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Introduction

Consider a group of people who are part of the same family, have common ancestors, live in the same neighborhood and together form an interdependent community. They face some serious problems which will affect adversely the lives and well-being of many of the people in their community, as well as make much of their neighborhood less habitable. This will happen unless they are able to cooperate effectively to manage these problems or solve them. It seems clear that such a group of people are apt to be considerably more successful in dealing with their problems if they are a strong community whose members are very much identified with it and committed to its survival and its effective functioning.

The people who live on planet Earth, a very distinctive neighborhood in the Universe, are members of a human family with a common ancestry. The people of the Earth face serious problems which will affect them and their planet with much adverse effects unless they are able to organize themselves so that they can cooperate effectively to deal with these problems. They do not, as yet, appear to have developed two of the socio-psychological prerequisites of effective
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cooperation: a strong community with members who are strongly identified with it and members
who are committed to helping the community develop the values, knowledge, and skills to
engage in effective cooperative problem-solving.

That is, they (we) have not yet developed a global community. A global community is the
interrelatedness of peoples, groups, communities, institutions, and nations that is facilitated by
technology and includes political, economic, and social interdependence (Marsella, 1998). The
global community is multicultural, multinational, and multiethnic and is affected systemically by
world events and forces including technology and media, environmental conditions and changes,
militarism and war, economic upheaval and inequality, disease pandemics, sexism, racism, and
social injustices, and more. Below, we employ theoretical and research knowledge of social
psychology about group formation and personal identity to provide the foundation for discussing,
more specifically, the development of a global community.

The chapter is divided into two major parts: A. Groups and B. Global Community. The
first part consists of the following sections: I. What are groups?; II. Group Formation; III. Group
Development and Functioning; IV. Personal and Social Identities. Part B consists of the
following sections: V. Development of a Global Community; VI. Personal Identification with a
Global Community; and VII. Facilitating Change to Create a Functioning Global Community.

A. Groups

I. What are Groups?

The term group is commonly used when there are two or more people who have: (1) one
or more characteristics in common; (2) perceive themselves as a distinguishable entity; (3) are
aware of the positive interdependence of some of their values, goals, and interests; 4) interact
with one another directly or indirectly; and (5) pursue their positively interdependent values,
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goals, or interests together. Groups that endure over time typically develop (6) a set of norms that guide member interaction with one another and with their external environment (which may include their habitat as well as other groups, persons, species, and objects); and (7) a set of institutions and roles, each of which has specific activities, obligations, and rights associated with it (see Forsyth, 2009; Levi, 2011; and Wheelan, 2004 for numerous citations, definitions and characteristics of groups).

For a group to exist it is not sufficient for people to be aware that they have a common characteristic (e.g., red hair, the same gender), nor that they are a distinguishable entity, different from others (they have red hair not brown, black, or blond; they are female, not male); nor that they have some common interests (e.g., for people with red hair might have to have special coloring, cosmetics, etc.; for females to have equality with males and fair, dignified, participation in the various institutions of society). Additionally, they must be able to interact with one another in some way, directly or indirectly.

Many friendships and other sociable groups only require the first four characteristics mentioned above. By interacting with other people who are similar to themselves in some important way, people with similar values and interests may feel more comfortable, less on-guard, more affirmed, and more able to maintain their self-esteem despite differences and derogation from others with other characteristics and values. Although such a social group may contribute to the satisfaction of two important needs described by Maslow (1943), belongingness and self-esteem, such a group, unless they have the characteristics of (5), (6), and (7), will not contribute much to the fulfillment of Maslow’s other three needs: physiological and physical well-being (such as for good food, clean water, comfortable and safe shelter, pollution-free air, disease prevention and treatment, and health maintenance), safety (protection from dangers that
arise from the destructiveness of nature, other living species, other persons, other groups, and other nations), and *self-actualization* (development of one’s talents through education and fulfillment of them through meaningful work, by active participation in one’s community to create a just, beautiful, joyful habitat which stimulates curiosity and openness to the possibilities in life).

It is well to recognize that to become a member of a group, one doesn’t necessarily have to form the group. One is *born into many existing groups that are already formed*: e.g., a family, a religious group, a tribe, a nation. One may be *required to become a member* of an existing group if you are a child in a given community: e.g., to be required to go to school, to be a member of a class or team in the school, to be drafted into the military, and to be assigned as a member of a given unit. To be in good standing in a larger community, the norms and obligations of the larger community may require you to participate in specific institutions and subgroups of the large community. Finally, you may become a member of an existing group by *choice*, if the group is willing to accept you (e.g., when you apply for a job in a company or admission to a college), or if the group is required to accept you by superior authority or power. As we shall see later when we discuss personal and social identities and community, these three different ways of becoming a member of a group (being born into it, required to join it, and choosing to join it) are relevant to the development of personal and social identities as well as to the development of a global community.

II. *Group Formation*

To turn back to the question of how does a group get formed, small groups may get formed spontaneously from the interaction of people who discover that they have common interests and values and are compatible. However, as Lindner (Chapter XX) points out it often
requires a “change agent” or a collection of change agents who believe that it would be desirable if a large group is established and acts cooperatively to effectively achieve mutually desired objectives: objectives desired by the change agents, by the group members, and possibly by the larger community within which the group would exist. Other names for the “change agents” are “social entrepreneurs” or “community organizers.”

Social entrepreneurs are a type of change agent who are interested in using their entrepreneurial skills to create organizations whose mission centers around bringing about social change on a critical social issue. Sometimes their work is directed at people in power (CEO’s, influentials) and sometimes with people who have little power as individuals but, collectively, could have much. Some of their characteristics include: flexibility in approach, a willingness to self correct; a desire to share credit and at the same time work quietly; a willingness to explore beyond established structures, since many such organizations start from scratch rather than within existing ones; freedom to cross disciplinary boundaries; and a strong ethical motivation (Bornstein, 2007).

Community organizers are another type of change agent who work collectively with members of a community to solve social problems in that community. They are similarly guided by a strong set of values that include: social and economic justice, equality, democracy, and peace.

Alinsky, in Rules for Radicals (1971) suggests that in order to be a good community organizer one needs curiosity, irreverence, imagination, a sense of humor, a bit of blurred vision for a better world, an organized personality, a well-integrated political standard, a free and open mind, and political relativity.
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Change agents, commonly engage in a series of activities to promote their vision of developing new groups. They may work at the “top” as well as at the “bottom.” Some of the things that change agents typically do.

1. They identify the individuals or groups that they seek to change.

2. In terms of group formation, they communicate empathetically with other individuals and groups why, and how, their values and interests could be furthered by their participation in the group that is being formed. This requires a clear, attractive, compelling mission statement for the group. Here, they must often overcome lack of trust, skepticism, defeatism, or inertia among those they seek to influence. By getting “influential” people who have credibility and influence among those they seek to influence, to support their efforts, those efforts are often much helped. Also, by having members of their social network, who are favorable to the formation of the group, communicate their support will be an important influence upon those who are initially reluctant to make a commitment.

In large communities, there is evidence to indicate that the structure of the communication network which exists among potential members (or which is created by the change agents) will affect the propensity of individuals to join a community and will affect the rapidity of community growth (Westaby, 2012).

3. Further, it would be useful for the change agents to provide suggestions for how the group could function to achieve its values and interests: how the group might organize itself and develop the norms, procedures, capabilities, and institutions to cooperate effectively to identify, analyze, and work creatively to deal with the problems, present and future, they face. Although change agents may make useful suggestions with regard

to these matters, the ultimate responsibility for their development and implementation rests with the group members.

4. Finally, it would often be helpful for the change agent to suggest clear markers for the group which clearly identify the group and its members and which distinguish it from other groups and from non-members. Here, we refer to such things as songs, flags, clothing items, pins, rings, pledges, rituals, celebrations, etc. Group markers such as these, not only make the group more visible to non-members but also to members. When markers are developed and used well, they make a group more cohesive and make its members more strongly identified with it.

III. Group Development and Functioning

There is considerable literature on group development and functioning (see Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977, Wheelan, 2004; for a comprehensive review, see Wheelan, 2005). We shall not attempt to summarize this vast literature. Instead, we shall present our own views that are based on our studies of group dynamics, our participation in various organizations, and our observations of various community groups.

As a group forms, begins to develop, and starts the process of functioning to achieve its objectives, it faces a number of issues that will require attention throughout the group’s life. They include:

1. The development of a clear, attractive and compelling group mission which is well-publicized. This is not only important for maintaining, as well as attracting group members, but it is essential for developing well-focused institutions and organizations and for defining the purposes of their activities. The mission may require redefinition from time to time as circumstances change.
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2. **Group cohesion.** For a group to function well, its members must have strong motivation to become and remain members, they must be able to have considerable trust and respect for one another as well as honest communication, the ability to work together without unnecessary hassle, treat each other fairly, and demonstrate a readiness to help one another. Those are some of the characteristics of effectively developed and functioning cooperative groups. (See Chapter XX for a more detailed discussion)

3. **Organization.** It must be able to organize itself (or be initially organized by its change agents) so that it can develop the subgroups (the institutions, organizations, and social roles) necessary to achieve its mission. Among its most important are several interrelated roles or functions:

   a) keeping the mission of the group clear, visible, and highly motivating;

   b) maintaining group productivity (its effectiveness in achieving the group’s goals);

   c) maintaining group cohesiveness (the dedication and loyalty of its group members);

   d) maintaining a productive relation with its external environments;

   e) evaluating (which keep the group aware of how well it is functioning);

   f) research (which seeks to develop new, improved methods of achieving the group’s goals);

   g) **conflict resolution** (which seeks to foster constructive rather than destructive processes and outcomes for the inevitable conflicts that will arise among the different members as they function within their different roles);

   h) and finally, most importantly, **leadership** (which includes playing a central role in keeping the group’s values and goals alive and salient; developing and coordinating the various functions and roles into one well-integrated and well-functioning group;
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developing the resources which are needed for the group to function well; and providing
an inspiration model with which group members can identify and be proud of).

In a small, face-to-face group, each of its members, working together, may be engaged in
implementing all of the functions listed above. As the group grows larger, there will be more
subdivision with different members composing subgroups that implement different functions and
within each subgroup different members may fulfill different roles.

Some of the advantages of increased group size are that as the size of the group increases,
it permits opportunities for individuals with different talents to take on different tasks, the human
resources available to the group may increase, and as a result larger groups may be able to
accomplish more difficult, complicated tasks. However, increases in group size with
accompanying role specialization often increases such problems as coordination and
communication among group members. Also, with division of responsibilities and role
specialization, there is typically the development of special interests and an accompanying desire
to further one’s own interests over those of others. Additionally, specialized language is often
developed in various subgroups which makes intragroup communication more difficult.
(Consider how as psychology has grown since World War II into many subspecialties how
difficult it is for any psychologist in any given specialty to know what is going on in all of the
specialties and often how difficult it is to communicate with those in other specialties.)

One particular difficulty of the development of special interest in one’s own role or
subgroup as the size of the group increases has to do with the role of leadership. Commonly,
this role has unique responsibilities and challenges as well as unique rewards and power
associated with it. Unless the group has well-developed democratic procedures for the election
of leaders and the limitation of their power, as well as norms to prevent corrupt leadership and
This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). The Psychological
make it undesirable, those who occupy leadership roles often are able to maintain themselves in these roles when they are no longer serving the group’s values and purposes well. Although there are exceptions, without the deterring influence of a well-structured democratic group that emphasizes the values of participation, freedom, equality, and justice, those who are advantaged in power and its resources will too often seek to maintain their advantages.

**Personal and Social Identities**

One’s social identities are important components of one’s personal identity but they do not completely define any individual’s sense of a unique identity. This sense arises from a number of factors including having a memory of experiences that you, and no one else personally had; and the awareness that one’s perceptions, one’s thoughts, and one’s personality exist in a unique body that is uniquely located in space and time which is yours alone, even though others may have similar experiences, perceptions, thoughts, and personality. However, components of one’s personal identity are the various social identities that one has acquired. George Herbert Mead, in his classic work *Mind, Self, and Society* (1934), pointed out that the individual’s self as well as his or her capacity for reflective thought develop in the course of social interaction with the members of his or her family and other groups in the community to which he or she belongs. By taking the role of others and responding to his or her own action as they would, the individual learns to anticipate the social effects of his or her actions. In addition, he or she learns that he and others are expected to behave toward one another in specified ways as a function of his or her particular personal and social attributes – such as age, gender, social class, race, religion, ethnic background, and nationality.

Thus a “black” boy learns to behave differently toward “black” than toward “white” children, and he learns to expect “whites” to behave differently toward him than they do toward
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“whites”. Similarly, children learn that certain activities are “feminine” and others are “masculine” and that disapproval is risked by engaging in behavior that is considered appropriate for the opposite sex but not for one’s own. However, each child’s experience is in some respects unique, and thus the conceptions among a group of what it is to be a member of that group will not be identical. Moreover, the meaning of any particular sub-identity, such as “black,” is influenced by the total configuration of social identities of which it is an element. Thus the conception of “black,” like that of “Jew,” is affected by the linking of the two attributes in the configurations “black Jew.” Adding other elements to the configuration, such as “rich,” “young,” “woman,” and “Brazilian,” further alters and defines the meaning of the initially specified sub-identity “black.” (See Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987 for a discussion of these ideas as they relate to self-categorization theory.)

Although the meaning of any personal sub-identity is influenced by the total configuration of sub-identities, it would be a mistake to assume that all elements are equally influential in determining an individual’s thoughts, feelings, and behavior. It is evident that situational factors help determine which sub-identity will be elicited most strongly at a given time: different sub-identities are likely to be most salient and most influential in different social situations (Abrams, Frings, & Randsley de Moura, 2005). The sub-identity of “white” is more likely to be elicited in the presence of “blacks” than in the presence of other “whites” – unless the other “whites” are discussing “blacks” or interracial relations. A New Yorker and a Texan are more likely to feel a common identity as Americans in China than in the United States. Thus a sub-identity is made salient in a situation by contrast with the presence of members of other different or antithetical groups that are used to mark off the boundaries of one’s own group (Alderfer & Smith, 1982). It is also made salient by the presences of threats, danger,
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discrimination, or other potential harm to oneself because of membership in a given group. If derogatory comments or discriminatory actions are liable to be directed at you or other members of your group at any time from almost anybody, then you will be continuously aware of your membership in this group. A sub-identity is also made salient by the prospect of reward or other potential gain resulting from membership in a particular group. More generally, the more eliciting stimuli that are present in a situation – whether those stimuli be negative or positive in implication - the more salient will be the identity in that situation.

It is apparent that sub-identities differ in their readiness to be evoked. Some sub-identities are more pervasive than others and are readily aroused in many different types of situations. One’s sub-identity as a member of one’s family group enters into many more situations than one’s sub-identity as a member of one’s tennis club. It connects with more people and with more of one’s other sub-identities, and thus it is a more pervasive influence on one’s thoughts, feelings, and behavior.

Sub-identities also differ in how central or important they are to the individual’s self-esteem; the more central a sub-identity is, the more likely it is to be evoked, and the more influential it will be when evoked. One measure of the centrality of the sub-identity is one’s readiness to resist its derogation or elimination. Thus one of the authors is more willing to give up being a squash player than a tennis player, and he would abandon either of these rather than quit his profession. Similarly, he is more ready to resist derogation of his ethnic group than his age group.

The importance of a sub-identity to one’s self-esteem is determined by the strength of the different types of bonds binding one to it. Several different types of bonds can be distinguished (McCall 1970): ascribed bonds, bonds of commitment, bonds due to investment, bonds of
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attachment, and instrumental bonds. The first three types of bonds (ascription, commitment, and investment) are in large measure “restraining bonds”; they restrain one from leaving a group even if one desires to do so. The latter two (attachment and instrumental) are “attracting bonds,” which pull the individual toward the group.

The strongest restraining bonds are those arising out of certain ascribed statuses – such as family, gender, racial, ethnic, and national group membership, many of which one acquires by birth rather than by choice. Such statuses can rarely be changed. It is the combination of their unalterability and their social significance that gives these ascribed statuses their personal importance. One’s handedness, left or right, may be as difficult to alter as one’s race, but it is rarely as socially significant. Membership in a family, racial, sexual, ethnic, or national group affects one’s thoughts and actions in many situations; these effects are pervasive. In addition, by common definition, membership in such groups typically excludes membership in other groups of a similar type. Thus, if you are male, you are not also female; if you are an orthodox Muslim, you are not also an orthodox Christian. Thus being a member is thought to be more or less distinctive, and since membership is linked to experiences from early on in one’s life, it is not unusual for one to get emotionally attached to such groups, with the result that these memberships play an important positive role in determined one’s sense of identity.

Bonds of commitment may also tie one to a group and to the identity connected with it. The commitment may be to other members of the group or to interested outsiders. Thus a girl who is engaged but no longer interested in marrying may be reluctant to break the engagement because of her commitment to her fiancé or because of the expected disappointment of her parents and friends. Similarly, one’s investments in a given identity – the amount of time, energy, life changes, money, and emotion previously expended in establishing and maintaining the
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identity – will generally serve to bind one to continue it even when one might not otherwise choose to do so. Nevertheless, it should be noted that people do break up long-standing marriages or change well-established careers if they expect that continued investments will be costly and not worthwhile. This is particularly likely if they are aware of a more rewarding alternative for their future investments. The restraining bonds of commitment and investment are, however, usually easier to break than those of ascription.

Bonds of attachment attract one to a group; such bonds develop when significant personal needs – for security, acceptance, and meaning, have been fulfilled in the group, and the group is thought to be largely irreplaceable or matchless as a source of fulfillment for these needs. A group is likely to be viewed as irreplaceable when no readily available alternatives are perceived (as in the case of the small child in relation to the nuclear family), when the feasibility of leaving the group to go to another one is small (as is the case of the citizens of most nations). Or when, as a result of an extended history of participation in the group, the group has taken on a unique significance (as is the case of family and ethnic groups).

Bonds of attachment provide a diffuse, nonspecific form of attraction to a group and to the idea of expressing one’s identity by membership in the group. In contrast, instrumental bonds arise from the success of the group in providing dependable rewards for fulfilling one’s specific roles or functions within the group and for being identified as a member of the group. Instrumental bonds are linked to the specific success of the group in providing specific satisfactions. However, the more success the group has in doing this, and the wider the range of satisfactions it provides, the more likely it is that diffuse bonds of attachment will also be developed.
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It is evident that an individual who is getting ample instrumental satisfactions from her group and is deeply attached to it will not find herself in conflict, because her investments and ascription will restrain her from abandoning her identification with the group. To the contrary, the more the individual is attracted to a group, the more willing she will be to make investments in it, to make personal commitments to it, and to bind herself irrevocably to it. Conversely, the less she is attracted to a group, the less willing she will be to bind herself so tightly that it would be difficult to leave it if she should choose to do so.

Suppose that one is emotionally attached to one’s sub-identity as a Jew, woman, or “black” – and irrevocably bound to it by bonds of ascription, commitment, and investment – but that it places one at a distinct instrumental disadvantage in obtaining many kinds of opportunities and rewards. How one copes with this situation will be largely determined by whether one views the disadvantages to be just or unjust and whether one thinks one can leave the disadvantaged group to join a more advantaged one (as when a “black” passes as “white” or a Jew converts to become Christian) (Tajfel, 1982). If those who are disadvantaged by their group identity accept their disadvantages as being warranted (and seek to separate themselves from their group by derogating it), they are unlikely to challenge and conflict with those who are profiting from their relatively advantaged positions. The sense of being treated unjustly because of one’s membership in a group to which one is strongly attached and bound is the energizer for much intergroup conflict; it often strengthens one’s identification with the group. (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1998; Grant, 1993). The sense of injustice is felt particularly intensely in interracial, interethnic, and intersex conflicts because of the centrality of these group identities to the individual’s self esteem. When women or blacks or Jews are devalued as a group, those who are identified and identify with the groups also are personally attacked.
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The fact that one has many social identities may, of course, lead to internal conflict. Thus, one’s obligations to one’s work as a psychologist may conflict with one’s obligations to spend more time with one’s children. However, as Lindner’s fascinating discussion of her sunflower identity (see Chapter XX) indicates how the various sub-identities of an individual can be integrated into a coherent whole. As she points out, there can be unity in diversity: one can be an African-American, and Irish-American, or Italian-American as well as male or female, a student or professor, and not feel conflict among one’s various identities. As Roccas and Brewer (2002) have indicated when one’s various social identities are not fully convergent or overlapping, one’s social identity structure is more complex. In their research, they found that lower social identity complexity was associated with stress and higher social identity complexity was associated with increased tolerance and positively toward outgroups. They suggest that “individuals who live in a multicultural society that embraces an integrationist ideology are likely to have more complex representations of their multiple identities than individuals who live in a monocultural or a stratified society” (Roccas & Brewer, 2002, p. 104). This view is concordant with Lindner’s “sunflower identity” model.

B. Global Community

In this Part, we draw upon the framework presented in Part A to discuss the development of a global community, the identification of its members and its component groups with the global community, and aspects of the functioning of the global community. A global community is one that necessarily includes all nations and people of the Earth due to their political, social, physical, biological and economic interdependence. The people and nations of the global community are inextricably bound as they are interrelated and mutually subject to the impact of global forces and events. In this section, we are more tentative and claim no extraordinary skill in This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace. To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
how to create a global community beyond our collective expertise in social psychology, conflict resolution and group dynamics. Yet, our aim is to illustrate how this framework could be used to think about a global community. Our hope is that others who have additional expertise will find this framework useful and that they will use it to develop more detailed ideas and proposals for action.

V. Development of a Global Community

If you are a change agent and you wish to help develop a global community, the first thing to realize is that there are many other potential change agents who are interested in the same objective. Thus if one “googles” such terms as “global community” or “global citizen,” one will find many other individuals, groups, NGOs, and other organization that are interested and active in relation to this topic. Thus, one of the first tasks of a change agent would be to identify a small group (30 to 50 in size) who could initially serve to organize, coordinate, and provide leadership for the larger collection of potential change agents. Once this initial group is organized and functioning, it will be active in recruiting other change agents to contribute to the development of a global community.

Once, a group of dedicated and well-organized group of change agents have been developed, it is important that they formulate a strategic plan for action. Such a plan would address the following questions:

1. What are the common values and interests which most of the people in the global community share? What are the common problems they must deal with if they, their children, or grandchildren are to avoid severe harm and to prosper?
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2. How can most people on the planet be communicated with so that they become aware that their values, interests, and problems are widely shared, locally and globally?

3. How can guidelines be developed and communicated which will encourage and provide workable models for effective cooperative action, at the local and global levels, to fulfill their values and address their collective problems?

We believe that, it is important to develop strategic planning for two levels: (1) the “bottom”, the people of the world and (2) for the “top”, the leaders of the existing institutions in the world such as the UN, nation-states, the global economy, education, healthcare, etc. The strategic planning for the different existing institutions would, undoubtedly, have to vary for each kind of institution. Despite these differences, it seems essential to communicate to those at the “top” as well as at the “bottom,” the common values, interests, and problems that most humans share.

*What are some of the common values of a global community?*

Below, are listed some that were drawn from various sources, mainly from the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* adopted by the United Nations in 1948, *The Declaration on the Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals, Groups, and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Freedoms* (adopted by the General Assembly of the UN in December, 1998), and Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Address to Congress on January 6, 1941 on *The Four Freedoms*.

Some common values:

1. *Survival of the human species.* This value implies recognition that we all are part of a common human family who originated in common ancestors despite our diversity in wealth, national origin, religion, race, gender, education, etc.
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2. *Sustaining the earth as a habitat that is suitable for congenial human living.* This value implies that each generation of humans has a responsibility for doing this not only for themselves but also for future generations.

3. *Freedom to live in dignity, without humiliation.* This value implies that all individuals have the rights described in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*

4. *Freedom from fear.* This value implies that one or one’s loved ones would not be the victim of war or violence between groups which lead to harms such as death, injury, loss, or forced displacement from one’s home.

5. *Freedom of information, speech, beliefs, and assembly.* This implies access to free sources of information (such as books, the press, media, TV, the Internet); freedom to express one’s thoughts publicly and through the media, and freedom to assemble with others to exchange information, thoughts, and plans for non-violent action: This also implies freedom of religion, as well as the freedom to reject religion.

6. *Freedom from want.* This implies that one is free of such impoverished circumstances that one and one’s loved ones can have adequate care, food, water, shelter, health services, education, and other necessities for physical and emotional well-being as well as a dignified life.

7. Finally, all people should have the *right to be protected from violations of their freedoms and the right to seek redress if they are violated.* This implies the responsibility and freedom to protect others whose freedoms and rights are being threatened or violated.

This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). *The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace.* To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
All of the preceding, and more, are included in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and the *Declaration of the Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals, Groups, and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. However, we have aimed for some of the brevity and simplicity well expressed in F.D.R.’s statement of *The Four Freedoms*.

*Some Common Problems the Global Community Faces*

There are many problems that the global community faces which could be enumerated. We shall mention a number of the most important: global climate change; weapons of mass destruction; global economic disruptions; disease pandemics; gross inequalities within and among nations; the enormous cost of militarism, wars, and the disastrous consequences of war; the enormous costs of sexism, racism and other social injustice to the world community; the inadequate education of children to be capable and responsible world citizens, etc. These problems will require effective global cooperation if they are to be managed well.

Undoubtedly, as change agents seek to recruit people to active membership in the world community, initially, they will have to focus on only a few of these important collective problems. Which should be chosen? We shall nominate three. Our choices are:

1. *Climate change*. As a result of recent climate changes there have been extensive droughts, floods, and devastating storms, which have affected world-wide food production and water supplies, killed many people, and made many homeless. As pollutants continue to accumulate in the Earth’s atmosphere, it can be expected that such disastrous effects will intensify and, as the seas rise, the land on which hundreds of millions of people live will be flooded and become uninhabitable.
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In the Stern Review (2006), a 700 page analysis, which was commissioned by the U.K. government and authored by Nicholas Stern, an economic adviser to Prime Minister Tony Blair and a former chief economist of the World Bank, it was estimated that the costs of climate change, if not addressed, will be equivalent to losing 5 percent (and potentially as much as 20 percent) of the global domestic product (GDP) “each year, now and forever.” Hundreds of millions of people could be threatened with hunger, water shortages, and severe economic deprivation. The report concluded that staving off such crises would require immediate investments equivalent to 1 percent of global GDP over each of the next 10 to 20 years, before the window of opportunity to mitigate the biggest impacts of climate change closes.

Although there is increasing political awareness of the importance of addressing climate change, the critical investments needed to stave off an irreversible, catastrophic climate change have not yet been made. This is an issue of much urgency.

2. Wars, violence, and their disastrous consequences. To prevent wars, their causes will need to be addressed. There are of course many causes of war that could be identified. Here, we wish to emphasize several socio-psychological causes: (a) the belief that one is in a win-lose (competitive) relation to the other; (b) the view that one can intimidate, coerce, or defeat the other by the threat or use of force; (c) or the belief that the other will seek to win through intimidation, coercion, or defeat of one by the use of force; and (d) the development of a military-industrial complex for the purposes of (b) or (c) which needs to justify its existence and large costs, once established, even if the preceding conditions (a, b, or c) no longer exist. Win-lose relations often develop between individuals, groups, or nations when they believe that what is essential to their well-being (e.g., wealth, scarce natural resources, power) is in scarce supply and cannot be shared at all or fairly. Leaders and the populations of various groups (nations,

This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). *The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace*. To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
regions, political factions, etc.) must acquire the values, knowledge, and skills of constructive
collision resolution if they are to avoid the disastrous consequences of a win-lose approach to
collusion. (See Chapter XX).

3. Economic disruption and lack of effective economic functioning. A well-functioning
community requires a well-functioning economy that develops the resources and produces the
goods and services which foster individual physical and mental well-being. It enables the
support of the various institutions and roles within the community that foster such well-being;
the family, education, health providers, government, a legal system, etc. Many factors can
contribute to the poor functioning and disruption of an economic system. These include: poor
cooperation and coordination among the various components of the system; corruption which
siphons off considerable value produced by the economic system from the general population;
injustices and social unrest resulting from gross inequality in the distribution of the income and
wealth produced by the economic system; a short-term rather than long-term perspective; poor
planning and poor regulation of the system so that overconsumption and greed lead to repeated
crises and breakdown in the economic system; and the lack of recognition that a well functioning
system requires “social rationality” as well as “economic rationality.”

There are several prerequisites to developing a global community in addition to
identifying important values in common. They include: communicating to the possible members
of such a community; helping those potential members imagine what it would be like; and
helping them become active, at their local level as well as global level, in developing such a
community. Each of these prerequisites is briefly discussed below in order to provide a context
in which more expert knowledge could be presented or developed.
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Communication. As recent events in Tunisia, Egypt, and other nations of the Middle East indicate, modern communication technology (e.g. social networks such as Facebook and Twitter) can quickly interconnect large numbers of people, motivate them, and help them coordinate their actions. This did not happen without some pre-planning by a small group of change-agents who were dissatisfied with the autocratic government in their countries and knew how to employ such technology to reach large numbers of people and organize them to demonstrate nonviolently for freedom and the end of autocratic rule.

Similarly, experts in modern communication technology could undoubtedly develop a communication strategy for reaching much of the world’s human population. Any group of change agents seeking to develop a global community should clearly include experts in modern communication technology who understand how access to such technology could be made available in areas of the world currently devoid of such technology. Such technology would have to include the capacity to communicate in languages and imagery appropriate to the various human populations of our planet.

Imagining. The context of the communication, we believe, should be hopeful, interesting, clear, and brief (with the possibility of accessing a fuller statement). It would communicate in shortened form (a) the basic rights and responsibilities, as well as the common problems, facing the members of a global community; (b) seek an affirmation or pledge of their willingness to be a responsible, active member of such a community; and (c) indicate what forms their activity might take. Specialists in public relations or in marketing, in creating illustrative imagery, and in dramatizing, could provide invaluable guidance in developing a well-crafted, interesting message.

A prestigious, well-recognized group or organization should introduce the message in a detailed and compelling manner using a well-recognized, prestigious spokesperson. We are not
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specialists but let us indicate how we might begin such a message. Our suggested message would begin as below:

Imagine a global human community in which you, your children, and grandchildren as well as all the others in our shared planet and their children and grandchildren:

... Are able to live in dignity and are treated fairly.

... Have freedom from the fear of violence and war and can live in peace.

--- Have freedom from want so that you do not ever have to live in such impoverished circumstances you and your loved ones can not have adequate care, food, water, shelter, health services, education, and other necessities for physical and emotional well-being as well as a dignified life.

... Have freedom of information, publication, speech, beliefs, and assembly so that you can be free to be different and free to express open criticism of those in authority individually or collectively.

... Have the responsibility to promote, protect, and defend such freedoms as those described above for yourself as well as for others when they are denied or under threat.

... Will work together cooperatively to make the world that their grandchildren will inherit free of such problems as war, injustice, climate change, and economic disruption.

Are you willing be a member of such a global human community?

If “yes”, please make the following pledge:

I pledge to promote these rights and responsibilities in my own life, in my community, and in the global community as best I can through nonviolent personal actions and working together with others.
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This statement is put forth to stimulate others to develop better and more appealing statements that could be communicated in various media and forms to a world-wide audience.

*Action possibilities.* For the global community to maintain the support of its members and to develop and function well, it has to develop a variety of institutions, social norms, and social roles as well as strategies for actions to deal with its collective problems and achieve its various goals. In our current world, some of this already exists but, unfortunately, much of what exists at all levels, (e.g., local, national, global) does not promote well the values described above nor the effective cooperative efforts to deal with the problems that confront us all. Thus, much action has to be directed at changing and reshaping what exists as well as erecting new institutions, norms, and roles.

The world is complex and multi-faceted. Although “renaissance thinkers” may help provide an integrated overview, many problems at all levels of community also require specialized knowledge for their solution. Thus, we believe that it could be useful for change agents promoting a global community to seek to develop many internationally composed “Specialists Without Borders.” Thus, in addition to Doctors Without Borders, there could be “Engineers Without Borders,” “Business Leaders Without Borders,” “Educators Without Borders,” “Democracy Leaders Without Borders,” “Farmers Without Borders,” “Musicians Without Borders,” “Artists Without Borders,” and “Community Organizers Without Borders.” Many other “specialists without borders” could be listed.

The point is that as members of a community seek to act in an effective way to deal with the problems of their community at whatever level, they may seek guidance in any or all aspects of problem solution: identifying the problem, diagnosing it, developing possible solutions, employing criteria to select the most effective in terms of the criteria, implementing the solution, This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). *The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace.* To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
evaluating its effectiveness, and making changes to improve its effectiveness. Having such help available will affirm values of a global community and stimulate action to deal with global problems and will also increase one’s personal identification with the global community.

VI. Personal Identification With the Global Community

The chapter by Lindner, in this volume, has much that is relevant to this topic. Here, we would add that personal identification will grow as: (1) an individual experiences more and more people are becoming so identified; (2) an individual, with others, engages in cooperative actions with others who are so identified; and (3) such actions begin to have some success in achieving goals of the global community.

Personal identification can be enhanced as the members of the global community develop unique indicators of membership such as: rituals (e.g., songs, chants, prayers, gestures); insignia (e.g., attire, rings, jewelry); displays (e.g., flags, posters, pictures of leaders); space (e.g., special buildings for global community functions, special cemeteries for global heroes, special arenas); celebrations and holidays; media and publications; education; history; and research disciplines. Of course, these would not supplant other important aspects of one’s identity.

Group-as-a-whole theory (Wells, 1995) is a useful perspective in thinking about how individuals and groups may identify (or not) with the global community. Group-as-a-whole theory posits that groups have “an élan vital” that binds them together that is more or less than each individual member (Wells, 1995, p. 55). The theory includes the idea that groups engage in defense mechanisms, in particular splitting, to ward off anxiety when under threat (Wells, 1995, Brazaitis, 2004, McRae & Short, 2010). The defense mechanism of splitting in this context refers to dividing the world, individuals, groups, subgroups, nations, etc. into all good or all bad.

When former United States President George Bush made his State of the Union speech on
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January 29, 2002 he identified states that constituted “the axis of evil.” This is an example of the concept of splitting at the international level. If some nations were identified as evil the implication is that others were the opposite. Identification with the global community necessitates working against destructive group dynamics such as splitting whereby other peoples, groups, nations are not seen as “other,” “not me,” or “evil” but rather that each person recognizes their connection to each other person. Thus the individuals in the global community make up the elan vital of the global group-as-a-whole. Said more specifically, in order to identify with the global community Americans need to view Middle Easterners not as exotic or foreign, but rather as part of their own group; the French need to see Moroccans as we/us, the Koreans need to see the Chinese as a part of them, rather than “other” and so on.

Indeed, personal identification with the global community can be difficult if it is perceived to be in conflict with one’s other identifications – with, for example, one’s national group or one’s religion. Lindner’s discussion in Chapter XX of “subsidiarity” and “universality in diversity,” as well as her image of a “sunflower identity” is very relevant here. It deals with this issue brilliantly and shall not be repeated here.

VII. Facilitating Change to Create a Functioning Global Community

To establish a functioning global community, do we have to start afresh and create all new institutions or do we need to reform existing institutions and possibly add some new ones? We don’t think it is feasible to start over: we are no longer at the time when the human species and human communities emerged. We believe that we have to reform many existing institutions and create new ones, as necessary, so that they support the central values of a global community and contribute to the cooperative efforts to deal with global problems.
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There are many different types of institutions and many exist at the international, multinational, national, and local levels. They include governmental, educational, health, economic, scientific, and others. It is clearly beyond the capacity of the authors to indicate how the institutions of the world should be reformed or to indicate what new institutions need to be created. However, we wish to make several points.

Just as change agents will seek to have many individuals in the world embrace active membership in a world community (including acceptance of its basic values and responsibility for engaging in cooperative actions to deal with global problems), so too they should seek to have as many institutions in the world embrace active membership in the world community. These would seek to influence international corporations (such as Microsoft, General Electric, ExxonMobil, and McDonalds) as well as nation states and international organizations (such as The World Bank, International Monetary Fund, Global Water Partnership), educational institutions, and so on. The existence of an active world citizen group should be able to help provide incentive and pressure for changes in institutions (and vice versa).

There are, undoubtedly, some institutions such as the United Nations that already embrace the values and responsibilities of active membership in a world community. The United Nations in its *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and its *Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups, and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* have articulated the basic values of a global community. And in its many agendas for action, it has articulated meritorious action related to dealing with global problems. Yet despite the many valuable activities of its various agencies (such as UNICEF, UN Development Programme), the United Nations has not yet been able to communicate to the world’s people the values of its declarations defining human rights.
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freedoms, and responsibilities. Nor has it had much success in having implemented its agendas of action for global problems. This inability to accomplish these objectives undoubtedly reflects problems in the way the United Nations is structured and its lack of adequate resources. We shall not attempt to articulate here how the United Nations and other worthwhile global institutions could be changed to become more effective and have more resources. But change agents should have this as an important objective.

We organize the remainder of this section around the ways of thinking about bringing about change to increase the effectiveness of a global community. Here we apply and extend the ideas of Diesing (1962), Hardin (1968), and others around what change agents would need to do in order to address the “commons dilemma”: to act in terms of individual ‘common (global) interests rather than (group, community, corporate, or national) interests. Further, we briefly discuss two important strategies for bringing about change in the status quo between low power and high power groups. And finally, we include some well tested skills and methods for change agents working with large and diverse groups.

Two issues for change agents to address in working to strengthen global community include the following: How do we resolve the dilemma of making decisions that favor individual interests versus those that favor collective or community interests? Secondly, what strategies exist for low power groups to best bring about nonviolent change to the status quo?

The Commons Dilemma and Complete Rationality

In developing a global community it is important to avoid “the tragedy of the commons.” Hardin (1968) described the tragedy of the commons as arising from the situation in which multiple individuals, acting independently and rationally in terms of their own economic self-interest, will ultimately deplete a shared limited resource even when it is clear that it's not to
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anyone’s long-term interest for this to happen. This dilemma exists not only for interdependent individuals but also for interdependent groups, corporations, and nations. Thus, if individuals, groups, corporations, and nations disregard the costs to the global community of such sources of pollution of the atmosphere as: employing coal to produce electricity, gasoline guzzling cars, not keeping habitats and buildings well insulated, the methane gas resulting from certain forms of agriculture, the destruction of forests (which absorb pollutants), etc., global warming will occur with harm to individuals, groups, corporations, and nations.

Many solutions have been proposed for the tragedy of the commons (See Wikipedia, “The Tragedy of the Commons”). Here, we emphasize a motivational solution: recognition that the promotion of well-being for an individual (group, corporation, or nation) requires the employment of the other forms of rationality as well as economic rationality. As Diesing (1962) has indicated, there are five forms of rationality: technical (efficient achievement of a single goal); economic (efficient achievement of a plurality of goals; legal (rules or rule following); political (referring to the rationality of decision making structures); and social rationality (integrating forces in individuals and social systems which generate meaning and allow action to occur). He defines rationality in terms of effectiveness and he describes a number of fundamental kinds of effectiveness in the social world: effectiveness refers to the successful production of any kind of value. A sixth type of rationality has also been added, and labeled ecological rationality – reasoning that produces, increases or preserves the capacity, resilience and diversity of an ecosystem, or in its largest sense, the biosphere (Bartlett, 1986)

We suggest extending the concept of social rationality to include community or global rationality. Global rationality could be thought of as decision making that is guided by the effective creation of value for our global community. So, in addition to looking at decisions
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from technical, economic, legal, political and ecological rationalities, an extension would be to look at decisions in terms of their global rationality, or value in creating or strengthening global community. It is based on the salience of the “interdependence, obligation and solidarity of unique relationships” connecting us to our global identity. Complete rationality would go beyond economic rationality and would require the integration of economic rationality with social (global) rationality and other forms of rationality as is appropriate to the specific situation of decision-making.

The limitations of “economic rationality” have been addressed in criticism of the measure of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The GDP is a flawed economic measure of the economic value of the goods produced nationally in a given year (it doesn’t include many costs of increased economic production such as the costs produced by environmental pollution) which is often taken as an indicator of the well-being of the nation’s citizens, individually and collectively. Thus, Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi (2010) argue, in Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why GDP Doesn’t Add Up, that the GDP is a deeply flawed indicator of well-being. Also, Nussbaum (2011), in her recent book, Creating Capabilities, The Human Development Approach, indicates that equating doing well (for a nation) with an increase in GDP per capita, distracts attention from the real problems of creating well-being for all members of a society by suggesting that the right way to improve the quality of life is by economic growth alone (ie, increased GDP).

A question that arises, then, is how can change agents encourage individuals and organizations to use complete rationality, and not simply economic rationality, in their long term strategies and day to day decisions?

This is a complicated matter that has been looked at from different perspectives. One important way is to redefine national as well as global well-being to include many more
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indicators than GDP. Thus, at the national levels, one would also include measures related to education, health, longevity, civil rights, income and wealth equality, social mobility, incarceration rate, and so forth. At the global level, one would include not only measures similar to those at the national level, but for the global level such other measures as number of refugees, value of global arms trade, recurrences of violent conflicts within and between nations, global measures of atmospheric pollution, measures of existing natural resources as water, minerals, forests, biodiversity, etc.

It is an important task for scientists from many disciplines, to work together to develop systematic, comprehensive measures of global functioning. Such measures, if taken annually, would help identify problems which need addressing and when addressed, if they are being addressed effectively. Currently, there exist many different measures of various aspects of global functioning. Most of the measures compare the various nations of the world on one or another measures. For example, the Gallup Poll provides polling data in 170 countries on individual well-being (percentage of people thriving): in the United States it was 57% for 2010, in Denmark, 82%; The United Nations has also developed many measures: The Human Development Index is a comparative measure of life expectancy, literacy, education, and standards of living worldwide; in 2010 Norway ranked #1, the United States #4); Standard of Living World Statistics (which provides data on various measures of all the world’s nations: thus, the U.S. ranks highest among the world’s nations in GDP but it has a relatively high measure of income inequality (a Gini index of 45, compared to Sweden’s 25). In addition, there exist various global measures such as: the atmospheric build up of greenhouse gases, the status of various natural resources (such as oil, water, minerals, forests, etc.).
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There may be need for additional measures of national and global well-being. However, we suggest that it would be valuable to develop several meaningful indices at the global level which would provide a clear, simple to understand picture of the state of our world. We timidly suggest that they might include global indices of the status of: Human Development, the Environment, Natural Resources, Destructive Conflict, and Economic Productivity.

One relevant perspective here is that of the conflict between decision making that maximizes self interest in the short term, and decision making that maximizes self and common or global interests in the short and long term. Ironically, in terms of global rationality, decisions that maximize self interest in the short term often have a deleterious effect on the long term community interests, which therefore would include oneself in those deleterious effects. For example, your decision to purchase a gas guzzling car rather than a hybrid car might involve a short term gain for you in terms of a lower price, and a long term harm to the larger community (e.g., increased carbon dioxide pollution). When you make decisions, individual [economic] rationality must be supplanted with a global (social) rationality. Your decision to purchase a gas guzzling car is best considered in light of not only what’s best for you now, but what’s best for your global community now and later. Your short term decisions that benefit you, also have long term consequences that harm you along with the larger system of which you are part. Hardin (1968) expresses this dilemma poignantly in the following: “The individual benefits as an individual from his ability to deny the truth even though society as a whole, of which he is a part, suffers.” (p 1245).

This framework can be applied to how we look at some of the world’s problems: by expanding our emphasis from individual (group, corporate, or national) harms and benefits to include benefits and harms to our global community. Change agents need to work to change the This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace. To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
orientation of nation states, multi national organizations, and other entities that have a significant influence on our global community. They should be encouraged to recognize, and act to upon their recognition, that they are part of an interdependent global community and that their own welfare is linked to the welfare of the other members of the global community. Here, we note briefly an interesting research study, “Global Social Identity and Global Cooperation” (Buchan et al., 2011), which employed a typical Commons Dilemma experiential format involving 1,195 participants from six countries. Its results indicate that those subjects who had a global social identification were significantly more likely to overcome the Commons Dilemma.

The research and theorizing on the delay of gratification conducted by Walter Mischel and his colleagues over the last several decades also provides some insights into developing complete rationality. Mischel and colleagues have investigated the cognitive processes and conditions involved in why people are able to delay gratification or not. We can link the ideas to the commons dilemma. Mishel et. al (2006) suggested that to successfully enable willpower, one must understand two interacting “systems:” a “hot” or “go” system may be understood as that which is emotional, simple, reflexive and fast. We are often well aware of how particular actions will gratify self interest. In contrast, they propose a cool, or “know” system which is complex, contemplative, strategic, reflective and emotionally neutral. It is this system that, in successful instances of self control, comes into play to balance the actions of the “go” system. Relating this to the commons dilemma suggests that learning of ways to increase the activity of the “know” system can have useful benefits for strengthening decision making that is based on global rationality rather than solely on economic rationality.

**Influence Strategies**
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One can anticipate that those with values interested in the existing institutions will often resist change. This is strongly the case when preserving the status quo also preserves one’s power over others. Elsewhere Deutsch (2006) has discussed extensively two important strategies for overcoming this kind of injustice: persuasion strategies and nonviolent power strategies. The essences of these two strategies are briefly summarized below, followed by some implications for their use by change agents to enhance the functioning of a global community.

**Persuasive strategies** involve three types of appeals:

1. *Moral values*: Appeals to moral values assume that those high power group members are not fully aware of the negative impact of their power on low power group members. For example, one might appeal to values related to justice, to religion, to the welfare of one’s grandchildren, to name a few. Engaging high power members to see the discrepancy between their practices and their moral values, or conscience, could move them to take action and change their behavior.

2. *Self interest*: These kinds of appeals emphasize the gains that can be obtained and losses that can be prevented when the high power group gives up some of its power and cooperates with the request of the low power group. It is important that such messages be carefully constructed to include characteristics as described by Deutsch (2006). Two examples are to clearly state the specific actions and changes requested of the high power group; and to highlight the values and benefits to the high power group by cooperating.

3. *Self-actualization*: Appeals to self actualization focus on enhancing the sense that one’s better self is being actualized, a self that one has wanted to be. In a sense, these are a type of self interest appeal. The gain for the high power group is the feelings associated with an actualized self. In considering ways that one might give up one’s power over
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others, change agents may emphasize the use of one’s power to further common interests; the spiritual emptiness of power over others; the fulfillment of creating something that goes well beyond self benefit. By creating power with others rather than maintaining power over (Follett, 1924), high power groups my actually increase their power. For example, the Gates Foundation acts in ways that are patriotic to a global community (in, for example, their efforts at eradicating certain diseases and thereby increasing the health of the global community). Here, economic power is being used to address one problem in our global community, and by so doing, increasing the power of the global community. Contrast this with the reluctance of Egypt’s military leaders to give up some of their control over Egypt’s industries. Here, persuasive strategies aimed at self actualization might emphasize the possibility of increasing the total economic output by engaging a wider sector of the labor force, perhaps with greater skill and qualifications.

Low power groups seeking change in those who have a vested interest in maintaining their power sometimes find it difficult to employ persuasion strategies because of rage or fear. Rage, as a result of the injustices they have experienced, may lead them to seek revenge, to harm, or destroy those in power. Fear of the power of the powerful to inflict unbearable harm may inhibit efforts to bring about change in the powerful.

Given the possibility of the prevalence of rage or fear among low power groups, it would be the goal of change agents to harness the energy created by feelings of rage and fear and convert it into effective cooperative action. (See Gaucher and Jost, 2011). By engaging large numbers of people through social media and other communication methods, the energy generated by feelings of rage or fear can be channeled towards effective action. Here the task of the change agent is to help people realize that they are more likely to achieve their goals through This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace. To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
effective action including cooperation with potential allies among members of high power groups. It is important for the change agent to recognize the power of the motivational energy of low power groups, regardless of its source.

A potentially effective strategic starting point using persuasive strategies would be for low power groups to use social influence strategies by seeking out and creating alliances with those members of high power groups, as well as other prestigious and influential people and groups, who are sympathetic to their efforts of building a global community (Deutsch, 2006). Developing allies is a key method of increasing a low power group’s power and of increasing its influence and credibility with those in power.

It is useful for change agents to understand the psychological implications of appealing to the power needs of members of high power groups: i.e., understanding how to convince those in power that their power needs can be fulfilled through fostering social or “global” rationality.

**Nonviolent power strategies** involve enhancing one’s own power (by developing the latent power in one’s self and one’s group, as well as developing allies), employing the power of the powerful against the powerful, and reducing the power of the powerful). Gene Sharp (1971) has elaborated in great detail the many tactics available to those who seek to employ nonviolent power strategies. There are three types of nonviolent actions:

1. **Acts of protest** such as have been occurring recently in the Middle East;
2. **Non-cooperation** such as in Aristophanes’ Lysistrata when the women withhold sex from their spouses until war is abolished; and
3. **Nonviolent intervention** such as general strikes and other methods of disrupting the economy and other components of the status quo.
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It is well to recognize that the employment of nonviolent methods against a potentially violent, autocratic, resistant to change power often requires considerable courage, discipline, stamina as well as effective pre-planning and organization.

There is a difference between persuasive strategies and non-violent strategies. Nonviolent strategies are often used when persuasion strategies, by themselves are not effective in bringing about change. The aim of nonviolent strategies is to “open” those in power so that they can be persuaded to change: resistance to and interference with the implementation of the power of the high power group makes its power ineffective and opens it to the possibility of persuasion. Both are useful in altering the status quo in service of strengthening the global community. However, in contrast to violent strategies, neither persuasion nor nonviolence seek to destroy those in high power: they seek to change the relationship so that power is shared and used to benefit the entire community.

There are two major problems with the use of violence. It commonly leads to increasing destructive cycles of reciprocating violence between the conflicting parties. And, it can transform those using violent methods into mirror images of one another: so, if a low power group employs violence to overthrow a tyrannical high power group, it may become tyrannical itself. The foregoing is not meant to suggest that violence is never necessary to stop unrelenting violence and resistance from a murderous other. However, one should guard against the potential self-transforming effects of engaging in violence.

Change Agent Skills and Methods

Change agents will need to be skilled in facilitating inter-group relations as they work to develop the global community. Ramsey and Latting (2005) offer a set of fourteen competencies.
that can be applied to working across social differences – race, ethnicity, religious identity, nationality, etc. These competencies make up a theoretically and empirically grounded typology that includes both reflection and action at multiple levels of a system (i.e. the individual, the group, the organization, and the environmental context). Their typology looks at skills useful for: self reflection and action; effective relationships with others; enhancing critical consciousness (eg, addressing dominant/nondominant group dynamics); and surfacing and working through systemic patterns. The authors delineate and describe such competencies as “reframing mental models,” “empathizing with multiple perspectives,” “connecting the personal to the cultural and social,” and “advocating and engaging in systemic change” all of which are directly relevant to fostering the global community (Ramsey & Latting, 2005, p. 268).

Methods and models for large systems change efforts needed to develop the global community have been created by organizational psychologists with expertise in large-scale group interventions. Bunker and Alban (2005) have compiled numerous examples of successful efforts to engage large groups of people to plan and implement needed change in a special issue of The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science on Large Group Interventions. In that issue Lukensmeyer and Brigham (2005) describe a method for holding Town Meetings with thousands of citizens so as to effect national scale change. Tan and Brown (2005) detail using the technique of The World Café with citizens from all walks of life in Singapore as part of an effort to create a national learning culture and to move from a hierarchical societal structure to a more open and inclusive one. Lent, McCormick, and Pearce (2005) discuss using the processes of Future Search and Open Space to help a religious community decide and implement its new future directions. Each of these examples provides possible strategies and methods for change agents working to develop a global community.

This chapter will appear in Peter T. Coleman and Morton Deutsch (eds.). The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace. To be published by Springer Press in 2012.
Summary and Conclusions

In this chapter, we have employed social psychological knowledge about groups and how they form, how they develop, how individuals identify with them — to provide a framework for thinking about some of the issues related to developing a global community. We have considered how ordinary people who live on our planet might be approached to induce them to become members of a global community. We have also considered how those in power who control the existing institutions in the world might be influenced to take a global perspective. Our discussion is only an outline of some of the important social psychological issues involved in developing a global community. Clearly, much work must be done by scholars from many different disciplines to build a base of knowledge that would help to foster an effective, sustainable global community. It is our belief that developing such knowledge is an urgent need that should involve more and more scholars and receive encouragement and support from universities, foundations, and governments.
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