

Insights and Innovations in Community Mental Health

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lectures

**organized and edited by
The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee**

hosted by William James College



**WILLIAM JAMES
COLLEGE**

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Foreward..... | 3 |
| The Leader and the Led: How the Nature of the Leader Affects Organizations and Societies | 4 |
| Introduction by David G. Satin, MD..... | 5 |
| Ervin Staub, PhD..... | 7 |
| Introduction by David G. Satin, MD..... | 7 |
| Ervin Staub, PhD | 7 |
| Discussion..... | 18 |
| Elena Cherepanov, PhD, LMHC | 22 |
| Introduction by David G. Satin, MD..... | 22 |
| Elena Cherepanov, PhD, LMHC | 22 |
| Discussion..... | 28 |

Foreward

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture is a forum in which to address issues of community mental health, public health, and social policy. It is also a place to give a hearing to those working in these fields, and to encourage students and workers to pursue this perspective, even in times that do not emphasize the social and humane perspective. It's important that social and community psychiatry continue to be presented and encouraged to an audience increasingly unfamiliar with its origins and with Dr. Lindemann as a person. The lecturers and discussants have presented a wide range of clinical, policy, and historical topics that continue to have much to teach.

Here we make available lectures that were presented since 1988. They are still live issues that have not been solved or become less important. This teaches us the historical lesson that societal needs and problems are an existential part of the ongoing life of people, communities, and society. We adapt ways of coping with them that are more effective and more appropriate to changed circumstances—values, technology, and populations. The insights and suggested approaches are still appropriate and inspiring.

Another value of the Lectures is the process of addressing problems that they exemplify: A group agrees on the importance of an issue, seeks out those with experience, enthusiasm, and creativity, and brings them together to share their approaches and open themselves to cross-fertilization. This results in new ideas, approaches, and collaborations. It might be argued that this approach, characteristic of social psychiatry and community mental health, is more important for societal benefit than are specific new techniques.

We hope that readers will become interested, excited, and broadly educated. For a listing of all the Erich Lindemann Memorial Lectures, please visit www.williamjames.edu/lindemann.

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee presents

THE FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL
ERICH LINDEMANN MEMORIAL LECTURE

The Leader and the Led: How the Nature of the Leader Affects Organizations and Societies

Many factors affect the character and direction of society. The commitment and character of leaders are influential. What determines the values and style of leaders, the choice of leaders, and how they affect the society against the many other influences? In all eras, ours not the least, leaders stand out for study and criticism. This Lindemann Lecture seeks to understand more clearly leaders and their affects on those they lead

Lecturer

Ervin Staub, PhD, professor emeritus of psychology at The University of Massachusetts Amherst, founding director of the doctoral program in the Psychology of Peace and Violence

Discussant

Elena Cherepanov, PhD, LMHC, professor emeritus of psychology at The University of Massachusetts Amherst, founding director of the doctoral program in the Psychology of Peace and Violence

Moderator

David G. Satin, MD, DLFAPA, Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School; Chairman, Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee

Friday, June 1, 2018, 2:30–5:00 pm

*William James College
1 Wells Avenue, Newton, Massachusetts*

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

I would like to welcome you all to the 41st annual Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture for 2018. The title is, *The Leader and the Led: How the Nature of the Leader Affects Organizations and Societies*. For those of you who have not been to the Lindemann lectures, the lecture is a forum in which to address community mental health, public health, and social policy issues; to give a hearing to those working in these fields; and to encourage students and workers to pursue this perspective even in times which do not emphasize the social and humane perspective. It is important that social and community psychiatry continue to be presented and encouraged to an audience increasingly unfamiliar with its history and with Dr. Lindemann as a person.

The lecturers and discussants have presented a wide range of clinical, policy, and historical topics that even now continue to have much to teach. I want to give credit to the Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee for conceiving the ideas, planning it, and doing all the legwork of getting this together. They include Dean Abby from the William James College, Elena Cherepanov who is going to share her expertise today, Frances Mervin, Jackie Moore from the North Suffolk Mental Health Association, and I sit on the committee also. The William James College of Graduate Psychology, which Dean Abby is the director of Continuing Education Programs, and provides a good deal of material and intellectual support, and its president Nicholas Covino, has been generous with his recognition and support for the Lindemann Lectures. The North Suffolk Mental Health Association is an example of Erich Lindemann's concept of community mental health, a partnership between the community and mental health professionals, each respecting what the other brings to the table. The North Suffolk Mental Health Association was an early partner with Dr. Lindemann at the Massachusetts General Hospital and its chief executive officer, Jackie Moore continues to support the Lindemann lectures to this day.

The organization of the lecture is that each of the speakers will speak: Professor Staub, the lecturer, and Dr. Cherepanov, the respondent, and then the discussion will be open between them and hope that you as active, interested people in professions and in the community, will lend your perspectives and your experience to the discussion.

Many factors affect the character and direction of societies. Among them, leaders are very influential. Sometimes history is written as if leaders made it, rather than leaders being the products of, and participants in, history. But certainly they are important factors. One expectation of leadership is that leaders represent the needs and values of their constituents and priority over their own preferences, seeing themselves as servants to the people. Another perspective is that leaders inform and lead their constituents in directions that the leaders determine, taking authority from having been chosen as

leaders and therefore giving credence to their ideas. In this light, it is clear that the commitment and character of the leaders is important. Thus it becomes important to understand what determines the values and styles of leaders, the choices of leaders and how they effect the societies that they lead. In all eras, ours not the least, leaders stand out for study and criticism. The Lindemann lecture seeks to understand more clearly leaders and their effects on those that they lead. Certainly that is an issue of community mental health. Today we are fortunate to hear from people who bring much experience and thought to this topic.

Ervin Staub, PhD

Professor Emeritus of Psychology, The University of Massachusetts Amherst

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

The Lindemann Lecturer is Ervin Staub, PhD. , professor emeritus of psychology at The University of Massachusetts Amherst, founding director of the doctoral program in the Psychology of Peace and Violence. He was born in Hungary, and lived through both German Nazism and Soviet Communism, so he knows something about leaders and their effects on society. He studied violence, helpfulness, and bystanders, prevention, reconciliation, and positive relations. He has authored books including: *Positive Social Behavior and Morality*, *The Roots of Evil*, *The Origins of Genocide and other Group Violence*, *Overcoming Evil: Genocide, Violent Conflict and Terrorism*, and in the works *The Roots of Goodness*, *Inclusive Caring*, *Moral Courage*, *Altruism born of Suffering and Active Bystandership*. He has won many prizes and awards, one of which struck me: The Psychologist for Social Responsibilities Anthony J. Marcella Prize for the Psychology of Peace and Social Justice for, “many decades of academic scholarship and groundbreaking field work addressing issues of helping and altruism, bystander behavior, raising caring and non-violent children, and the prevention of genocide”. Professor Staub.

Ervin Staub, PhD

Thank you very much for that wonderful introduction. As you can see, I am a decorated person. It’s a pleasure to be here with you. Dr. Satin and I discovered that awhile back, I didn’t remember this, and he didn’t know it, many years ago I already gave a Lindemann Lecture. So it is a pleasure to be here again in this beautiful environment, which is really very impressive and it wasn’t here whenever I gave that lecture.

It’s very nice for me to talk about this because this topic relates to my work in many different ways, but it is not exactly the topic that I often talk about and so it is really inspiring for me to do this. And also it is inspiring for me to see all of you here in this building.

Obviously leaders have great potential influence, but leaders are only leaders if they can attract followers. How they attract followers makes a big difference in how they lead. Whether they are destructive leaders or constructive leaders, they are more capable of leading the group if they have a vision for society. And again, the kind of vision they have makes a huge difference. Destructive leaders, as I call them, propose and develop ideas and visions that ultimately create harm. And they usually arise, and these visions are

created, in response to what I call difficult conditions of life in a society. Not always. Sometimes leaders can create destructive visions even without that, but very frequently it is a response to things like economic decline in a society, not poverty but things worsening for people economically, unemployment and various other things. Political chaos and disorganization, great social changes, and there is one other thing that I didn't write, which is an ongoing conflict between two groups.

All of these conditions have existed in a number of genocides and mass killings that I have studied. Take for example Rwanda, where I have spent a lot of time working on reconciliation. In the world market, the two major products of Rwanda tin and coffee, have greatly declined in price. Economic deterioration. For the first time, new political parties were created, and some of these parties had divisions that were propagating hostility towards the other group. Hutus propagating hostility towards the Tutsi minority, which was only 8% of the population. So, a lot of chaos and disorganization. These political groups, especially the Hutu were trying to attack people by offering them some funds at a time, like as I said, with significant unemployment. There was a civil war between Hutus and Tutsis. The Tutsis, many of them escaped as refugees into other countries sometime back, and a group of them came back because they were not allowed to come back by the government. They came back trying to reclaim their rights. So there was a civil war, although there was a peace treaty at that time and it subsided for a while. There were all these things going on before the genocide started there.

So what happens when there are all these conditions? I would propose to you that core, basic, human psychological needs which we all possess, are frustrated in times like this. What are some of these needs? A need for security, to feel that my body is safe, my family's bodies are safe, and I can provide for them so that they will survive. A positive identity. We all need to feel some kind of a positive identity. Now, admittedly there are some people who have such difficult lives, difficult childhoods, that in fact they look at themselves negatively, and if anybody tries to make them feel good about themselves, they push that away. But that is a rarity, rather than what is common for whole groups of people, usually. So a positive identity, positive connections to other people. Understanding the world that we live in and our own place in it. All of these things are frustrated in these difficult times.

So how will people fulfill these needs? They could try to create positive social processes that address the difficult conditions. But, they usually feel helpless in the face of what's going on. The leaders and the people turn to a number of other things that create some psychological sustenance, that fulfill some of these basic needs to a limited degree. One of these is to intensify the devaluation of a group of people that have historically been already devalued. So, social conditions and culture join. One of the elements of the culture is a history of devaluation of a group of people. These people are

often scapegoated in difficult times. It's not our fault what's happening. The difficulties we are facing are not because of anything we did or didn't do. It is because of these particular people.

Another thing that happens in most of these situations is that an ideology arises. What's an ideology? An ideology is a vision of how to live life. A vision of the conditions of the group, which exists or needs to be created. Unfortunately in these times, very often the ideology that arises is a destructive ideology. What do I mean by that? There is a positive element of this vision. So, for example, in Cambodia the Khmer Rouge created a vision of social equality. They focused on the idea that everybody should be equal in society. Sounds pretty good. How many of you would say no, there should be no social equality? However, they did what happens in the case of destructive ideologies, which is identify groups of people who supposedly stand in the way of creating this vision. Who were these groups of people? It included those who were in power before the Khmer Rouge came to power. So former landlords and other people who were in power. It included members of minority groups, like Vietnamese and Chinese. It included intellectuals. Why? Because they believed that people who have studied, focused on learning, would not accept social equality. Would not contribute to it, and would not accept it. And this went to a real extreme, because wearing glasses, according to the Khmer Rouge, was an indication that these people have read a lot of books, that's how they ruined their eyes, and so they are intellectuals and they are enemies. Wearing glasses put people into the danger of all kinds of things, including being killed. So, I am giving you this one example but in all of these situations such ideologies have emerged.

So what happens with these scapegoating ideologies? People, by devaluing others, feel elevated, feel better about themselves. By scapegoating others they feel they are not at fault, and by creating a positive vision of the future, like social equality, like superiority of that particular racial group in Germany, and so on. They gain hope. And they also have another possibility of taking action. The action they are taking is not to improve the social conditions, it is to turn against the group who is supposedly standing in the way of creating and fulfilling this ideology. Once all this is in place, then usually actions are taken against this scapegoat and supposed enemy.

And what happens then? An evolution follows, and everybody has to participate in the evolution. Its not only the leaders, it's also the followers who are joining with the leaders. And it is not entirely clear that all this emerges from the leaders, it also emerges from the population, from the elites. As people and as a group begins to harm another, a number of things can happen. One is that others step in and say, "this is not right". The others are the bystanders. Who are the bystanders, the witnesses? These are the people who are neither part of the vanguard, the people who are the potential perpetrators moving the group towards violence, neither are they members of the victim group, but

the rest of the society, which is usually the majority. They usually don't do anything. And so when the group harms some other group and nothing happens to stop this, people justify what they have done. "Why did I do this? It is not because I am bad. I am doing this because there are reasonable and justifiable reasons for what we are doing", and that makes further such action more likely. A potentially, more than potentially, positive thing is that this evolution can also go in a positive direction. When people take action to help others, to support others, to benefit others, similarly an evolution can begin.

I already started to talk about the role of bystanders. As I said, the passivity of bystanders helps this evolution to unfold. Bystanders are often not only passive, they, in various ways, become complicit. For example, look in Germany. In Germany, Germans were willing to take over Jewish property. The government was taking away property from Jews, exerted influence on Jews to give up their property and Germans were willing to take it over. Contrast this with Belgium, even though it was under German occupation, the government in exile, which was out of the country so it was easier for them to speak out, were telling the Belgian people not to do this, not to accept Jewish property. And they did not. And in Belgium there was more effort to save Jews from deportation, and as a result Jews were more likely to act on their own behalf. Because if you are abandoned by the group in which you lived, if you are a Tutsi and all the Hutus turn against you and you are abandoned by them it becomes more difficult to take action. You are more likely to be immobilized. So being active as bystanders, in whatever ways, is very constructive.

Now, I was talking about the passivity turning into complicity. One other example of complicity is that at some point German businesses said Jews don't have the same relationship to labor as Germans. And so they stopped paying them for holidays. This was very interesting because businesses went ahead of the government in engaging in activities that the Nazis did not yet demand. Then the government had to hurry up and create laws that caught up with these practices by businesses. This is a clear example, I think, of complicity.

Another example. Psychoanalysts rewrote psychoanalytic doctrine in order to fit Nazi principles. All of these are examples of complicity. There were also exceptions. When the Germans began to kill people who had some sort of, in their view, physical or mental fault, physical disability, handicap, some kind of mental issues and problems, and they started to kill them in the so called "euthanasia program". But euthanasia means "mercy killing". It wasn't a euthanasia program, it was a eugenics program to create a "purer" race. When families found out about this they started to protest. When lawyers groups started to protest an influential German bishop spoke out against it and the official program was terminated. The single example of anybody speaking out against the persecution or deportation of the Jews was when the husbands of Jewish women were taken to Auschwitz. A large group of women gathered outside of government

buildings and protested this. And what happened was that the government stopped taking the men away, and brought back some of the men who were already in Auschwitz. This was the only single case of it.

I gave a talk somewhere recently, New Orleans, and somebody from the audience said that he mentioned this to a rabbi, a famous family of rabbis, one of them, Rabbi Rosens. They used to live in London, they moved to Israel, some of them tried to work on positive Palestinian-Israeli relations, and this rabbi didn't want to believe it. I don't know why he didn't want to believe it, but my theory is he didn't want to believe it because he thought if actually a group of people could have this kind of an effect, what might have happened if there had been real opposition to the Nazi policies? The fact is the Nazis were brutal in relation to Jews and their persecution, but it never happened that a whole group of people tried to protest it. So it is an interesting issue.

Now there are many examples of bystanders not being passive. After the Dayton Agreement, between Serbs and Bosnians, and peace in the former Yugoslavia, there was a nonviolent uprising. Students and workers started to protest, they completely stopped traffic in Belgrade using buses and cars and all kinds of things. And the leader was kicked out as prime minister. So, these things happen.

Let me talk for a moment about external bystanders. It is really interesting. Leaders, followers, what is the role of people on the outside in this, when it comes to destructive leaders? In Rwanda, when the genocide began, every major country, European, the U.S., and so on, sent in military missions. Why did they send in military missions? They sent in military missions to get their own citizens who were in Rwanda at the time, gather them and fly them out. Now what does that say to perpetrators? I think it says, 'you can do whatever you want, we are not interfering, we are not doing anything, we are just wanting to make our citizens safe'. So there were similar kinds of complicity in relation to Germany. But then again, in relation to South Africa there were some very positive actions, huge demonstrations influencing corporations stopping doing business with South Africa because of apartheid. And in response the business community inside South Africa also began to pressure the government. So again former followers, this business community always benefited from the practices of apartheid and now as the result of external pressure and influence, they turned around and began to pressure their own government to change their practices. Followers becoming active bystanders as the result of external influence.

Do all of you know the Stanford Prison Experiment? How many of you know the Stanford Prison Experiment? Okay, a fair number of you, but a lot of people don't. Professor Philip Zimbardo at Stanford decided to study what happens when he sets up a prison with prisoners and guards. He put ads into the paper. By the way, I'm going to talk about this because, those of you who know it would not think of it as an example of

destructive leadership, so I am going to tell you how this is an example of destructive leadership. He put ads into the paper inviting people to be participants in a study of prison life. And a good number of people agreed. It was in the summer in Stanford, he was going to pay them. People were divided into guards and prisoners. Then he arranged it that the prisoners were actually picked up by the police as they would be normally, with all of the police cars, sirens, going to the home of this person, putting the person into handcuffs, putting him into the back of a car, taking them in. Prisoners. Then there were guards. His notion was that the structure, the environment of a prison with guards and prisoners inherently gives rise to abuse, leads to abuse by guards. That maybe so, but it depends also very much on the nature of the prison and how it is set up. The fact is the guards became quite abusive, very abusive. And the prisoners became very intensely psychologically distressed. Soon the study was terminated. By the way, it was not a “study”, it was a demonstration. In a study you repeat something again and again, and you compare it to other conditions. It was neither repeated nor compared to other conditions, so it was a demonstration.

When Zimbardo oriented the guards as to how they are to behave, this is what he told them, “you can create in prisoners feelings of boredom, a sense of fear to some degree, you can create a notion of arbitrariness, that their life is totally controlled by us, by the system—you, me---, that they will have no privacy at all, there will be constant surveillance, nothing they do will go unobserved, they will have no freedom of action, they can do nothing or say nothing that is not permitted. We are going to take away their individuality in various ways. In general, what it all leads to is a sense of powerlessness’. So these were the instructions to the guards. This was not a neutral prison, even if you do not tell the guards anything. It is a different situation when you tell the guards something like this. In another prison guards could be told, ‘you know, you are treat people with dignity. You give them dignity. Yes they are in prison, but they are human beings, and they should be treated with dignity’. Completely different instructions.

In my opinion, this is an example of destructive leadership, and it contributed for sure to very abusive behavior by the guards. In my book *The Roots of Evil*, I had a hypothesis which said, it wasn’t only the structure, I did not yet think about the destructive leadership which I am now talking about, but I thought its not anybody who volunteers for a study of prison life. People who volunteer for a study of prison life are likely to have certain characteristics. This was in 1989, Callahan and McFarland did a study, they published it that year. (31:35). They put advertisements somewhere in western Kentucky, this was at Western Kentucky University. Somewhere in that area they put advertisements in the paper. In some ads they looked for people to participate in a psychological study. In other ads they put an ad into the paper that asked people to

participate in a psychological study of prison life. Psychological study, psychological study of prison life. Then they administered a lot of questionnaires to them.

Some of the things they found were: people who volunteered to participate in a psychological study of prison life in contrast to people who volunteered to participate in a psychological study had higher scores on aggression, authoritarianism, Machiavellianism—I don't know if you know the Machiavellianism scale, but an very important element of that is a vision of human nature. So people who score high on Machiavellianism have a negative view of human beings and human nature—narcissism, and social dominance. They had significantly lower scores on dispositional empathy and altruism.

Zimbardo and his associates administered tests to guards and prisoners to make sure that they don't have mental health issues, and they found that these people didn't have mental health issues. Their scores on authoritarianism were similar to people in a very restricted prison. So these people were likely to be different. One of the things that is important about it is that I am talking about societal processes and people turn to leaders, or even themselves generate processes to help fulfill their psychological needs. But they do this not only in response to social conditions, they also do this because they are likely to have certain characteristics. So social conditions and personal characteristics are likely to join in leading people to generate destructive leadership and to join destructive leaders.

There is an old truism in social psychology, and that is that behavior is a function of situation and personality, circumstances and who we are. Some of the people who have studied members of the Nazi party, they asses that these people under normal conditions are like normally behaving people who are reasonable members of society. But when certain social conditions arise, then they engage in these kinds of psychological processes and join destructive groups.

One other thing. That is, we are talking about leaders and followers, but followers also very much influence each other. Zimbardo described one guard, gave him the name of 'John Wayne' because of how forceful and negative he was. He was the most violent of all the guards. A guard who usually worked with him on the same shift apparently felt competitive with him and he became more violent in the process, towards the prisoners. This is something that very much happens in a variety of groups.

For example, I studied terrorist groups from a long time ago. In Germany and Italy, and so on. It usually was the case that in these groups people who were striving for leadership were doing so by advocating for more extreme actions, and then others joined and the whole standard of behavior changed as the result of the advocacy of some particularly ambitious people, or people with a certain orientation that influenced everybody else in the group. Sometimes what happens is that there is a leader who

advocated certain groups and then there are processes within groups where people influence each other along the lines of the leadership, of what the leadership advocates.

One other thing about the Stanford Study is that after these beginnings that I described, when all this abusive behavior went on Zimbardo and his staff were watching everything that was happening through video cameras but they never interfered with the abusive behavior. So they, I believe, to some extent generated behavior and then they were passive in relation to it.

I studied Abu Ghraib, partially because I was an expert witness in one of the Abu Ghraib trials. There was this abusive behavior towards prisoners by the guards, by untrained prison guards because they were members of the U.S. military and they weren't prison guards but they were put into that situation and they also were instigated because investigators told them to soften up the prisoners for the interrogation. My point here is that they would march prisoners neatly across the prison compound and put them naked into a cell, and superior officers would walk by. Didn't say a word, just let it unfold and let it happen. So again, leaders, followers, being in sync around this abusive behavior, and then the abusive behavior of the guards developed further.

I don't know if you remember, it was already a few years ago, but they did all kinds of things like getting dogs to threaten them and forcing people to engage in sexual kinds of demonstrations, and so on, which was contrary totally to their practices as Muslims, and so on. Anyway, the point I am making is that people who are in leadership roles can be passive in relation to important things happening and that makes it more likely that those things will happen.

Other processes that people, followers, including members of a leadership group, including people perhaps around the president, accommodate to immoral events around them and then participate in them, shifting their values in the process. This can happen kind of naturally. I have taught and written about what I call moral equilibration. So the group is moving to harmful practices. So what are you going to do? You are not going to oppose the leader, and you have this strong internal conflict if you hold onto your old values and you are following a leader who is advocating harmful behavior towards others.

So what is likely to happen is that you shift in your values, you equilibrate your actions and your values and some of this equilibration involves things like replacing concern about human welfare with loyalty. You have to be loyal to the group, and with a certain kind of patriotism. I will refer to that in a moment. Somebody else, named Leidner, studied something related to this, morality shifting. When people are exposed to harmful behavior by members of their own group towards others, members of the national group, society, America, towards others they do this. They shift values. They shift towards values like loyalty, obedience, and they become moral values in their

minds. The moral thing to do is to be loyal. The moral thing to do is to be obedient. Rather than the moral thing to do is to respect the humanity of everybody. Leaders can propagate this.

I'll just briefly mention in relation to this that I have studied, and I use these terms, blind and constructive patriotism. Blind patriots say "my country, whatever", and constructive patriots say "when my country is untrue to humane values or to its own traditional values, it's my obligation to speak up". Interestingly, blind patriots are less politically informed, they were less politically informed in the study we did. They also have some interesting things like they feel that our cultural products are ours, they didn't like it that the Japanese play baseball because baseball is "ours". And all that feeds into, personal characteristics feed into what I am talking about here, replacing moral values with other kinds of values, or already coming to the process with other kinds of values.

A couple of things about the U.S. today. Does President Trump have an ideology? It seems that his ideology is making the U.S. great again. It is very interesting because usually such an ideology of returning to past greatness is propagated when a country is in real difficulty. For example, Turkey used to be a great power and then everything in a sense was going to hell, and I don't have the time to describe how it was going to hell. And so they had a vision of renewed patriotism and the greatness of Turkey, and it was part of what guided them to partake in the genocide against the Armenians. The thing is, an ideology if it is destructive then there are enemies to identify who stand in the way and as we know immigrants, Hispanics, are both such enemies for our president. One of the things that's important about this is that when you advocating dealing with people... I just want to say something else before that, and that is the most destructive practice that I am aware of so far that the U.S. is now engaged in is this business of separating children from parents. It's flabbergasting. It's just about unthinkable. The thing is when you define various groups as "others" and devalue them, then other kinds of prejudices have a chance to come to the surface. So people who engage in prejudicial behavior and who hold prejudicial attitudes more openly, not only about the group that is devalued by leaders, but it gives them permission also to bring forth other prejudices and other devaluations. That is all I am going to say about that for now.

Lets talk a little bit about constructive leaders and followers. Constructive leaders tend to want to overcome divisions between "us" and "them". They tend to value human beings and don't draw these distinctions. They are more likely to show empathy. In conditions of conflict and hostility they work to bind wounds and promote reconciliation. One example is Lincoln. When General Lee was putting down his weapons, and the South was giving up, Lincoln ordered the orchestra there to play "Dixie", which was the song of the South. It was one symbolic expression on his part, and he clearly had an

interest in following this up with others to bring the South and the North to reconciliation.

Mandela, I think we all know, immediately engaged in symbolic and actual practices to move blacks and whites in South Africa together, rather than to create further divisions. Probably some of you have seen, or knew it from other sources, when there was this rugby game played by a team that used to be, it used to be a white team and blacks weren't allowed on this particular team, he put on the jersey of that team when he went to see their game. Symbolically saying something very significant.

FDR, very interesting. He did an incredible service by creating the work programs at the time of the depression, which told Americans 'you are all part of the whole, we are all together in this'. And it is being outside of the whole in difficult times that contributes to people turning against other groups. However, FDR didn't open his heart and his practices to everybody. You know, the internment of the Japanese, right? And you can understand panic, fear, and so on. But it is a little difficult to understand because a lot of these people, for a very long time, have been loyal American citizens. So it was very difficult at that time, because of the climate, to create new laws to allow people to come into the country. But the United States only filled ten percent of the quota allotted to Jews not allowing Jewish refugees from Germany to come to the United States even though there already existed quotas. So here is this great leader doing wonderful things and at the same time drawing this line between "us" and certain "them". Is it possible for leaders not to do that?

Truly constructive leaders respect human psychological needs, and act accordingly. To fulfill this means effectively empowering people, whether nations or organizations. It is important to engage followers in creating these kinds of visions. Without involving followers, especially when you talk about organizations, people are not likely to follow. When followers are inspiring and committed then leaders sometimes come around. It is interesting, one of the times when there were huge demonstrations in Iran against the government, a former Iranian prime minister joined the demonstrations and he wanted all to be according to civilized routines, not to get out of hand. But his followers moved him to go ahead, to take the lead in demanding revolutionary change.

What I want to go to is that authors writing about organizations say very similar things to what I have said about whole societies. If you are the head of a corporation, if you are a head of some other organization, if you are a head of an NGO—a nongovernment organization, a non-profit organization, in every case if you want to create change within the organization and what the organization works for, it is extremely important to create what some authors who write in this domain call a compelling vision. A strong vision of what it is you are trying to accomplish, and to invite people into creating it. Also to explain very clearly why these changes are important.

You know I am a little late, so I am going to talk very briefly about a couple of other things. I, and my associates, have worked in Rwanda for many years trying to promote healing and reconciliation there after the genocide. We led groups, Laurie Pearlman?? And I led groups of all kinds of community organizations that worked with groups in the community, of national leaders, and various other groups. Then we created educational radio programs, and all of them had very similar content. One of the radio programs that we created started to broadcast in 2004 and it is still broadcasting. Of course the themes have evolved and changed, but it is going on. Starting a year after we began to broadcast 89% of the people who listened to radio at all listened to our radio programs, and it still has a very high listener base. What we did was to describe the influences that lead to genocide or mass violence, based primarily on my research, and also on how violence may be presented. We also talked about the traumatic impact of violence and how people may heal, and what may be needed for reconciliation. We worked a fair amount with leaders, talking to them after we presented this, talking to them about what is it that is likely to lead to more violence, what kind of actions, and what makes violence less likely. We talked about practices that they were currently introducing. One of the things they were doing was they were going to provide financial assistance only to Tutsi victims of the genocide, survivors of the genocide, but not to Hutus no matter how poor they were or whatever was going on for them. So we were examining this, is this likely to be constructive and helpful or is this likely to be problematic? This is just one example.

I have spent many years training police to be active bystanders. Active bystanders to other police officers, in order to stop harmful behavior, unnecessary violence and unnecessary harm towards civilians. This has been going on in a very large and total scale in New Orleans now for the last three years. New Orleans had probably the worst police department in the country in terms of the violence of police officers towards people. There is a total transformation. Everybody has been trained in this, and there are many reports in the community of substantial changes in the behavior of the police. The superintendent of the police, who was also trained, wears a little badge that everybody wears who went through this program. He said publicly that, 'I am wearing this badge all the time to let my officers know that if I do something that is harmful, they can challenge me'. One of the important things for the police is that not only does this program stress the benefits of the community, but it also stresses the benefits to the police. Because it is unlikely then that a police officer will be prosecuted, loses his job, is sent to jail... It is unlikely that a bystander who watches this, a police officer who is a bystander, will be prosecuted because there are laws that allow prosecution of such passive witnesses.

The reason I am telling you about this is because the involvement of leaders in this is crucial. It is unlikely that this is going to happen without the participation of leaders, because police usually support each other no matter what. If a fellow officer does

something, historically your obligation as a police officer is to support that officer. So now, that whole thing needs to be redefined. Support now means to try to prevent harmful behavior.

I wanted to read to you something, but it is more important for us to talk. I worked in Amsterdam. I was invited to work on improving Dutch-Muslim relations after violence there. Maybe you remember that a television producer, broadcaster, was killed at some point because they created a program about Muslim women, and some people were really upset and he was killed. There were hundreds of violent attacks on Mosques and Muslim schools and churches and so the city was very concerned and they invited me to make proposals to improve things. And they acted on those proposals. So here is a leadership of the city that takes action, invites advisors, consultants, and then acts on that consultation. Under eleven proposals that I developed carefully on the basis of research.

I am going to stop because I want us to have a conversation and I want to propose that we all ask a question for ourselves, 'How can I be an active effective bystander who contributes to constructive change. In what domain will I act. What will I do to influence leaders, followers, the social world around me?'

Thank you very much.

Discussion

Participant:

I have a comment. I want to thank you for your presentation because on Sunday I returned from Rwanda. I was there for a week at a prison reform human rights conference, invited by a couple of people from Rwanda who wanted to find out what they might be able to do if they created a chapter to help do something about prison reform. I'm sitting here saying, 'how could this be?' That was Sunday, today is Friday and here I am. So thank you, so very much.

Ervin Staub:

You are extremely welcome, and thank you for going to Rwanda.

Participant:

I did go to the museum, reconciliation village as well.

Ervin Staub:

There is an extremely well done genocide museum in Rwanda. There are many genocide sites in Rwanda where people who were killed in a church, or...one of my early experiences there was, the person who we had the most connection to, who was later

foreign minister and this and that, he took us to some other city from Kigali. Along the way we stopped and there was this hill, beautiful view. Rwanda is a beautiful country. There was a school there, and in the past people could gather around schools and somehow they were protected and not harmed. Well that wasn't the case this time, and something like 32,000 people were killed at this school. There was one guy who was a caretaker there, with kind of a remnant of a hole in his forehead. As a museum there were artifacts that were preserved laid out on planks in the building. I must say, it was a really heart breaking sight.

Participant:

You started to touch on something about parenting. You used the words “flabbergasted” and maybe “inconceivable”. And that is about the family court system taking children away from parents. I think it is something that the people in this building can influence that we've got the family court system where we've got judges that do not have mental health training are trying to solve issues where there is mental health problems, such as people with personality disorders that are able to dupe the courts into causing the alienation of a child from the parents and the courts kind of endorse that.

Ervin Staub:

That's a wonderful comment. That's a great comment. You know, I don't think...I assume that in this group I don't have to talk about the amazingly destructive affects that it would have to take children away from parents and put them together with strangers who are probably not treating them particularly kindly, or with care. Who are not saying to them 'I know how you must feel not having your parents there, but we are going to take care of you with love and affection'. That is not what is likely to be happening. And even when that is happening, it is still a traumatic experience to be separated. So it is absurd. Frankly it reminds me, this may be an absurd comparison, but it reminds me of the Nazis. As people were going into gas chambers, some of them were taking the children away and putting them into a different line. So it is communicating as effectively and powerfully as you can, the destructive affects of this on a child. I think it is extremely important. Talking about it, approaching judges about it, writing about it in as many formats that you can. I don't feel that, unfortunately, that just writing about any topic is that helpful. But this topic is specific enough that I think it can be really helpful.

Participant:

I think everyone in the room has been thinking about exactly this issue as you've been talking. That's my hunch. The fact that the government doesn't even know where these children are, that they've already separated from...and yet I can feel the weight... the first conversation I have with my friends is not 'what are we doing today about this?'

And part of me feels that every one of us should be calling every single member of congress. Whether they listen or not. Or we should all be going—something has to happen. We've all been numbed. It's been so toxic for so long that I think many of us are feeling relatively helpless. And I think this is exactly what you've been talking about.

Ervin Staub:

I must say, that as a bystander, I had been feeling rather helpless. But this can be a really important issue. And first of all, you want to address the issue. But after we express ourselves in relation to the issue, one can always raise the question, what kind of a leader would create something like this? Because this could be a crucial thing. Everybody, every parent can understand what it must be like. So this, I don't know if this is the appropriate word, but this can be a kind of wedge issue here. It is very important in it's own right, and it is also important in the general political context in which we are.

Participant:

I am originally from Venezuela, so I see that happening in my country who used to have many issues but used to be a paradise in many ways. So I guess I wonder, any recommendations to avoid the trap, even in this country when it comes to immigrants and being one myself, I feel like when I want to talk in a rational fashion with my folks who don't agree with me, we fall in the trap, all of us, by assuming my side, pro immigrant or pro democracy or this or that, I feel like I am being rational but I feel the disconnection with the other.

Ervin Staub:

This is extremely difficult. I mean, I was part of a group of people who when President Bush was elected for the second time we were saying, 'we have to find people from the other side, get together and talk'. But it is extremely difficult. Many years ago I gave a talk at some kind of a peace event in Israel. There were some women presenting there, Palestinians and people from the settlement. And they were saying we have been meeting for a very long time, engaging in dialogue and we have come to accept and even like each other. But nobody changed their mind, they said. So changing the mind of people at the extremes is very difficult. But many people are in the middle. If you can find people who are in the middle and engage in dialogue... The only place that I have relatives, other than my family now here, is Israel. They are, what is called, very right wing. I went to Israel a number of times to give talks about peace events and so on. So we talked to each other and no change whatsoever. However, they still love me. And that is something.

Participant:

Thank you so much for the talk. I am from Rwanda and I was fortunate to be here. I was surprised about the Hutu/Tutsi history. I was fortunate to listen to this talk. I have a question. We can see in our society destructive and constructive leaders. My question is, what is effective action we can take to stop destructive leaders, the most effective action we can take? Thank you.

Ervin Staub:

Small question, haha. You know, the thing is on their own many people who should be speaking out are just accepting our president's actions and following. I cannot think of anything more constructive right now than trying to get you people into leadership positions, into congress. You know, Trump did one good thing. Unfortunately he did it in a very problematic way and he is not following up on it. That is, apparently in the United States there are a lot of people who have been suffering who have lost jobs, conditions changed, great social changes for them. It is not only losing jobs, it is the great social changes that I was talking about. And he called attention to that. It is amazing to me that our politicians before weren't really attending to this. Didn't they know it? Didn't they care at all? So speaking to those people in a different way and offering them representation is one constructive thing. And another constructive thing is to try to get you people into leadership positions, into congress, but also in the public domain. Do you watch CNN? I am sick of CNN. They are again and again doing the same things, rather than presenting real ideas, fresh ideas. We need a vision, we need to speak to the people who have been suffering over the years because of the conditions in the United States and we need to move people into positions of leadership.

David Satin:

I want to thank Professor Staub for so much. He fed us so many ideas, so many demanding, impressive responsibilities. One thing that struck me was that he spoke some about leaders proposing ideologies and proposing programs, but he spoke much more about the society not being blindly led by leaders but influencing leaders to stop and to change, and just now talking about substituting leaders. The other thing he spoke about was the ideology of the people, and the personalities of the people. These are much larger, much more intransigent issues to deal with than an individual or even a group. Changing minds, changing values, changing efforts is a big task but it does underlie what the bystanders or the society does and it underlies what the leader does.

Elena Cherepanov, PhD, LMHC

Professor at Cambridge College; Behavioral Health Lead for Refugee-Integrated Care at Lynn Community Health Center

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

I would like to introduce our respondent, Elena Cherepanov, Ph.D. , L.M.H.C. , professor at the Cambridge College where she founded one of the first certificate programs in trauma studies in the United States. She is the behavioral health lead for refugee-integrated care at the Lynn Community Health Center. She earned the Carol Hacker award for her excellence in trauma work. She has worked across the globe with multiple humanitarian organizations. She is the author of over sixty papers and books, translated into many different languages. Her newest book, *Ethics on Global Mental Health* is being published this August. Dr. Cherepanov.

Elena Cherepanov, PhD, LMHC

Thank you very much, Dr. Satin. It is difficult to talk about such a powerful presentation that we just heard. I am going to switch gears a little bit and talk about one of the social conditions, like Dr. Staub calls it. I am going to talk about the totalitarian regime. In particular the question that I am trying to answer, to myself, why this propensity leads to repeating the same patterns. We all know that it has been terrible. So how come we keep living through the same kind of historical patterns? In particular I will focus on the trans-generational legacy of totalitarian regime, in hope that it will provide us with some answers.

The understanding of totalitarian regime that speaks to my heart is that of Arthur Schlesinger that, “a totalitarian regime crushes all autonomous institutions in its drive to seize the human soul”. I found it to be accurately representing my understanding. Also, in order to study it, I am a psychologist by training so I want to study, so I positioned a totalitarian regime as a form of cultural trauma. We have a definition of cultural trauma by Jeffery Alexander, “cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways”.

Let me tell you a little bit about my background, because in a similar way like Dr. Staub, you can hear it from my accent that I have personal investment in this topic. I am originally from Russia. On this slide you can see millions and millions of people who died during Stalin’s time in Russia. Obviously I have not lived through that, and my parents were very young and never talked to me about that. My grandfather, he was so called

“old Bolshevik”, so basically he was one who started and contributed to all that happened later. We never talked about that.

There were some indications. For instance, what I remember, there was a woman who kept coming to our home. My mother was always very respectful to her, inviting her, having lunch with her, getting her some food, clothes. She was homeless, very unkempt. Very cheerful, and absolutely out of her mind. My apology for not giving clinical diagnosis. Only once I confronted my mother saying, come on she has scabies, why do you keep bringing her? My mother explained that she was the daughter of my grandfather’s old friend, an Estonian communist, and this woman lost her mind after her parents were shot in front of her. Actually, that was another thing that I started thinking about. She basically survived only because she had gone mad. I had other cases, other instances when I heard about when people are faking mental illness or really becoming mentally ill, and that is how they survived.

There were other indications. For instance, I remember conversations what to do when my grandfather had a gun. Because even after the death of Stalin, he always carried it with him to be able to shoot himself when they would come to arrest him. But other than that there were no conversations much. As I grew up I started finding out that I’m a little bit overly sensitive to particular facts of life. Some demagoguery, also certain words like when someone calls others “enemy of the people”, because in Stalin’s time it meant a death sentence. Social paranoia, like Dr. Staub described as scapegoating. These are true posters from Stalin’s time. They tell people do not leak information because then you are helping enemies. Then there was joint or shared frame of reference. When I go to work, I have a colleague of mine, I don’t know her much. We talk very superficially. She is my age and she is also from Russia. Once she came to work looking very sickly and I said, “what happened?” She said she could not sleep the whole night. I said “what was it?”. She said, “I looked up in the middle of the night and I saw a black car with the lights off slowly cruising in the neighborhood. Picking up undocumented immigrants”. She didn’t have to say much, I just knew that this is what she was referring to. There was a black car in that time called “voronok”, or “black crow”. This car was also cruising neighborhoods and arresting people.

Once I was walking with a friend of mine, a family doctor, also of my age. I told him it is so funny because polling people are ridiculous. They call people of Russian families and expect we are going to discuss politics on the phone. He said “yeah, do you know why I chose this profession?” I said, “to help people”. He said “because my father told me that it is a good profession to have in the labor camp”. At that moment I decided that I grew really curious about how the totalitarian regime continues impacting our choices, our social conditions, our meanings, our life scripts, and many, many other things in our life without us really knowing about that, because we did not live through this regime.

Then once I started thinking about that, it was several years ago, I became curious how this experience is actually being transmitted. So there are different narratives, but there have been studies that trauma narratives are not accurate, they are biased. They might have therapeutic value, but in terms of the historical references they are not always accurate. Art, a very powerful way to communicate your experiences, but obviously it is very subjective. It is very difficult to establish and to study the psychological contents. It is possible, but it is difficult.

I came to think that there is another way to study this, and those are survival messages. People who survived very difficult trauma such as holocaust, or lived in Stalin's time regimes, they don't always talk about that. So then how do we know what happened? I thought that it would be possible that maybe even if the parents or grandparents never tell us about the experience, they still somehow tell us how to survive.

For instance, in Russia at the time there were circulated instructions for how to survive in the jail, and we all know about that. Another example of that could be a woman who was raped and then she tells her daughter to stay away from men. She may not tell about the rape, but the survival message is still there. To keep your daughter safe, and to increase your chances to survive. In this way, by studying survival messages we would be able to kind of figure out what actually was going on and what kind of trauma lays behind that.

There are also superstitions, proverbs, and wisdom of elders that I described in my paper, *The Psychodrama of the Survivorship*. So you can access that, it is open access in the journal, or in the research gate. If not I can forward it to you if you are interested. My hypothesis was that wisdom of elders and the superstitions and proverbs, partially also are survival messages that are removed from the initial source of trauma.

So we don't know what happened, but we still follow these instructions. For example, I don't know what happened to the first person who broke the mirror and then did not have seven years of good luck. But I am also not going to challenge that, I am not going to try it. I don't want to have seven years of bad luck. That is a fascinating area, but it goes a bit outside of the scope of what we are talking about today.

Let's focus on the survival messages. Survival messages are condensed prescriptions that are passed down generations in the family, both consciously and unconsciously. They are generated by the family desire to protect progenies from a similar pain and fate and to increase their chances to survive. There are theoretical sources that I based my study on, and later I will tell you about this project. Bowen family system therapy, obviously because with his kind of assumptions that we cannot really see separately individual, family, and society. Everything is interconnected. He also has a very interesting concept of differentiation. His understanding is that when there is a trauma

too long or too severe, the family other group will lose a differentiation and stop being able to differentiate their own cognition from the group thinking. That is actually what Dr. Staub was talking about. They kind of start believing that what government is telling is their own cognition, their own understanding.

The second is Ann Ancelin Schutzenberger. She is a psychodrama psychoanalytic therapist. My background is in psychodrama. She was doing genograms and she was trying to identify family patterns. For instance, when in the family someone died at the age of thirty-three, so then she might see that other family members are also preparing to die at that age. She was helping them to identify these messages. Of course there is Yael Danieli, who studied trans-generational trauma transmission via parental style. I'm sure you know about her, we don't need to talk about that.

I launched an international project with a Russian colleague of mine. Her name is Anna Varga. She is a family systems therapist. The initial pilot project was that we asked students, psychology students, a sample of convenience, about their survival experience of their family. How this information is kind of communicated. Then we did the content analysis and identified repeating categories that were: prescriptions about skills and abilities; attitudes generally about self-sufficiency, hope; prescriptions about how to approach difficulties: accept, avoid, face, prepare for the worst; resources, we need to stockpile resources; sources of strength, faith, hope positive outlook, never give up, work hard, don't think about the future just keep going; supports; messages linked to social trauma; interpersonal relationships.

There was one that we did not expect: messages about food. That was huge. May I ask you to raise your hands those of you who feel uncomfortable throwing away food? Now just look around. That sounds like a very universal message. For those who work in the integrated care and work trying to tackle obesity that might be one of the kind of ways to try to approach it.

After that the idea was when we were comparing Russian and American students, the idea was that each family had their own traumatic experience and hardship. It's not cultural. You will be surprised how many Americans have in their family life conversations recollections about the Great Depression and McCarthy times. In Irish families it is still the potato famine. I did not expect that those who grew up here kind of have no problems. However, the hypothesis was for those who grew up in the countries with totalitarian regimes, they might have their special set of messages that is different, in addition to messages reflecting general hardship.

Those are messages that were generic. They were common. They were specific to the family history but not specific to the totalitarian regimes. For instance, hope for the best but prepare for the worst. That was funny, one of my colleagues, she's from Saudi Arabia, and she said 'in my culture there is a message that we need to trust Allah, but to tie out

camel'. I said, this sounds very familiar. This message seems to be cross-cultural. Another one very common across cultures is fake it 'til you make it, be nice to others because you never know when you will need their help, and as I had mentioned about food waste.

Here we have Sergey Brin, who is co-founder of Google and who owns about \$47 billion. In his interview he said that he has great difficulties leaving food on the plate, and throwing away food. So it has nothing to do with how much income people have.

Again there were sacral foods, I'm not going to go in here into the archetypes. I wrote that in my paper, but it is a very cultural concept. They are a lot of fairytales, and basically, if you disrespect food you should go to hell, in many cultures.

However, there was another group of messages. The messages that I found not only in Russians, but I found in many other of my students because this project continues, we are collecting much more data. Actually we are hoping that we will be able to kind of enrich our multi-cultural project with bringing in a researcher from China, who also that it sounds very familiar. These messages again are universal but they seem to be universal for cultures with a history of totalitarian regimes. Those messages are: do not trust, except for family. In totalitarian regimes people don't trust each other. Even don't trust family but we have idea of the "kitchen talk". So we can talk politics only in the kitchen with close friends. Parents should not talk politics to their children. I actually found it quite helpful, this message. These days, it helps to preserve families. Do not hope, don't make big plans, because you can get disappointed and there are also proverbs in many cultures that God laughs when you make plans. There are messages that we should not show that we are afraid, because it will reveal our weaknesses and others will take advantage of that. We should not ask for help, because we will never know what we will be asked to do or to return back. That also goes to the archetypal story about when the person asked the devil to do something, that he has to return something back which is usually much more valuable. Another one is we should keep a low profile and do not show off, because in the totalitarian regime those people who show off are the first to go.

Like Dr. Staub mentioned, people who are kind of brainy people with eyeglasses, we have the same in Russia as well. This one actually is not helpful, especially during the job interviews. So we can kind of pick and choose messages that, some could be more helpful than others. That's how the results came together.

It sounds like in their responses, respondents talked about general pro-social orientation when there is no recent history of totalitarian regime. Trusting people, asking for help, helping others, importance of work ethic. Actually here in the United States it seems to be very specific. Good communication skills, being law-abiding citizen, helping the police. That is what we got from the students here in the United States. In addition, in Russia and in other responses from students coming from the countries with recent

history, those were to trust no one, rely only on yourself and the family. So, be self-sufficient. Don't ask for help. Citizens are not responsible for the society, and are unable to change anything anyway. Despise the government and officials, and take advantage when you can. That comes very close to what Dr. Staub was talking about when he talked about the active bystanders. So it is actually everything but.

The other side of these messages is that they were developed to help the progenies. In fact, they create vulnerabilities. That's what was my conclusion that I wrote about in my paper. For example the same woman who was raped and tells her daughter to stay away from men, what happens is as this daughter grows up she either decides not to have anything to do with men and remains single, or she falls in love and since she doesn't know any kind of social cues that would identify or signal risks, so then she might end up at higher risk for meeting the fate of her mother.

The vulnerabilities in these survival messages are very clearly seen in this kind of break down of the results. Because this scenario, when people don't trust governments, when they don't want to work with them, they don't believe that they can change anything, they don't have any inspirations, in this place the negative processes are quite likely, because people are avoiding to take social position. Why do they do that? Because all these messages are based on fears.

We can see signs of repeating patterns now in Russia. This is one of the posters that were published after the Olympics when Russians won over Germany. So here Stalin asks, 'how are you doing successors?' and he is praising that 'you are good boys, you won'. So more and more images popping up. At that time I became completely hopeless. Because I saw this kind of cycle of the trauma repeating. I could not get out of my head saying that people who do not know the history they are doomed to repeat it, and those people who do know the history they are doomed to hopelessly watch how others repeat it. That's how I felt for a long time after. I know that it is sad, kind of saying, but that is how I felt up until very recently. It was before I heard Dr. Staub's inspirational lecture, but it goes along the same lines. I recently got some kind of influx of hope after I saw the children's crusades that are happening concurrently, both here and Russia. The slogan of these children is 'we are not going to allow fear to guide our social decisions, and speak up our mind'. That's kind of my hope and my inspiration, and that's something that I keep looking forward to.

Thank you.

David Satin:

I want to thank Dr. Cherepanov, who really extends Professor Staub's argument. Professor Staub talks about the society being able to influence the leader, and Dr. Cherepanov talks about the society being crippled from their experience in totalitarian regimes and being unable to change. Yet she looks to a new society in a sense, children

who will be unaffected by the experience and by the ideology. That's a little hard for me to understand, because children are very quickly socialized into the society in which they are born. So that leaves a real task, a real important puzzle. How is a new approach, a new ideology, a new world, created in the face of such influential and such oppressive acts? It does happen. After all, some of the totalitarian regimes were major changes in ideologies and in programs, although one might say there were germs of them in the past. But they made the change. How does one make the change back? How does one create a society that has a more positive, a more loving, more caring, more flexible, more accepting outlook? I would like to give you the answer, but I don't have it. I wonder if we could wrack our brains about that and see what's the message here? What's the message about finding good leaders supported by good society, to make a good society?

Discussion

Participant:

One of the things that comes to my mind, is that I know right now there is a lot of training going on about bullying, and the bystander dynamic is addressed in the workshops and trainings that kids get in school. So I think that's a small piece. If you look at some of the school shootings, it comes from people feeling bullied and the lack of control in their life. So I think it creates more of a sense of empathy in the kids who are learning these skills and concepts. It's a small thing, but it could be a big thing.

Participant:

I've noticed a change in the Catholic Church in recent years, after the exposure of the priests abusing children. There's been a transformation from accepting the authority of the church in a knee jerk reaction to expressing disapproval of the concealment of abuses in the church, that's one big factor. I think in Ireland recently with the retraction of the law prohibiting abortion... I participated in a group at Boston College with parents of gays were very expressive of their disapproving of...rights to receive certain sacraments... one of the leading spokesmen...but they're also the one's who wear glasses.

Participant:

I think that I have two things to say. One is I was heartened recently, two comments ago, to hear that in public schools ethics or civics is going to be taught again in Boston Public Schools. Or at least it is being proposed to be taught again, as a requirement and projects around it. I think that is very hopeful. I think that from the beginning it is public education that was a building block of democracy and I think we've kind of lost the pieces that have been put into public education. I was hopeful when I was heard of civics being reintroduced into curriculum. The other thing that concerns me is the lack of civic

organizations, and I think the decrease in people's involvement in their communities and in local organizations is a big problem and goes a long way towards people feeling disenfranchised and not connected. I'm not sure what the solution to that is. I mean a view that I hold to some extent is that when there are two parents, full-time working families, it's very hard to have civic engagement. There just isn't the space, there isn't the time, there isn't the bandwidth for people to engage in that way. I don't know what the solution is, but I see it as a very big problem that if we found a solution to reinvigorate civic involvement, I think that could be a hopeful possibility.

Participant:

I want to call attention to a dilemma that I don't have a real answer to. I think there is an element that so far has been missing from this discussion. There is a real tension post abuses, and I think our society is going to face it assuming we transform back from where we seem to be headed, between reconciliation and accountability. For example, the reaching out to Lee and the Whites in the South, how Lincoln would have done it, we know that the end result was a hundred years of terror for the Black citizens of the South. We now have a CIA director who is actively involved in the torture program because there was no accountability for people. We look forwards not backwards, as President Obama said. We have rehabilitation for the Iraq war, because there was no accountability for that. There are now revered commentators on T.V., I think there's a real tension, and I want to thread the needle between reconciliation and trying to heal the wounds. Yet saying things were wrong, and people did wrong things and they need to be accountable for that. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, with some success, they avoided the worst of the break up of society. Again, at great cost to the Black majority who had an escalating murder rate and social pathology of much worse than was true under apartheid. It didn't transform that aspect of society. I don't know the thoughts on this, but it seems to be that's something we really have to deal with is the accountability as a major part of the picture.

Ervin Staub:

You are absolutely right, and I don't think reconciliation means lack of justice. It doesn't mean lack of accountability. I mean, you go to an extreme situation like Rwanda where people have perpetrated genocide, reconciliation doesn't mean forgetting, forgiving, we are just going to live happily ever after. In order for reconciliation to truly happen, which means an increasing acceptance of the other, there has to be consequences to harmful and especially terrible actions. One of the interesting things that seems to be happening in the United States I think is that people do all kinds of things and then they just go on in public life. There is not accountability in many ways,

and that is really problematic, and that affects everybody in society. People look around and see these people are doing these things and look—they are happily in leadership positions. They are in positions of power and importance. Then people say, ‘why should I behave in a good way?’

It is really important to identify places where change can happen. So for example, schools and anti-bullying. I have developed a training program for schools about active bystanders, for students being active bystanders. But before that I studied in a whole school system the extent to which there is harmful behavior by students towards each other, and positive behavior. One of the interesting things that we found is what anti-bullying programs mainly address. What is important is we also evaluated how unhappy kids were in school. Do you know who were the most unhappy? They were the kinds who received neither positive nor negative behavior directed to them. Kids who are not part of the social system. They were the least happy, the most unhappy kids in school. The kids who had negative behavior directed at them were not as unhappy as these kids because there was a human connection, even though it was negative. It was not only negative, what we think of as bullying is that everyone behaves negatively to them.

The point that I am making is that we have to attend to everybody, because who knows what happens to those kids who are socially isolated in that way over time. When some people engage in violent public behavior, the neighbors often say ‘he was such a nice person, he didn’t bother anybody’. Maybe there is absolutely no connection, but maybe there is. When you are excluded and you are not connected your needs are not fulfilled. The need for connection, the need for a positive identity. There is nobody to reinforce you, because nobody interacts with you. The need for effectiveness, you feel ineffective if you cannot make a human connection. So these important needs are not fulfilled. The question is how can people be empowered so that they can move in a constructive direction.

Participant:

Part of the problem as I see it is, and I maybe following my own opinion, is that to be empowered we have to be unified. And to be unified we need to be hearing the same information. What’s happened, particularly because of the Internet, which is a wonderful device in many ways, there are now multiple news sources. In this room we all may listen to one or two or three news sources. Outside of this room people may be listening to news sources we never turn on. In the 60s everybody was listening to ABC, NBC, and CBS. The epitome was Walter Cronkite. Today, there is a different opinion on a different channel all the time. It’s too diluted. There is no solid mass coming together. I think back in the 60s and 70s when we all went over to the Cambridge Commons and the Boston Commons and protested, it was deeply personal. I think that has changed. People are too

busy, and it's not personal anymore. People will go on with their lives. We were protesting because we were saying, 'I don't wanna get killed'. I think what we're seeing today is that gun control and gun violence has become deeply personal and represented by the Parkland school. Those kids are the first group of people to do something. They went into Rubio's office and demanded change, and they got it. Because there was a solid mass. Until we can come together with a critical mass we're going to be divided and just dog paddling and treading water.

Participant:

I just wanted to kind of bring it to the here and now because there's a Black Lives Matter movement, and a Me Too movement, and that's deeply personal for lots of people. Our own legacy here of slavery... I've never been to a memorial or a, you're talking about the genocide memorial that you went to. There are people living in this country, from this country, having trans-generational trauma that's playing out here and now. I think it's easier, certainly for me, to think about it how my distant European Jewish traumas affect me as opposed to my neighbor who is having it in real life every day.

Ervin Staub:

I just want to say, if we could create a healing society...Some people are traumatized, but many people suffer from life wounds. How many of us have not have what I call life wounds? You know, you are five years old and you love this other little kid and the little kid moves away to another part of the country and you never see him again. We don't think of that as a big thing, but it may be for that child. There are so many other things some people are not affected by, but others may be. A couple of people have done studies of violent criminals. These are people in jail, not because they engaged in violence simply for some gain, they engaged in violence for a variety of reasons. In both of these large studies they found that a large majority of these people were acting such as children. Clearly these people carried serious, severe trauma.

One of the conditions that I believe contributes to genocide is a society that has been the victim of violence or a victim of other great suffering. What happens is you come to feel vulnerable, see the world as dangerous. When there is some new threat you feel you need to protect yourself and you strike out. This is just one of the variety of things that we see. The same thing is likely to happen at the individual level. If you have been treated in such a way that you feel deeply vulnerable, then you see the world as more dangerous, you see other people as less trustworthy, and under various conditions you are likely to engage in behavior that you need to do in order to protect yourself. The behavior may be hostile, harmful to others, and so on.

So, can we create a society of healing where there are social processes that engage with other people's wounds?

Participant:

I wanted to respond to the person who spoke two times ago. It's true that our media is incredibly divisive and people who listen to Fox News have a completely different sense of reality than those of us who don't and listen to NBC, or whatever. But I just wanted to object to your sense about social activism. I was very active in the 60s, and I've been super active again now. Demonstrations are equally huge. The Women's March right after Trump was inaugurated was gigantic. The march about immigration in Copley Square was unbelievable. In fact people were out demonstrating every single week last year. So I think your sense is a little, not quite correct about what's going on. Just to add to that, one other thing. I was part of the anti-war movement in the 60s; I thought that we were the majority. It turned out we weren't. We were just a very vocal minority. So I'm not sure that protests happening now are smaller than what was happening in the 60s.

Participant:

I would just like to address some comments, picking up on the themes here and the concerns about how to create a healthier society, and take some of the things that are already on the table. The discussion, Dr. Cherepanov, of a traumatizing culture, a traumatizing society, as opposed to a non-traumatizing environment for children. Children, as we know, it takes an awfully long time to raise a child and it is very hard to change adults once they're formed. I think that we can look at the two major styles of parenting as addressed in your research, and also by George Lakoff in *The Political Mind*, that the authoritarian style of parenting which is pretty traumatic, I grew up in an authoritarian family and can testify to that and how hard it has been to change from that. Also the benefits of nurturing parenting. It seems to me that in our culture right now we don't have sufficient understanding of the differential effects of those two parenting styles, how much children need nurturing parents and how damaging authoritarian parenting can be. Even when it is done by very religious people, well intentioned people who think they are doing good. I grew up in a very Irish Catholic family of nine and watched myself and my other eight siblings be pretty devastated over the course of their life times, by the parenting that they got from very good, religious, well intentioned parents who were just children themselves really. They had never had nurturing parents. So I think what we as psychologists could really focus on now as a point of leverage is educate, create more programs to educate society at large about the cost and benefits of nurturing parenting and the costs and damages of authoritarian parenting. I think with

conservatives on the right, and authoritarians on the right, you have these people who think that being un-empathic is the right thing to do. It is a smaller group of people who were raised, were lucky enough to be raised in a nurturing kind of way, feel differently that we should be more understanding and we should dialogue and we should help each other. It comes down to, I think, this very basic choice that some people—it's how we raise children. Many people really don't know how to raise children in a nurturing way, or even that they should be raised in a nurturing way.

I remember my father, an authoritarian, religious man, was complaining at one point that they didn't teach in schools how to be a good parent. Maybe that's one place where we could focus. In high school, really getting some good courses with some good psychological foundations and research foundations as to what leads to what. What kind of parenting leads to what kind of results? People don't change that much. It takes them twenty years to learn how to deal with the world and then they continue in the mode. So focusing at that time and at that level would be very constructive towards creating a healthier society.

Participant:

I know I already spoke, but I have to respond to that. As the child of the free-to-be-you-and-me parents, and now a mother raising young children, that I am just going to put in a plug for neither over nurturing nor totally authoritarian because I think that lots of love and guidance, expectations and rules go very nicely together. I might have taken the words nurturing and authoritarian as too binary, but I can't see one without the other.

Participant:

Just very quickly, your point is well taken. Diane Baumrind identified the authoritative style of parenting. So it's structured and clear guidance, but also nurturing.

Participant:

I have worked many years in the private sector, and I am currently in the public sector. I have dealt with micro-managing leaders, but what I am wondering most about is the absent leader. The leader that is not here, not giving guidance, not giving feedback. I had to work all these years to really experience that. It's incredible. Every day that I go to work, the day goes by and they are more absent every day. So what to do with that—the absent leader?

David Satin:

I have a feeling that we haven't solved the problem. We are getting overwhelmed with the problem. One issue struck me, I'm not sure that we touched on it, is

responsibility. Who is responsible for doing these things? I think that we've shown that you can't count leaders to do it, and you can't count on society as a whole to do it. I think that the individual has to take some responsibility for thinking clearly, having the courage to act clearly, and then individuals and multiple individuals giving support, voice, and encouragement to others to take the responsibility to 'heal the world' as it is said in the scriptures. To make things better when you see that they are not. How you do that, I'm not sure how much is child rearing, how much is political empowerment, how much is spiritual, or how much is finding the courage and finding the self confidence to speak up and show what you would like to see in your society.

Anyway, thank you all very much, speakers and participants, for having addressed a very important, very big, and very difficult subject. I hope we will think more about it I hope to see you again next year at the 42nd Lindemann Memorial Lecture.