

December 2004

## Worldviews, Normative Masculinity, and the Invention of Peace

Gordon Fellman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj>

---

### Recommended Citation

Fellman, Gordon (2004) "Worldviews, Normative Masculinity, and the Invention of Peace," *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*: Vol. 3: Iss. 2, Article 19.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol3/iss2/19>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications and Programs at Seattle University School of Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Seattle Journal for Social Justice by an authorized editor of Seattle University School of Law Digital Commons.

## **Worldviews, Normative Masculinity, and the Invention of Peace**

---

Gordon Fellman<sup>1</sup>

### IT IS TIME TO INVENT PEACE

War is no more necessary than smallpox or ignorance. War, like most human activities at this stage of our species' development, is a human invention. It is fed by and reinforced by a worldview that sees war as natural and inevitable. I have named this the "enemies worldview." It is the dominant worldview on our planet today.

There is a secondary worldview I call the "cooperation worldview." It sees peace as preferable to war and is convinced that just as war is a human invention that we have lived with for millennia, peace can also become a reality. This secondary view holds that peace is possible so long as we put our imaginations and energies toward cooperating with each other to make us all secure rather than competing for the security and prosperity of some at the expense of the insecurity and misery of others.

Masculinity is as much a social construction as war or any other institution. Today, "normative masculinity," meaning masculinity in its dominant form in most societies, favors war. It could be reconstructed to favor peace. This reconstruction is essential to moving toward peace throughout the world.

### THE ASSUMPTION THAT WAR IS NECESSARY

"War will always be with us." "We have always had war." "War is part of human nature." "Men are aggressive; there is nothing you can do about it." "It's testosterone. Men are biologically destined to make war." "Our economy needs war; we really cannot do without it."

And so on. For about twenty years, I have been teaching an undergraduate course that explores whether war is necessary. At the start of the semester, I always hear comments like those above. I get the same responses from people in audiences that I speak to about this topic and from various colleagues, acquaintances, and strangers when conversation drifts toward the agonies and costs of war.

On topics such as gender, money, politics, religion, or war most people are bound by conventional wisdom passed on to them by families, schools, governments, religions, mass media, and other institutions. Part of that wisdom is that things have to be the way they are; institutions as we know them are eternal.

#### IMAGINATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Yet societies do change, even though the conventional wisdom either takes a dim view of that truth or ignores it altogether for good reason: social change can be thrilling and liberating in its implications, as well as very frightening. Centuries of assumptions about the inevitability of slavery, the inferiority of people of color, and the second-class status of women have been challenged head on by the antislavery, civil rights, and women's rights movements, respectively. Slavery has not completely ended, but much of the world—almost all of it—has rejected it.<sup>2</sup> In this country, slavery was formally abolished less than a century and a half ago.

It is hard to deny that in the last hundred years progress has been made in extending human rights to more people. However, it is also hard to deny that progress is not only complicated but also frustrating and exasperating to activists and bewildering and frightening to people who are content with old ways.

We are often so attached to conventional wisdom that we have a difficult time imagining that things can be other than the way they are. Change builds from imagination. "We've always done it this way" is one of the timeless replies to any call for social change, as well as one of the greatest

poisons preventing it. “We’ve always done it this way.” Well, sure; we used to die of smallpox, but we do not now. Before the discovery of hygiene, people ate with dirty hands and even performed in the operating room without washing up. We do it differently now. We used to need weeks or months to make long trips by sea or horse-drawn carriage, but we do not now. We used to wait days for letters to arrive at their destination. Telegraphs, telephones, faxes, and e-mail make that wait no longer necessary or even conceivable for many people.

Invention is a major part of what humans do. We are not unique in inventing, but the extent and depth of our inventions are part of what distinguishes us as a species. We invent not only tools but also language; not only exercise but also sport; not only medicines but also religion; not only vehicles but also political systems, economic systems, and much more.

Why has it, though, been easier for us as a species to invent central heating and air conditioning, refrigerators and stoves, air travel, automobiles, computers, space technology, complex medical procedures, atomic and hydrogen bombs, stealth airplanes, and poison gases than to address and resolve problems like homelessness, unemployment, an uneven system of health care, mediocre education, starvation, cruel political systems, an economy that benefits no more than 20 percent of the world’s population, and war?

What do we make of a species that is determined to eradicate disease but falls hook, line, and sinker for the conventional wisdom that poverty will always be with us? Why not “disease will always be with us,” or “disease is part of human nature”?

Social change is far more complicated than technological change. For one thing, it is not possible to measure it exactly. For another, it assumes certain values; for instance, discriminating against people because of race or gender is bad or representative democracy is preferable to dictatorship or it is time to wind down war. Prospects of change are always resisted by some people. There is very little objection to making more efficient automobile

engines, developing cheaper telephone technology, or eliminating smallpox. But ending racism insults people comfortable with racism. Ending sexism insults people used to it and living comfortably off of it. Ending dictatorship offends dictators and their supporters.

#### THE APPEAL OF WAR

And thus with war. There is no reason we have to continue to have war, but however ugly and devastating war may be, many people are comfortable with it. Some people make a lot of money off war.<sup>3</sup> Others define their masculinity in terms of the discipline, challenge, hardness, bravery, cruelty, and submission to absolute authority made possible by war.<sup>4</sup>

Our lives are often humdrum, and war is anything but that. It is gripping, requires immediate attention, and makes every action for countless people one of survival or death. War is exciting for many citizens. The media make it fascinating, play up the drama and technical expertise of war, and downplay or ignore the hideous scenes of humans ripped apart by weapons or burnt to a crisp by napalm or atomic devices as well as the fact that lives, cities, and even entire peoples are destroyed as a consequence of war. In fact, countless men and women have found and do find thrills and challenges in war that they find nowhere else.<sup>5</sup> War is often a test of bravery, timing, speed, skill, courage, and more.

War is a useful outlet for the anger we all carry within us. We need to express this anger somewhere. War presents us with perfect enemies, whom our leaders and the media tell us are purely evil while at the same time extolling us as purely good. The anger we all carry around—which starts in family life and extends to workplace, neighborhood, community, nation, people, religion, and more—can rarely be expressed at its real objects. It is a relief for many to shift all their anger at people and experiences in their own lives to people they have never met and know virtually nothing about.<sup>6</sup>

This shift is rather easy. Certain kinds of leaders and their staffs make war with technical competence and perfectly understandable intentions. Furthermore, although war technology changes, people do know how to make wars. That they often do not do it well does not seem to interfere with the habit of having wars. At the end of a war, someone has won and someone has lost. That someone can be an entire population. Looked at from another angle, though, that someone is a leader or group of leaders who, for whatever reasons, have decided to opt for war as a way of resolving conflict.

If thousands or millions of people are dead at the end of a war, including people whose deaths are caused by their own side as a result of confusing orders and messed up strategies, that is the way it goes. If resources are squandered on war that could otherwise have gone toward housing, education, health care, recreation, and other ways of meeting pressing human needs, well bye-bye to the project of meeting pressing human needs. If vast reaches of the environment are devastated in war by oil spills, if radioactive materials remain dangerous for millions of years after causing their initial war damage, and if species are destroyed by reckless invasions of fragile environments, well, war is war. And war is hell.

Indeed, the horrible effects of war are rationalized, and quite understandably: “well,” we are often reminded, “that is what war is about.” Yes, all those terrible prices are indeed what war is about. But we would have a lot more plane crashes if we took for granted that mechanical errors and terrorist bombs placed in luggage are part of the price we pay for air travel. In that realm, we plan carefully and thoroughly to avoid disaster, and we have come a long way in successfully doing so. In war, we plan for even greater disasters—the death of troops and civilians and damage to cities and nature. Why do we not instead plan for how to prevent such devastation? Is that not odd? We plan for human-made catastrophes as if they were inevitable, which they rarely are, and then we do everything that

we can to carry out the war plans and to toss peace possibilities into the wastebasket.

One of the most mind-boggling things about war is how often failed efforts are repeated. Another is how the same mistakes are made endlessly by people who refuse to consider whether there might be more effective ways of proceeding or ways not to have wars at all.<sup>7</sup>

#### THE DESIRE FOR REVENGE

By its very nature, war means losers as well as winners. One of the implicit rules of war is that losers accept defeat and victors glory in their triumph. It is startling that little attention is paid to the psychology and behavior of losers in war. As it turns out, they often do not accept defeat gracefully. Rather, they nurse fantasies of revenge and often take it. War perpetuates itself partly because of the understandable desire to seek retribution after losing.<sup>8</sup>

That desire for revenge is in one way natural and in another way not natural at all. It is natural because when we are defeated, we get angry and want to get even. It is unnatural in that the cycle can be ended by recognizing something rarely acknowledged so far in war: the humiliation of defeat feeds the passion for revenge.

Ending the very concepts of defeat and humiliation would be part of the strategy of ending war. Had the Germans not been so thoroughly humiliated at the end of the First World War, it is quite likely that Hitler, bent on revenge, would never have taken power and forced us into the Second World War.

#### INVENTING PEACE

Resolving conflict is a task. Conversation and negotiation, the methods by which most conflicts are addressed, are two ways to manage conflict. Litigation, so common in U.S. society, is another. These alternatives to war require imagination just as war itself does. While we might desire to end

war, how might we go about inventing peace? Indeed, how do people go about making any changes they find desirable?

The imagining of agriculture had to begin with observations about how food grows. It may be that agriculture was the first great human invention. War itself seems to begin with that seemingly benign decision to grow food deliberately, which made for stable and permanent human settlements and accumulated goods and food, as well as temptations to steal those goods and food.

It is the invention of war and the subsequent making of war that our species has mastered. We know how to do it. Endless numbers of people have declared wars, planned wars, organized wars, fought wars, won wars, lost wars, survived wars, and died in wars.

#### OBSTACLES TO THE INVENTION OF PEACE

But once peace is imagined, how does one invent peace? There are no technological devices involved, no peace weapons, no computers coordinating peace strikes. There are few academies training peacemakers how to prevent or end wars. Although there are now a number of graduate programs in conflict resolution and coexistence in several countries, their graduates play roles in peacemaking but do not end major or even most minor wars by intervening between the antagonists to bring about peace.<sup>9</sup>

Along with that, few media outlets report peacemaking efforts.<sup>10</sup> Is that not rather sad? What journalism there is on the topic is haphazard and not very well developed. Mainstream tend to be driven by profit, and it is a cliché, albeit true, that violence sells better than nonviolence and peace. The people who move the media in these unfortunate directions are not ill intentioned or ignorant. Rather, they are captives of the values and ways of the institutions that employ them.<sup>11</sup>

As such, the media tend to serve as cheerleaders for the status quo. They make great efforts not to let the citizenry be exposed to radical critiques, complex thinking, or the possibilities of fundamental changes in anything.



Hence, reporting about the Iraq war rarely, if ever, looks to the war's institutional roots, the lies and manipulations behind it, or the institutions that profit from selling weapons and rebuilding that which U.S. armed forces destroy. The media is there to inform only within a circumscribed territory, which assumes that established institutions must remain in place and function as they do and that innovation and criticism are suspect, disloyal, and even unpatriotic.<sup>12</sup>

Most people crave peace; thus, it is somewhat embarrassing for us as a species that our governments are rarely attuned to the desire of the public. The media are also not attuned to that desire. No one so far seems to be clever enough to figure out how to make peace efforts and accomplishments dramatic. It would be a great challenge, although not impossible, for journalism to take this on as a major task.

Again, what is needed is people willing and patient enough to develop the expertise that would elevate peacemaking to among the highest and noblest human endeavors. But before this can happen, imagination is essential—the ability to imagine peace, to imagine ways of bringing people together to make peace, and to convince entire populations that peace is both possible and desirable.

Here is a vague analogy. Countless industries pollute the air, the streams, the lakes, and the oceans. It does not take much imagination or effort to pollute. It takes far more sweat and strength to figure out how to clean up pollution and prevent it in the future. Like the continuation of pollution, the continuation of war reflects a massive and tragic lack of imagination among policymakers, war makers, legislators, executives, businesses, the public who supports them, and the media, which make war seem necessary and acceptable.

Our economic system is a gigantic obstacle to peace. Arms manufacturers found the Second World War to be a great economic bonanza.<sup>13</sup> Not only did their skills in inventing, organizing, and producing weapons succeed in helping the allies overcome the axis, but those

companies also found that they were making huge profits while at the same time helping their country win a terrible war.

It appears to have occurred to some of these businessfolk that it would be greatly desirable to keep the war economy going, even in peace time. The cold war was the perfect boon for these people. Even though the Soviet Union pleaded with the United States not to insist on an arms race, the United States went ahead with it and forced the Soviet Union to do likewise. I do not mean to reduce the cold war to this one dimension. Rather, I mean to suggest that without huge profits made from designing, manufacturing, and selling weapons systems, big businesses might have been less eager to carry the war torch for as long as they did and continue to do.<sup>14</sup>

Let us be absolutely clear: huge fortunes are made off of war planning, war making, and reconstruction after war. An economic system whose primary value is profit rather than human well-being quite reasonably, even if tragically, finds war more attractive than health care, education, and housing for everyone.<sup>15</sup> In short, the obsessive demand for profit outstrips recognition of the vast field of human needs—their chronic neglect and our enormous capacity as a species to meet them for everyone.

The tenacity of this economic system is a crucial underpinning of a worldview that sustains war, hatred, and violence and needs to be examined as carefully as possible. For this system, and the worldview behind it, have brought our species to the brink of catastrophe. Without the proper care, understanding, and actions, we could destroy ourselves. This consequence now appears to be common knowledge outside high political and industrial circles.

#### INVENTING PEACE INCLUDES CHANGING WORLDVIEWS

Every once in a while, cars need an oil change. And every once in a while, people need a worldview change. The one that they have used for a long time has too much crud in it and does not work very well anymore.

The realities that it used to apply to have changed, and it is time for the worldview to change as well. It is time that people look for something more suited to their time, for as times change, so must worldviews.

Worldviews are the basic statements of what we believe to be true from day to day and of what is worth striving for. Worldviews are the directions that we are given about how to relate to people who seem to be like us and how to relate to people who seem to be unlike us. Worldviews tell us what to think and feel and do about nature, our bodies, sex, the economy, religion, the political system, material things, greed, love, hate, war, peace, and just about everything else.

Our worldview is, to put it briefly, how we understand the world to work. Some of us experience the world as a dangerous, hostile, menacing place filled with hate, suspicion, and plots and incapable of ever being anything else. This is the enemies worldview.

By contrast, we can see the world as a place that beneath its surface of huge antagonisms and problems is full of wonder and human possibility for friendliness and environmental health. We can dream that all the world religions, secular views, peace, and love will eventually guide human endeavors on our fragile planet. This is the cooperation worldview.

If we hold the enemies worldview, we see it as necessary to get as much as we can for ourselves and to deprive others of what they need and want. We feel the need to close ourselves off from others and not recognize them as fellow and equal human beings. In this worldview, we see the world in terms of “us versus them” and live in great fear that what we have could be taken away. If we hold this view, we are convinced that all people are out only for themselves and that it is right and necessary to get as much as we can for ourselves. If this means that billions of other people wind up with less than they need for themselves, that is just the way it goes. Those of us who accept the enemies worldview do not feel connected to people who are outside our own social class, race, ethnic group, generation, gender, sexual orientation, or who are different in any way. We feel in some way that they

want to take away something that belongs to us, and we are determined not to let them take it.

If we hold the second, alternative worldview, that is, the cooperation worldview, we see that all people are entitled to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” We recognize that all humans have the same needs for food, clothing, shelter, human connections, emotional fulfillment, security, respect, meaning, education, health care, entertainment, exercise, confidence in themselves, and faith in nature to provide and protect. We recognize that people with the enemies worldview have run the world since the dawn of recorded history, but we know that humans have just as much potential to cooperate as to compete. We also know that just as human beings can hate, they have equal or perhaps even greater potential to love. We know that although humans can mock, ridicule, and despise, they also have a great capacity to understand, empathize, and cooperate.

Each of us is a unique hodgepodge of tendencies that fall within both worldviews. However, in every one of us, there is a predominant emphasis on either the enemies worldview or the cooperation worldview. Most of us, in the ways in which we act toward other people and in our political commitments and behavior, favor one of these views over the other.

#### THE WORLDVIEWS CONTRASTED

In the enemies worldview, bodies are bewildering and frightening because they threaten to erupt in uncontrollable sexuality, violence, or both. In the cooperation worldview, bodies are the center of our being, beautiful, sensuous, and entitled to feel grace, strength, sexuality, and goodness. People holding this view, like those committed to the enemies worldview, recognize that bodies also harbor great sexuality and violence, but they know that there are ways to contain those parts of them and to find pleasure and fulfillment in their lives without hurting themselves or anyone else.

In the enemies worldview, politics exist to contain the violent, antisocial inclinations lurking beneath the surface in everyone, at whatever cost in

terms of brutality, threat, punishment, and angry behavior. In the cooperation worldview, politics is the art of creating institutions that not only recognize and restrain violent tendencies but also permit and encourage creative, life-enhancing, self-fulfilling tendencies.

The word “realism” is a mainstay of the enemies worldview. It is, according to the assumption of countless people, unrealistic to think that war can ever end. Instead, it is realistic to believe that war is with us permanently. Do not fight it. Do not be childish and whine about it. Face the fact that wars happen, and do everything you can to win. Likewise, realism once applied to many other notions of the past. For example, until very recently, it was considered unrealistic to think that women could be serious and accomplished athletes, executives, surgeons, scientists, or national leaders. Surely at the time of the American Revolution, it was unrealistic to think that the colonists could succeed. According to John Adams, about one-third of the colonists supported the Revolution, one-third were opposed, and one-third were neutral.<sup>16</sup> Notice—and this is crucial to my entire analysis—those supporters were dismissed by the majority as idealists. But, in the end, they carried the day and were right. The idealistic claim that the thirteen American colonies could free themselves from Great Britain and establish a free democratic society was right. The realistic claim that such a feat was impossible was wrong.

It is assumed in the enemies worldview that things that exist now are forever. It is assumed that it is not necessary or even worth the effort to try to imagine good social change and how to bring it about. “Grow up!” “Shape up!” “Be realistic!” are some of the ways that people who wonder about good change are ridiculed and urged to abandon those ideas and efforts. Instead of idealism being a prized word indicating imagination, creativity, and determination to bring about liberating social change, it is stigmatized. That process keeps the majority of people from giving careful thought to possibilities for liberating change.

The enemies worldview defines the world as a very dangerous place that will always be a very dangerous place. To feel safe, you have to be armed and prepared to make war at a moment's notice. You must not let up your guard, and you must not try to reconcile with people who have disliked or hated you or people whom you have disliked or hated, for reconciliation is a pipe dream, a naïve hope, an unrealistic vision.

You must be on your guard against these other people, and you must be opposed to them because, it is assumed, they are opposed to you. If you perceive them as somehow getting in your way—and you are taught usually to see them that way—then you must fight them, and if all goes well, overwhelm and overcome them. It does not matter how many of them die, or for that matter, how many of your own people die. You are operating on the basis of some eternal truth that must be respected and honored. You have no other choice.

Thus, in the enemies worldview, safety lies in separating from other people and opposing them. You are on your guard, trying to make sure that no one encroaches on your space and your privileges, to say nothing of your wealth and your reputation. Other people could undermine you, intimidate you, humiliate you, embarrass you, attack you, harm you, or destroy you. Furthermore, as long as they hold the same assumptions, you are in a permanent condition of mutual suspicion, apprehension, fear, and eventually—as the inevitable outcome of all this—mutual hatred and eventual violence. One thinker calls this “adversary symbiosis.”<sup>17</sup>

#### DISCIPLINE AND WORLDVIEWS

One of the keys to worldview differences is attitudes toward discipline. People who hold the enemies worldview tend to be highly punitive.<sup>18</sup> They believe that punishment is the prime way to make people behave in civil ways, or rather, in ways that the people who hold this worldview believe people must behave. Rather than try to persuade people to see their point of

view, or use incentives that are not terrifying and humiliating, they often resort to force—punishing and hurting.

I had a grandfather who was a horse trainer for a brief period of his youth. He told my father that you raise children the way you train horses: first you break their spirit, then you can get them to do anything you want. It was Machiavelli who wrote that it is better to be feared than to be loved.<sup>19</sup> Exactly my grandfather's sentiment, apparently. My father, the oldest of seven children, was one of two who especially bore the brunt of this philosophy of raising children. What I believe to be true about my grandfather from what I have heard about him (he died before I was born) is that he knew how to make his family fear him, but he had no idea how to let them love him. I do not think it is an accident that according to his younger brother, whom I did know, my grandfather was a sweet and gentle man until he served seven years in the Russian army around the turn of the twentieth century. He came out of that experience a tyrant. Thus, my grandfather demonstrates that the enemies worldview, through the military training that all armies are required to teach, turns people into accepters and promoters of this worldview.<sup>20</sup>

#### EMOTIONS AND WORLDVIEWS

Highly punitive people want and need love as much as anyone else, but they often are at a loss as to how to get it. They fear the softer parts of themselves—the tender, loving parts. Men more than women tend to be taught to fear the vulnerable and frightened parts so they give up any hope of loving and being loved and settle instead for fearing and being feared.<sup>21</sup> That is about as far as they can go, which is human and understandable, yet tragic.

For example, the highly punitive people who seek to punish women who accidentally get pregnant also reject offering sex education and contraception. They appear to be motivated by a diffused anger that diverts itself from what they are really angry about (most likely the way their

parents treated them punitively) and take it out on their own children and others.

The major alternative to this kind of harshness, this free-floating punishment, is patience, care, and nurturance. Even when a crying child is being nasty and obnoxious, it is possible to understand that she is either frightened or in the grip of emotions too strong for her to be able to handle well at her tender age. The crying child is saying something about what she needs but does not know how to put it into words. Or, the child can put her needs into words but does not have the capacity yet to realize that what she wants cannot be had. Rejecting the child's anger is a form of punishment. Recognizing the anger and holding the child, while rejecting what the child is demanding, is a way of cooperating with the child's feelings even if not accepting her demands. The parent working in the cooperation worldview honors all feelings as real feelings, even those that exasperate. The parent working in the enemies worldview mocks, disdains, or rejects feelings they do not want to deal with. This is part of the foundation for preparing the parent and child to experience each other as enemies and preparing the child to accept and perpetuate the enemies worldview.

This practice plays into the conviction of the enemies worldview that we are all individuals, apart from everybody else, with no real connections among us and no inherent obligations to one another or positive feelings for each other either. People live more or less isolated from each other, even if they are in the same city, office, apartment building, or household. As individuals, their interests often are assumed to oppose the interests of most other people, including, not uncommonly, their fellow workers and even members of the same family. In the enemies worldview, nothing can be done about this. You have to live with it and make the most of it. That is the way it goes.



## INDIVIDUALISM AND WORLDVIEWS

This individualism has great advantages. People can venture out on their own. They can innovate, create, and improvise. They can feel the exhilaration of their unique, individual lives. They can create not only products and businesses but works of art, books, adventures, athletic records, business plans, and ideas. They can even—and sometimes do—create themselves anew. They make of themselves what they want to be and what they believe they truly are, even if that is not what other people had in mind for them. Sometimes such individuals succeed in self-transformation and that can be spine tingling and thrilling. Sometimes they fail, and it is dismaying. They often succeed in some ways and fail in others.

The individual in the enemies worldview is seen as supremely important. Groups are suspected of somehow making unreasonable claims on individuals. That you might feel positively connected to others and obligated to them in fulfilling ways strikes holders of the enemies worldview as either sick, terrifying, or both. They tend to fear deep connections outside their families and their friendship circles. That fear is habitually masked by feelings and expressions of contempt and bewilderment that anyone could possibly believe that fulfillment can be found in relating to others as well as in pursuing one's own exciting projects.

Adherents of the enemies worldview reject notions that people are inherently connected with each other. They are suspicious—indeed, often contemptuous—of people whom they do not know. They make fun of other nationalities and races. They make jokes at the expense of people of the other gender or people who are not overtly heterosexual. They ridicule people with physical imperfections and emotional problems. They idealize being self-sufficient and are scornful of people who turn to therapists, clergy, or even friends for help when they are miserable, confused, depressed, anxious, or despondent.

When holders of this view feel lonely, isolated, friendless, and sad, they figure that is just the way it is. That is the world, that is life, and you cannot do anything about it. Other people are more often viewed as potential or real enemies than as potential or real friends.

When people caught up in this worldview feel this way, they are tempted to obliterate those undesirable feelings of isolation, fear, and confusion. Although feelings actually cannot be obliterated, they can be numbed in any number of ways. People can learn how to deaden feelings in order to reduce the pain, loneliness, and emptiness that accompany the assumption of being so superindividual and separated from others. Because the hurts experienced in reality are so painful to them, holders of the enemies worldview sometimes understandably gravitate toward alcohol, nicotine, drugs, and gambling to blunt those feelings. They may also engage in violence against other individuals or groups, expecting—often correctly—that violence is a way of temporarily avoiding the pains of severe loneliness, sadness, and despair that so often accompany the enemies worldview.

Opposing others, then, in politics, in war, in business, even in sport, is a way to avoid certain feelings that are soft, gentle, tender, and sweet, especially among people who learn to suspect and reject those feelings as illegitimate. War is the culmination of this strategy, where you learn to deaden your feelings against the reality of people who die on the enemy side—often even people who die on your side—of people whose lives may be ruined by deaths in their families, and by so much wealth being spent on war rather than on making life more comfortable and satisfying for vast numbers of people.

The cooperation worldview respects the beauties of individualism and is grateful for them. However, this view sees individualism not in opposition to feeling good with other people but simply as a part of life that also includes the pleasures of feeling connected and comfortable, even enhanced and fulfilled, with other people.

This view sees people as essentially social from the start. It recognizes that we are not born individuals; instead, we are born tied to other people and completely dependent on them for our survival. It recognizes that children need nurturing, caring, and loving people in order to survive. It knows the tenuousness of a child's grasp of reality and its deep, deep need for compassionate parents to see it through the incredible puzzlements, fears, bewilderments, and perils of childhood. It is aware that people learn emotions, language, and worldviews from and with other people, beginning with their parents, and that people are dependent on others for approval, recognition, and love.

The cooperation worldview does not see individualism as all there is to our lives. It sees that we are dependent on others, but that being dependent on others does not mean that we have to be subservient to others. Rather, the cooperation worldview understands and celebrates interdependence, that is, the idea that people need each other and thrive off each other when they are functioning at their best.

#### THE PIVOTAL ROLE OF NORMATIVE MASCULINITY IN WORLDVIEW CHANGE

At the core of the enemies worldview lies a tenacious set of cultural assumptions and practices widely called "normative masculinity" in the field of sociology. Every worldview makes certain assumptions about masculinity and femininity. In the dominant worldview that I am describing here, the enemies worldview, normative masculinity assumes that men have to be tough, hard, and determined in order to get ahead or even just to get along in the world. Increasingly, these assumptions are recommended to women and taken on by many of them as well.

This view is applied to the body itself. "Hardbody" is currently a term of great approval in the enemies worldview. There are magazines devoted to showing men and women how, through weight lifting, exercise, diet, and supplements, they can make their bodies literally as hard as possible. Some

plastic surgeons offer silicone implants to make the pectorals of the chest, the muscles of the calves, and muscles of other parts of the male body more prominent and hard than they otherwise are. Some women use plastic surgery to make their breasts smaller and harder than they are naturally. Although the women's movement, enormously successful in many ways, gained equal rights for women previously denied to them, it has perhaps taken on more of normative masculinity than it intended to or than many feminists would be comfortable admitting.

In the enemies worldview, sexuality is seen as something crucial to master. It means having lots of sex and enjoying vigorous ejaculations and orgasms. In this view, nature has obvious designs for men and women having sex together—otherwise, the species would die out. Among some normatively masculine people, the idea of sex as pleasure for its own sake is either rejected or guiltily enjoyed in private and denied in public. The idea that sex with someone of the same gender can be fulfilling is somehow very threatening to both normative masculinity and normative femininity under this worldview. Finally, this view also has severe limits on how far it can integrate sexual pleasure with other aspects of intimacy and love.

#### FEELINGS AND NORMATIVE MASCULINITY

Men and women who hold the enemies worldview learn to celebrate and express emotions of anger, fury, annoyance, exasperation, frustration, antagonism, hostility, animosity, rivalry, rage, competitiveness, conquest, contempt, scorn, hatred, derision, condescension, superiority, dominance, power, and other feelings that put down other people. These emotions are largely endorsed by other men and women who are taught to admire these aspects of normative masculinity.

Normative masculinity teaches men to be suspicious of more troubling feelings such as hurt and fear and softer emotions such as tenderness, compassion, empathy, and love. Those feelings may be okay in intimate relationships, if there are any in a man's life, but they are not acceptable

more broadly, and certainly not in public. It is increasingly common for women to take up these attitudes as well.

Some men are hard, steel willed, cold, ruthless, triumphant, unfeeling, uncaring, and supercompetitive. Some men are gentle, warm, compassionate, cooperative, and can express the entire range of human feelings. Most men do not fit either of these descriptions fully but partake of both to one degree or another.

The same goes for women. Some women are hard, steel willed, cold, ruthless, triumphant, unfeeling, uncaring, and supercompetitive. Some women are gentle, warm, compassionate, cooperative, and can express the entire range of human feelings. Like most men, most women work out their idiosyncratic blending of both these models of behavior.

Nonetheless, men tend more toward the hard and cold model, and women tend more toward the warm and gentle model. This pattern of coldness, hardness, and lack of emotion is normative masculinity. In American society—and we are hardly alone in the world in this—men are pressured more toward the cold, hard model than the warm, gentle one.

Most men simply take for granted that to be seen as adequate men by other people, often including women, they have to be chilly and rigid. They have to let themselves know only a very narrow range of human feelings, concentrating mainly on anger, scorn, and combativeness. Moreover, these men have to strive to feel and to be seen as superior to other people, men and women alike. They attempt this on the playground, in sport, in business, in politics, in romance, in parenting; in fact, they attempt this in almost any line of work and public activity. Whether factory worker, accountant, student, physician, lawyer, or CEO, most men play to win and know that they are seen as especially masculine not only if they win but also if they display as many as possible of the harsh qualities of normative masculinity.

## WHAT IS IT TO BE A MAN?

For most men, it is not so much that they have chosen normative masculinity as that they see other people expecting it of them. Fathers, and often mothers, press their sons to compete and to be supercontrolled in their emotions. It is perhaps corny but true that countless millions of boys are taught that boys do not cry, that you have to win, that being ruthless and out mainly for yourself is the way to succeed in the world, and that tenderness and kindness are the marks of wimps, wusses, sissies, scaredy-cats, and fags—not of real men. Increasingly, women accept these premises too.<sup>22</sup>

Real men do this. Real men do not do that. Countless men learn to worry if they are man enough, real men, up to the challenge, and the like. When “Be a man!” is bellowed at a male of any age, the bellower means the following: be determined and tough and brutal. That is what is expected of a man. Anything else makes you inferior to real men, a failure they will mock and scorn.

It has never been clear exactly what “man enough” means, so men often grope around, sometimes frantically, to figure it out. Some men undergo military training, hoping that will make them man enough. Others devote themselves to especially rugged sports, hoping that will do the trick. Some men build fortunes, often at the expense of other people, and glory in the recognition that conventional success and wealth bring them.

It is not uncommon for a country’s leaders to go to war against other countries, or even against parts of their own population, to show others and themselves just how manly they are. These efforts are often buttressed by words and phrases such as “kicking butt,” “obliterating,” “creaming,” “mauling,” “nailing,” “annihilating,” and “deep-sixing the opponent.”

The image of normative masculinity is of someone who is self-sufficient, someone who does not need anyone else: the cowboy, the loner, the godfather, the empire builder, the king, or the warrior.

### THE WARRIOR

Ah, the warrior. Let us look at this for a moment. There is a noble theme in history of the warrior as a man who is brave, courageous, physically fit, skilled in weaponry, strong in body and good in heart, disciplined, unafraid, moral, and subservient to authority. Television's Xena, "the warrior princess,"<sup>23</sup> is an exception to this theme.

This warrior theme is very compelling. Achilles, Hector, Joshua, David, and soldiers awarded the purple heart—these are men who capture our imaginations because they are the essence, the quintessence, of something historically male. We see them as muscular, quick, agile, alert, cunning, smart, wily, sturdy, tough, and hard. We admire that they conscientiously follow a code of war and are unquestioningly loyal to their commander, general, king, or god.

When the warrior fights, it is for a reason he accepts because it is the command of a trusted authority. When he kills, he is convinced that he has no other choice. It is typical of the warrior that he learns not to question authority, not to think for himself. Thus, it is ironic that at the height of his strivings to be a certain kind of man, he acts like the typical and perfect child: not knowing or trusting enough in himself to think for himself. It may seem odd, but a fundamental part of normative masculinity is not thinking for yourself if you are anywhere but at the top of a chain of command. Normative masculinity, therefore, has something profoundly childish at the heart of it: the inability to assess and criticize higher authority. The normative male takes this so for granted that he does not see the massive irony in saying that a man is as fearful of challenging authority as he may well have been as a young child. He avoids this crucial issue by turning his attention elsewhere.

The warrior is hyperalive to the dangers around him. He knows that if he does not kill swiftly enough, he may himself die. He lives with the correct assumption that just as he is out to kill if his commanders and kings tell him

he must, there are people on the other side with the same instructions from their leaders.

There is certainly nothing like the probability that one either kills or will be killed to quicken the senses and give life that tingle that most people lack in their everyday existence. We think of the warrior—and he appears to think of himself—as living on the edge. If he triumphs, he is a hero. If he dies, he died for his king, his queen, his emperor, his empress, his country, or his god. He was patriotic until the end. He was courageous, fearless, robust, astute, and powerful. He was a man's man. He did what he was told, unquestioningly and unthinkingly.

It is understandable that people are in awe of this warrior ideal and its romantic place in history. In many cultures, both preindustrial and advanced, boys are trained to be warriors as the highest realization of manhood. Indeed, there are cultures where a boy is not a man until he first kills an enemy. This can be one of countless forms of *rites de passage* that mark the transition from boyhood to manhood. In modern cultures, these forms are less defined, less distinct, or absent from the lives of most males.

Movies, dramas, myths, legends, and comic books flow from the gripping figure of the warrior with his shield and spear, his helmet and rifle, or his fatigues and rocket launcher. This picture is vivid and influential. There is something sensuous about the very idea of the strength, poise, and skills required to undergo the rigors of military training and the challenges of combat, whether face-to-face with daggers and lances, or from a distance with guns and rockets. There is a romance about the warrior—his powerful and swift sexuality, his steel-jawed fearlessness, his swagger, his confidence, and his certainty about his talents and his purpose. There is a reason why the fictional Rambo, who could not speak anything on his mind or in his heart and wreaked havoc on those who challenged him, seized the yearnings and imaginations of millions of people around the world.

Wars at this point in history range from close-up killing to distant slaughter by high-tech means. Remote killing weakens the romance of the



warrior, for it is computers, not an individual's astuteness and lightning-swift responses, that determine success in this kind of war. The high-tech warrior need not be physically strong or even physically fit if his or her task is to run a computer program with the end result of death, rather than to use his or her own body as an agent of someone else's death. Nonetheless, the warrior continues to pique the public imagination just enough to allow wars to continue as a way of resolving conflicts. Yet, how successfully are conflicts resolved by war?

Violence does not end violence. Violence sanctions violence. Rather than imagining a way beyond the cycle of violence, most leaders waging war tend to feel locked into the violent cycle and suffer the terrible, endless consequences. The mistake in that judgment lies in the belief that violence can bring an end to violence. That belief is taken for granted by most people who believe that nothing is able to persuade them to reconsider their violent habits.

It turns out, though, that violence rarely ends violence. Oh sure, for a time it might—for a few years, or even a generation. But eventually, the defeated side will have its payback. That is, unless it is so nearly annihilated that it cannot muster the force to retaliate, or unless it is rehabilitated thoughtfully and considerately (as Germany and Japan were at the end of the Second World War).<sup>24</sup> The desire for revenge and the determination to achieve it is the Achilles heel of the belief that violence can bring an end to violence.

Violence cannot bring an end to violence because violence justifies violence and implicitly gives the go-ahead for everyone involved to engage in further violence. The use of violence makes violence acceptable. It makes it normal. It makes it seemingly unavoidable. And there are plenty of people to claim that this lie is true.<sup>25</sup> Capital punishment follows the same logic. It actually legitimizes violence in a pretense that doing so will discourage or end violence, which it cannot and will not do.<sup>26</sup>

The very act of violence celebrates violence. All the reasoning in the world about how it is necessary just this one last time (remember that the First World War was going to be the “war to end all wars”) is a delusion. It may be an earnest delusion, and it may be that people who offer it really mean it from the bottom of their hearts, but it is a delusion all the same.

Violence sanctions violence, and therefore, even if not by intention, invites more violence in return. War is not a way to end violence. War is a fundamental and traditional way to perpetuate violence, to guarantee its continuation, and to sanction its legitimacy. It cannot be otherwise.

In most of history, there was no intention of using violence to end violence. The vision of real peace is a fairly recent idea. Until about two hundred years ago, most people took for granted that war was a natural part of the human condition.<sup>27</sup> They did not delude themselves into thinking that violence would end violence or that any war would be the last one. They simply knew as part of the common wisdom that war was in the human condition and would go on forever. War was seen as something that people do, by our nature, as part of our lives. The point was winning. Violence was not valued as an end in itself, but as a means toward a very highly valued end: winning.

#### WINNING

What could be more glorious than winning a war? Magnificent homecomings of soldiers; victory parades; bouquets from a grateful public; civilian and military leaders riding triumphantly in war vehicles and open cars and being admired for staying the course, no matter what the criticisms of them were or what even their own doubts might have been; men proving they are truly man enough; endless news stories detailing the splendor of battles, the grandeur of strategies, the heroism of individual warriors, the effectiveness of new weapons.

And there is so much more: the battlefield tragedies of our own side’s lives lost; the bitterness toward the hated, now subdued, enemy; the scorn

heaped upon the defeated party; the mockery of the purposes and motives of the losers; the conviction that the victors' deity or deities wanted this result; the prayers to those deities first for victory, then for thanks; the certainty that history was meant to come out this way.

The achievement of war is the peak of normative masculinity, which places overcoming other people as one of its highest goods; which recognizes that wars can be lost as well as won; and which finds itself supremely grateful for success. These aspects of normative masculinity know that the virtues of muscle, determination, and unavoidable brutality are the ways of the world. The conviction is that the victorious man is a successful man, that he is successful as a man, and that winning is all important.

Winning means placing myself above someone else. I am a better soccer player, chess player, business executive, physician, lawyer, politician, athlete, teacher, carpenter, musician, mechanic than you are. The conviction of superiority is strong and profoundly attractive for many people. It is a vindication of its own worth. It is a statement that I am good only if I know that I am better than you. I *am* better than you. I have shown the world that I am better than you. Hooray, hooray, hooray. I am the king of the hill. I am the victor. I have won.

Who can deny the sweetness of this feeling? Some of us live for it. Our lives are empty and frustrating without it. We need it. We crave it. We know (or at least assume) that countless other people respect us and admire us for it. It can even be the core of meaning in life. For some of us, winning is the meaning of life.

On the other hand, winning means mastery. We have used our bodies, our musical talents, our minds, our entrepreneurial skills, or our political savvy with supreme effectiveness. Mastery feels very, very good as an end in itself. It feels good to do something really, really well. Hitting the home run that won the game, or kicking the ball into the net of the other side, or sinking the winning basket means that my strength, grace, senses, timing,

eyesight, coordination, teamwork, and judgment all came together in the right way at the right moment. I took on something extremely challenging and did it perfectly. I feel great for having done this. Other people admire me and celebrate me for it too.

This feeling occurs not only in sport. It also occurs in politics, winning the election; in business, winning the contract; in education, receiving a high rank in a national magazine's annual ranking of colleges and universities; in art, winning a commission from a very rich patron or winning great reviews for your one-person show. This feeling occurs when we are being recognized as a great preacher, a great teacher, a great pianist or violinist, a great chef, a great architect, or a great advertising copywriter.

While such victories usually come at someone's expense, they rarely mean the death of competitors. They may result in some disappointment, but that is vastly different from the devastation and death that are essential to war. Whatever winning is in every other part of society, it is different in war, because winning a war means the deaths of a lot of people, including people on your own side. Increasingly, war means horrible costs to the environment as well. There is no way to deny that war is about death.

#### CHALLENGING WINNING

It is time to separate winning in war from all other forms of winning and to declare that the focus on winning in war is no longer tolerable. But why? Why make that distinction?

Whether it was ever worth it, massively destructive winning has become too costly to our lives, resources, and the environment to continue. Why does war persist? Is it because so many people insist on it? Glory in it? Thrill to it?

The development of alternative ways of resolving disputes has become a public issue very recently in history. Most people are unaware of these ways or they are just barely aware but deeply suspicious of them because they are not what we are used to. For understandable reasons, we tend to

adhere to what we are used to. If, however, what we are used to is no longer serviceable, then we are challenged to exercise our imaginations. In the past, this transformation allowed us to move from using horses and wagons for our primary means of transportation to using fuel-powered machines, to replace most sea travel with air travel, and to replace the telegraph with the telephone and the computer.

We are more able to let our imaginations move us from familiar objects to new and more effective objects than we are able to move from familiar social patterns—such as war—to new and more effective social patterns—such as ways of resolving conflicts that do not involve war.

However hard it is to make and win a war, it is even harder to make and win peace. Little is known about it. Worst of all, and perhaps first of all, the very effort to make peace without war is widely seen as wimpy, feeble, and pathetic.

Our culture is riddled with ambivalence. In the central text of Western civilization—the Bible—Jesus does not announce, “Blessed are the war-makers.” No, he tells his followers, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God.”<sup>28</sup> Yet the Bible is filled with war tales, and Judaism, Christianity, and Islam have inspired countless wars that have killed millions of people.

Joel instructs us to “[b]eat your plowshares into swords.”<sup>29</sup> But Isaiah recommends, “Beat their swords into plowshares.”<sup>30</sup> Given that swords were not the only implements of warfare at that time, it is likely that Isaiah’s counsel was to convert implements of war into implements of peace and to turn energies that go into war into energies that sustain and promote peace.

In both Psalm 37 and in Jesus’s Beatitudes, we do not read that “the rich, powerful, and ruthless shall inherit the Earth.” Rather, we read that “[b]lessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.”<sup>31</sup> It appears that “meek” in this context means subordinating oneself to the will of God. In a striking parallel, “Islam” means submission.<sup>32</sup> Another possibility is that

“meek” could mean put-upon. It could mean that the victims of historical processes of force and subduing will eventually take over from the forcers and subduers who tormented them, no matter what the reasons for that.

CONCLUSION: RECONSTRUCTING AND REINVENTING  
MASCULINITY—TOWARD THE COOPERATION WORLD VIEW

It is time to reexamine the old assumption that being able and ready to use violence against other people is a fundamental part of being a man. When people are angry, hurt, or afraid, they often tend to strike out and hurt someone else. Thus, they can express their anger directly against someone (usually not the person who provoked the anger in the first place), they can hurt people as a way of getting even for being hurt by others (seldom the ones who actually hurt them), and they can make other people fear them (usually not the same people who caused their fears in the first place) as a way of taking revenge.

All of these are reasonable as natural responses to anger, fear, and hurt. But how useful is it to act in this way? When we make other people angry, hurt them, or make them fear us, we breed resentment, anger, hurt, or fear that leads them to do in return what was just done to them.

Normative masculinity is stuck in that bind, like a bear in a steel trap. Men who accept normative masculinity are taught adamantly to deny their own hurts and fears. They are taught that every sign of doubt, hurt, fear, vulnerability, hesitation, and confusion is not manly. So instead of letting their real feelings of doubt, hurt, fear, vulnerability, hesitation, and confusion surface and dealing with those feelings, these men are under enormous pressure to pretend that they do not have them, or they try to stifle them in shame and embarrassment if they let themselves even for a moment recognize the truth—that the feelings are there. In desperate reaction, they turn to hurting and dominating others.

Normative masculinity prizes action over feelings, conquest over empathy, and winning over cooperation. Action is often wonderful, when

something good comes of it, but action for its own sake, as in lashing out at people in anger, is not helpful in running a society where people feel safe and valued.

The price that conventional “real men” pay for normative masculinity is odd. It is a price that says that lying about your feelings is okay. This means lying to yourself and to others. According to normative masculinity, it is more important to appear tough (it turns out you really can fool most of the people most of the time) than to appear caring, compassionate, and responsive to other people’s hurts, pains, and feelings of humiliation and anger. That, I believe, is tragic. It is exactly as if one were taught that of the five senses—touch, taste, sight, hearing, and smell—only two of them were legitimate, and the others had to be squelched. The consequence of not squelching the other senses is not being considered a man.

Why deny oneself the pleasures of any feelings? Even the bad ones (shame, hurt, humiliation, guilt, pain, fear) are part of what we are. We know we are alive when we feel our feelings. The greater the range of feelings we allow ourselves to feel, the more fully alive we are—I feel; therefore I am.

And so I propose a fundamental redefinition of “real men.” Real men control their angry, violent feelings and tendencies. They use courage not to kill and maim, but to rein in feelings that lead to behavior that violates the rights and self-respect of other people. Real men do not kill; they nurture. Real men respect all people and all feelings, and they allow themselves to struggle with all of their own feelings. They use courage to face the difficult, frightening task of talking about their feelings, which is essential to learning how to rein them in when one wants to and how to move beyond them when one desires that.

Making peace is so hard that we cannot name many people who are very good at it. We can name thousands of men and women who fought wars and won them, but how many people can we name who worked for peace and won it?

In my reconstruction of masculinity, real men connect with other people. They do not run away from them. Violence is the strongest way to turn away from other people. Being violent says, in effect, I do not know how to talk with you. I do not know how to connect with you. I do not know how to approach you. I fear you but cannot admit that. I do not know how to explain myself. I do not know how to open myself up to the reality of another real, complex, feeling human being. Because of all these human things I find I cannot do (or rather, I am mistakenly convinced I cannot do), I will in desperation strike out and hurt other people, make them suffer, fear, feel humiliated and defeated. When push comes to shove, I will do everything that I can to avoid connecting with other people, except in the most hideous, destructive way, by inflicting pain, even unto death.

It is time to redefine weakness as losing the ability to control one's anger, which becomes expressed in violence. It is time to redefine weak people as those who cannot embrace their real humanity and their natural feelings like other humans. We can redefine "weakling" to mean the person who is lacking the strength to control him or herself and to act thoughtfully, instead of blindly following orders of a commander or acting in rage.

We can recognize that many people (including women) are brought up to believe that cruelty is somehow admirable and strong. To be unfeeling, rough, harsh, and destructive is to succeed at something valuable and therefore is not only acceptable but also prized. The new definition of a "real man" suggests that those past conceptions are efforts to flee from the challenges of really knowing and coming to terms with the self.

But if people have trouble doing that—and everyone does, in one way or another—we would do better to feel compassion and understanding for such people and find ways to help them discover their full selves. Calling them names simply perpetuates the problem.

Making peace has to draw on empathy, caring, and feeling the full humanness of others. It has to draw on talents and feelings usually shoved aside in normative masculinity. Most men are starved of those feelings and



told not only that they must not have them but also that the feelings are not worth having anyway. This is one of the biggest lies of all time.

War means using force to push people apart and against each other. Peace means persuading people who have been apart and against each other to come together. War means rage and hatred. Peace means acceptance and reconciliation. It means empathy and compassion. Ultimately, it means accepting and achieving the highest value of the world religions: love.

We must recognize our worldview options and deliberately decide to support and enhance life rather than death, and we must accept a reconstructed adulthood for men and women that affirms honesty with the self and others, connection, vulnerability, and life and love. If we do this, we will figure out how to invent the institutions that will become the foundation of a life that moves us as a species to our next higher level: honest self-awareness, love, and peace.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gordon Fellman received his B.A. from Antioch College in 1957 and his Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1964. He is Professor of Sociology and Chair of Peace, Conflict, and Coexistence Studies at Brandeis University.

<sup>2</sup> Slavery is a complex matter. Not only chattel slavery, but female sexual slavery, indentured service, and other forms of coerced labor still exist widely in the world. There are estimates of 200,000 to 300,000 children enslaved from early childhood as carpet weavers in India; 30,000 Haitian slaves working sugar fields in the Dominican Republic; hundreds of thousands of sex slaves in Asia; 90,000 chattel slaves in Mauritania; and unestimated numbers in Sudan. For further information on slavery, see iAbolish: The Anti-Slavery Portal—Slavery Today, at [http://www.iabolish.com/slavery\\_today.htm](http://www.iabolish.com/slavery_today.htm) (last visited Apr. 14, 2005).

<sup>3</sup> See THE WAR ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES: READINGS ON MILITARY INDUSTRY AND ECONOMY (Seymour Melman ed., 1971); SEYMOUR MELMAN, THE PERMANENT WAR ECONOMY: AMERICAN CAPITALISM IN DECLINE (1974).

<sup>4</sup> See JOSHUA GOLDSTEIN, WAR AND GENDER: HOW GENDER SHAPES THE WAR SYSTEM AND VICE VERSA (2001); CHRIS HEDGES, WAR IS A FORCE THAT GIVES US MEANING (Anchor Books 2003) (2002); and DAVID A. GROSSMAN, ON KILLING: THE PSYCHOLOGICAL COST OF LEARNING TO KILL IN WAR AND SOCIETY (1995).

<sup>5</sup> Chris Hedges writes that one reason war persists is because of the excitement it holds for warriors as well as their home populations. See HEDGES, *supra* note 4, at 3. David

Grossman makes a similar point about the engulfment of the warrior in the acts of war. See GROSSMAN, *supra* note 4.

<sup>6</sup> See SAM KEEN, *FACES OF THE ENEMY: REFLECTIONS OF THE HOSTILE IMAGINATION* (1986); FRANCO FORNARI, *THE PSYCHOANALYSIS OF WAR* (Alenka Pfeifer trans., Doubleday 1975) (1966); GORDON FELLMAN, *RAMBO AND THE DALAI LAMA: THE COMPULSION TO WIN AND ITS THREAT TO HUMAN SURVIVAL* (1998).

<sup>7</sup> See BARBARA W. TUCHMAN, *THE MARCH OF FOLLY: FROM TROY TO VIETNAM* (1984).

<sup>8</sup> Perhaps the clearest example here is the rise of Hitler following the grand humiliation of Germany in the Versailles Treaty ending the First World War. It is not only the economic crises of the thirties that fueled the Nazi appeal to Germany's masses. It was also the desire to get even for the losses of the First World War. Leni Riefenstahl's documentary of the Nazi Party Congress at Nuremberg in 1934 makes vivid the emotional involvement in the project of restoration of national dignity. *TRIUMPH OF THE WILL* (Leni Riefenstahl 1934). Palestinian humiliation at the occupation of Palestinian territories by Israel is another example of this phenomenon. Chechnya's response to Russia and many parts of the former Yugoslavia's policies toward what is now Serbia and Croatia are further examples. Violence in Spain, China, and India, among other countries, is testimony to the realities of rage and violence that often follow "defeat" by weaker powers at the hand of a stronger power. These are but a few examples of an extremely common phenomenon.

<sup>9</sup> Some of the leading graduate programs in peace studies and conflict resolution studies are at the University of Bradford in England, George Mason University in Virginia, the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, Eastern Mennonite University in Virginia, and Antioch University in Ohio. This year, Brandeis University began the world's first M.A. program in Coexistence Studies.

<sup>10</sup> Newsletters, such as *Peacework* of the American Friends Service Committee, found at <http://www.afsc.org/peacework/default.htm>, and *Fellowship Magazine* of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, found at <http://www.forusa.org/fellowship/default.html>, report on peacemaking efforts and successes more often than mainstream publications. Leading peace journals include *Peace and Change* and *Peace Review*. For more information on *Peace and Change*, visit <http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/journal.asp?ref=0149-0508>, and for *Peace Review*, visit <http://www.usfca.edu/peacereview/>.

<sup>11</sup> See JONATHAN MERMIN, *DEBATING WAR AND PEACE: MEDIA COVERAGE OF U.S. INTERVENTION IN THE POST-VIETNAM ERA* (1999); SUSAN CARRUTHERS, *THE MEDIA AT WAR: COMMUNICATION AND CONFLICT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY* (2000).

<sup>12</sup> See DAVID CROTEAU & WILLIAM HOYNES, *MEDIA/SOCIETY: INDUSTRIES, IMAGES, AND AUDIENCES* (2d ed. 2000) [hereinafter *MEDIA/SOCIETY*]; DAVID CROTEAU & WILLIAM HOYNES, *THE BUSINESS OF MEDIA: CORPORATE MEDIA AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST* (2001) [hereinafter *BUSINESS OF MEDIA*]. See also Columbia Journalism Review—Who Owns What, at <http://www.cjr.org/tools/owners/> (last visited Apr. 14, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> See MELMAN, *supra* note 3, at 15–16.

<sup>14</sup> See *THE WAR ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES*, *supra* note 3; MELMAN, *supra* note 3.

<sup>15</sup> There could be no clearer illustration of this than the current administration's budget for 2005. For a comprehensive analysis of the 2005 budget, visit AFL-CIO's website at <http://www.aflcio.org/issuespolitics/bushwatch/2005budget.cfm>. See also U.S. Dept. of State, *Bush Administration Seeks More Funds to Fight Terror Financing* (Jan. 16, 2004), at <http://usinfo.state.gov/ei/Archive/2004/Jan/22-39865.html> (last visited Apr. 15, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> See HOWARD ZINN, *A PEOPLE'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES* 76 (1980).

<sup>17</sup> Howard F. Stein first used this term in *Adversary Symbiosis and Complementary Group Dissociation: An Analysis of the U.S./USSR Conflict*, in 2 FROM METAPHOR TO MEANING: PAPERS IN PSYCHOANALYTIC ANTHROPOLOGY 272 (Howard F. Stein & Maurice Apprey eds., 1987). I have used this term in my book, *Rambo and the Dalai Lama: The Compulsion to Win and Its Threat to Human Survival*. FELLMAN, *supra* note 6, at 49, 118.

<sup>18</sup> See GEORGE LAKOFF, *MORAL POLITICS: WHAT CONSERVATIVES KNOW THAT LIBERALS DON'T* 65–107, 162–78 (1996).

<sup>19</sup> NICCOLÓ MACHIAVELLI, *THE PRINCE* 17 (Robert M. Adams ed. & trans., Norton 1977) (1513).

<sup>20</sup> See KEEN, *supra* note 6.

<sup>21</sup> See *id.*

<sup>22</sup> One of the accomplishments of modern feminism is the admission of women into previously all—or nearly all—male preserves in numerous institutions in our society. One of the implicit conditions for their acceptance into these institutions is their embrace of the career and emotional norms of the men who had previously excluded them. Consider women heads of state, university presidents, lawyers, physicians, politicians, business leaders, etc.

<sup>23</sup> Xena is a mythical warrior princess who is about equivalent to the male hero Hercules. She is all powerful, all wise, all clever, all effective, and muscular, lithe, and young. She wins just about all her battles. The television series, *Xena: Warrior Princess*, aired from 1995–2001.

<sup>24</sup> Part of what might be termed the brilliance of the Marshall Plan, available at <http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/57.htm>, following the Second World War, was its generous rehabilitation of Germany and Japan and in effect their induction into the processes of economic development among the industrially advanced nations. See JOHN GIMBEL, *THE ORIGINS OF THE MARSHALL PLAN* (1976). Supporting rather than humiliating a defeated enemy is neither unique nor common at the end of a war.

<sup>25</sup> These include heads of state, ministers of war and defense, other politicians, journalists, academics, clergy, and still others. For war to persist as an institution, the fantasy/conviction that violence can eventually end violence must be reaffirmed endlessly, as must the disparagement of peace effort and peace ideologies.

<sup>26</sup> There is voluminous cross-cultural evidence that capital punishment, rhetorically meant to discourage violence, does not. See generally Death Penalty Information Center, *Facts About Deterrence and the Death Penalty*, at <http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/article.php?scid=12&did=167> (last visited Apr. 15, 2005) (providing an extensive list of resources on deterrence statistics). That reality does not discourage its advocates, whose conviction that the threat of death *must* serve to deter

---

murder, appears unshakable by data to the contrary. The same is of course true about war and the limits on the ideology that war can end hatred and violence.

<sup>27</sup> See MICHAEL HOWARD, *THE INVENTION OF PEACE: REFLECTIONS ON WAR AND INTERNATIONAL ORDER 2* (2000). British historian Michael Howard is one of the world's leading scholars of the history of war.

<sup>28</sup> *Matthew* 5:9.

<sup>29</sup> *Joel* 3:10.

<sup>30</sup> *Isaiah* 2:4.

<sup>31</sup> *Matthew* 5:5.

<sup>32</sup> THE AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE 927 (4th ed. 2000).