

Definitions of Terms as They are Used in Lindner's Writing

© Evelin Gerda Lindner

March 2003

Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, <http://www.humiliationstudies.org>

We appreciate that you contact the author if you wish to quote from this text. Texts may usually be copied for non-profit educational use if proper credit is given to the author and Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies. No part of this file may be transmitted, distributed or reproduced in any other way without permission from the author.

Contents List

Definitions of Humiliation.....	3
You are putting me down! How humiliation is a downward push and may lead to anger	3
Do I have to bow, or not? How humiliation is different in dignity, honor and pride societies	3
Not Up, not down, but halfway! How humiliation and humility, humbleness, shame, pride, honor, respect and dignity unfold.....	4
Don't humiliate to humble! Why I better do not humiliate you in case I want to humble you	5
Stop putting me down! How humiliation, conflict, victimhood, and trauma relate	6
Feel and act! How the word humiliation is used	7
Definitions of Other Terms	8
Capitalism.....	8
Conflict	8
Democracy.....	8
Dignity	8
Egalization.....	9
Genocide.....	9
Globalization	10
Group and individual	10
Honor.....	11
Humankind	11
Human History	11
Human Rights.....	12
Humiliation (a shortened definition)	12
Humility.....	13
Individual and group.....	13
Information age	13
Justice	14
Modernity	14
Peace.....	14
Pie of Resources	14
Post-Modernity	14
Pride.....	15
Respect	15
Security.....	15
Security dilemma.....	15
Shame	16
Stability.....	16
Trauma.....	16
Trust.....	16

Definitions of Humiliation

In everyday language, the word humiliation is used threefold. Firstly, the word *humiliation* points at an *act*, secondly at a *feeling*, and thirdly, at a *process*: “I humiliate you, you feel humiliated, and the entire process is one of humiliation.” In Lindner’s work the reader is expected to understand from the context which alternative is meant, because otherwise language would become too convoluted.

You are putting me down! How humiliation is a downward push and may lead to anger

Humiliation means the enforced lowering of a person or group, a process of subjugation that damages or strips away their pride, honor or dignity. To be humiliated is to be placed, against your will (or in some cases with your consent, for example in cases of religious self-humiliation or in sado-masochism) and often in a deeply hurtful way, in a situation that is greatly inferior to what you feel you should expect. Humiliation entails demeaning treatment that transgresses established expectations. It may involve acts of force, including violent force. At its heart is the idea of pinning down, putting down or holding to the ground. Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of humiliation as a process is that the victim is forced into passivity, acted upon, made helpless.

People react in different ways when they feel that they were unduly humiliated: some just become depressed – anger turns against oneself – others get openly enraged, and yet others hide their anger and carefully plan for revenge. The person who plans for revenge may become the leader of a movement. Thus “man” is perhaps not “aggressive” by nature, and frustration alone cannot make him aggressive either, feeling humiliated may be a strong trigger of aggression. Thus, feelings of humiliation may lead to rage, that may be turned inwards, as in the case of depression and apathy. However, this rage may also turn outwards and express itself in violence, even in mass violence, in case leaders are around who forge narratives of humiliation that feed on the feelings of humiliation among masses.

Do I have to bow, or not? How humiliation is different in dignity, honor and pride societies

For human rights advocates, humiliation is a violation of dignity enshrined in human rights, the *illicit* putting down and holding down of people; it is the *unlawful* hierarchical ranking of human dignity. Human rights stipulate that every human being possesses an inner core of dignity that ought not be humiliated. Slavery and Apartheid are but two examples of the stratification of human worth that are deemed to be illegal. Countless other, less stark expressions of such rankings are in the process of following suit at present. All societal, social and psychological relationships are affected by this transition; relationships between employers and employees, women and men, parents and children, and even everybody’s most intimate self-definition are affected. Relative deprivation and inequality acquire a taste of obscenity. Among the consequences of these transitions is that feelings of humiliation that previously were simmering covertly are released and intensified.

For people who adhere to the more ancient honor code, humiliation is utterly

legitimate, more so, it is seen as *necessary* in order to keep stability and order in a hierarchical system. Relative deprivation and inequality are regarded as highly legitimate. In such a framework, the act of humiliation is institutionalized as societal backbone. It is enshrined in law that – just to give an example – the father and husband has to beat his disobedient wife and children and that they have to respect him for this; a practice that exemplifies the general rule that rebellious underlings have to be taught “lessons” of humiliation. Not seldom, underlings accept and even defend their lowliness and embellish bowing down as their *honorable culture*. Defiant underlings who succeed in toppling their masters will not dismantle hierarchy but replace the master.

For people living as hunters and gatherers, humiliation is often something *unknown*, something for which they have no mental tools available to deal with. For people who are used to wander about freely, in the African Sub-Sahara, for example, prison is unbearable; these people might even die when deprived of their freedom to roam. Their pristine pride is not malleable enough to tackle humiliation. Death or freedom is their choice. This choice reminds of the Somali saying “A man deserves to be killed, not humiliated.”

Not Up, not down, but halfway! How humiliation and humility, humbleness, shame, pride, honor, respect and dignity unfold

Humiliation is embedded into a wide conceptual field including notions such as humility, humbleness, shame, pride, honor, respect and dignity.

In a human rights context, *a person is unlawfully humiliated when debased to a level inferior to equal dignity*. Such a person is encouraged, by human rights ideals, to rise to the line of equal dignity. It would be an illicit arrogation of superiority, however, if a former underling were to rise to the level of a master. Within the human rights vision, masters, tyrants, all those who put themselves higher than others, are asked to step down to the line of equal dignity. It would be an equally illicit misuse, within the framework of human rights, if masters, on their way down, were humiliated below the line of equal dignity. The point of human rights is that all – masters and underlings – have to meet at the line of equal dignity; nobody is allowed to arrogate superiority and humiliate others or be humiliated.

Pristine pride is the condition of people who have been spared experiences of humiliation. Children and indigenous people often do not know how to cope with humiliation and may be destroyed by it. However, on the other side, they may also not recognize the merits of humility. A noble Somali warrior, for example, is proud and cannot be humiliated because he would rather die. As referred to above, there is a Somali saying, “a man deserves to be killed, not humiliated.” However, this proud warrior, set to defy humiliation, may fail to see the virtues of humility. Humility resembles pristine pride, however, has learned that bowing sometimes is necessary and vital. It is prosocial to bow to rules and regulations that make it possible for communities to live together in peace, and bowing to the limits of the biosphere that humankind depends on is equally beneficial. In other words, it may be beneficial to stop in front of a red traffic light and not interpret the requirement to stop as humiliation. Fighting one’s way through at every cross-road, as pristine pride may indicate, is not necessarily prosocial.

Honor is like dignity; only that it is ranked and embedded in an acceptance of such ranking. It is a definition of human worthiness that is built on the notion that humiliating those below is one's duty. If those who are humiliated succeed to resist, they will turn the balance, but not the ranking order. They will replace the master, but not the hierarchical order. Whoever is strongest, humiliates those below. Within a framework of honor, putting down people or accepting lowliness in case of defeat are *tokens of respect for the overall ranking order*.

In a framework of human rights, on the other hand, putting down people represents the square opposite, namely a *token of disrespect for the overall order of equal dignity*. If used in this way, *honor* and *dignity* are profoundly opposing words.

Shame blushes in my face when I transgress limits of *humility* and decency. Shame is when a person accepts her shortcoming. Only a person or party who recognizes her inadequacy can be shamed. This is not least the basis of torture, which exposes people to situations they are, indeed, ashamed of. If they were not ashamed of these situations, it would not be torture. Public rape, for example, being made to parade naked, or being left in one's excrements, this is torture precisely because shame is abused.

While shame arises when I recognize that I indeed transgress limits of decency, humiliation occurs when my limits are transgressed by somebody else. In the case of *shame* I am the *author* and the *actor*, it is *me* who has subscribed to shame limits, whereas in the case of *humiliation* *somebody else* forces herself *upon* me. The *locus of agency* is posited in *me* in the case of *shame* and *not in me* in the case of *humiliation*. Both can, as said earlier, be intertwined. Torture uses shame in order to humiliate and vice versa.

Humiliation, however, does not automatically and necessarily elicit shame in the targeted person; on the contrary, shame might be rejected profoundly. A Mandela was utterly humiliated, but presumably hardly ever ashamed. Fortunately, Mandela subsequently rose to wise heroism and did not unleash genocide on white South Africans. A Hitler was a wretched humiliated individual who hooked up to German national humiliation; he too, was humiliated but not ashamed. Tragically, Hitler translated defiance of shame into a world war.

Don't humiliate to humble! Why I better do not humiliate you in case I want to humble you

When I humiliate you and hope to shame you, I might reap defiance. As soon as you are defiant, the only option which is left to me is to hope that this defiance will translate itself in Mandela-like ways and not à la Hitler. Therefore, in case prosocial humbling is the aim, humiliation is obsolete.

In order to instill prosocial shame in a tyrant, for example, I better abstain from any action that might be understood as humiliation. In order to invite people into prosocial humility and prosocial shame, it is important to build a framework of trust within which respect for individual dignity is guaranteed. This is the lesson of Hitler Germany, South Africa, and equally the lesson for September 11, 2001, and its aftermath.

Stop putting me down! How humiliation, conflict, victimhood, and trauma relate

The way *conflict*, *victimhood*, and *trauma* are defined, depends on the social and societal context within which they are embedded. The same event elicits different framings in different contexts. A woman being beaten by her husband has three ways in which she can frame this event. Firstly (1), in case he was not in control of himself – let us say he was under the influence of some medication – she can interpret the beating as a kind of accident, an event in which a perpetrator is lacking. She would allow herself to be in distress, however, there would be no conflict, and the extent of her victimhood and trauma would be to some extent limited.

Secondly (2), she can frame the beating as “honorable medicine” that is “good” for her, almost irrespective of whether she was disobedient or not and thus “merited” the beating or not. Within the honor code beating lesser beings has the merit of “reminding” those lesser beings of their lowly place, and thus the beating stabilizes the overall order. The beaten person is expected to “respect” the beating so as to show esteem for the overall order. In case all parties adhere to the honor code, there is convergence and concord and all players define the beating as prosocial. There is no place for notions such as victimhood or trauma.

Parents would beat female children to “remind” them of their lowliness; however, within the *Strict Father model* male children would be beaten so as to turn them into strong adult males, strong enough to withstand attempts by potential attackers to put them down. Thus, lesser beings, like females, would be beaten to stay down; future male masters would be beaten so as to learn to stay up under adverse circumstances. In both cases, the beating would be regarded as prosocial and there would be no place for concepts such as conflict, victimhood or trauma.

In the third case (3), the beaten wife may frame her beating as humiliating violation of her dignity. The human rights worldview shows her a path to define herself as victimized and traumatized. In case her husband, the perpetrator, continues to adhere to the honor code, there discord and conflict will evolve. This conflict will stay invisible as long as the wife’s inner rage stays turned against herself; she merely gets more quiet and depressed. The conflict becomes apparent, however, in case she turns her opposition, protest and anger outwards. In that case, the husband might beat and humiliate her more, in order to return her into accepting her “due” lower position within the honor order. He may succeed. However, he may merely arrive at turning open rage into hidden rage and thus create more depression. Or he may trigger separation and divorce.

Feel and act! How the word humiliation is used

As mentioned before, the same word, *humiliation*, is used for widely different events, both for the act of humiliation perpetrated by a perpetrator, and the feeling of humiliation felt by a victim. We typically expect that acts of humiliation are carried out by perpetrators and that the victims harbor painful feelings of humiliation that they would wish to be without. In short, we could write: humiliators intend to humiliate humiliatees, who do not agree to such treatment.

However, the role of the victim is not necessarily always unambiguous – a victim may feel humiliated in the absence of any deliberately humiliating act – as a result of misunderstandings, or as a result of personal and cultural differences concerning norms about what respectful treatment ought to entail – or the “victim” may even invent a story of humiliation in order to maneuver another party into the role of a loathsome perpetrator.

Or, the perpetrator may just want to help; still the receiver of this help may feel humiliated. Thus help may humiliate – a situation where the receiver of help defines a situation as humiliation, not the actor.

Or, neither actor nor victim may define a situation as humiliating, but a third party. The social worker wants to rescue the battered wife, but she just answers that beating her is her husband's way of loving her. Marx talked about false consciousness when workers did not feel humiliated and did not want to rise.

Then, you may expect that humiliation is avoided, yet, some people seek it, for example in sadomasochism, or religious rites, where people whip and humiliate themselves to praise god.

To summarize, a perpetrator might want to commit humiliation but not succeed, a “benefactor” might humiliate while trying to do good, a third party might observe “victims” who do not see themselves as such (or fail to see victims in cases where they do exist), or humiliation is sought instead of despised.

Thus, to round up, humiliation is an act, an emotional state, and a social mechanism that is relevant for anthropology, sociology, philosophy, social and clinical psychology, and political science. Its multidisciplinary nature may be the reason for why the notion of humiliation has almost not been studied on its own account before the research that is the basis of Lindner's work has been incepted.

Definitions of Other Terms

Capitalism

In Lindner's work terms and concepts such as capitalism are treated with a certain amount of detachment, and history is punctuated in alternative ways. Capitalism is regarded as an epiphenomenon of transitions such as globalization and egalization.

Conflict

The word *conflict* stems from Latin *cum* which means *with* and the verb *flectere*, to *bend*, to *curve*. The term conflict, similar to the terms victimhood and trauma, is dependent on the particular framing of reality forged by players and the overall society's mindset within which they are embedded. The same event is experienced differently in different contexts; it may be lived through as *necessary pain*, or as *trauma*. As soon as I define a certain treatment as a *violation*, I *bend*, or the overall situation becomes *bended*, *curved* and *convoluted* instead of *smooth* and *straight*. In conflict, *discord* displaces *concord* (*cord* means *heart* in Latin) and this can lead to confrontation. The word *confrontation* entails the Latin word *frons* which means forehead. In *confrontation* *faces* are placed *against* each other, in *opposition*. However, conflict may also stay quiet. As long as those who feel violated do not raise their voices, conflict is mute.

Democracy

In Lindner's work an attempt is made to detach from terms and concepts such as democracy, and history is punctuated in alternative ways. Democracy is regarded as an epiphenomenon of transitions such as globalization and egalization.

Dignity

In Lindner's work, dignity is defined as resembling pride and honor, however, as equipped with additional knowledge. People with dignity know how painful undue humiliation can feel, however, instead of resisting haughtily, they have learned humility. The notion of dignity as used in Lindner's work characterizes the psychological make-up of people and societies that base themselves on the human rights ideal. The first sentence in the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights."

Egalization

The word *egalization* has been coined by the author in order to match the word *globalization* and at the same time differentiate it from words such as equality, because the main point is not equality. The point is rather equal dignity, even though there is a connection between equality and equal dignity. (The connection is “hidden” in the human rights stipulation that equal chances and enabling environments for all are necessary to protect human dignity.)

The term egalization is meant to avoid claiming that everybody should become equal and that there should be no differences between people. Equality can coexist with functional hierarchy that regards all participants as possessing equal dignity; equality can not coexist, though, with hierarchy that defines some people as lesser beings and others as more valuable.

If we imagine the world as a container with a height and a width, *globalization* addresses the horizontal dimension, the shrinking width. *Egalization* concerns the vertical dimension, reminiscent of Hofstede’s power distance. Egalization is a process away from a very high container of masters at the top and underlings at the bottom, towards a flat container with everybody enjoying equal dignity.

Egalization is a process that elicits hot feelings of humiliation when it is promised but fails. The lack of egalization is thus the element that is heating up feelings among so-called “globalization-critics.” Their disquiet stems from lack of egalization and not from an overdose of globalization. What they call for is that *globalization* ought to marry *egalization*.

Genocide

Genocide is about killing, this is the usual assumption, about killing another ethnic group. However, this seems to be an inaccurate conception. If genocide were merely about killing, bringing victims to death would be “sufficient.” Yet, killing is only the last act and, unfathomably for outsiders, many victims almost yearn for it. They yearn for death because it seems that something else is much more important for the *genocidaires*, the perpetrators of genocide, namely humiliating their victims. In the genocide in Rwanda, grandmothers were forced to parade naked in the street before being killed, daughters raped in front of their families; victims paid for bullets and begged to be shot and not hacked to death.

Genocide is about humiliating the personal dignity of the victims and denigrating their group below what is human. The Rwandan genocide, 1994, provides a gruesome catalogue of intricate practices designed to *bring down* the victims’ dignity. The most literal way of achieving this debasement was cutting the legs of tall Tutsi so as to *shorten* not only their bodies, but also their alleged *arrogance*. The verb *to arrogate* is deeply inscribed within the linguistic web of humiliation and is opposed to the verb *to derogate*. Both verbs are built on the Latin verb *rogare*, which means *to ask*. *Rogare* is either combined with the prefix *de*, which means *down from*, or the prefix *ad*, which means *toward*. *To arrogate superiority* means *to appropriate superiority* (Latin *to ask toward*),

and to *derogate* means to *belittle*, *denigrate*, and *minimize* a person (Latin *to ask down from*). Tutsi were perceived to have arrogated superiority, and by cutting their legs short they were derogated, cruelly forced to *come down*.

Globalization

In Lindner's work *globalization* is defined as the *coming together* of humankind, or what anthropologists call the *ingathering* of the human tribes, both physically and psychologically into *One single global village*. Globalization promotes the coming-into-being into an interdependent *global village* combined with an awareness of how small and vulnerable the planet is that humankind inhabits. Both, growing interdependence as well as increasing awareness, are driven by myriads of large and small processes that coalesce and are powered by a growing world-wide communication network (telecommunication, air traffic, satellites, and television).

This technology promotes the perception of the world as *One single global village* on a small planet in a vast universe. Globalization is thus the physical, mental and emotional coming together of humankind on the tiny planet Earth. The process of globalization affects the hearts and minds of an ever increasing number of the world's population. Numerous new tasks emerge, such as how to proceed with what we could call *world formation*.

If we imagine the world as a container with a height and a width, *globalization* addresses the horizontal dimension, the shrinking width. *Globalization* is when humankind huddles together on a planet that is viewed as a tiny human homestead lost in a vast universe, as opposed to a large Earth taking the prominent seat in the middle of the universe.

One of the most unique aspects of globalization is the waning of several *villages* in favor of *One global village*. In the current global village the *security dilemma* gets weaker, a win-win context emerges due to knowledge becoming the main resource, and all concepts that were previously connected to *outside* events fade. Words and concepts such as *war*, or *soldier* lose their anchoring in reality. Thus, globalization is seen to entail deep prosocial and pacifying elements. It is the lack of *egalization* that causes people to feel unease about the process of *globalization*.

Group and individual

The relationship between the individual and the group is not seen as one way relationship in Lindner's work. The individual is conceptualized as actor and as acted upon, as shaper of the world and as shaped by the world. Deliberations made and feelings felt by an individual may resonate with nobody else in a given community and thus remain singular. Or, they may resonate with many others, in which case whole communities may move in one direction. It is when this happens on a large scale that "humankind" makes a move. As, for example, when agriculture almost "suddenly" became a new way of life, starting about 10,000 years ago, and, even more "suddenly," hardly any farmers are to be found in today's Western knowledge societies anymore.

Honor

Honor in Lindner's work is defined as pride that is ranked. The notion of honor is used to characterize the psychological make-up of people and societies that base themselves on the ideal of ranked societies of masters and underlings. Ritualized bowing is at the core of any honor order, as well as routine humiliation. Humiliation is the "lesson" that is taught to underlings so as to "remind" them of "where they belong." Underlings are expected to accept this treatment as a kind of "honorable medicine." In honor societies such practices are regarded as necessary so as to protect what they see as a divine order of rankings. It is argued in Lindner's work that honor orders characterized the past 10,000 years of human societies wherever agriculture made hierarchically organized societies possible, and that this order currently is pushed aside to give space for human rights based dignity orders. What is not intended by Lindner, however, is to stipulate that the Western idea of human rights is the culprit of human history and that all other designs are worthless. Honor based societies are regarded as responses to a strong *security dilemma* and win-lose games. Human rights are conceptualized as responses to a new situation, namely a weaker *security dilemma* and win-win games.

Humankind

See group and individual.

Human History

Social and cultural change occurs in complex ways. Sometimes it is slow, sometimes there are tipping points and situations transform suddenly. Sometimes individuals have a new idea, and this idea may take root, or it may not. Individuals may resonate with the feelings of masses, or they may not. Worldviews are often defended for long time stretches, only to crumble in a moment.

Whether change is a constructive "adaptation" or a destructive one, is often decided only in hindsight. Over longer stretches of time, some adaptations may filter out as more "useful" than others and form long-term cultural traits. The relationship between limitations given by "reality" on one side, the *worldviews*, *cultural mindsets*, *scripts*, and *Zeitgeists* that entail ways of handling this reality on the other side, and the individual on the third side may thus be adaptive or maladaptive, but in any case it is always mutually interwoven.

Some scholars, in order to avert being misunderstood as arrogantly humiliating humanity's past and humanity's diversity, deny that any historic evolution took place. They reject the very word evolution and the notion of historic stages. They attempt to describe human history not as development, but as diverse endeavors by human beings of putting in place equally valuable and worthy social and societal systems. These thinkers attempt to give equal dignity to all human experiments ever designed on Earth, particularly to those groups that previously were branded as "primitive," "barbaric," or in other ways "aberrant."

Lindner agrees with the goal that arrogant humiliation ought to be avoided, not least as to human history and the diversity of human societies that ever lived on the planet. History

as academic field is not to be at the service of colonialism, imperialism or other -isms. However, stages must not automatically be ranked hierarchically. They can be posited on an equal level of worth and value. Lindner stipulates that humankind coped creatively with *logics* that were changing and that the different designs that were developed ought not be ranked. The human rights vision seems to be the best suited for the *global village* because they can be understood as the appropriate application of *inside* ethics to the entirety of the globe.

Human Rights

In Lindner's work the central message of the human rights ideals is taken to be the message of equal dignity. Human rights stipulate that each human being possesses an inner core of dignity that ought not be humiliated. The first sentence in the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." There is a Kantian interpretation of human rights as abstract rights and a Lévinasian interpretation that rather highlights care for *the other*. Human rights is often promoted in the first sense and understood in the second.

Humiliation (a shortened definition)

In everyday language, the word humiliation is used threefold. Firstly, the word *humiliation* signifies an act, secondly a feeling, and thirdly, a process: "I humiliate you, you feel humiliated, and the entire process is one of humiliation." This triple meaning of the word humiliation complicates its use; sometimes *humiliation* indicates the feeling of a victim, sometimes the act of a perpetrator, sometimes the entire process from act to feeling. (In Lindner's work it is expected that the reader understands from the context which alternative is meant, because otherwise language would become too convoluted.)

The core meaning of humiliation is that it entails a downward push, down to the ground, to earth, Latin *humus*. This push can be perceived as violation or not, depending on the overall societal, cultural, and psychological framework. In cases when being pushed down and held down is perceived as violation, it will lead to suffering. It may lead to rage that may be turned inwards or outwards. Rage and fury turned inwards render feelings of depression, abandonment, anomie, and alienation. Rage and fury turned outwards feed violence, even mass violence.

However, in cases where being put down is interpreted as "honorable medicine," it will not elicit the same consequences. Societal conditions such as inequality or relative deprivation are only perceived as painful humiliation in cases where they are perceived as illegitimate violation.

As discussed earlier, humiliation is a word that is used for the act of humiliation perpetrated by a perpetrator; it is also used as a word for the feeling of humiliation felt by a victim. However, situations of humiliation can also occur when only one side labels it as such. For example, help may humiliate. In that case there is a benevolent helper on one side and no evil perpetrator at all. Yet, this help may still result in feelings of humiliation in the recipient. Only one participant identifies this event as humiliation, the other labels it as help.

Or, neither actor nor victim may define a situation as humiliating, only a third party. The social worker wants to rescue the battered wife, but she claims that beating her is her husband's way of loving her. Or, Marx talked about false consciousness when workers did not feel humiliated and were less enthusiastic to stage a revolution. In this case, both is lacking, perpetrator and victim, seen from the participants' point of view; still the situation enters the discussion as a case of humiliation, yet through a third party.

Then, you may expect that humiliation is always avoided, however, some people seek it, for example in sado-masochism, or religious rites, where people whip and humiliate themselves to praise God. Thus, humiliation is an act, an emotional state, and a social mechanism, which is relevant for anthropology, sociology, philosophy, social and clinical psychology, political science. I believe it is this multidisciplinary that may be the reason for why the notion of humiliation has almost not been studied on its own account so far.

According to Lindner's analysis all human beings basically yearn for recognition and respect. It is when people perceive that recognition and respect are withdrawn or denied that they may feel humiliated. And since feelings of humiliation are a strong force to create rifts between people it breaks down relationships. Whether a withdrawal of recognition is real or the result of a misunderstanding, still the perceiver is prone to feel humiliated, whether he or she is rich or poor, marginalized or not. Thus, it is suggested that the desire for recognition unites us human beings and that it is universal and can serve as a platform for contact and cooperation. Consequently, many of the rifts that we observe may stem from an equally universal phenomenon, namely the humiliation that is felt when recognition and respect is perceived as lacking.

Humility

Humility is the renouncement of arrogance. Humility is a virtue that requires bowing. Arrogant people believe they can take down the sky and do the impossible. Humble people, on the other side, recognize that there may be limits. Shaming often tries to elicit humility. Shaming is therefore the current business of civil society. Corporations and governments are being *shamed* into abiding to the promises of humility they made. They are asked if they are not ashamed of cutting down the trees that are the backbone of a healthy global climate. Humility is the acknowledgement of the embeddedness of every living creature on Earth within a fragile bio-sphere. Humility is also the acknowledgement of equal dignity for every human being, and more dignity for animals.

Individual and group

See group and individual.

Information age

In Lindner's work the attempt is made to detach from terms and concepts such as information age, and punctuate history in an alternative way. The information age is regarded as an epiphenomenon of two other transitions that may be labeled as *globalization* and *egalization*. Knowledge, that characterized the currently unfolding information age, represents an expandable pie and thus is regarded in Lindner's work as

an element that contributes to more *benign* outfalls of conflicts.

Justice

See peace.

Modernity

In Lindner's work the attempt is made to detach from terms and concepts such as modernity, and punctuate history in an alternative way. Modernity is regarded as an epiphenomenon of two other transitions that may be labeled as globalization and egalization.

Peace

Peace can be defined in two profoundly irreconcilable ways. Firstly, the label *peace* may mean the stillness resulting from elites successfully keeping down underlings; secondly it can describe the voluntary bowing of dignified citizens to commonly agreed-upon rules and super-ordinate institutions. The first definition is linked to the traditional honor context, the latter to a human rights based worldview of equal dignity for everybody.

Similar to words such as *stability*, *security*, or *justice*, the label *peace* can thus be used by masters who wish to defend their privileges and at the same time by underlings who call for more equality. The fact that these labels can be applied to so profoundly diametrically opposed goals and mindsets makes the unqualified use of these terms almost redundant. They may mean one thing, however, at the same time they may mean the square opposite. In the *global village* *peace*, *stability*, *security*, and *justice* may mean, "Peace, stability security and justice are attained when we topdogs have successfully silenced underdog protest," or, "Peace, stability, security, and justice are attained when all citizens are included in a global village in which globalization has married egalization."

In Lindner's work, the use of labels such as *peace*, *stability* or *security* is in many cases avoided, unless these terms are specifically discussed. The term *social peace* is sometimes used and is in those cases meant to cover the human rights based version of a *global village* where globalization has married egalization.

Pie of Resources

A pie of resources can be expandable or fixed. A fixed pie yields a win-lose context, an expandable pie a win-win situation. The abundance of wild foods for early hunters and gatherers represents an expandable pie of resources that does not force opponents into win-lose paradigms. When abundance falters, win-lose games emerge. In the course of human history, agriculturalists attempted to expand resources by *intensification*. In modern knowledge society, knowledge represents an expandable pie of resources, and thus potentially a win-win game.

Post-Modernity

In Lindner's work the attempt is made to detach from terms and concepts such as post-modernity, and punctuate history in an alternative way. Post-modernity is regarded as an

epiphenomenon of two other transitions that may be labeled as globalization and egalization.

Pride

Pride in Lindner's work is defined as the psychological state that emerges when I trust that nature will provide for me, when I even "expect" to be provided for, and when I have not yet experienced systematic subjugation at the hand of other human beings. The notion of pride is used by Lindner to characterize the psychological make-up of hunters and gatherers who move in environments of abundance and a weak *security dilemma*.

Respect

Pride, honor and dignity are all possible "targets" for respect. However, respecting honor is not the same as respecting dignity. Otherwise comments would not be possible as the following, commenting honor killings, "How archaic and primitive! Don't these people understand that they violate their own dignity through such cruel concepts of honor?" This sentence unveils how concepts of honor and dignity may deeply oppose each other and how respecting them may have completely different outfalls. A beaten woman may "respect" the hierarchical patriarchic honor order by humbly accepting being beaten, while another woman may reject being beaten on the grounds that she wants her dignity to be respected.

Security

See peace.

Security dilemma

The *security dilemma* could be described as follows: "I have to amass power, because I am scared. When I amass weapons, you get scared. You amass weapons, I get more scared." Thus an arms race and finally war are likely to be triggered. In such a context, even the most *benign* sovereign is compelled to be belligerent because he is the victim of the *security dilemma*. So-called *classical* and *structural realism*, two *early international relations* theories, see the *security dilemma* as unavoidable. The *security dilemma* makes it very dangerous to live in a world of several *villages* (as opposed to *One global village*). War between *villages* is almost inescapable and calm and quiet continuously disturbed.

The *security dilemma* can be heightened or attenuated. A culture of male prowess tends to be a response to a strong *security dilemma* and makes it even stronger. In Germany, for example, at the outset of World War I, a *cult of the offensive*, a *cult of militarism*, a *cult of having to hit before being attacked* increased the problem instead of solving it.

The *security dilemma* can also get weaker. This happens, when more actors play a role than only heads of states, as, for example, civil society. And it gets more *benign* when *villages* get interdependent and begin to communicate in ways that make it possible to discern the motives of *the other*. The *security dilemma* gets weaker when *villages* are being drawn closer together and trust can be built between *villagers*. Its logical underpinnings disappear as soon as there is only *One single village*, such as the *global village*.

Shame

Shame in Lindner's work is differentiated from the notion of humiliation. Shame is what I agree to; humiliation is what I do not agree to. Shame is seen as humbling that at some point has been accepted by the person who feels this shame. Humiliation, on the other side, is seen as perpetrated by somebody else and deeply rejected by the party who feels humiliated. I blush when I break wind inadvertently; I am ashamed even if nobody notices it. I am ashamed precisely because I have learned to subscribe to the notion that farting as a transgression of decent behavior that is demarcated by shame.

Shame is widely regarded as an asset. A human being that is not capable of shame is seen as a monster. Shame is what keeps human society within the limits of social rules and regulations. We all hope that shame will deter our neighbors from lying to us and stealing from us. More so, I hope that my neighbor will feel guilty and not have an affair with my spouse. Guilt can be defined as moral shame, shame over moral shortcomings. With other words, we all hope that our neighbors will humbly bow to the rules and regulations, which safeguard that our community can live together in harmony. We hope that shame and guilt will limit social disruption and we therefore deem these forms of shame and guilt as highly valuable.

Stability

See peace.

Trauma

Trauma can be caused by events such as natural disasters; however, Lindner suggests that deep trauma is caused by humiliation. It is one thing to have my house destroyed by an earthquake and another to have bulldozers leveling it. In the case of an earthquake, people can stand together and help each other to overcome trauma. There is no perpetrator and no need for hatred. However, as soon as I am harmed by a fellow human being, in a way I deem to be a violation, I may feel traumatized in a way an earthquake can never forge. In societies characterized by the honor code, harming underlings is seen as legitimate and underlings are not supposed to view this as violation. Thus, in such contexts the trauma definition is usually not applied when pain is inflicted and harm done. However, in societies based on human rights ideals, the situation is different. Many practices of humiliation that previously were regarded as "honorable duty" perpetrated on underlings who "deserved" it, move into the category of trauma in a context of human rights.

Trust

Trust, at its basis, is the illusion that we know what is happening in our neighbors' hearts and minds. In reality, nobody can ever know anything definite about neighbors. We even do not know what we ourselves are capable of doing or not and whether we can trust ourselves (many people promise themselves to stop smoking, for example, without actually managing to do it).

Some people trust blindly; however, it seems preferential to proceed in a more measure

fashion. *Tit-for-tat* strategies that start with cooperation and continue cooperating only with cooperators seem to be optimal. Repeated successful encounters with a person thus can increase trust. Yet, hundred percent certainty as to the other's intentions, motives, feelings and deliberations can never be attained. Thus, trust in my neighbors is the educated hunch that they will not kill or otherwise harm me.

The emergence of trust is facilitated when people are included into *my ingroup*. The very same person, merely by being framed as member of *my ingroup*, will be judged more leniently as if this person were member of *my outgroup*. *Ingroup* members believe that *we* wish to mainly care for *our* loved ones and not harm the rest.

Thus, the coming-into-being of the *global village*, and its push towards framing the entirety of humankind as *One single ingroup*, represents a push towards global trust. However, dynamics of humiliation may undermine this trust and damage the underlying benign tendency of globalization.