be too high (war) – the world and I no longer use land as a main resource. True, by identifying primarily with all humanity, in many ways I am betraying my parents’ Silesian culture, accepting what Judith Viorst (1987) calls *Necessary Losses*. This I do, even though I love my parents deeply, profoundly resonate with their suffering, and would be overjoyed if their culture could survive.

I have discussed these issues at great length with my dear friends on all sides of the divides in many world regions, not least the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. There are two ways out of homelessness: violent fight for a limited piece of land, or building a profoundly new global world of all-encompassing inclusiveness. Nobody forces us to define homeland in narrow ways. We are free to adopt the entire planet as our home and transform it, in the future, to house all humankind in a sustainable way. I regard such a struggle to be more benign than competition for narrowly defined pieces of land. Safety is not to be found in “owning” territory, because the concept of ownership itself is relational – it is dependent on its larger social context. Safety emanates only from building secure relationships among all world citizens in an all-encompassing manner. The mere option of such a vision, I hope, can facilitate compromises by reducing the despair with which people hold on to every inch of the land they believe is “not yours.”

At this point, I also wish to explain why I think that human rights are a suitable framework for building a new global culture. If we take Lasswell’s maximization postulate, and combine it with Evanoff’s interactive avoidance of realist/idealist extremes, we find that human rights provide a framework that is suitable for the new reality of *one single global village*. The old honor order was adapted to a world of *several*

*villages fearing each others' attacks* (caught in the Security Dilemma). We live in a new reality today, we have to cooperate no longer *against* others, but *for* the single one village that is left to us. This requires new frames, and I believe that human rights provide precisely this frame. This entails that I do not look down on honor codes, I respect them as solutions developed in different, local, context. For today's global context, human rights are more suitable. Thus, my stance for human rights is not born out of Western arrogance, but out of a deep analysis of the new challenges that all humankind jointly faces today.

### **Some guidelines for implementation**

Stella Ting-Toomey (1999) puts forward a list of recommendations for ethical transcultural communicators. An ethical transcultural communicator

1. is willing to make mindful choices in response to the various situational contingencies of problematic cultural practices;
2. is willing to assume a social commitment to work for mindful change so as to create a morally inclusive society;
3. is willing to uphold the human dignity of others via a respectful mindset, an open heart, inclusive visions through ethnorelative lenses, and practicing mindful transcultural communication competencies (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 276).

Let me present my list of recommendations for creating a new global culture that has the historically new insight at its core that humankind is one single family with the joint responsibility for a tiny fragile home planet.

From intercultural communication to global interhuman ethical and functional communication:

1. Highlight commonalities and give them priority, because they are crucial as unifying common ground
2. Highlight differences, yet, relegate them to a secondary level and do not imagine and/or reify difference/s, because this gives them undue priority
3. Use human rights as tool to identify and nurture those commonalities and those differences that support human rights and deemphasize those that do not; the most significant cultural fault lines in the world are not between cultures – Japanese, Western, Easter, and so forth – but between commonalities and differences that support human rights, versus those that do not

Using such a template entails great promise, not only for a more constructive global cultural frame, but also for what Jean Baker Miller (1986) describes as the “five good things” that characterize growth-fostering relationships:

- 1) increased zest (vitality),
- 2) increased ability to take action (empowerment),
- 3) increased clarity (a clearer picture of one's self, the other, and the relationship),
- 4) increased sense of worth, and
- 5) a desire for relationships beyond that particular relationship.

Since many who read this journal are consultants to corporations, national, international, or transnational, I would like to round up this lecture with a note on creativity. Creativity and creative self-realization represent *pragmatic* calls for equal dignity, in the spirit of the maximization postulate. Being treated as somebody of equal dignity, as somebody whose views have weight, opens space for creativity. People are much more creative when they feel well-treated than they are when they experience humiliating lowliness. The old practice of ranking human worth resembles Chinese foot binding. Both incapacitate, at least partially. Women with bound feet were reduced to be more dependent and helpless than they would otherwise have been. Likewise, underlings in coercive hierarchies are usually forced into artificial incapacitation. For creativity to flourish, all this has to be undone, on all sides.

Creating a *Global Culture of Peace* needs consultants who counsel the world well. We need consultants who make us beware of tacit knowledge that overlooks, for example, the damages of practices that have foot-binding effects. We want consultants who show us the way out of the box, who warn particularly young people that even though predefined solutions and career paths might have the highest status, searching for new solutions, though initially a fuzzy and unrewarding process, might be what the world needs most.

Cycles of humiliation destroy the social fabric of communities around the world. And the very fact that millions of people on our globe live in abject squalor, while a minority indulges in luxury, humiliates the humanity of all of us. The international community, the global bystander, including every citizen, carries a responsibility for counteraction, for building a Global Culture of Peace harnessed in global cultural and institutional structures that ensure a decent and dignified life for all. We need a world movement for a decent global village. The Cultural Creatives around the world must organize themselves. The goal is a sustainable world, both socially (peace, and justice as defined by human rights) and ecologically (survival of humankind within the biosphere of our planet).

Happy isolation is no longer possible. It would resemble the passivity that we criticize when we think of Nazi-Germany and how people turned their backs when their Jewish neighbors were transported to the concentration camp. We cannot sit and do nothing. We need to find ways that alleviate the suffering in the long-term for the entire world (not just short-term solutions for some parts of the world). Let us all become global culture builders, pathfinders for a new and more constructive future for humankind, let us save the Titanic from going down. Let us transcend past collectivist honor culture that turned people into obedient underlings, let us leave behind current Western “rugged” individualism that condones uncaring arrogance, let us strive for a global culture of connected individualism, where we combine *shutaisei* autonomy with humility and mutual connection.

With respect to the field of intercultural communication, let us inscribe *global interhuman communication* into *international relations* and *intercultural communication*. Let us found a new field, the field of Global Interhuman Communication.

Martin, Nakayama, and Flores (2002) offer a dialectical approach to intercultural communication. Their emphasis is on “meaningful” rather than “effective” communication that emphasizes skills. I believe that emphasizing global interhuman communication will greatly enhance both, meaning and effectiveness.

Peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos commends the term “global interhuman.” He writes: “That is a good generic term that covers interpersonal, intragroup, intergroup,

intranational, international dimensions. We have to learn to educate ourselves and help educate others to learn how to use languages peacefully for the good of Global Society/Humankind. Such humanizing use calls for humility/humbleness, humiliation avoidance and prevention, for a keen sense of planetary belongingness, as advocated by interculturalists (in a personal message, June 4, 2006).

### Reference list

- Lasswell, Harold Dwight and Lerner, Daniel (Eds.) (1965). *World Revolutionary Elites: Studies in Coercive Ideological Movements*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Guha, Ranajit and Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (Eds.) (1988). *Selected Subaltern Studies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cooperrider, David L. (Ed.) (2000). *Appreciative Inquiry: Rethinking Human Organization Toward a Positive Theory of Change*. Champaign, Ill: Stipes Publishing.
- Jordan, Judith V., Walker, Maureen, and Hartling, Linda M. (Eds.) (2004). *The Complexity of Connection: Writings From the Stone Center's Jean Baker Miller Training Institute*. New York, NY, London: The Guilford Press.
- Althusser, Louis (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2006). The Case for Contamination. In *New York Times*, January 1, <http://www.muhsenberg.edu/mgt/provost/frg/humanities/AppiahContamination.pdf>.
- Bachika, Reimon (2006). Symbolism and Values: Towards Improving Interreligious/Ethnic Relations. In *Bukkyo Daigaku Shakaigakubu Ronso (Journal of Bukkyo University, Faculty of Sociology)*, 3, pp. 1-21.
- Banks, James A., Cookson, Peter, Gay, Geneva, Hawley, Willis D., Irvine, Jacqueline Jordan, Nieto, Sonia, Schofield, Janet Ward, and Stephan, Walter G. (2001). *Diversity Within Unity: Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society*. Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, <http://www.educ.washington.edu/coetestwebsite/pdf/DiversityUnity.pdf>.
- Baratta, Joseph Preston (2004). *The Politics of World Federation: Vol.1: The United Nations, U.N. Reform, Atomic Control. Vol. 2: From World Federalism to Global Governance*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Battle, Michael Jesse (1997). *Reconciliation. The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press.

- Bem, Daryl J. (1970). *Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bonanno, George A. (2001). Emotion Self-Regulation. In Mayne, Tracy J. and Bonanno, George A. (Eds.), *Emotions: Current Issues and Future Directions*, pp. 251-285. New York, London: Guilford Press.
- Boudon, Raymond (1989). *The Analysis of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (translated by Richard Nice).
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1979). *Algeria 1960: The Disenchantment of the World, the Sense of Honour, the Kabyle House or the World Reversed*. Cambridge / Paris: Cambridge University Press / Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London and Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Broadbent, Geoffrey (1988). *Design in Architecture: Architecture and the Human Sciences*. London: Fulton.
- Buber, Martin (1944). *I and Thou*. Edinburgh: Clark.
- Butcher, Melissa. (2005). *Empathy, Experiencing Difference*. Tokyo: Seminar given at the 20th Annual Conference of the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR) Japan, June 26th 2005, Rikkyo University.
- Chalmers, David (1996). *The Conscious Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Deutsch, Morton (1999). A Personal Perspective on the Development of Social Psychology in the Twentieth Century. In Rodriguez, A. and Levine, R. V. (Eds.), *Reflections on 100 Years of Experimental Social Psychology*, pp. 1-34. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Douglas, Mary (1984). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Ark Paperbacks.
- Dow, Elizabeth I. (2005). *Approaching Intercultural Communication From the Space Between*. Tokyo: Seminar given at the 20th Annual Conference of the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR) Japan, June 26th 2005, Rikkyo University.

- Dower, John W. (1999). *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Dweck, Carol S., Mangels, Jennifer A., and Good, Catherine (2004). Motivational Effects on Attention, Cognition, and Performance. In Dai, David Yun and Sternberg, Robert J. (Eds.), *Motivation, Emotion, and Cognition: Integrative Perspectives on Intellectual Functioning and Development*, pp. 41-56. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Enriquez, Virgilio G. (1977). Filipino Psychology in the Third World. In *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 10, pp. 3-18.
- Evanoff, Richard (1998). A Constructivist Approach to Intercultural Ethics. In *Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics*, 8, pp. 84-87.
- Fisher-Yoshida, Beth (2005). Reframing Conflict: Intercultural Conflict As Potential Transformation. In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan*, (8), pp. 1-16.
- Foucault, Michel (1977). *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, Michel (1979). *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Friedman, Thomas L. (2005). *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gilligan, Carol (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Gomes de Matos, Francisco (1997). Teachers' Intercultural Rights: A Plea. In *FIPLV World News*, October 1-2 (FIPLV stands for International Federation of Modern Language Teachers, with LV having originally stood for Langues Vivantes).
- Granovetter, Mark S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. In *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (May), pp. 1360-1380.
- Greenfeld, Liah (1996). Nationalism and Modernity. In *Social Research*, 63 (1), pp. 3-40.
- Gruen, Arno (1992). *The Insanity of Normality: Realism As Sickness: Toward Understanding Human Destructiveness*. New York, NY: Grove Press, translation of *Der Wahnsinn der Normalität* by Arno Gruen (1989).
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2, System and Lifeworld: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Hofstede, Geert H. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. Revised and expanded 2nd Edition, edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill USA.
- Hyde, Janet Shibley (2005). The Gender Similarities Hypothesis. In *American Psychologist*, 60 (6), pp. 581-592  
(<http://www.apa.org/journals/releases/amp606581.pdf>).
- Jackson, Robert H. (1990). *Quasi-States, Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Jahn, Robert and Dunne, Brenda (1997). Science of the Subjective. In *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 11 (2), pp. 201-224.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (2004). *Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (1995) World Class: Thriving Locally in the Global Economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kelly, George Alexander (1955). *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. New York: Norton.
- Kim, Uichol, Yang, Kuo-Shu, and Hwang, Kwang-Kuo (2006). *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding People in Context*. New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Kluckhohn, Florence Rockwood and Strodtbeck, Fred L. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Kramsch, Claire (2001). Intercultural Communication. In Nunan, David and Carter, Ronald (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, pp. 201-206. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lacan, Jacques (1977). The Mirror Stage As Formative of the Function of the I As Revealed in Psychoanalytic Theory. In Lacan, Jacques (Ed.), *Écrits - A Selection*, London: Tavistock Publications.
- 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.
- Levine, Peter A. (1997). *Waking the Tiger: Healing Trauma*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000). *Social Constructionism, Logical Positivism, and the Story of Humiliation*. Oslo: University of Oslo, published by Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoware/evelin02.php>.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006a). "Sugawara and the Secrets of Calligraphy": Exposing the Wounds Inflicted by Ranking People in Higher and Lesser Beings. Reflections after seeing *Sugawara and the Secrets of Calligraphy* on 20th April 2006 at the

- National Bunraku Theatre in Osaka, Japan, published by Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies at  
<http://www.humiliationstudies.org/howeare/evelin02.php#bunraku>.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006b). *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict*. Westport, CT, London: Greenwood Press and Praeger Publishers.
- Luhmann, Niklas (1997). Globalization or World Society?: How to Conceive of Modern Society. In *International Review of Sociology*, 7 (1, March), pp. 67-80, downloadable from <http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpluhmann2.htm>.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- March, Robert M. (1996). *Reading the Japanese Mind: The Realities Behind Their Thoughts and Actions*. Tokyo.
- Margalit, Avishai (1996). *The Decent Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marsick, Victoria J. and Sauquet, Alfonso (2000). Learning Through Reflection. In Deutsch, Morton (Ed.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, pp. 382-399. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Martin, Judith N., Nakayama, Thomas K., and Flores, Lisa A. (2002). A Dialectical Approach to Intercultural Communication. In Martin, Judith N., Nakayama, Thomas K., and Flores, Lisa A. (Eds.), *Readings in Intercultural Communication: Experiences and Contexts*, pp. 3-13. Second edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Matsumoto, David Ricky, Yoo, Hee Seung, and LeRoux, Jeffery A. (2005). Emotion and Intercultural Communication. In Kothhoff, Helga and Spencer-Oatley, Helen (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics, Volume 7: Intercultural Communication*, Berlin: Mouton - de Gruyter Publishers.
- Mendes-Flohr, Paul (1999). *German Jews: A Dual Identity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mezirow, Jack (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, Jean Baker (1986). What Do We Mean by Relationships? *Work in Progress*, No. 22, Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.
- Molander, Bengt (1993). *Kunskap i Handling*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Munir, Lily Zakiyah (2006). Women's Theology and European Unity. In *Jakarta Post*, May 5, 2006, <http://www.thejakartapost.com>, also in Common Ground News Service, May 16, 2006.

- Nagashima, Koichi (1999). *Glocal Approach Toward Architecture of the Future*. Zushi: This article was written in 1995 for the UIA Work programme "Architecture of the Future," but published in June 1999 for presentation at the XX UIA Beijing Congress, as a joint publication by Union Internationale des Architectes and the Japan Institute of Architects.
- Nagata, Adair Linn (2005). Promoting Self-Reflexivity in Intercultural Education. In *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 8, pp. 139-167.
- Nagata, Adair Linn (2006). Transformative Learning in Intercultural Education. In *Rikkyo Intercultural Communication Review*, 4, pp. 39-60.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko (2002). *Kamikaze, Cherry Blossoms, and Nationalisms: The Militarization of Aesthetics in Japanese History*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Opatow, Susan (1995). Drawing the Line: Social Categorization, Moral Exclusion, and the Scope of Justice. In Bunker, Barbara Benedict and Rubin, Jeffrey Z. (Eds.), *Cooperation, Conflict, and Justice: Essays Inspired by the Work of Morton Deutsch*, pp. 347-369. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Pearce, W. Barnett (2005). *Toward Communicative Virtuosity: A Meditation on Modernity and Other Forms of Communication*. Santa Barbara, CA: School of Human and Organization Development, Fielding Graduate University.
- Peng, Tan Huay (2005). *What's in a Chinese Character*. Beijing: New World Press, by arrangement with Marshall Cavendish International (Asia).
- Polanyi, Michael (1962). *Personal Knowledge*. Corrected edition. London.: Routledge.
- Ray, Paul H. and Anderson, Sherry Ruth (2000). *The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People Are Changing the World*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Rudmin, Floyd Webster (1991). Seventeen Early Peace Psychologists. In *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 31 (2, Spring), pp. 12-43.
- Salama, Ashraf (2005). *Skill-Based / Knowledge-Based Architectural Pedagogies: An Argument for Creating Humane Environments*. 7th Intl Conference on Humane Habiate-ICHH-05 - The International Association of Humane Habitat IAHH Rizvi College of Architecture, Mumbai, India, January 29-31, 2005.
- Scheff, Thomas J. (1997). *Emotions, the Social Bond and Human Reality. Part/Whole Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheff, Thomas J. (2003). Attachment, Attunement, Attraction. In Scheff, Thomas J. (Ed.), *Love and Shame in Relationships*, Forthcoming.

- Schön, Donald A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Schön, Donald A. and Rein, Martin (1994). *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Serres, Michel (1997). *The Troubadour of Knowledge*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Singer, Marshall R. (1992). *Conflict Resolution - Sri Lanka - Tamil Eelam: Alternative Solutions to the Conflict*. Colombo: from a Paper presented by Professor Marshall Singer to the 44th Annual Meeting for Asian Studies, at Colombo in 1992, and published in the Sinhala owned Sri Lanka Sunday Island on 26 July 1992, downloadable from <http://www.tamilnation.org/conflictresolution/tamileelam/92singer.htm>.
- Singer, Marshall R. (1998). *Perception & Identity in Intercultural Communication*. Boston, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Skjervheim, Hans (1976). Objectivism and the Study of Man. In Slagstad, Rune (Ed.), *Positivisme, Dialektikk, Materialisme. Den Norske Debatten Om Samfunnsvitenskapenes Teori*, pp. 186-203. Oslo: Universitetsforlag.
- Smith, Brian Cantwell (2005). *The McLuhan School*. Toronto: aif proposal, second round, February 10, 2005, submitted by Brian Cantwell Smith, Dean, Faculty of Information StStudies (fis).
- Smith, Peter Bevington and Bond, Michael Harris (1999). The Characteristics of Cross-Cultural Interaction. *Social Psychology Across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives*, Second edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Staub, Ervin (1989). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- The International Panel of Eminent Personalities to Investigate the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda and the Surrounding Events (2000). *Rwanda: The Preventable Genocide*. Retrieved September 30, 2000, from [www.oau-oua.org/](http://www.oau-oua.org/).
- Ting-Toomey, Stella (1999). *Communicating Across Cultures*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Tschudi, Finn (2006). *Notes Towards an Optimistic View of Restorative Justice in International and Intergroup Conflicts*. Tel Aviv: Revised version of paper for Bar Ilan conference on "Restorative Justice and Contact Hypothesis in Managing Ethno-National conflicts," March 5, 2006 Bar Ilan University, Tel Aviv.

- Turner, John F. (1997). The Role of the Professional. In Burgess, Rod, Carmona, Marisa, and Kolstee, Theo (Eds.), *The Challenge of Sustainable Cities*, London: ZED Books.
- Ury, William (1999). *Getting to Peace. Transforming Conflict at Home, at Work, and in the World*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Viorst, Judith (1987). *Necessary Losses: The Loves, Illusions, Dependencies and Impossible Expectations That All of Us Have to Give Up in Order to Grow*. New York, NY: Fawcett Gold Medal.
- Volkan, Vamik D. (2004). *Blind Trust: Large Groups and Their Leaders in Times of Crisis and Terror*. Charlottesville, VA: Pitchstone Publishing.
- Walzer, Michael (1986). The Reform of the International System. *Studies of War and Peace*, pp. 227-240. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Wasilewski, Jacqueline Howell (2001). Interculturalists As Dragon-Riders. In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan*, 4, pp. 75-89.
- Watson, John B. (1928). *Psychological Care of Infant and Child*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Wendt, Alexander (2003). Why a World State Is Inevitable. In *European Journal of International Relations*, 9 (4), pp. 491-542.
- Wendt, Alexander (2005). Social Theory As Cartesian Science: An Auto-Critique From a Quantum Perspective. In Guzzini, Stefano and Leander, Anna (Eds.), *Constructivism and International Relations*, New York and London: Routledge, forthcoming.
- Wintersteiner, Werner (1999). *Pädagogik Des Anderen: Bausteine Für Eine Friedenspädagogik in Der Postmoderne (Pedagogy of the Other: Building Blocks for Peace Education in the Postmodern World)*. Münster: Agenda.
- Yamada, Haru (1997). *Different Games, Different Rules: Why Americans and Japanese Misunderstand Each Other*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yoshikawa, Muneo (1980). *The "Double Swing" Model of Eastern-Western Intercultural Communication*. Paper prepared for the Seminar on Communication Theory from Eastern and Western Perspectives, East-West Communication Institute, Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Yoshikawa, Muneo (1987). The "Double Swing" Model of Intercultural Communication Between the East and West. In Kincaid, D. Lawrence (Ed.), *Communication Theory: Eastern and Western Perspectives*, pp. 319-329. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

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), downloadable from <http://ijea.asu.edu/v3n3/>.