The thesis of this chapter is that relations that are characterized by human dignity are essential to a harmonious, sustainable peace at all levels of human life, from the interpersonal to the international. Humiliation in contrast, whether one is the humiliated or the humiliator, leads to psychological states that destroy or prevent harmonious relations. In this chapter, I discuss several of the psychological components of relations that sustain human dignity. I posit that these psychological components not only require non-humiliating, dignified relations but also induce such relations, in line with my Crude Law of Social Relations (Deutsch __).

Below, I list the psychological components of sustainable, harmonious, peaceful relations. Here, I shall discuss only the first four components. All are discussed more fully in Coleman and Deutsch (in press).

1. Effective Cooperation
2. Constructive Conflict Resolution
3. Social Justice
4. Satisfaction of Basic Human Needs and Emotions
5. Creative Problem Solving
7. Reconciliation

*The Psychological Components of a Harmonious, Sustainable Peace*

It is well to recognize that my discussions of the major psychological components of a sustainable peace does not mean to imply that such other factors as the economic, political,
institutional, and spiritual are not critical to the development and maintenance of a sustainable peace.

*Effective Cooperation*

Much research (Deutsch, in press, Johnson and Johnson 2005) has demonstrated that the typical effects of effective cooperation also tend to induce such cooperation. The typical effects include:

1. Effective, open, honest communication.
2. Friendliness, helpfulness, and positive attitudes toward one another develop.
3. The parties work together productively to achieve their common goals through coordination of effort, division of labor, and an orientation to task achievement.
4. Confidence in self and others grow as well as a sense of similarities in beliefs of values as they work together effectively.
5. There is an increased sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of the others.
6. Respectful and fair treatment of one another become important values.
7. Willingness to enhance the others' power (knowledge, skills, resources, and so on) to achieve the others' goals increases. You are strengthened as they are strengthened.
8. Attempts to influence the other are confined to processes of persuasion.
9. Defining conflicting interests as a mutual problem to be resolved by collaborative effort enhances the search for a creative solution responsive to the needs of all.

*Constructive Conflict Resolution*

As indicated above, effective cooperation induces a cooperative orientation to a conflict and enables them to reframe their conflict as a mutual problem to be resolved through cooperative effort among the conflicting parties. For such cooperative effort to result in
successful, constructive resolution of the conflict, it is helpful if the participants adhere to the social norms, and acquire the skills, of constructive conflict resolution.

*Social norms for constructive conflict resolution.* Some of the norms are:

- Place the disagreements in perspective by identifying common ground and common interests.

- When there is disagreement, address the issues and refrain from making personal attacks.

- When there is disagreement, seek to understand the other’s views from his or her perspective; try to feel what it would be like if you were on the other’s side.

- Build on the ideas of the other, fully acknowledging their value.

- Emphasize the positive in the other and the possibilities of constructive resolution of the conflict. Limit and control expression of your negative feelings so that they are primarily directed at the other’s violation of cooperative norms (if that occurs), or at the other’s defeatism.

- Take responsibility for the harmful consequences—unwitting as well as intended—of what you do and say; seek to undo the harm as well as openly accept responsibility and make sincere apology for it.

- If the other harms you, be willing to forgive if the other accepts responsibility for doing so, sincerely apologizes, and is willing to try to undo it; seek reconciliation rather than nurturing an injury or grudge.

- Be responsive to the other’s legitimate needs.

- Empower the other to contribute effectively to the cooperative effort; solicit the other’s views, listen responsively, share information, and otherwise help the other - when necessary - to be an active, effective participant in the cooperative problem-solving process.
• Be appropriately honest. Being dishonest, attempting to mislead or deceive, is of course a violation of cooperative norms. However, one can be unnecessarily and inappropriately truthful. In most relationships, there is usually some ambivalence, a mixture of positive as well as negative thoughts and feelings about the other and about oneself. Unless the relationship has developed to a very high level of intimacy, communicating every suspicion, doubt, fear, and sense of weakness one has about oneself or the other is apt to be damaging to the relationship—particularly if the communication is blunt, unrationalized, and unmodulated. In effect, one should be open and honest in communication but appropriately so, realistically taking into account the consequences of what one says or does not say and the current state of the relationship.

• Throughout conflict, remain a moral person—therefore, a person who is caring and just—and consider the other as a member of one’s moral community—therefore, as a person who is entitled to care and justice.

Skills for constructive conflict resolution. Skills are also vitally important if one wishes to develop and implement successfully an effective, cooperative problem-solving process. There has not been much systematic discussion of the skills involved in constructive solutions to conflict. There are, I believe, three main kinds useful to the participants in a conflict as well as to third parties (such as mediators, conciliators, counselors, or therapists) who are called on to provide assistance to conflicting parties. For convenience, I label them “rapport-building skills,” “cooperative conflict resolution skills,” and “group process and decision-making skills.”

First, there are the skills involved in establishing effective working relationships with each of the conflicting parties, and between the conflicting parties if you are the mediator; or with the other, if you are a participant. Some of the components of this broad category include such skills
as breaking the ice; reducing fears, tensions, and suspicion; overcoming resistance to negotiation; establishing a framework for civil discourse and interaction; and fostering realistic hope and optimism. Thus, before negotiations begin between two individuals or groups perceiving each other as adversaries, it is often useful to have informal social gatherings or meetings in which the adversaries can get to know one another as human beings who share some similar interests and values. Skill in breaking the ice and creating a safe, friendly atmosphere for interaction between the adversaries is helpful in developing the prenegotiation experiences likely to lead to effective negotiations about the issues in dispute.

A second, related set of skills concerns developing and maintaining a cooperative conflict resolution process among the parties throughout their conflict. These are the skills that are usually emphasized in practicum courses or workshops on conflict resolution. They include identifying the type of conflict in which you are involved; reframing the issues so the conflict is perceived as a mutual problem to be resolved cooperatively; active listening and responsive communication; distinguishing between needs and positions; recognizing and acknowledging the other's needs as well as your own; encouraging, supporting, and enhancing the other; taking the perspective of the other; identifying shared interests and other similarities in values, experiences, and so on; being alert to cultural differences and the possibilities of misunderstanding arising from them; controlling anger; dealing with difficult conflicts and difficult people; being sensitive to the other's anxieties and hot buttons and how to avoid pressing them; and being aware of your own anxieties and hot buttons as well as your tendencies to be emotionally upset and misperceiving if they are pressed so that these can be controlled.

A third set of skills are involved in developing a creative and productive group problem-solving and decision-making process. These include skills pertinent to group process, leadership,
and effective group discussion, such as goal and standard setting; monitoring progress toward group goals; eliciting, clarifying, coordinating, summarizing, and integrating the contributions of the various participants; and maintaining group cohesion. The third set also includes such problem-solving and decision-making skills as identifying and diagnosing the nature of the problem confronting the group; acquiring the relevant information necessary for developing possible solutions; creating or identifying several possible, alternative solutions; choosing the criteria for evaluating the alternatives (such as the “effects” on economic costs and benefits, on relations between the conflicting parties, and on third parties); selecting the alternative that optimizes the results on the chosen criteria; and implementing the decision through appropriate action.

Social Justice

What is Social Justice? As Evelin Lindner (2006, 2009) has well-discussed, conceptions of social justice have evolved during the course of human history and have varied in different cultures. The most universal and authoritative statement regarding social justice and its values is incorporated in The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations on December 10, 1948.

Democratic egalitarianism pervades the 30 articles of the Declaration. Effective cooperation among and within nations (i.e., among the individuals, groups, and institutions which comprise national and international groupings) is necessary to create the social, material, and environmental conditions that are conducive to democratic egalitarianism. Egalitarianism is expressed in the first sentence of the Preamble to the Declaration. “Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the
foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world..." In my book, *Distributive Justice* (Deutsch, 1985, pp. 41–42), I have written about equality and egalitarianism as follows:

The concept of equality has been discussed extensively by moral and political philosophers (Berlin, 1955–1956; Tawney, 1964; McCloskey, 1966; Wilson, 1966; Benn, 1967; Pennock and Chapman, 1967; Oppenheim, 1968; Rawls, 1971; Dworkin, 1981a,b; Walzer, 1983). In the vast literature dealing with equality, it is defined in various ways. I shall not attempt to summarize or critically examine this literature. My sense of it is that advocates of equality and egalitarianism are primarily opposed to invidious distinctions among people but do not assume that all distinctions are invidious. Invidious distinctions are ones that promote (1) generalized or irrelevant feelings of superiority–inferiority (if I am a better tennis player or more good-looking than you, I am superior to you as a person); (2) generalized or irrelevant status differences (if I am a manager and you are a worker in a factory, I should have a higher standard of living than you); (3) generalized or irrelevant superordinate–subordinate relations (if I am a captain and you are a private, I can order you to shine my shoes); or (4) the view that the legitimate needs and interests of some people are not as important or do not warrant as much consideration as those of other people (this may be because of my sex, race, age, national or family origin, religion, political affiliation, occupation, or physical handicap, or because of special talents or lack of talent).

Egalitarianism is conducive to effective cooperation in that it promotes social harmony, which in turn promotes mutual aid and the efficient specialization of function in cooperative work. (See Deutsch (1990) for a discussion of the psychological consequences of different forms of social organization.) Although the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not imply that all individuals, groups, or categories of people are treated identically or have the same positions in society, it does imply that the material and social conditions that affect individual well-being are distributed so that there are not gross, systematic disparities in the well-being, opportunities for human development, or the rights of people, individually or collectively. Of course, due to inadequate knowledge, there is considerable uncertainty and conflict about how to create a world which would actualize the values of the Universal Declaration. In this paper, my discussion of forms of injustice and oppression assumes that systematic, large inequalities of the kinds described earlier are unjust.

*Distributive justice.* Every type of system—from a society to a family—distributes benefits, costs, and harms (its reward systems are a reflection of this). One can examine the different forms of capital (consumption, investment, skill, social) and such benefits as income, education, health care, police protection, housing, and water supplies, and such harms as
accidents, rapes, physical attacks, imprisonment, death, and rat bites, and see how they are distributed among categories of people: rich versus poor, males versus females, employers versus employees, Whites versus Blacks, heterosexuals versus homosexuals, police officers versus teachers, adults versus children. Such examination reveals gross disparities in distribution of one or another benefit or harm received by the categories of people involved. Thus, Blacks generally receive fewer benefits and more harm than Whites in the United States. In most parts of the world, female children are less likely than male children to receive as much education or inherit parental property, and they are more likely to suffer from sexual abuse.

Procedural injustice. In addition to assessing the fairness of the distribution of outcomes, individuals judge the fairness of the procedures that determine the outcomes (see Lind and Tyler, 1988, for a comprehensive discussion of procedural justice). Research evidence indicates that fair treatment and procedures are a more pervasive concern to most people than fair outcomes. Fair procedures are psychologically important because they encourage the assumption that they give rise to fair outcomes in the present and will also in the future. In some situations, where it is not clear what “fair outcomes” should be, fair procedures are the best guarantee that the decision about outcomes is made fairly. Research indicates that one is less apt to feel committed to authorities, organizations, social policies, and governmental rules and regulations if the procedures associated within them are considered unfair. Also, people feel affirmed if the procedures to which they are subjected treat them with the respect and dignity they feel is their due; if so treated, it is easier for them to accept a disappointing outcome.

Retributive injustice. Retributive injustice is concerned with the behavior and attitudes of people, especially those in authority, in response to moral rule breaking. One may ask: Are “crimes” by different categories of people less likely to be viewed as crimes, to result in an
arrest, to be brought to trial, to result in conviction, to lead to punishment or imprisonment or the
death penalty, and so on? Considerable disparity is apparent between how “robber barons” and
ordinary robbers are treated by the criminal-justice system, between manufacturers who
knowingly sell injurious products (obvious instances being tobacco and defective automobiles)
and those who negligently cause an accident. Similarly, almost every comparison of the
treatment of Black and White criminal offenders indicates that, if there is a difference, Blacks
receive worse treatment.

*Moral exclusion.* Moral exclusion is about who is and is not entitled to fair outcomes and
fair treatment by inclusion or lack of inclusion in one’s moral community. Albert Schweitzer
included all living creatures in his moral community, and some Buddhists include all of nature.
Most of us define a more limited moral community. Individuals and groups who are outside the
boundary in which considerations of fairness apply may be treated in ways that would be
considered immoral if people within the boundary were so treated. At various periods in history
and in different societies, groups and individuals have been treated inhumanly by other humans:
slaves by their masters, natives by colonialists, Blacks by Whites, Jews by Nazis, women by
men, children by adults, the physically disabled by those who are not, homosexuals by
heterosexuals, political dissidents by political authorities, and one ethnic or religious group by
another.

Moral exclusion “is perhaps the most dangerous form of oppression” (Young, 1990, p. 53). It has led to genocide against the Jews and gypsies by the Nazis, the Turkish genocide of the
Armenians, the autogenocide by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, the genocides in Rwanda and
Darfur, the mass killings of the political opposition by the Argentinian generals, widespread
terrorism against civilians by various terrorist groups, and the enslavement of many Africans, to
mention only a few examples of the consequences of moral exclusion. Lesser forms of moral exclusions and marginalization occur also against whole categories of people—women, the physically impaired, the elderly, and various ethnic, religious, and racial groups—in many societies where barriers prevent them from full participation in the political, economic, and social life of their societies. The results of these barriers are not only material deprivation but also disrespectful, demeaning, and arbitrary treatment as well as decreased opportunity to develop and employ their individual talents. For extensive research and writing in this area, see the work of Susan Opotow (1987, 1990, 1995, 1996a, b, 2001).

*Cultural imperialism.* "Cultural Imperialism involves the universalization of a dominant group’s experience and culture and establishing it as the norm" (Young, 1990, p. 59). Those living under cultural imperialism find themselves defined by the dominant others. As Young (op. cit) points out: “Consequently, the differences of women from men, American Indians or Africans from Europeans, Jews from Christians, becomes reconstructed as deviance and inferiority.” To the extent that women, Africans, Jews, Muslims, homosexuals, etc. must interact with the dominant group whose culture mainly provides stereotyped images of them, they are often under pressure to conform to and internalize the dominant group’s images of their group.

*SatIsfaction of Basic Human Needs*

The most influential description of basic human needs is one made by Maslow (1970). Initially, he postulated a hierarchy of human needs and, here, they are presented in his order of priority:

- Physiological needs: for air, water, and food, and the need to maintain equilibrium in the blood and body tissues in relation to various substances and the type of cell. Frustration of these needs leads to apathy, illness, disability, and death.
• Safety needs: for security, freedom from fear and anxiety, shelter, protection from danger, order, and predictable satisfaction of one’s basic needs. Here, frustration leads to fear, anxiety, rage, and psychosis.

• Belongingness and love needs: to be part of a group (a family, a circle of friends), to feel cared for, to care for someone, to be intimate with someone, and so forth. Frustration produces alienation, loneliness, and various forms of neurosis.

• Esteem needs: for self-esteem (self-confidence, mastery, worth, strength, and the like) and social esteem (respect, dignity, appreciation, and so on). Feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, helplessness, incompetence, shame, guilt, and the like, are associated with frustration of these needs.

• Self-actualization needs: to become the kind of person one is most suited to become; to realize one’s full potential in relatedness to others, in developing talents, and in participating in one’s community. The need for self-actualization also includes such meta-needs as truth, curiosity, justice, beauty, aliveness, playfulness, and the like.

The arbitrary withholding of the means for the satisfaction of many of these basic human needs, or gross discrimination in the availability of such means, is likely to be experienced as unjust, as humiliating, and as an attack on one’s dignity. Effective cooperation and constructive conflict resolution are unlikely unless basic human needs are treated fairly. While satisfaction of basic human needs facilitates effective cooperation and constructive conflict resolution, these can occur even under severe hardships with regard to psychological and safety needs. Thus, despite very limited food and water, as well as considerable threat to security and life, cohesive groups of people have sometimes worked together effectively in confronting dire situations.

*The Psychological States of the Humiliator-Oppressor and the Humiliated-Oppressed*
Common reactions to being humiliated - submission, depression, helplessness, and rage - do not foster the development of psychological components which foster a harmonious sustainable peace. Nor do the common psychological states associated with being a humiliator-oppressor; domination, power seeking, arrogance, aggression against challenges, fear of loss of control, contempt for the weak. Below I characterize the distorted relationship between the humiliator-oppressor and the humiliated-oppressed.

*The Oppressed.* Imagine the situation of an oppressed or abused child, wife, employee, or citizen. Each is in some critical way dependent upon the oppressor—the parent, the husband, the employer (company or organization), and the governing undemocratic power. Suppose the oppressed has needs or desires of which the oppressor strongly disapproves (e.g., physical affection, self-esteem, autonomy, self-determination) or only allows their expression in distorted dissatisfying, self-abusive forms. The reaction of the oppressed is apt to be one of frustration→anger→anxiety if the oppressor indicates, even subtly, that the oppressed will be severely punished if the oppressed expresses her desires, frustrations, or anger. One way of reducing the anxiety aroused by the temptations to manifest the forbidden desires is to build an internal barrier to their expression by internalizing the threat through *identification with the oppressor* (Freud, 1937). Doing so leads, at one level, to guilt and self-hatred for having these desires. At a deeper level, it leads to guilt and self-hatred for abandoning one’s self, as well as rage and a sense of moral superiority toward the oppressor who is responsible for this abandonment. As a result of these processes, submission and obedience to the oppressor, as well as depression, are commonly found among the oppressed when they are interacting with oppressors or when they are in oppressive situations.
However, it should be recognized that many who experience oppression in some aspects of their life do not necessarily experience it in other aspects, so that they are not necessarily submissive and depressed personalities racked by guilt, self-hatred, and rage in all situations. Damage to the personalities of oppressed people will be limited, even when exposed to pervasive oppression, if they are also part of a supportive, cohesive community whose values oppose oppression.

The Oppressor. If we were to examine the oppressors psychologically—the child abusers, the husbands who batter their wives, brutal bosses, and political tyrants—I believe that we would find that the oppressors need the oppressed. Their need to control and dominate the other, their intolerance of the autonomy of the other, makes them dependent upon having vulnerable, weaker others for the definition of their own power. Their own deep sense of vulnerability (anxieties about helplessness and impotence, guilt about forbidden desires and rage, self-hatred for vulnerability) leads to strong needs both to deny one’s vulnerability (by projection of one’s anxieties, guilt, and contempt onto others who are more vulnerable) and to have the power to control those who are vulnerable or can be made to be more vulnerable. The oppressor needs to be able to make demands, which are arbitrary and unreasonable so that the obedience of the oppressed is due to the oppressor’s power and not to the agreement of the oppressed. The oppressor’s intolerance of the autonomy of the oppressed is (Lichtenberg, 1990, p. 26) “neither idle nor freely chosen; it is a function of dependence on the vulnerable others for the definition of his or her own power.”

One can, of course, be more powerful in a relationship (such as a parent-child, employer-employee relationship) without being an oppressor. Power can be used “for” the other rather than “against” the other.
The Psychodynamic Relationship of the Oppressor and the Oppressed.

There are structural similarities between the sadomasochistic and the oppressor-oppressed relationship. Each side of the relationship has some of the latent qualities of the other side: the sadist when he is whipping the masochist is also whipping himself; the oppressor when he is controlling the oppressed is controlling himself. The masochistic, when whipped, is also having the sadist within himself punished. Similarly, the oppressed who is being controlled is also having his rage controlled.

It seems obvious that not all oppressors have “oppressive” personalities nor do all the oppressed have “oppressed” personalities in the sense that they do not consistently prefer and seek out relationships where they can be the “oppressors” or the “oppressed.” Nevertheless, I suggest that in any longstanding oppressive relationship, both the psychodynamics within its participants as well as social expectations will contribute to its persistence and resistance to change. Thus, in Afghanistan (despite the ending of the rule of the Taliban and their exposure to different models of family relationships on TV), many wives will continue to believe that their husbands have the right to beat them if they disobey them.

I conclude this section of my discussion by stating that any attempt to end long-enduring oppressive relations will have to address the psychodynamic issues which lead people to resist changing unhappy but familiar relationships. Some of the anxieties and fears that have to be addressed for the oppressed and oppressor are listed as follows:

1. Both feel anxious in the face of the unknown. They believe that they will be foolish, humiliated, or helpless, in a new unclear relationship.

2. Both fear the guilt and self-contempt for their roles in maintaining the oppressive relationship.
3. The oppressed fears that their rage will be unleashed; the oppressor is in terror of this rage.

4. Both fear punishment, if they change; the oppressed from the oppressor, the oppressor from the oppressed and other oppressors.

5. Both anticipate loss from the change: the oppressed will lose their sense of moral superiority and the excuses of victimhood; the oppressor will lose the respect and material benefits associated with being more powerful.

Concluding Statement

How do we change the relations between the oppressor-humiliator and the oppressed-humiliated? It is not easy to do. However, I suggest that we must seek to actualize the psychological components, outlines in the beginning of the paper, that sustain human dignity. Doing this will also require attention to and changes in the social, economic, political, institutional, ideological, and religious elements that sustain oppression. (See Deutsch, 2006, “A Framework for Thinking About Oppression and Its Change” for a further discussion.)


