

CHAPTER TWELVE
Emotion and Conflict:
Why It Is Important
to Understand How Emotions
Affect Conflict and How
Conflict Affects Emotions

Evelin G. Lindner

Lindner, Evelin G. (2006). Emotion and Conflict: Why It Is Important to Understand How Emotions Affect Conflict and How Conflict Affects Emotions. In Deutsch, Morton, Coleman, Peter T., and Marcus, Eric C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*. Second edition. Chapter twelve, pp. 268-293, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

We have all experienced strong emotions related to conflict. Our emotions affect the conflicts in our lives and conflict, in turn, influences our emotions.

This chapter begins with two brief examples, one international and one personal, to show the interaction between emotions and conflict. For the international example, let us look at World War II.

Hitler was an isolated and alienated loner obsessed by the weakness of Germany during World War I and after. At some point, however, his obsessions began to resonate with the feelings of what was called in Germany “the little people” (*die kleinen Leute*, or the powerless). He offered a grand narrative of national humiliation and invited “the little people” to join in with the personal grievances they suffered due to the general political and economic misery. “The little people” occupied a distinctly subordinated position in Germany’s social hierarchy prior to Hitler’s rise. They rallied to Hitler’s cause because he provided them with a sense of importance. He was greeted as a savior, as a new kind of leader promising them love and unprecedented significance instead of insignificance. Only after World War II did they have to painfully recognize how he had abused their loyalty. As soon as he had enough popular support, Hitler built institutions that forced his manipulation on everybody, evoking noble feelings of loyalty and heroic resistance against humiliation, convincing the German people that the Aryan race was meant to lead and save the world. Hitler was an expert on feelings. Many Germans put such faith in Hitler that they followed

him until 1945, even when it became clear that the situation was doomed. Intense loyalty and highly emotional participation in a collective obsession undercut even the most basic rational and ethical considerations.

Now to a personal example: Envision yourself as a therapist with a client named Eve who came to you because she was depressed. She is severely and regularly beaten by her husband, Adam. Neighbors describe scenes of shouting and crying and the bruise marks on Eve's body are only too obvious. You are afraid Eve may not survive and you visit her as frequently as your schedule permits. You try to convince her to protect herself, by leaving her unsafe home to seek refuge in sheltered housing, at least at times of crisis. In your mind, you define her as a victim and her husband as a perpetrator. You explain to Eve that "domestic chastisement" has long been outlawed. You suggest that Adam utterly humiliates her and that she ought to develop a "healthy" anger as a first step toward collecting sufficient strength to change her life. To you, this situation clearly represents a destructive conflict loaded with hot and violent emotion and you wish to contribute to its constructive resolution.

Eve stubbornly undermines your efforts and thwarts your dedicated and well-intentioned attempts to help her. She argues along these lines: "Beating me is my husband's way of loving me! I am not a victim. I bring his anger on myself when I fail to respect his authority! He saved me from a cruel father! My father never spoke of love and care – Adam does!" And Adam adamantly refuses to be labeled a "perpetrator," accusing *you* of viciously disturbing the peace of his home and claiming that you violate his male honor.

From Adam's perspective, there is no destructive conflict, no suffering victim, and no violent perpetrator. It is you, the therapist, the human rights defender, an uninvited third party, who introduces conflict. The definition of love and benevolence is crucial here. You define love as the meeting of equal hearts and minds in mutual caring, a definition embedded in the human rights ideal of equal dignity for all. Eve and her husband, on the other hand, connect love with female subservience. You introduce conflict by drawing Eve's attention to a new definition of love, one that is in total opposition to the couple's definition.

We can easily link the example of Eve and Adam to events at the international level. Human rights framings of equal dignity for all do not always meet friendly acceptance in the supposed "perpetrators." The South African elites were defensive about Apartheid – they felt entitled to superiority. So-called "honor-killings" have only recently received attention. This practice has moved from the rather neutral category of "cultural practice" to the accusatory category of "violation of human rights." Or, consider the Indian caste system, which has only very recently been labeled "Indian Apartheid," a new definition for a way of life that has endured for thousands of years.

In this conundrum, in which emotions and conflict are entangled in painful ways, questions arise such as: When and in what ways are emotions (feelings

of suffering, pain and rage, or love and caring) part of a “conflict” that calls for our attention? And when are they not? Who decides? What we can be sure about is that emotions and conflict are not static. They are embedded into larger historical and cultural surroundings. We live in times of transition toward increasing global interdependence and more equal dignity for all. Emotion and conflict and their consequences – how we live them, how we define them – are part of this transition. They, too, change as the world transforms.

THE NATURE OF EMOTIONS

What are emotions? Are emotions cultural or biological, or both? Are they nothing more than constructs of folk knowledge? Are they merely bodily responses, dictated by hormones, skin conductance levels, and cerebral blood flows? Are there basic emotions? Affects? Feelings? Thoughts? Why do we have them? What functions do they serve? What about the so-called social emotions? Are there universal emotions across cultures? Are emotions rational? Controllable? To which actions do emotions lead? Is there an automatic link between emotion and action?

William James (1842-1910), one of the fathers of psychology, was interested in research on emotion; however, his immediate successors were much less so. Only a few visionary scholars, such as Silvan S. Tomkins, Magda B. Arnold, Paul Ekman, Carroll E. Izard, Klaus Scherer, and Nico H. Frijda, invested their energies in efforts to understand human emotion. The problem was that for a while behaviorism and cognitivism were “sexier” than the topic of emotion. However behaviorism turned out to be too narrow, as did cognitivism.

Today we know that thought, behavior, and feeling are closely connected. Hence, interest in learning about emotions, though resuscitated only very recently, is now exploding and already rapidly changing. Up until only a few years ago, researchers were intent upon constructing classifications categorizing the fundamental “basic” emotions. For those who are interested, Andrew Ortony and Terence J. Turner (1990) give a tabular overview of some of the classification systems.

Today, the new cohort of researchers no longer endorses a single perspective on emotion, preferring a multi-layered approach that conceptualizes elaborated emotions as comprehensive packages of meanings, behaviors, social practices, and norms that crystallize around primordial emotions. James R. Averill (1997) discusses how emotional experiences are “scripted.” Jan Smedslund (1997) describes the *psycho-logic* inherent in our dealings with emotion. The application of such scripts, however, varies according to cultural and historic influences. A rich overview of the new approaches to emotion research is to be found, among others, in David Yun Dai and Robert J. Sternberg (2004), Joseph P. Forgas (2001), or Tracy J. Mayne and George A. Bonanno (2001).

This approach has invalidated the old “nature versus nurture” debate. We are learning that emotions are both hardwired *and* malleable, and adaptive to social and cultural influences. Hardwired basic affects such as the fearful fight or flight reaction, or its opposite, pleasurable approach, are the bedrock on which elaborated emotions build. Our primordial emotions are universal biologically based response systems that have enabled humans to meet the problems of physical survival, reproduction, and group governance. Culture, however, has loosened the link between those primordial emotions and their functions. New solutions to old problems have emerged, as well as new uses for old emotions.

Humans display the greatest variety of feelings and emotions of all species and this is reflected in the complex web of connections between the more recently developed prefrontal area and the older limbic structures of the brain. The historical evolution of the brain and emotions is mirrored in each human being’s individual development. *Ontogeny* (development of an individual organism) often recapitulates *phylogeny* (evolution of a particular species). Newborns process basic affects in lower brain structures. Emotions which are more recent in human evolution become possible only when certain cognitive milestones have been reached in the life of a child. In the second half of the second year of life the cognitive capacity of objective self-awareness emerges, with accompanying emotions such as embarrassment, empathy, and envy. Between two and three years of age, the complex ability to evaluate one’s behavior according to an external or internal standard emerges. Self-conscious evaluative emotions such as pride, shame, or guilt are now possible. Schemas for emotions evolve to organize what we believe and how we react to emotions. Finally, cognition and affect are forcefully intertwined in cultural symbol and knowledge systems such as religions.

The most immediate function provided to us by our emotional apparatus is to warn us. Fear alerts us to potential danger or to potential benefit. We hear a noise. It could be a thief – or just our favorite cat. The first brain structure to react is the *amygdala*, an almond-shaped neuro-structure in the lower cortical brain. This structure identifies shapes, sounds, and other perceptual characteristics, sorting for threats and, very quickly and automatically, responding with avoidance if necessary. It acts as a pre-attentive analyzer of our environment and works without our conscious control, triggering fast and automatic emotional changes in autonomic tone and heart rate. Is it a thief? We jump up from our chair, breathe heavily, and feel frightened. Fear is a primary reaction that is processed via adrenergic neurons (as opposed to dopaminergic neurons). This system developed early in human evolution and dominates our first years as children. In adults, stress brings it to the fore again, often in unfortunate ways.

Let’s assume the noise proves to emanate from our favorite cat, back home from an excursion! If a situation shows itself to be rewarding, rather than a

threat, the amygdala can relax, passing the data on to the basal ganglia to encode and store, awash in positive-valence dopaminergic neurons. We get ready to approach the situation. We open our arms to our purring pet. This simple daily stimulus response is aided by information from two internal “library”-structures (left prefrontal cortex and a posterior area) from which our brain draws stored abstract semantic and associative knowledge. All this is automatic. We are not in control.

Our brain “wakes up” to controlled emotion processing when another, higher brain structure (the *anterior cingulate, ACC*) signals discrepancy, uncertainty, errors, conflicts, pain, or violations of expectations. The ACC tells us when something is wrong, when our automatic responses do not work and we need to do something different. At that point, two high cortical structures (*ventromedial frontal cortex [VMFC]* and *orbital frontal cortex [OFC]*) weigh our current goals and the affective value of the situation we face. We need these higher cortical structures particularly in conflict situations, because they empower us to regulate and control our emotional responses. Here we learn and adapt, and generate self-consciousness, abstraction, and imagination.

As we see, when Eve faces Adam – or when global neighbors negotiate nuclear disarmament – the participants’ brains loop through at least six brain structures that deal with emotion, from lower to higher brain structures, from evolutionarily older to more recent components, from stored memories of how we reacted as children to new modes of responses that are open to us as adults. There are several distinctions and dualities. Feelings can be hot or cold, they can be positive or negative, and they can be automatic or controlled. Furthermore, there is the doer-watcher duality. The duality of attention and processing is based on the fact that we can perform a task and at the same time watch ourselves performing this task. Emotions can interfere in this duality and disturb task focus and performance.

What we discussed so far indicates that emotions serve at least three functions. First, emotions monitor our inner world; second, they monitor our relationships with the outer world; and third, they help us act. There is order and coherence in these emotional processes, but that order can quickly degenerate into chaos if we are unaware and insufficiently in control. Research indicates that our behavior is regulated by feedback loops that are organized hierarchically. *Superordinate loops* attend to longer-term, abstract goals. Embedded within them are *subordinate loops* for short-term tasks. We create or maintain destructive conflict when we allow lower-order mechanisms to supersede higher-order mechanisms. We invite failure when we permit phylogenically more immediate and automated emotional processes to override more abstracted regulatory processes. Long-term goals require that we refrain from jumping at them with short-term mental tools.

Earlier, we discussed that emotions are hardwired *and* malleable. How can we imagine the various levels playing together in daily life? There is the

hardwired physiological response and negative state of “feeling bad” or, at the psychological level, “this is bad for me.” Parallel, there is the hardwired positive state of “feeling good” or “pleasure” or “this is good for me.” As the “me” acquires social identity, these basic responses form the nucleus for our more *elaborated* emotions toward other persons, groups, notions, or ideologies. Rejection and enmity as well as affection, attachment, loyalty, cooperation, and other positive emotions are no longer automatic. A very simple example shows this. Spiders or worms are greeted as welcome delicacies in some cultures, and in others with disgust. Or, for a vegetarian, eating meat is sickening, while it is a joy for a non-vegetarian. The example of Eve and Adam shows how our emotional reactions are embedded into broader historic transformations of normative contexts. The term “domestic chastisement” expresses positive valence – the “man of the house” has the right and duty to “chastise” his wife and children and it is regarded as “good” for all involved to be reminded of “their place.” Nowadays, particularly in social contexts influenced by human rights values, this term transmutes into the negative concept of “domestic violence.” In other words, the same sequence of behavior is no longer regarded as “good for everybody,” but as “bad for everybody.”

It would be easy to overwhelm readers with an over-abundance of concepts and terms at this point. Goals, attitudes, affects, feelings, emotions, emotional states, moods, consciousness, self, psyche – the list of terms is endless and often scholars do not agree on their definitions. For our purposes, it is sufficient to understand that we have to give up any quest for rigid context-free classifications of complex elaborated emotions. Elaborated emotions are multifaceted clusters embedded in culture and history. It is important to recognize, furthermore, that there is an ongoing tension between older, more primitive emotional responses and our more recently achieved capabilities. To some extent, we manage to resolve this tension through a series of hierarchically structured feedback loops. If we succeed, emotions can be helpful and guide us well. Unfortunately, those loops are too often overridden in conflict situations, when the older parts of the brain leap into action to ensure the organism’s immediate survival. This can lead to disaster. Learning to recognize and defuse this tension may be one of the most important skills an individual committed to healthy conflict resolution can achieve.

THE INTERACTION BETWEEN EMOTION AND CONFLICT

This section focuses on key emotions (negative and positive) such as fear, anger, humiliation, guilt, hope, confidence and warmth, illustrating how they affect conflict and are affected by conflict. What may happen when, during a conflict, one experiences an emotion as a dominant emotion and the likely consequences of trying to induce an emotion in the other (for example, trying to

make the other feel afraid, guilty, or humiliated) will be discussed. Furthermore, the issue of what distinguishes a “normal” from a “pathological” version of an emotion and under what circumstances an emotion may play a constructive or destructive role in a conflict or negotiation will be raised.

This section begins with the subject of fear, as a basic emotion processed in our “old” brain. From there, we will move on to more complex emotions.

Fear and How It Affects Conflict and Is Affected by Conflict

“The voice of intelligence is drowned out by the roar of fear. It is ignored by the voice of desire. It is contradicted by the voice of shame. It is biased by hate and extinguished by anger. Most of all, it is silenced by ignorance.” (Karl A. Menninger)

Fear can lead to an avoidance of conflict (“flight”), or to a counterphobic aggressive response (“fight”), or to a desire to avoid disaster by reaching an agreement. It can hamper constructive conflict resolution or enhance it when it sharpens our senses and alerts our thoughts.

As discussed earlier, fear is basic. Its seat in the brain is the amygdala. Fear warns us. It jolts us into alertness in a split second, sending stress hormones soaring, making our vision narrower and more focused. Our old brain takes over to save us from immediate danger. We may gain short-term safety. However, there is a price to pay.

In 1998, Adam Bixi was interviewed by this author in Somaliland. He described growing up in the Somalian semidesert, learning as a very small boy to be constantly alert, even at night, for dangerous animals and “enemies” from other clans. He learned to be ready for fight or flight in a matter of seconds, at any time, day or night. Continuous emergency preparedness meant that all other aspects of life had to wait. Emergency trumped everything else. Bixi felt he had not lived life. Modern managers often feel the same way. Continuous emergency alertness diminishes our zest for life. It may even lead to cardiac failure. Essentials such as sound long-term planning and institution building are neglected.

Earlier, we saw that feelings can be hot or cold and automatic or controlled. We have a hot “go” system and a cool “know” system. The cool “know” system is cognitive, complex, contemplative, slow, strategic, integrated, coherent, and emotionally rather neutral. It is the basis of self-regulation and self-control. Fear, as well as acute and chronic stress, accentuate the hot “go” system. The hot system is impulsive and hastily reactive and undermines rational attempts at self-control. Intense fear causes “tunnel vision,” reducing the range of one’s perceptions, thoughts, and choices, risking that we make suboptimal decisions.

In other words, the hot “go” system represents a double-edged sword. It may save us from immediate danger. However, in case of a complex conflict, fear easily operates malignly. Fear and humiliation have the potential to link up in particularly disastrous ways. In Rwanda, fear of future humiliation, based on

the experience of past humiliation, was used as justification for genocide. In his speeches, Hitler peddled that he feared future humiliation by the World Jewry. The Holocaust was his horrific “solution.”

To conclude, we are well advised to cool down when we experience fear during a conflict, in order to avoid disastrous tunnel vision and reap the potential advantage of fear, enhanced alertness. Likewise, we should help our opponents in conflicts and in negotiations to calm their fears. In negotiations, operating with threats – making others afraid – may undermine constructive solutions rather than provide advantages.

Let us consider the example of Eve and Adam. At some point they both seek counseling. The counselor begins with reducing the level of threat and fear between them. The therapist works on transforming their fears into alertness and motivation for change. Adam is afraid to lose power and Eve is afraid to be empowered. Tackled in a calm manner, these fears can be translated into deep personal growth for both. However, this is possible only in an atmosphere of warm firmness that provides safety, an atmosphere of respect, love, understanding, empathy, and patience, all of which the therapist needs to make available, aided by the larger social support network.

Anger and Hatred, and How They Affect Conflict and Are Affected by Conflict

We easily get angry when we feel hurt. Sometimes we even kick a chair that stood in our way and gave us a bruise. Yet, anger is a more composite set of mental processes than fear. It unfolds in a complex fashion in time and entails cognitive and emotional elements. Our brain does three things. First, it maps a comprehensive representation of the thing, animal, or person who has hurt us; second, it maps the state of our body, for example our readiness to fight; and third, it maps the kind of relationship we have to the perpetrator and how we might respond. For example, we usually refrain from hitting our boss or a sumo wrestler.

We react with anger – rather than sympathy – when we believe the other person, either through neglect or intentionally, treats us with disrespect. The more we feel hurt, the more we get angry. We get angry when we deem that the person who hurts us has sufficient control over the situation to avoid harming us (the so-called *controllability* dimension). We get even angrier when we infer that the other intended to hurt us. Indeed, research shows that we want to harm others, either overtly or covertly, when we believe they could have avoided hurting us. It is one thing to be pushed accidentally by a drunken man, another to be harmed deliberately by an apparently clearheaded man. As Keith G. Allred (2000) explains, it is crucial how we *attribute* – in the case of the pushing man, whether we attribute his behavior to drunkenness or to fully conscious malevolence.

Our beliefs as to why others behave as they do are being addressed by *attribution theory*, one of the dominant paradigms in social psychology. Fritz Heider (1958) is regarded to be the first attribution theorist. This theory has been elaborated since and has been instrumental in shedding light on biases of which we are unaware and that can hamper conflict resolution – we know, for example, the *fundamental attribution error* or the *actor-observer bias*. The fundamental attribution error and the actor-observer bias refer to the tendency to attribute behavior coming from the other (for example, hostile remarks) to the other's personality dispositions rather than to transient circumstances (such as your belittling remarks) while you attribute your own hostile remarks to circumstances (such as his hostile remarks) rather than your own dispositions. During a contentious conflict this may lead each side to overestimate the other's hostility as well as one's own benignness. (For further discussion of attribution theory see Gilbert, 1998; Jones and Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967; and Ross, 1977.)

For both Eve and Adam, anger can lead to destruction – or open a path to personal growth. Adam is angry that Eve is not submissive enough, while Eve does not dare to be angry at his wrath – frightened by him, and the possibility and the strength of her own anger, she seeks relief in subservience. The therapist attempts to transform the explosive fury that Adam projects onto Eve into deeper reflection on his own growth. The therapist ultimately invites Adam to relinquish using anger as an easy-to-use escape route and instead face deeper feelings of hurt and pain that lie buried. She explains to Eve and Adam that the new normative universe of mutual respect for equal dignity defines concepts such as love, loyalty, cooperation, attachment, connection, and relationship in profoundly new ways. She encourages Eve to embrace these new ways and no longer efface herself in front of Adam. It is important for Eve to dare to feel anger, at least sometimes – not frantic rage and hatred – but a definite firmness that she can use for constructing a richer and more comprehensive repertoire of being a person than merely shrinking into a self-effacing servant.

If we consider intergroup or international relations, the world will benefit from everybody getting firmly angry in the face of abuse instead of disengaging and looking away. What we have to heed, though, is that anger must be translated into Mandela-like strategies – rather than hatred and violence – to render constructive results.

Now to humiliation, and how it affects conflict and is affected by conflict.

Humiliation and How it Affects Conflict and Is Affected by Conflict

“It has always been a mystery to me how men can feel themselves honored by the humiliation of their fellow beings” (Mahatma Gandhi).

Fear is basic, anger more complex, and humiliation even more so. The act of humiliation involves putting down, holding down, and rendering the other helpless to resist the debasement. The feeling of being humiliated emerges when one

is unable to resist the debasement and one deems it to be illegitimate as well as unwanted. What counts as humiliation and the consequences of humiliation are determined by emotional scripts that vary from one historical period to another, from one cultural sphere to another, from one person to another, and even within a single person as he or she reacts at different times to the same humiliation.

Morton Deutsch (2006) explains how Nelson Mandela “kept his self undistorted by preserving his dignity and refusing to submit, psychologically, to the definition of self that the oppressors tread to force upon him” (Deutsch, 2006, p. 38). Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela described the following incident after landing on Robben Island:

“We were met by a group of burly white wardens shouting: ‘Dis die Eiland! Hier gaan jiel vrek! (This is the island! Here you will die!)’ . . . As we walked toward the prison, the guards shouted ‘Two – two! Two – two!’— meaning we should walk in pairs . . . I linked up with Tefu. The guards started screaming, ‘Haas! . . . Haas!’ The word haas means ‘move’ in Afrikaans, but it is commonly reserved for cattle.

“The wardens were demanding that we jog, and I turned to Tefu and under my breath said that we must set an example; if we give in now we would be at their mercy . . . I mentioned to Tefu that we should walk in front, and we took the lead. Once in front, we actually decreased the pace, walking slowly and deliberately. The guards were incredulous (and said) ‘. . . we will tolerate no insubordination here. Haas! Haas!’ But we continued at our stately pace. (The head guard) ordered us to halt and stood in front of us: ‘Look, man, we will kill you, we are not fooling around . . . This the last warning. Haas! Haas!’ “To this, I said: ‘You have your duty and we have ours.’ I was determined that we would not give in, and we did not, for we were already at the cells.” (Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela, 1995, pp. 297–299)

Deutsch concludes: “By his persistent public refusal to be humiliated or to feel humiliated, Mandela rejected the distorted, self-debilitating relationship that the oppressor sought to impose upon him. Doing so enhanced his leadership among his fellow political prisoners and the respect he was accorded by the less sadistic guards and wardens of the prison” (Deutsch, 2006, p. 39).

Feelings of humiliation can be the “nuclear bomb of the emotions,” a term coined by Evelin G. Lindner (2002). Lindner’s research suggests that feelings of humiliation may acquire the quality and strength of obsession and addiction. They can dominate people’s lives to the extent that their actions become destructive for themselves and others. If instigated by humiliation-entrepreneurs, such as in Rwanda in 1994, feelings of humiliation can fuel mayhem in ways that even make the purchase of expensive weaponry superfluous. In Rwanda, everybody had machetes at home for agricultural use. When people are intent to perpetrate atrocities – and feelings of humiliation may be most instrumental – costly military weaponry may not be needed for people to proceed in perpetrating mayhem.

Vamik D. Volkan (2004) in his *theory of collective violence*, in his recent book *Blind Trust*, puts forth that when a *chosen trauma* is experienced as *humiliation* and is *not mourned*, this may lead to feelings of *entitlement to revenge* and, under the pressure of *fear/anxiety*, to *collective regression*.

The view that humiliation may be more than just another negative emotion, but may indeed represent a particularly forceful phenomenon, is supported by the research of a number of authors, such as James Gilligan (1996), Linda M. Hartling and Tracy Luchetta (1999), Donald C. Klein (1991), Helen Block Lewis (1971), Evelin G. Lindner (2000), Richard E. Nisbett and Dov Cohen (1996), and Thomas J. Scheff and Suzanne M. Retzinger (1991).

Until very recently, however, few researchers have studied humiliation explicitly – the phenomenon of humiliation typically figures only implicitly in literature on violence and war. When humiliation is treated explicitly, it is often used interchangeably with shame or conceptualized as a variant of that emotion. Humiliation has only very recently been studied on its own account, among others, since 1996, by Evelin G. Lindner (2000), and by Jennifer S. Goldman and Peter T. Coleman (2005). Humiliation is a complex phenomenon of acts and feelings that can occur without shame being involved. As in the case of Nelson Mandela, people who face humiliating treatment may sternly reject feeling humiliated or ashamed. And even when they feel humiliated, victims of torture and maltreatment recount that part of their success in being resilient was not to feel ashamed while indeed feeling humiliated.

Considering feelings of humiliation may shed more light on violence and terrorism than other explanations. We do not perceive conditions such as inequality, or conflict of interest, or poverty, as automatically negative. As long as all players accept justifications (poverty as “divine order,” for example), there might be pain, but no shared awareness of a problem that needs fixing, no conflict, and no violent reactions. And conflict, even if it occurs, is not automatically destructive either – it can be solved mutually and creatively. It is when feelings of humiliation emerge that rifts are created and trust destroyed. If feelings of humiliation are not overcome constructively, cooperation fails. In the worst-case scenario, violence ensues.

As Lindner (2006) explains, at the current historic juncture, two new forces bring humiliation to the fore in unprecedented intensity. “Globalization” (or the coming-together of humankind), in concert with the human rights revolution, increases the significance of feelings of humiliation. As long as people live far away from each other, in isolation, relative deprivation goes undetected. But, today, Western soap operas and Western tourists walking about are teaching the less privileged of the world to recognize their own deprivation. At the same time, the human rights call for equal dignity teaches underlings around the world that their poverty, their relative deprivation, is no longer to be accepted as divinely ordained, but represents a violation of their very humanity. When

a deprived person identifies the rich of the world as perpetrators of violation, when she suspects that the rich peddle empty human rights rhetoric to maintain their powerful positions, poverty turns into humiliation. Currently, the gap between the poor and the rich, locally and globally, grows wider. The underdogs in the world, and those who identify with them, listen to empty human rights rhetoric from elites and feel humiliated by the emptiness of the sermon: “to recognise humanity hypocritically and betray the promise, humiliates in the most devastating way by denying the humanity professed” (Stephan Feuchtwang, November 14, 2002, in a personal note).

Thomas Friedman, *New York Times* columnist, states, “If I’ve learned one thing covering world affairs, it’s this: The single most underappreciated force in international relations is humiliation.” Aaron Lazare (2004) writes: “I believe that humiliation is one of the most important emotions we must understand and manage, both in ourselves and in others, and on an individual and national level” (pp. 262).

What happens when feelings of humiliation emerge? Blema S. Steinberg (1996) posits that feelings of humiliation may trigger narcissistic rage and acts of aggression meant to lessen pain and increase self-worth. Steinberg analyzes political crises and cautions that international leaders, when publicly humiliated, may instigate mass destruction and war. Roy F. Baumeister (1996) suggests that perpetrators of violent crime combine high self-esteem, albeit brittle, with poor self-regulation, particularly when it is challenged. Walter Mischel, Aaron L. DeSmet, and Ethan Kross (see Chapter Thirteen, “Self-Regulation in the Service of Conflict Resolution” in this book) explain that rejection-sensitive men may even get “hooked” on situations of debasement in which they can feel humiliated.

In our example of Eve and Adam, Adam may be such a rejection-sensitive man. As long as Eve merely fades into subservience at his onslaught, no open destructive conflict and no cycles of humiliation occur. An unwise therapist could very well create such cycles of humiliation if she were to nurture feelings of humiliation in Eve that would lead to nothing but tit-for-tat retaliation. Eve would merely learn the same dysfunctional handling of humiliation as Adam engages in. The therapist needs to lay out a vision for a “Mandela-like” handling of feelings of humiliation for both Eve and Adam.

Cycles of humiliation occur when feelings of humiliation are translated into acts of humiliation that are responded to in kind. In cases of collectively perpetrated mayhem, Hitler-like humiliation-entrepreneurs “invite” followers to pour their frustrations into a grander narrative of humiliation that calls for retaliatory acts of humiliation as “remedy.” Only “Mandelas,” individuals who know how to build dignified relationships, can avoid this. Massacres typically are not just “efficient” slaughter, but generally more cruel. Rape, torture, and mutilation often precede killing. Many soldiers engage in these actions, even though nothing suggests that they are rapists in civilian life or are drawn to sexual sadism or sadistic violence. The extreme

cruelty is therefore hard to explain with average forensic theories. In the Rwandan genocide, for example, killing was not enough. The victims were humiliated before they died. Why else would an old woman be paraded naked through the streets before being locked up with hungry dogs to be eaten alive?

To conclude, feelings of humiliation affect conflict in malignant ways when they are translated into violence *à la* Hitler, or modern terrorism, and set off cycles of humiliation. However, feelings of humiliation do not automatically trigger violence. There is no rigid link. Feelings of humiliation can also be invested into constructive social change. Nelson Mandela showed that there is a constructive script that proceeds from being humiliated and feeling humiliated to beneficial engagement in change, as opposed to retaliation with brutal humiliation-for-humiliation. Mandela was certainly exposed to humiliating treatment, for twenty-seven years in prison, but he did not unleash genocide on the white elite in South Africa. Nelson Mandela did not allow himself to feel humiliated at the attempts to humiliate him, or, if he did feel humiliated, he did not allow himself to translate these feelings into violent retaliation. In contrast, in Rwanda, the former underlings killed their former elite in genocide.

Conflict, in turn, affects feelings of humiliation through the way conflict is managed. If managed in a respecting manner, the probability for finding constructive solutions is high. If managed in condescending, patronizing and arrogant ways, even if this is done unwittingly, feelings of humiliation will undermine any constructive cooperation. This insight can be institutionalized. At a societal level, to secure peace, in his book *The Decent Society*, Avishai Margalit (1996) calls for institutions that do not humiliate.

Guilt and How It Affects Conflict and Is Affected by Conflict

“It has become appallingly obvious that our technology has exceeded our humanity. Technological progress is like an axe in the hands of a pathological criminal. I believe that the horrifying deterioration in the ethical conduct of people today stems from the mechanization and dehumanization of our lives, a disastrous by-product of the scientific and technical mentality. *Nostra culpa!*” (Albert Einstein)

Guilt is an elaborated emotion and a topic for psychology, psychiatry, ethics, criminal law, and other related fields. To feel guilty, we need self-awareness and the ability to measure our behavior in relation to standards. Self-conscious evaluative emotions such as pride, shame, or guilt are not possible earlier than the second or third year of life. However, as discussed earlier, elaborated emotions are very culturally dependent. The concept of guilt might never evolve, at least not in the Western sense – in some cultural spheres a word for guilt simply does not exist.

In its simplest description, guilt may be understood as an affective state of regret at having done something one believes one should not have done.

Humiliation, humility, shame and guilt are related concepts. When I feel ashamed, I accept that I fell short. I blush when I break wind inadvertently; I can be ashamed even if nobody notices. Norbert Elias (1897-1990) places the emerging “skill” of feeling shame at such transgressions at the center of his *theory of civilization*. Being able to feel shame is prosocial, as is the ability to feel guilt. When I feel guilty, I accept that I have committed a moral transgression. People, who are not capable of feeling shame or guilt, are seen as “shameless” monsters. We all hope that the desire to avoid shame and guilt will safeguard social cohesion and foster humility before social and legal rules and the need to cooperate for building a sustainable world. We deem humility to be a virtue, and shame and guilt as hugely important, with guilt, according to some scholars, superseding shame due to its greater potential of leading to empathy and sensitivity toward others. Guilt can render healing for perpetrators, victims and larger society, through remorse, apology, forgiveness, and restorative justice.

Shame and guilt societies have been differentiated (Ruth Benedict, 1887-1948). In a shame society, it is said, I seek to maintain my good name in the eyes of the others, while in a guilt society I have internalized moral norms into my super-ego and feel guilty when disobeying them. “Face” and “face-saving” is usually associated with Asian culture. Chinese scholars, however, explain that shame and guilt shade into each other, both directing people into self-examination in social situations and motivate people to evaluate their behavior and adapt it.

Guilt can be abused, however, as a tool of social control, because guilty people feel less deserving and are less likely to assert their rights and prerogatives. Some children, as well as some groups, are taught to feel guilty for their very existence or for certain characteristics of their appearance. Such cases represent a pathological occurrence and destructive application of guilt.

To revisit Eve and Adam, Eve is kept in timid subservience not least by feeling guilty. She partly believes Adam’s complaint that she ought to be more docile. Their therapist brings clarity into the normative confusion of the couple. Indeed, in traditional normative contexts of ranked honor, a woman is expected to efface herself. However, times have changed, and subservience no longer represents the same kind of virtue, at least not in cultural contexts influenced by the human rights message. Eve is entitled to develop a more comprehensive and expansive personal space – not arrogantly attacking Adam in retaliation – but applying a spirit of firm and respectful humility. Adam, on the other hand, is no longer required to feel ashamed and guilty for not succeeding in keeping his wife meek and lowly – and he no longer needs to bypass his shame at his failure and cover up with violence. He is entitled to feel proud to be a male who supports a strong woman at his side. He may even come to feel guilty and apologize to his wife for not having grasped this insight earlier. An exchange of

mutual respect for equal dignity, in a spirit of shared humility, may lead to a new and nourishing relationship between Eve and Adam.

To conclude this section, feelings of guilt can prevent people from doing evil. Feelings of guilt for past omissions and transgressions, if acknowledged, remedied by apology and forgiveness, can be a powerful healing force in conflict. What is needed for shame and guilt to be healing forces is the courage to face them and gauge them with candidness, humility and warmth. If not acknowledged and worked through constructively, if bypassed, feelings of shame and guilt can help maintain destructive conflict. In turn, conflict can impinge on feelings of guilt. Feelings of guilt can be pushed toward violence if conditions inhibit their acknowledgement and healing. Moreover, deliberately creating “pathological guilt” by making opponents in a conflict or negotiation feel guilty so as to weaken them, may rather undermine long-term constructive solutions. Successful negotiation or solutions to conflict depend on firm commitments from strong players. Guilt can best be borne to healing, if embedded in respectful restorative justice.

Hope and How It Affects Conflict and Is Affected by Conflict

C. Richard Snyder (2002) developed *hope theory*. Snyder’s work is related to and overlaps with theories of learned optimism, optimism, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and coping. Snyder reports that higher hope is consistently related to better outcomes in academics, athletics, physical health, psychological adjustment, and psychotherapy.

Interestingly, hope can be learned. Most people lack hope, Snyder points out, because they were not taught appropriately during childhood; many experienced having their nascent hopeful thinking strategies destroyed. Snyder recommends the building of cultural and institutional frames that highlight insights from hope theory: “When laws are implemented so as to allow a maximal number of people to pursue goal-directed activities, then citizens should be less likely to become frustrated and act aggressively against each other” (p. 261). As a result, higher hope will lead to better social adjustment, both with one’s extended family, one’s friends and larger social networks, and public health and general well-being is likely to increase.

Hope is not to be confused with naïve and unrealistic expectations. On the contrary, this would be a recipe for hopelessness. A strategy of hope entails continuously weighing opportunities (or the lack of opportunities), and strengths (or their failing), and finding optimal solutions. In a conflict situation, in negotiations, setting too high levels for expected outcomes could be disastrous. Hope is not an illusion born out of misguided daydreaming or wishful thinking, but a strategy of successful adaptation.

Let us revisit Eve and Adam. Adam undermines Eve’s social support network. She is to live for him alone. He systematically humiliates her and destroys

whatever confidence is left in her by telling her that nobody but him could love her. She is to be worthless without him and his love. Both believe that this strategy, if only intensified sufficiently, will lead to a happy relationship – however, it brings only violence and tears. Their therapist reformulates their definitions and strategies of hope. Slowly, Adam understands that by inducing hopelessness in Eve, both lose. The therapist rekindles Eve’s confidence in herself and Eve’s life begins to flourish. The therapist also helps Adam to gain confidence in his ability to keep a strong woman as a partner and enjoy her fresh zest of life – rather than be frightened by her newly won strength. Both learn to nurture higher hopes for their relationship and work for newly defined, share goals.

To conclude, we need to learn hope and develop cultures of hope and institutions for hope to support us as we strive for constructive conflict resolution. This means creating more alternative goals, more potential pathways, and more endurance, both in us, for us and in our societies. If we succeed, we will have people gravitating to wider social networks that benefit everyone. Positive emotions will follow. Ironically, pessimists are oblivious of these insights. By lamenting, they indulge in increasing the burden of conflict instead of lessening it and thus risk tipping the situation toward downfall. We have to learn constructive optimism and hope, because only this will render beneficial framings. A cancer patient, if told that she is in deep crisis, might survive if mobilizing maximum hope. She might die if surrounded by pessimists. For the world, we need constructive hope that models emergency and crisis as a challenge and not as the end of the world.

Confidence and Warmth, and How They affect Conflict and Are Affected by Conflict

“What sets worlds in motion is the interplay of differences, their attractions and repulsions. By suppressing differences and peculiarities, by eliminating different civilizations and cultures, progress weakens life and favors death.” (Octavio Paz)

As long as we live in isolated, homogenous cultural spheres, we can usually guess correctly what our fellow human beings are trying to tell us with their words and actions. We tend to behave with a certain amount of “confidence,” secure in the certainty of our environment. However, this illusionary definition of “confidence” is not beneficial to us, particularly not in times where the world’s cultures move ever closer together. If we reflect for a moment, we know that even our children and our spouses represent “other cultures.”

What we have to learn is to confidently float in uncertainty rather than cling to assumed certainties. We have to become confident *voyagers* and not rigid

vindicators, according to David Ricky Matsumoto, Seung Hee Yoo, and Jeffery A. LeRoux (2005):

Those people who cannot control their emotions reinforce and crystallize their pre-existing ethnocentric and stereotypic ways of dealing with the world that are limited. This is a no growth model, and these individuals are not engaged in a journey. This is a model of stagnation, with no growth potential inherent in such a process. We call these people “vindicators,” because their worldviews are established solely to vindicate their pre-existing ethnocentrism and stereotypes, not to challenge them and grow. (p. 18)

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. Guessing what our spouses (or terrorists) “want” and basing our actions on such speculations simply does not work. We have to learn to stay calm while we use frustration creatively, with imagination and inspiration, and for that we need curiosity, courage, and patience (Satoshi Nakagawa, personal communication from Jacqueline Wasilewski, June 25, 2005).

Muneo Yoshikawa (1987) has developed a *double-swing model* that conceptualizes how individuals, cultures and intercultural concepts can meet in constructive ways. It relates to what Peter A. Levine (1997) calls *pendulation*, the swinging back and forth between our own point of view and that of the other that allows us the potential for understanding each other. Successful pendulation can produce solidarity and social integration; without it, we have alienation and lack of social integration. Double-swing pendulation – from you to me, back to you, back to me, and so on – has to be conducted with warmth and respect for all conflict parties. Respect and warmth are the glue that keeps people together while they move back and forth. Respect and warmth do not befall us; they can be learned.

To conclude, to “wage good conflict,” we must design our efforts in ways that keep the double swing connected. Healthy “identity in unity” and pendulation is interdependent – neither independent and isolated, nor engulfed. Both parties in conflictual relationships must avoid going too far, “walking over” the other or allowing the other to “walk over” them. Adam walked over Eve and Eve allowed him to do so. In therapy, both understand that when all players in a conflict learn to invest respect, warmth, and calmly floating confidence rather than frantic righteousness, conflict can be framed benignly. In the beginning, Eve and Adam threw monologues at each other and tried to prove to the therapist that the respective other was evil. Then, slowly, they began to listen to each other. They tried to grasp the other’s feelings and thoughts. They learned using both sides of the double swing. Finally, they emerged mutually enriched. Now, they recognize that their conflict was based on solipsistic misperceptions of the other, due to each of them looping in only one side of the double swing. They know,

furthermore, that their conflict continued because of their immature and self-defeating conflict-solving strategies. And finally, they understand that they suffered from a high degree of normative confusion. In a haphazard manner, they had jumbled together the contradictory normative frames of ranked worthiness versus equal dignity, helplessly oscillating between the contradictory emotional scripts that are related to those normative universes. Today, Eve and Adam no longer wish to participate in an order of “higher” and “lesser” beings (with Adam at the top and Eve at the bottom), but attempt to treat each other as worthy of equal dignity.

Not only Eve and Adam’s conflict, but also community conflicts and global conflicts can be conceptualized along similar lines. Not least, Germany has gained international respect by apologizing to the world and acknowledging that Hitler’s strategy of presenting and viewing himself as arrogant “savior” and responding to perceived humiliation with mayhem was disastrous.

HOW TO INTERVENE IN CONFLICT, CONTROL NEGATIVE EMOTIONS, AND FOSTER POSITIVE EMOTIONS

“More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginning of all wars. Yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments.” (Winston Churchill)

“When will our consciences grow so tender that we will act to prevent human misery rather than avenge it?” (Eleanor Roosevelt).

Earlier, we discussed that our mental short-term “go” system might be counterproductive when we are trying to achieve broad, long-term objectives. For complex long-term problems, we need to entertain superordinate regulatory loops in our higher brain structures. We need to slow down our thinking processes so we can critically assess them. We need to get in touch with deeper feelings, thoughts, and factors outside of our dominant mental and sensory models. We have to tap into the largely unconscious, automatic, parallel-distributed processes that supply us with creativity. It is wise to recognize that everybody has “hot buttons” that, if triggered, will stir up strong emotions such as anxiety, anger, rage, fear, depression, or withdrawal. It is valuable to know the other’s hot buttons so as to avoid pressing them and it is important to know one’s own hot buttons and how we tend to react when they are pressed, so that we can control our reactions in that event.

How do we slow down and cool down? Let us assume, you have just quarreled and are “out of your mind” (the old brain has taken over). Modern brain imaging yields evidence of the effectiveness of meditation techniques. Buddhists claim that destructive emotions can be greatly reduced (in contrast to the common Western assumption that our biological programming for emotions is fixed).

Some Tibetan Buddhists think it is possible and advisable to overcome, even eliminate emotions such as anger or hostility, which Western philosophers see as “natural and immutable.” Buddhist concepts such as *mindfulness* and the concept of *sukha* (“a deep sense of serenity and fulfillment that arises from an exceptionally healthy mind”) are related.

We find similar approaches in many disciplines. Victor Frankl’s concept of *self-observation* in the framework of logotherapy is comparable. In a more general way, Erving Goffman, an “ethnographer of the self,” has described how people negotiate and validate identities in face-to-face meetings and establish *frames* within which they evaluate the meaning of their encounters. To return to Eve and Adam’s therapist, she offers a wide panoply of “cooling” approaches – from relaxation techniques to dream journeys or taking in larger frames such as the shortness of life and the futility of petty goals.

Let us assume that you have slowed down and gained distance by using any approach that suits you, be it meditation or new framings. Now, you are ready for the next step. You have to constructively channel and manage your negative emotions of anger, fear, and distress because they are the “gatekeepers” of any communicative effectiveness. “If we cannot put our inevitable negative emotions in check, it is impossible to engage in what is clearly higher order thinking . . .” say Matsumoto, Yoo, and LeRoux (2005, p. 9). They explain that four main ingredients to personal growth are key to successful handling of conflict, namely Emotion Regulation (ER), Critical Thinking (CT), Openness (OP), and Flexibility (FL). These psychological processes are the *psychological engine* of adaptation and adjustment.

A host of tools is available that helps regulate negative emotions. Earlier, we discussed hope. Maintaining high hope means engaging in very specific strategies of approaching the world. One such strategy, for example, is the “glass-is-half-full” approach. Lamenting over whatever is “missing” or whatever is yet unaccomplished only drains energy. Lamenting makes it more difficult to conceptualize what is missing as challenge, as a next step, that has to be approached with enthusiasm, motivation and courage in a joint effort. Eve and Adam have to go beyond wallowing in pain and filling their lifetime with decrying their misfortune – they have to envisage with excitement the experiences of growth that lie ahead of them.

We should not conclude, however, that negative emotions are altogether maladaptive and ought to be avoided. The premise of “keep smiling” would not do. It is rather a question of avoiding too much and too little. Negative emotions can be functional, not only in emergency situations, but also for effective learning. Successful conflict resolution often requires a certain amount of conceptual change for which negative emotions can be instrumental. Too much positive emotion may hinder effective learning. Studies did not find a clear relation between positive affect and conceptual change. More so, rather than avoiding conflict, “blissful ignorance” may even create it.

Let us assume you have managed to dampen your negative feelings to constructive levels. Now you can embark on nurturing positive emotions. Barbara L. Fredrickson and Robert W. Levenson (1998) study positive emotions. They offer an interesting new theoretical perspective, which they call the *broaden-and-build model*. This model questions common assumptions of contemporary emotion theory, namely that emotions must necessarily entail action tendencies and lead to physical action. Rather than action, positive emotions seem to facilitate changes in cognitive activity. What negative emotions are to threat, positive emotions are to opportunity. As we have seen, traditional action-oriented models for negative emotions indicate that negative emotions *narrow* a person's momentary thought-action repertoire, an effect that is adaptive in life-threatening situations that require quick action. In contrast, positive emotions *broaden* a person's momentary thought-action repertoire. Positive affects and emotions promote intuitive-holistic (right hemisphere-RH) mental strategies, while negative affects and emotions further analytic-serial (left hemisphere-LH) mental strategies. It has been shown that coping and resilience are associated with positive emotions even under the chronic stress of, for example, care-giving and bereavement. For Eve and Adam, panicky actionism, fueled by pain, has to give way for calm reflection and firm resolve in an atmosphere of hope and courage.

Suppose you have now calmed down, calibrated negative emotions so that they inform you but do not overwhelm you, and fostered positive emotions. What else can we draw upon? Earlier we discussed the benefits of mature mutual love, of anger harnessed in constructive resolve, of humility and hope, of the confidence of a voyager, and the warmth that we need to connect us all. There are many other insights we can employ. For example, the benefits of cooperation have to be made known widely. In *Deutsch's Crude Law of Social Relations*, Morton Deutsch (1999) stipulates that "cooperation induces and is induced by a perceived similarity in beliefs and attitudes, a readiness to be helpful, openness in communication, trusting and friendly attitudes, sensitivity to common interests and de-emphasis of opposed interests, an orientation toward enhancing mutual power rather than power differences, and so on" (p. 19–20). In contrast, unhelpful competition induces and is induced by coercion, threats, deception, suspicion, self-serving biases, poor communication, and attempts to enhance the power differences between oneself and the other.

Matsumoto's voyager needs what W. Barnett Pearce (2005) calls *cosmopolitan communicative virtuosity*. For a *cosmopolitan communicator*, disagreement is an opportunity for learning and constructing new realities. Disagreement – rather than a catastrophe – is a dilemma that calls for further exploration to find creative solutions. *Virtuosity* means (a) a "grand passion" for what we are doing; (b) an ability to make insightful distinctions; and (c) the ability to engage in skilled performance.

So, what we need for a world that engages constructively in conflict is “grand passion,” passion for developing new forms of communication that entail a careful and skilled balance between what we discussed earlier, namely the broaden-and-build capacity of positive emotions and the conceptual-change capacity of negative emotions.

In order to achieve communicative virtuosity, it is necessary to unlearn some unhelpful beliefs about intelligence and learning. Intelligence is not *fixed*, it is *malleable* (the *incremental* theory of intelligence). People who believe intelligence is fixed develop an *ego-oriented performance orientation*. They wish to satisfy expectations of others, avoid mistakes, and look smart. They are “façade-polishers,” who endanger others, for example, when they cover up for hazardous mistakes. Those with *task-oriented learning-mastery goals*, on the other hand, desire to learn new things, even if they might get confused, make mistakes, and not look smart. Research shows that people with mastery goals are basically more successful. In extension, conflict benefits from being approached with a task-oriented mastery orientation: we learn together from our mistakes. (See Chapter Fourteen, “Implicit Theories and Conflict Resolution,” in this book.)

We might, furthermore, draw on what has been called a *third factor* of strength and faith, such as closeness to divinity, appreciation of compassion, or faith in shared humanity. Kaethe Weingarten (2003) recommends *compassionate witnessing*. Compassionate witnessing helps us acknowledge and reinstate our sense of shared humanity, and stop dehumanizing others. Concepts such as personhood, dignity, rights, character, autonomy, integrity, shame, humility, oppression and empowerment are all intertwined here. We have a *duty for self-respect*. We cannot be moral citizens if we violate our own dignity. Finally, Aaron Lazare (2004) asserts: “One of the most profound human interactions is the offering and accepting of apologies. Apologies have the power to heal humiliations and grudges; remove the desire for vengeance, and generate forgiveness on the part of the offended parties. For the offender, they can diminish the fear of retaliation and relieve the guilt and shame that can grip the mind with a persistence and tenacity that are hard to ignore. The result of the apology process, ideally, is the reconciliation and restoration of broken relationships” (p. 1).

To conclude this section, it is important that we know what our “hot buttons” are and, if pressed, find a way to “slow down and cool down” so that we can think and act in a manner that will foster a positive emotional rather than a negative emotional climate for resolving the conflict. It is important to be aware that negative emotions have to be managed particularly cautiously because the ability to constructively channel and manage negative emotions is the “gatekeeper” to communicative effectiveness. It is desirable to dampen strong negative emotions and use their energy to foster constructive positive emotions. Meditation is but one way among others to “slow down and cool down.” With regard to opponents, it is advisable not to hit the others’ “hot buttons” but to attempt

developing a mutually respectful, caring, and cooperative relationship that is characterized by “cosmopolitan communication virtuosity.”

Let us revisit Eve and Adam to round up their case. Eve and Adam gradually learn that there are other definitions of love and happiness around, not just love defined as mutual dependence in submission/domination. Adam originally believed that only a weak partner would need him, so he kept Eve weak. And Eve tried her best to fit in. Now, both learn that love can flourish between two confident and strong partners who mutually enrich each other. It is a long learning process for Eve and Adam. It is like mastering a totally new language. All their hypotheses about “what works” and “what does not work” have to be redefined. Time and again they “fall back.” However, they do not give up.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

This chapter concludes with highlighting the challenges we face at the current historic juncture. Newly recognized global ecological and social problems require global cooperation for their resolution. Is humankind prepared? Conflict and emotions are at the core of both the problems and the solutions. Social emotions at the global level are no longer defined and channeled by a few diplomats. They are felt and responded to by millions of people and become salient for conflicts in the “global village” in unprecedented ways. Global terrorism is one outfall, an atrocious one, and psychology is bound to gain significant importance in the field of political science.

Two problems stand out, globalization and the human rights revolution. The coming together of humankind (globalization) increases anxiety and the risk for misunderstandings. This danger needs to be tackled in ways that safeguard cooperation and avoid new divisions. Traditional ingroup/outgroup demarcations hurt more than before. Ingroup pride, if built on outgroup disparagement, is no longer constructive. Concurrent with the ingathering of humankind another unprecedented social phenomenon radically questions old norms: the continuous human rights revolution. This revolution (or transformation or movement or trend) affects our relationship with our children, spouses, and boss as much as world politics. The human rights revolution is fueled by feelings of humiliation and it fuels feelings of humiliation in the global public arena as much as at home. Formerly legitimate humbling is turned into illegitimate humiliation. Feelings of humiliation cross-cut other explanations of violence. Conditions such as poverty, inequality, or conflict of interest can all be tackled constructively by cooperation; enabling environments can be built jointly; scarce resources can be shared. It is when feelings of humiliation emerge that rifts are created and trust destroyed. If feelings of humiliation are not overcome constructively, at best, cooperation fails; at worst, violence ensues.

All this is occurring at a time when humankind remains blind to the fact that it is emotionally unprepared. Many believe that Mandela's maturity cannot be learned, and that he is simply extraordinarily gifted. This might partly be true. But, we still have to try. We need to learn, for example, that we no longer can continue to hope that domination/submission will bring peace, justice and love – at home or abroad. Rather than bringing peace and cooperation, an adversarial culture with combative communication styles triggers the fight-and-flight avoidance system and deepens rifts. We have to learn to swing back and forth, get into the others' perspectives and feelings, and then move back into our own perspective, not faltering in the face of contradictions but using them courageously and constructively. We have to learn to stay calm while using frustration creatively, with imagination and inspiration. For that we need to nurture in ourselves and in others the qualities of curiosity, courage, and patience. We need to learn to use firm respect and warmth to build feasible relationships rather than unfeasible fences, both at home and in the world.

We must learn to nurture positive emotions, particularly in conflict situations, because they broaden our problem-solving capacity. This is a daunting challenge, but we can achieve it, if we train to attend to our negative emotions first, knowing that they are the gatekeepers to our deeper, more positive capacities. We must learn to tolerate a certain amount of negative feelings, respecting that negative emotions are a necessary – if unpleasant – component of conceptual change. “Positive thinking” can be overdone – we do not want to descend into “blissful ignorance.” Instead, we need to learn how to foster positive feelings that are firm, and take from negative feelings only what is constructive, without letting them dictate us.

We need, in the final analysis, to learn to “wage good conflict” through mutual empowerment and cooperative problem solving. This chapter represents a guideline. We need to change our mind-sets deeply if we are to prevent and solve conflict at home and in the world. It is not a question of some experts having a collection of smart techniques. We have to forge new practices and institutions locally and globally. The shortest “hands-on” guideline for managing emotions in conflict would go as follows: Cool down – yourself and others. Down-regulate negative feelings – far enough to avoid tunnel vision, yet not too far; avoid “blissful ignorance.” Up-regulate positive feelings by invoking a positive long-term vision – ask, what kind of world do we wish our children to live in? Urge a joint learning orientation for humankind. Forge new mature Mandela-inspired emotion scripts that connect us in cooperation even when circumstances are difficult and humiliation hurts. At the global level, promote a *decent global village* in the spirit of Avishai Margalit's call for *The Decent Society* with decent institutions that do not have humiliating effects. Craft global cultural practices and institutions for the stewardship of our planet as a joint task based on Article 1 of the Human Rights Declaration, which states that every human being is born with equal dignity.

REFERENCES

- Allred, K. G. "Anger and Retaliation in Conflict: The Role of Attribution." In M. Deutsch and P. T. Coleman (eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Averill, J. R. "The Emotions: An Integrative Approach." In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, and S. Briggs (eds.), *Handbook of Personality Psychology*, San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press, 1997.
- Baumeister, R. F. *Evil: Inside Human Cruelty and Violence*. New York: Freeman, 1996.
- Dai, D. Y. and Sternberg, R. J. (eds.). *Motivation, Emotion, and Cognition: Integrative Perspectives on Intellectual Functioning and Development*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004.
- Deutsch, M. "A Framework for Thinking About Oppression and Its Change." *Social Justice Research*, forthcoming.
- Deutsch, M. "A Personal Perspective on the Development of Social Psychology in the Twentieth Century." In A. Rodriguez and R. V. Levine (eds.), *Reflections on 100 Years of Experimental Social Psychology*, New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- Forgas, J. P. (ed.). *Handbook of Affect and Social Cognition*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.
- Fredrickson, B. L. and Levenson, R. W. "Positive Emotions Speed Recovery from the Cardiovascular Sequelae of Negative Emotions." *Cognition & Emotion*, 1998, 12 (2), pp. 191–220.
- Gilbert, D. T. "Speeding with Ned: A Personal View of the Correspondence Bias." In J. M. Darley and J. Cooper (eds.), *Attribution and Social Interaction: The Legacy of Edward E. Jones*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1998.
- Gilligan, J. *Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and How to Treat It*. New York: Putnam, 1996.
- Goldman, J. S. and Coleman, P. T. *How Humiliation Fuels Intractable Conflict: The Effects of Emotional Roles on Recall and Reactions to Conflictual Encounters*. New York: International Center for Cooperation & Conflict Resolution, Teachers College, Columbia University, 2005.
- Hartling, L. M. and Luchetta, T. "Humiliation: Assessing the Impact of Derision,

Degradation, and Debasement.” *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 1999, 19 (5), pp. 259–278.

Heider, F. *The Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Jones, E. E., and Davis, K. E. “From Acts to Dispositions: The Attribution Process in Person Perception.” In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 2, Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press, 1965.

Kelley, H. H. “Attribution Theory in Social Psychology.” In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1967.

Klein, D. C. “The Humiliation Dynamic: An Overview.” *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 1991, 12 (2), pp. 87–92.

Lazare, A. *On Apology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Levine, P. A. *Waking the Tiger: Healing Trauma*. Berkeley, Calif.: North Atlantic Books, 1997.

Lewis, H. B. *Shame and Guilt in Neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press, 1971.

Lindner, E. G. “Healing the Cycles of Humiliation: How to Attend to the Emotional Aspects of ‘Unsolvable’ Conflicts and the Use of ‘Humiliation Entrepreneurship’.” *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2002, 8 (2), pp. 125–138.

Lindner, E. G. *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press and Praeger Publishers, 2006.

Lindner, E. G. *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda/Burundi, and Hitler’s Germany*. Oslo, Norway: University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, Doctoral Dissertation in Psychology, 2000.

Mandela, N. R. *A Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. London: Little Brown, 1994.

Mandela, N. R. *A Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. London: Little Brown, 1995.

Margalit, A. *The Decent Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Matsumoto, D. R., Hee Yoo, S., and LeRoux, J. A. “Emotion and Intercultural Communication.” In H. Kotthoff and H. Spencer-Oatley (eds.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics, Volume 7: Intercultural Communication*, Berlin: Mouton—de Gruyter Publishers, 2005.

Mayne, T. J. and Bonanno, G. A. (eds.). *Emotions: Current Issues and Future Directions*. New York: Guilford Press, 2001.

Nisbett, R. E. and Cohen, D. *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1996.

Ortony, A. and Turner, T. J. "What's Basic About Basic Emotions?" *Psychological Review*, 1990, 97, pp. 315–331.

Pearce, W. B. *Toward Communicative Virtuosity: A Meditation on Modernity and Other Forms of Communication*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: School of Human and Organization Development, Fielding Graduate University, 2005.

Ross, L. "The Intuitive Psychologist and His Shortcomings: Distortions in the Attribution Process." In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 10. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press, 1977.

Scheff, T. J. and Retzinger, S. M. *Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1991.

Smedslund, J. *The Structure of Psychological Common Sense*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997.

Snyder, C. R. "Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind." *Psychological Inquiry*, 2002, 13 (4), pp. 249–275.

Steinberg, B. S. *Shame and Humiliation: Presidential Decision Making on Vietnam*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1996.

Volkan, V. D. *Blind Trust: Large Groups and Their Leaders in Times of Crisis and Terror*. Charlottesville, Va.: Pitchstone Publishing, 2004.

Weingarten, K. *Common Shock: Witnessing Violence Every Day—How We Are Harmed, How We Can Heal*. New York: Dutton, 2003.

Yoshikawa, M. "The 'Double Swing' Model of Intercultural Communication Between the East and West." In D. L. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication Theory: Eastern and Western Perspectives*, pp. 319–329. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press, 1987.

Our lives are incomplete without emotions, and it is the crucial element we cannot ignore. We react to situations because something triggers our feelings, and that drives our actions and words. As adults, everyone must learn to use emotions to the best of their knowledge. When we can handle every emotion that we feel constructively, we are rightly on the road to being emotionally mature. Always express your feelings and how you feel towards others as well. Make it a habit to write down your daily activities and the emotions associated with it (journaling). This will reduce stress levels to a certain extent as you learn to deal with your feelings, even the unpleasant ones. Negative emotions can be overwhelming, and you are unable to handle it. Emotional conflict is the presence of different and opposing emotions relating to a situation that has recently taken place or is in the process of being unfolded. They may be accompanied at times by a physical discomfort, especially when a functional disturbance has become associated with an emotional conflict in childhood, and in particular by tension headaches "expressing a state of inner tension...[or] caused by an unconscious conflict". Emotions affect your behavior. Emotions are states of feelings that arise naturally during conflict. Emotions are experienced as good or bad - relations are defined by the kind of emotion that is expressed. They serve a variety of functions and negative emotions such as anger can serve as a wake up call. Natural tension of opposites. Feelings and how they fit into the model are presented along with a list of emotions typical when ones needs are not being met. classified as: Activated or deactivated and Unpleasant or Pleasant. What is required to engage and collaborate in conflict? What is it when applied to both negative and positive emotions? Why would one want to be in the midrage of emotional expression? What happens when you express more extreme emotions? 2. How to Deal with Extreme Emotion. In general when some feeling inside seems to be growing larger and out of control, naming or identifying that feeling internally will, by itself, tend to diminish the feeling and bring it under control. It also helps to be able to adopt the stance of a detached observer. This allows perspective to analyse the emotions and think of ways of dealing with them. It is important to note that even awareness and recognition of emotions may not be enough to control behaviour. Alena i think you are very wrong, you should study culture and understand how there are different cultural expectations in communication from different genders. he has well stated that in some cultures there are expectations when it comes to displaying emotions in negotiation. Reply. Today emotions are seen as an integral part of conflict and conflict resolution. Research, mostly experimental or simulation based, has shown that emotional "reappraisal" or "self-regulation" can have a positive effect on conflict transformation. Drawing on lessons learned from a case study of conflict transformation involving Jewish and Arab students in Israel, this paper illustrates how the "reappraisal" of difficult emotions can play a central role in creating more positive relationships. It is also useful to recognize that some emotions can be helpful in trying to resolve a conflict to the extent that individuals want to feel a sense of belonging and recognition (Lindner 2014).